

Woman Suffrage

IN
CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

DEBATES

UPON THE

Report of the Suffrage Committee

IN REGARD TO

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN
CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

DEBATES

UPON THE

Report of the Suffrage Committee

IN REGARD TO

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

DEBATES

UPON THE

Report of the Suffrage Committee

ON

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Constitutional Convention of the State of New York met in the Assembly Chamber in the Capitol at Albany, August 8, 1894, at eight P. M.

President Choate called the Convention to order.

The President—The question before the Convention to-night is the special order, whether the Convention will agree to the adverse report of the Committee on Suffrage on the amendment introduced by Mr. Tucker, introductory No. 194, the report being adverse to the amendment.

Mr. Lincoln — Mr. President, I understand that the amendment was amended to-day by the Suffrage Committee. I suggest that the amendment as amended be read.

The President — The Secretary will read the amendment as it was returned to-day by the Suffrage Committee, amended.

The Secretary read the proposed amendment as follows :

Proposed constitutional amendment to amend article two of the Constitution, so as to separately submit to the electors of this State the question of woman suffrage.

The Delegates of the People of the State of New York, in Convention assembled, do propose as follows :

Section one of article two of the Constitution is hereby amended by adding the following words at the end thereof:

But at the general election next succeeding the general election at which this Constitution shall be submitted to the electors of this State for adoption or rejection, the question, "Shall the word 'male' be stricken from article second, section one of the Constitution, and cease to be a part thereof?" shall be separately submitted to, and be decided by, the said electors; and in case a majority of the electors, voting at such election on that question, shall decide in favor of such striking out, then, and not otherwise, the said word shall be stricken from this section, and cease to be a part thereof; and in that event every female citizen shall thereafter be entitled to vote, at all elections held in this State, upon the same qualifications and conditions as are in this section prescribed as to male citizens. It shall be the duty of the Governor, by his proclamation, to make known the result of such election, as to the question so separately submitted, immediately upon the completion of the canvass by the State canvassers.

Mr. Lauterbach — Mr. President, the task of arguing that the adverse report of the committee be not sustained, and of securing for the subject of woman suffrage full consideration by the Convention, has been intrusted to me, owing to the physical inability of Mr. Tucker to assume that duty. If the policy that actuated the Legislatures of 1892 and 1893 had been carried out to its legitimate conclusion, I would be addressing a body composed not only of male delegates, but also of women delegates to this Convention. So far has the ability of women adequately to fill public place and decide important questions been conceded, that, without solicitation on their part, the Legislature of 1892, recognizing the changed condition of affairs that had supervened since 1867, put upon the statute book a provision that the delegates of the Constitutional Convention of 1894 might be both men and women; when that act was carefully revised in 1893 it remained, in that respect, unaltered, and by section 7 of the statute of that year, under which we are here assembled, the right of the people of the Empire State to send women to the floor of this Convention was re-enacted; it is to a Convention called together under the influence of such conditions, and in an age that betokens so liberal a spirit, that I am to address myself, not so much upon the main question involved as to ask at this time simply your non-assent to the report of the Suffrage Committee, so that the important question which it involves may be properly and fully discussed in the Convention itself. Why the opportunity thus presented was not availed of, so as to take form in the selection of some women delegates to the Convention, I know not. But if it had been,

and if some one of the women who addressed the Suffrage Committee upon the subject of the rights of womanhood could, in my stead, have addressed you in the brief, clear, terse, cogent and unanswerable manner that has concededly characterized all their public utterances in this connection, the cause which they espouse would have benefited thereby. I shall make but a poor substitute for any one of those noble women who addressed you through your committee upon the justice of granting the prayer of the petitions, and who so eloquently expounded every phase of the subject, supported so conclusively every argument in its favor and annihilated so thoroughly whatever had been suggested in opposition to their claims. When the public hearings had been completed and their addresses had been fully considered, in opposition to the revamped and exploded doctrines of Goldwin Smith, and of those who believed that we were still living in an age when force only controlled, and not in an age of intellect, it was admitted on all sides that if the force of argument was to be considered, if sound reasoning were to govern, if the modesty, the candor, the ability, the straightforwardness of the women were contrasted with the bold, unsupported assertions of the men, the emissaries of those who are opposed to the prayer of the petition, advocates who had to say in this matter nothing except the upholding of force, and who seemed to recognize the existence only of a few unfortunate outcasts, in whose portrayal they delighted, while ignoring the great mass of noble womanhood, the decision would have been favorable to the prayers of the women. If this Convention could have determined the matter after the nineteen representatives gathered upon that platform and who, in speeches of only five minutes each, had fashioned a diadem of unexampled gems of eloquence, of pathos, of cogent argument and sound reasoning, following, as they did, the sound, scientific discussion of the subject by Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, and its presentation in its historical aspects by that noble champion of every noble cause, that self-sacrificing woman whose life has been devoted to everything that has savored of patriotism, love of country, true Americanism, Susan B. Anthony, it would have resolved that the word "male" should then and there be stricken from the Constitution. These women came to us, not from the highest walks of life only, but representing every phase of womanly activity. The wife of the farmer and of the artisan; the college graduate; the working woman; one engaged in every industry and every vocation, and asked, for what reason do you deprive us of the ballot, of this, the most highly prized emblem of citizenship, the

proudest of the possessions of American citizens? And we could make no answer. They said to us: Surely you would rather be deprived of your fortunes, rather find your lives cast in less pleasant places than they are, sooner lay down much of all that you have acquired sooner than be deprived of your right to exercise the elective franchise, the symbol of power, the weapon of defense, the instrument of self-protection. We are, they said, members of this community; we are citizens of this State, entitled in theory, as we should be in practice, to all the privileges, as we are, in fact, made subject to all the burdens that citizenship implies. Some of us are taxpayers. All of us are loyal to our flag and our country. Why this demarcation against us? Why this differentiation which deprives us of that one right which is synonymous with citizenship itself? Where have we erred? What sin have we committed? What fault has been perpetrated? Have we the necessary intelligence to cast our vote? Do you doubt it? Look throughout all womanhood, grade for grade, class for class, from the top to the bottom. Does not every woman in every rank of life stand, at least, the equal in general capacity and intelligence of her male associate in the same rank of life? Why, then, this deprivation of what we should hold so dear, could we obtain it? And there was, as there could be, no answer.

In determining this question submitted to your consideration I ask two things; one that you pay heed to the record which these women themselves have made here, their own testimony, rather than to my inadequate presentation of the case, or that of any champion of their cause outside of their own ranks. Next, I ask for the exercise of your unpledged, unbiased, individual judgment. I ask you to remember your oaths, honestly and fairly to determine this as every other question, and if the echo of the solicitation of party leaders still rings in your ears urging you to adjudicate adversely to the petitioners on the ground of party policy, or on the score of cowardly expediency, or because the success of unworthy party schemes or selfish aims would be put in jeopardy, I beg of you to free yourselves from these influences, so that your minds shall at least be as blank paper, receptive of the merits of the arguments that have been advanced and that may be advanced in favor of the simple proposition which you are asked to determine. I entreat every delegate, whatever may have been his pledges, actual or implied, whatever may be his idea of party necessities or party exigencies, to recall that it is his duty upon this matter, at least, to act without bias, called upon as he is, as an American citizen and as a man, to

do justice to one-half of the citizens of this State, his fellow-beings and fellow-citizens, rather than to be guided solely by his own notions of party loyalty, party fealty or party policy. To this extent I know that I shall succeed, and whether it shall have been enunciated as Democratic party policy or Republican party policy to vote this measure down, that you will nevertheless do justice to the demands of these supplicants, in spite of all the dictates of those who regulate party machinery, or who may assume to regulate the affairs and concerns of this Convention. That if you are honestly convinced that the rights of your mothers, your wives, your daughters, your sisters, are being unjustly ignored, if it be shown that their interests and the interests of other women, less fortunately situated than they, are unjustly and injuriously affected, you will act in their behalf and in behalf of womankind at large, irrespective of any party proclivity or party expediency, and that you will resent the application of the party lash.

No sooner was it determined that this Convention was about to be convened, than the demand rang out throughout the State for impartial suffrage. Hundreds of thousands of men and women declared their views in respect of this great question. Every city, every town, every hamlet, every nook and corner became busied with the discussion of the matter. Petitions for granting this inestimable right were rapidly subscribed and circulated, not in the dark hours of the night, and kept back in order to be precipitated upon this Convention, but openly, so that the adversaries of the proposition, if any there were, should be fully advised thereof. Rapidly and willingly the adults of the State subscribed them. None but those qualified to vote under existing law, or those who would be qualified to vote if existing law and existing justice were synonymous, were called upon to approve them. You are petitioned to submit this question to the determination of the people. You are implored that while you have the power to prevent this submission, you will be generous, at least, to the extent of the non-exercise of that power. Six hundred thousand petitioners pray that your action shall be such that the million and a half male electors of the State of New York shall be permitted to express their views upon this all-important subject at the ballot box. The orange-ribboned packages came from every quarter, day by day, not only from districts like the Thirty-second, whose population was almost unanimous in favor of this measure, not limited in their origin to any quarter or any section of the State, but pouring in from every point of the com-

pass to an extent never equalled, and probably never to be surpassed. Anti-suffrage meetings were called and anti-suffrage petitions were circulated. It is difficult to conceive that any women should have been found willing to subscribe such petitions. But some do exist. They are, happily, few. They are of the elegant dilettanti, of whom it was said, when their petition was presented, "they are more lovely, more beautiful, more elegant and exquisite than the women represented by the other petitions." These lovely, high-toned exquisites secured the co-operation of some 5,000 or 6,000 men, some 15,000 in all, and that only after the expenditure of much money, as the result of the arguments of retained attorneys, after every ingenious device that aristocracy could invent had been exerted. The names were of those chiefly who could not bear the thought of political affiliation with the laboring woman or with the woman engaged in domestic service. Shall we, they urged, contaminate our skirts by going to the same poll with the cook, the laundress, the chambermaid, the dressmaker? Their husbands make no such protest against the ballot; they, having exercised it, have yielded to its leveling influences, so essential in a republican government. The fellowship which it inspires, the obliteration of class distinctions which it causes, create a true democracy. When the ballot is given to the women, even those of limited liberality will be vastly benefited thereby. The exercise of the elective franchise will level, equalize, marshal and arrange the whole social status, lowering those, perhaps, who stand too high in their own conceit, but generally elevating the community to an equal social plane, and there would then be no further protest by the aristocratic dame against meeting women who earn their daily bread and who now need only the ballot to enable them to earn it under the same advantageous circumstances as does the laboring man of the State of New York, who, by reason of its possession, stands politically the peer of all men.

The whole community became as much interested in the prayer of the pro-suffrage petition as did the 175 members of this Convention. You will remember that salient fact, and bear in mind that you are asked to submit to the people, just as familiar as you yourselves are, the determination of this subject. There is no man or woman in the community that is not thoroughly acquainted with every element that pertains to this question of woman suffrage, as well as is the President of this Convention, and upon this subject the judgment of the men here gathered is of no more importance than that of any other equal number of individuals in the community. Its

elucidation needs no expert knowledge, as do questions involving the system of judicature or apportionment, or the relations of the State to charitable institutions, or any of the many vexed questions which we must determine after grave consideration, and with a fair assumption that we have superior and especial knowledge upon the subject involved; in regard to these the people have a right to expect that we must first render our fiat before submission to popular vote.

But this is a simple problem, the solution of which does not require your intervention. It may be asked, why leave this directly to the vote of the people, without the expression of our assent or dissent, and not pursue the same course in respect to every other subject that is to be determined? Because this one proposition, supported by 600,000 men and women, mooted and discussed for the last thirty years in every possible phase by the greatest orators and statesmen, is as well understood in every aspect, is as well understood by the humblest member of the commonwealth as it is by yourself. Whatever may be your personal opinions, they are entitled to no more weight in the determination of this matter than those of any other elector, and this is our justification in asking you to permit this matter to go to the people. There is no strain to the conscience or violation of duty in permitting your personal predilections to be thus subordinated. We are rapidly advancing in the methods to be sought in learning the wishes of the people. We do not hesitate to avail ourselves of the referendum, which, up to the present day, has been an unused, if not an unknown factor in the determination of public questions. But when the project of an underground railway came up for consideration at the last Legislature, and it was about to consider whether the municipality should be permitted of itself to engage in, or to extend its credit or give its funds for the support of an enterprise of that character, the press and the people of the city of New York asked to be permitted to determine this matter for themselves. The demand was complied with, and the people of that city will, simultaneously with their determination of the merits of the Constitution to be submitted by you for their approval, vote directly upon the question involved, ignoring Assemblies and Senates, ignoring all intermediate legislative bodies, and arriving at a determination upon a subject which they understand as well, if not better, than do their representatives. Cannot this vexed question be similarly submitted with equal justice and propriety to the people of the State of New York?

This is all that you are asked to do. You are entreated to take this question of woman suffrage out of your own jurisdiction, not to exercise the power you possess to destroy, not to say to these women, as, unhappily, you are enabled to do: "You are hence dismissed, and shall remain unheard until at some future day two successive Legislatures can be found to regard your prayers with approbation before the people shall be permitted to vote thereon." I have some confidence that you would rather follow the suggestions of Mr. Tucker and leave this question to be voted upon directly by the people now. Is there any one who will really feel that he will violate his oath of office in so doing? If the moss-grown prejudices existing in your own mind shall compel you, next November, to vote against the main proposition itself, so be it. But will you not have acted fairly, if you permit other people equally as well qualified to vote, also to express their individual convictions. Vote as you severally please in November. I have great confidence, in spite of your prejudices, how that vote will be cast in almost every instance. I feel that no member of this Convention will, on the morning of election, leave his family circle, where he may have heard the political questions of the day discussed from every standpoint by its female members with as much intelligence, thoroughness and efficiency as he himself can master, and yet fail to vote for impartial suffrage. But that is not the question for you now to determine. If the prejudice shall still exist without your knowing why it exists (because no man can know why), and you shall still insist upon maintaining your long existing opposition, it is the more your duty to accord the people of the State of New York the privilege of the referendum.

You say that a majority of men are against the main proposition. Afford them the opportunity of so proclaiming. I believe that the majority of the voting men of the State of New York are in its favor. Shall you prevent the fair expression of their feelings? Shall you, because you have the technical power so to do, vote that ninety men here shall render impossible the expression of opinion upon this popular subject of 600,000 or 700,000 voters eager to give voice to their ideas in respect thereof at the polls next November?

The petitions immediately struck a responsive chord in the minds of the delegates. The first installment had scarcely been laid upon the secretary's desk, when numberless amendments were proposed, seeking in some manner to remedy the existing injustice. Unhappily unison of action, which would greatly have facilitated the accomplishment of the desired result, was lacking. And so, instead of

standing by the prayer of the petitioners, every possible theory that had a trend in the direction of fairness, while not fully according it, was presented. So there were presented propositions to permit voting at municipal elections, at school elections, amendments that the subject should be referred to the women for adjudication, some that the right should be tentative, and only if the exercise of the privilege proved successful that then the right could be fully accorded. All these, with other suggestions, were referred to the suffrage committee. The bold, manly thing to have done was to have fought out the good fight on the direct proposition to strike out the word "male" from section 1 of article 2 of the Constitution, and to have fairly and squarely sent the proposition to the people and have it flatly, unequivocally and finally adjudicated by them. But this was not a course consonant with that which the majority of the committee deemed expedient. That body was so organized as to accord the most patient hearing to the women, the most kind and courteous treatment. It was a body never lacking the most polished courtesy toward them, permitting them to be fully heard and apparently susceptible to such legitimate impressions as they might create; but intrusted with the mission finally to dispose of them and their grievances, as Legislatures have done again and again; to inspire them with hope and yet to make its realization Dead Sea fruit. It was a re-enactment of the spectacle that you have again and again seen in the Legislature. For years it has been the habit of the representatives of the people in this State to toy and trifle with this important subject; for the Assembly in one year to vote favorably upon the proposition and for the Senate to vote adversely; then for the Senate to regard it favorably and the House to dismiss it. It has been no unusual spectacle to see the women of the State buoyed up by false hope, by the apparent encouragement of the party in power, and you have seen that party ingeniously defeat the project by according it a few votes less than were necessary to pass it. On no subject have Legislatures been so unfair, so treacherous. The power to deny justice which men have possessed in this respect has not even been fairly exercised, but its employment has been accompanied by a course of deceit which should have caused those engaged in the shameful farce to blush at the outrage which was being perpetrated. There are those in this chamber who can testify to the truth of what I say. There are those whose vote was not infrequently given on those occasions to "jolly the women along," and so we have adopted the precedent, and have "jollied the women along;" when they came

we received them politely, the committee listened to them most patiently and attentively. No reasonable request was made that was not promptly complied with, but if there is any man in this Convention who, within forty-eight hours of the organization of the committee, did not know the vote would be thirteen against the proposition and four for it, he knows less of the inner history of this Convention than he was entitled to know. Upon the committee devolved the delicate duty of defeating the claims of the women, and yet of not displeasing them.

Neither the Republican nor the Democratic party could afford to incur their enmity. We all recognize their power. The record of their tremendous influence in every political emergency is known to us. It was to their energy and self-sacrifice that, in a large measure, was due the accomplishment of the civil war and the obliteration of slavery. Through them, in a great measure, it became possible to enact the thirteenth federal amendment to the Constitution, and they were induced to indulge in the hope that the gratitude of the Republican party would manifest itself in their favor when the fourteenth amendment was adopted; they were disappointed, but hoped that when the fifteenth amendment came to be enacted, as it inevitably would, that at last their rights would be secured. The addition of the word sex to the amendment, when proposed, would have brought disenfranchisement and freedom to the women of America as it did to the negro, but expediency led the great Republican party to treacherously abandon those who had been their most faithful coadjutors, and limited the bestowal of enfranchisement to the negro, while denying it to the white women of the United States. Openly to repeat the injury would be inadvisable. They are giving constant manifestations of their great power. In Brooklyn, at the last election, they had assisted in destroying the wrong and sustaining the right, and the political salvation of that city was due to them in no small degree. Deny them every right, but to placate them, accompanied by the direction not to affront, but to placate them. The policy has been faithfully and skillfully carried out, and nothing is left to the advocates of impartial suffrage except the discussion of this matter in this form, a most unhappy one, in a parliamentary sense, which accords to us only the poor privilege of striving to overturn a majority report, which attempt, if successful, will simply carry us to the committee of the whole, and thence to the Convention itself, where the fight must be waged all over again, and yet it will be fought all over again, if you will only give us the opportunity of so doing. I think that

opportunity will be afforded, and that upon this August night the long enacted farce will cease, and that the members of this Convention will put their votes upon record in favor of giving these women a real, an honest and a fair chance (not the pretense of a chance) of going to the people for an expression of popular opinion.

While it will not be in order to enter to-night in this phase of the subject upon a discussion of all the aspects of impartial suffrage, while it would be idle and irrelevant at this moment to discuss the main question in all its phases, to debate the scientific aspects of the question, to determine whether the exercise of the elective franchise is not a natural and inherent right that inures to women as to men, yet I concede that some reference to the merits of the case must be made so as to show that the prayer of the petition is founded upon an admissible claim, and not upon a mere vagary, for it is a conceivable possibility, though not a probability, that there might be some project, which, even though supported by six or seven hundred thousand people, would nevertheless be fallacious, untenable and unworthy of your earnest consideration, and undesirable in spite of the magnitude of the petition in its favor, to be sent before the people for disposition.

It is maintained by many, and has been long maintained, that the right to the elective franchise is natural and inherent, belonging of right to women as to men, and that to prevent them from exercising it, is repugnant to such natural right. I leave to more philosophical minds the discussion of that theory. To me it is immaterial whether you label the voting power as a natural right or an artificial right, whether you designate it as a conventional regulation or a privilege. Whatever may be the category in which you place it, whatever the nomenclature that may be given it, seems to be immaterial. Take it in its least advantageous sense and denominate it a privilege merely. Is it not right now to extend that privilege? Do women stand in a situation to require it? Do they occupy a position so that if accorded to them they will be able to do justice to the great boon with which you shall have intrusted them? These are, it seems to me, the only questions to be considered. There was a time not long since when it would have been, at least, inexpedient, probably not for the good of the body politic, not for the benefit of the State, to have accorded the privilege. But that was before the nineteenth century had accomplished for women the great regeneration which it has accomplished, before, wittingly or unwittingly, you had yourselves assisted in removing every disqualification, and in causing them to be fully

equipped to perform the full rights of citizenship. If we do not mean in this fin de siècle to carry out what we have impliedly promised throughout the whole century, what our acts have indicated we would do, we shall perpetrate a wrong for which atonement will be impossible. If we had not meant to make women fully and absolutely our equals; if we had not intended to qualify them for the full rights of citizenship, then it was our duty to have kept them in the condition of benighted ignorance, in which they found themselves in the beginning of the century.

It was with great hesitation that their changed condition, which the liberality of the age demanded, was permitted to take place. Long beyond the beginning of the year 1800 the right of women to be educated, except in the most rudimentary matters, reading, writing, perhaps arithmetic, was denied her. Though the products of her industry were used to establish schools for learning, she had no place therein. It was only after the establishment at Troy of the Willard School for Women, only after its noble founder, successfully tried the experiment of educating women in the higher branches, that steps for higher education were generally taken. That example, emulated because it had been successful, caused school after school to be opened, Vassar and other great female colleges to be founded, the common schools, from the primary through the grammar department and the high schools, to be opened to them. Even public Normal high schools were finally created for them as a part of the common law system. Other circumstances helped to insure their liberal education. The work of the housewife at the farm was no longer as absorbitive as it had been. The representative of the Grange, who told her simple and highly interesting story upon that platform, has explained to you how the cheese-making and the butter-making, that had occupied all the time of mothers and daughters, became a matter of factory work; that spinning and kindred arts had passed away as domestic employments, and that the time which had been applied to such industries could now be, and was being, devoted to the acquisition of useful knowledge; that upon the farms of the State, as in the household of the artisan, the women, with more leisure to devote to the study of political problems, was better qualified to determine them than the farmer or the mechanic. What wonder, with this great leisure, the result has come about that in all the great institutions of learning the average attendance of women is greater than that of men, and their grade of excellence generally higher? What wonder

that, being so thoroughly educated, so fully equipped in every mental attribute, in every intellectual qualification, she will be able intelligently not only to cast her vote, but to take practical part in the administration of the government. The men of the State of New York, if they will follow the policy which they have pursued in respect of the education of women, will richly deserve the gratitude of the sex; but if, having brought them to the threshold of full political rights, after having created the natural desire to enjoy them and the ability to partake of them to advantage, they shall turn them from the door; if they shall raise the cup filled with the nectar of equal rights to their lips only to strike it from them, then have they indulged in a torturing cruelty like that to which Tantalus was subjected, for which there is no apology.

But not in this direction alone have you created a reasonable expectation, the realization of which you should not hesitate to permit. You have, in respect to her material rights and in regard to her legal status toward her property and her children, her belongings in every respect, justified her in the belief that you would aid, and not prevent, her from obtaining the crowning glory of it all. Time was when the husband and the wife were one. The husband was that one. What was the femme-coverte? A nonentity; her property, his property; her children, his children; her belongings in every respect, his belongings; her individuality absolutely absorbed in the individuality of the man. The degradation of women to the condition of a chattel had continued for centuries, originating in the Orient, where her individuality was so unimportant that it could not even be counted to make up the number of worshipers sufficient to unite in prayer to God; where a harem was her only home, her only sanctuary. It was the perpetuation of iniquity foreign to the true spirit of Anglo-Saxonism, but yet it was perpetuated, and continued to be until 1848. Has history ever shown a year like 1848? You older men know its record. How every civilized country in the world, as if by one simultaneous outburst, became involved in the work of regeneration and improvement. How all the nations of the earth became engaged in the destruction of the wrong and the substitution of the right. Glorious 1848! It will have its counterpart in what will be glorious 1894, if full justice be now accorded to womanhood. Then it was, for the first time, that man's inhumanity to woman became somewhat understood; that it became recognized, even if she could not yet exercise the full rights of citizenship, that she was entitled to the possession of her own property. The beginning then made in that

direction took several years before final accomplishment resulted, but, in that year, the people of the State of New York, always first to do justice after all, the generous people of the generous Empire State, enacted the law that disenthralled married women, and who, up to that time, had been abject slaves, and made them secure in their own property; justified in holding her own earnings. It took twelve years more before the same rights in respect to the guardianship of her children were accorded her, but finally, since 1870, the laws have been so regulated that women are entitled to the fruits of their own industry, and to a voice in the guardianship of their own children. Marriage no longer means absorption and elimination. It means companionship and fellowship. Equal rights civilly, with one exception, and if justice be done by this Convention now, equal rights civilly and in a political sense.

It may be useful to remember that when these changes were first mooted the same dire forebodings of resulting domestic discords in the event of separate ownership of property by husband and wife were in, as are now made in regard to the enfranchisement of married women. If, as it has turned out to be in the first instance, those prophecies of evil were unfounded, how much less reason exists for harboring any of these fancies in respect to the effect of woman suffrage.

So the women who now stand before you beseeching for a fair share of the civic privileges which you enjoy, you have rendered fitted for their acceptance. You have cut off her shackles; she has shown her gratitude for her freedom by rising to full equality with her former master. If you doubt it, her record in the schools she has attended will testify for her. The result of every enterprise in which she has been engaged will give you testimony of her ability. Now that you have made women better, nobler, freer, untrammelled, your companions, your equals, will you stop short of destroying the last remnant of your former injustice? Are you willing to still keep one mark of her slavery and degradation imprinted upon her shoulders? Shall the ignoble fleur de lis of disfranchisement still remain? Or are you willing to obliterate it and make her as she should be politically, what she is in all other respects, your helpmate, your co-worker, your associate, filling the sphere which she was intended to occupy, and which she will completely fill if you will have the confidence to permit her to exercise the full right of citizenship.

While to women, cared for by solicitous fathers, husbands, friends, the suffrage will be a priceless privilege, highly to be cherished, there

are other women to whom this right is not a mere privilege, but to whom it has become an absolute necessity. I speak of the half-million of women in the State of New York engaged in industrial enterprises, school teachers, factory girls, shop girls, bookkeepers, women engaged in every enterprise, from the highest to the lowest, who are pursuing their vocations under almost crushing difficulties, which would at once disappear if this franchise were accorded them. I pray you on behalf of this myriad of women for the bestowal of this weapon of offense and defense, that shall enable them to do justice to themselves and of securing it to be done, who are begging for the protection which only the right to vote can give them. What would be the condition of the workingmen of this State without the ballot? I ask their representatives who are gathered here. Would their existence be bearable? Before its great force was recognized by them, before co-operation and combination, supported by the power of the ballot, had become availed of, before the giant learned to know his strength, he was underpaid and oppressed; but when associating with others of his kind he announced, "I will use my vote in favor of those who do me justice, and against those who do me injustice," his lot was immediately improved. How rapid the change. From degradation and squalor, from the depths of misery, the workingman arose to be a man, self-respecting and world-respected; an American citizen, the peer of every other American citizen; rejoicing not in added wages alone, not in financial prosperity only, but in the consciousness of power and the right of its legitimate exercise. What is the condition of the unenfranchised woman, gentlemen? You see them everywhere about you. They are honest, industrious, faithful and loyal, but they have no vote. Its use, both as a weapon and as a shield, is denied them, and with what result? Longer hours of labor than man; underpaid, far below the payment given to man. The thoroughly trained female teacher, obliged to maintain herself respectably, so that she may be a credit to the school where she performs her duty, earns, in the city of New York, \$440 a year. The man who does the same work and does it no better, whose expenses are no greater, receives \$1,000 for the performance of the same service.

I am the director of a railroad company. Its ticket-takers (men) proved to be systematically engaged in robbing the corporation. They were discharged and women put in their places. The experiment has run along for three years, and although it was begun in fear and trembling, it has been most successful. Honesty has taken the

place of dishonesty, and loyalty to the corporation's interests has been substituted for disloyalty. The work entailed upon them has been accomplished by the women, and not a single dollar has been misappropriated by a female employe. She has proven to be prompt, accurate, punctual, to have all the merits that should attach to the place. And how is she requited? Her hours of service are longer; the men received fourteen dollars a week; she receives ten dollars. She has capacity, intelligence, but no power. There is better service, better ability, and yet I am confident that it is only the absence of the vote that enables oppression and discrimination to continue, which would disappear if that potent instrument were placed in her hands.

I do not speak for the aristocratic dame who may have signed the petition in favor of the proposition, or for those who may have signed against it. I do not speak for your wives and daughters, but I do most earnestly represent the injustice which the present system is perpetrating against women of toil. I advocate this cause for the women whose life is spent in honest labor, to whom you, in your partial generosity, have opened up every avenue of work and employment, and who evince their gratitude by doing their work properly and well. I entreat you to complete your generosity, which will then become justice, to these underpaid and suffering women, and that you change their condition of misery into one of happiness by permitting this matter to go to a popular vote; for the people, if the opportunity be afforded them, when they recognize this feature of the proposition, will certainly accord this boon to those who so much require it. I represent one of the working-women's organizations in New York. I believe that it is through that association that my intense interest in this matter was excited. Its officers have come here, year after year, to the Legislature. What they have asked has been very little. Earnestly and eloquently they have petitioned that the factory law might be extended so as to embrace the great dry goods establishments in New York, so that the laws made for the reasonable protection of the women employed might be enforced. Again and again they have come to the legislative committees and presented their case. There was no lack of courtesy in receiving them, as the Suffrage Committee has received the women who appeared before them, and there was no lack of politeness displayed in showing them the door, while their modest request was laughed away. I have seen delegates representing workingmen's conventions, who have demanded to have boycotting legalized; they represent hundreds of thousands of voters; and I have seen a subservient committee of the

Assembly report in favor of the application almost before those who had demanded it (not asked it as a favor), had left the committee room. Is this not conclusive evidence of the difference that the possession of the ballot affords?

No time is afforded me to discuss the abstruse questions which are said to underlie this matter, based upon the physical and pathological conditions of the sexes. Suffice it now to say that I believe them to be ridiculous, and that that feeling is general. They were once humorous. They are now so trite as to be no longer even entertaining. The average woman is well able to pursue her ordinary avocations and yet attend to the mere matter of depositing a ballot on election day, or even of attending to primary elections, just as well as the average man is able to perform his usual duties and yet not fail to make the slight sacrifice that the community demands of him. It is idle to say that women cannot afford the time; that their domestic duties absorb them too much. Were this true, it would be bitter and condemnatory testimony of the injustice of men, who would insist upon her assuming occupations so absorbing as to prevent them from studying the great political questions of the day, from familiarizing themselves with the affairs of State, from having sufficient leisure to devote a portion of their lives to their country's interests, as well as those of the men with whom they are in affiliation.

Objection is made that the use of the ballot will degrade her, and that your chivalric instincts will not permit her to suffer herself to be lowered from her high estate. Glorious chivalry! that exhibits itself in selfishly caring for those directly connected in interest with us and refusing to turn ear to the thousands whose needs should equally demand our attention. Degraded by the use of the ballot! What is the proudest emotion that every American citizen has felt during his life? Was it not when, on the November day succeeding his majority, he was able to take advantage of his citizenship and the proud heritage descended from his forefathers, to exercise his right to cast a vote with respect to the affairs of government, when on that November day he could add his flake to the great snow storm of ballots which dropped into the ballot-box? Were you to enact a law that would tend to deprive him of that ballot, make one intimation that, except for crime or imbecility, he would lose that right, a resistless storm of indignation would sweep through the land which would carry you from your seats. Degradation by the ballot! The mere assertion is an insult to the whole American republican system of government.

Is this degradation to women to come about because of their association with men in political life? Surely we are not willing to say premeditatedly of ourselves that our characteristics are such that the women of our families cannot go openly in the light of day to any poll, to any ballot-box as American citizens, and cast their vote without fear of insult? On the contrary, the rudeness that might be excusable in their absence would disappear as if it had never existed, when they shall join with us in these political functions. Their influence will be as ennobling there as it has been in social life. I resent the insult which this statement implies, in the name of every American gentleman. High or low, rich or poor, I resent the aspersion against the ballot, that it ever degrades. It elevates, ennobles, never lessens; it never injures; it never can destroy.

But we are warned that the ignorant vote will be extended; that it is not greater quantity, but better quality that we desire in the electors. It is said that a great mass of additional ignorance will at once precipitate itself into the general scheme and policy of our government to its disadvantage. According to the census of the State, the number of women who cannot read and write was about six per cent of the entire female population. The number of men, eight and a half per cent. There is before your Convention a proposition, submitted by Mr. Gilbert, that an educational qualification shall be requisite, after the year 1905, for every voter who has not become entitled to vote before that day. If you agree with that suggestion, then every voter, man and woman, will be equally affected. But if you shall hesitate to check the growth of the ignorant male vote, I am content that when this matter comes to the Convention for deliberation, that we shall attach an educational qualification to the right of women to vote. The discrimination would be of short duration, for women have proven so quick, apt and ready to discern what is to their advantage, their native intelligence is so great, and the desire to fit themselves for the exercise of the elective franchise would be so keen, that few years would pass before their disqualification would no longer exist.

The most dangerous adversary of the proposition is he who concedes that while the privilege should be extended, the time for its extension has not yet arrived. But if it has not yet come, when will it come? What further ordeal must woman pass through before the right to which she is entitled shall be accorded her? If the contention as to her present condition, which has been made, is correct, and to me it appears to be undeniable, the years have

passed in the State of New York since its women citizens were entitled to be thus honored. You are performing no great act of courage or self-sacrifice. It is only one of the merest and the plainest justice in hesitating no longer to break down the barrier. I can understand, that in the Convention of 1867, when Mr. Tucker, Mr. Veeder and Mr. Schumaker, who are here with us now, and who there voted with the sixteen other men in favor of woman suffrage, that in that remote period, in the comparative condition of ignorance that then existed, while women were still subordinate in social rank, when the great industrial occupations had not yet been opened to them, that it required courage of no mean order to vote as they then voted. But now that it has become a matter of duty and obligation, to refuse its performance, were indeed cowardice.

In a current periodical, Senator Hoar, in an able discussion of the subject, says, that he has never seen anywhere any well-considered statement of the conditions of which the right to vote ought to depend, except these:

1. Stake in the country.
2. Attachment to the country.
3. Capacity to judge of the character of candidates.
4. Capacity to judge of the public interests.
5. Contribution to the cost of government.
6. Capacity to serve it in public office.
7. Capacity to bear arms in its defense.
8. An intelligent interest in public affairs.
9. Sufficient education.

He considers these conditions elaborately. He proves irresistibly that she is endowed with each of the attributes which are considered essentials, except capacity to bear arms. Of course, she has not that capacity, but he points out that "we apply no such principle to people who are above the military age, those unfitted to bear arms, or those whom we exempt because of their profession, as clergymen, or those assigned to other public duty, as legislators. Certainly, the woman who does not go to war, does not so much deserve to be disfranchised as the man who can go and won't go. Besides, in modern times, women have to bear a large share, both of the risk and burden of carrying on war." And this idea he elaborates. But I prefer to quote upon this point from Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, who says: "We do not admit that exemption from military duty is

a concession of courtesy, for which women should be so grateful as to refrain from asking for anything else. The military functions performed by men, and so often perverted to most atrocious uses, have never been more than the equivalent for the function of child-bearing imposed by nature upon women. It is not either fanciful or sentimental. It is an exact and just equivalent. The man who exposes his life in battle can do no more than his mother did in the hour she bore him, and the functions of maternity persist and will persist to the end of time, while the call to arms are becoming so faint and rare that three times since the Revolutionary war, a generation of men has grown up without having heard them."

This amendment is brief. It provides that at the next general election there shall be submitted to the people, for their approval, an amendment to section one of article two, which, if adopted at that election, will, at the next following election, enable the question, whether the word 'male' is to be stricken from the Constitution or not, to be submitted entirely apart from the rest of your work. It is, perhaps, unfair that this concession to the opponents of the measure, to those who fear that their work may be prejudiced if this question be simultaneously submitted, or shall form a part of the general submission, should be made; but the women who represent the movement are willing to go through the ordeal of what will be practically a double submission to popular vote, rather than put in jeopardy the rest of the result of your labors. They feel and appreciate that there are other matters of importance to be regarded; none so sacred, none so important, in their opinion, as this particular question now engaging our attention, but they are willing that there shall be no embarrassment to the general work of this Convention, and are willing to encounter these additional difficulties rather than that you should come to harm through them. To insure this the more thoroughly, the preliminary amendment, now being considered, can also be separately considered at the election in 1894, so that your Revised Constitution, which I am as anxious as you shall be made as perfect as possible when submitted to the people, shall, in no respect, be jeopardized. To you, perhaps, it may be more important to determine whether the Court of Appeals shall consist of seven or nine judges; whether future election boards shall be of a bi-partisan character or not; whether some newly devised scheme of apportionment be adopted; and while these may appear to be of small consequence when weighed against the rights of a number of your fellow-citizens, equal to the number of present electors, who remain

unjustly ignored, yet we yield submissively to the proposition that the trivial projects of every delegate which may be embodied in our revision shall be determined upon their merits by the people without what may appear to some to be the contamination of this proposition. Let Mr. Tucker's amendment be submitted with the main Constitution, or even apart from the main Constitution, at the election of 1894. If it be adopted it will work no injury to either party to the controversy that the final decision be postponed until 1895. A more solemn and deliberate adjudication will be secured at a time when there is nothing else to vex the public mind, no one's scheme to be thwarted and no individual desire to be defeated. Then, with the preparation of a whole year, with an opportunity for the people to have fully discussed the question, the men of the State will be permitted to determine the question deliberately and with as little bias as the masculine mind may be susceptible of in the consideration of this matter. Then shall we decide whether the glorious women of the Empire State, who have stood with us in every hour of adversity, who have rendered happier every hour of prosperity, inclusive of the independent, struggling, honest women of toil, and of those in whose veins runs the blood of the forefathers who created this government that we might all equally be endowed with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, shall become finally vested with this important right.

All will agree that what these women have done must have been done most unselfishly, must have been done simply for the sake of the principles they advocated; for them there was no corporate interest to subserve; for them there was no ambitious longing to placate; they wanted no judgeships, they wanted no places, they had no scheme for self-aggrandizement; unselfish at all times, they have come here year in and year out, have grown grey in the service, are almost ready to give up the battle of life which, in this respect at least, they have waged so well, so nobly, but, alas, thus far, so unsuccessfully. May it not be that with the adoption of the contemplated action, pledging yourselves to nothing, but according this slight privilege of the right of going to the people, that finally, in this year of grace, 1894, there will come redemption, at last! at last! (Applause.)

Mr. Titus — Mr. President, and gentlemen of the Convention: The arguments presented against the question of universal suffrage melt like snow before a mid-summer sun. But the question that we have to deal with here is the question whether we, the servants

of the people of this State, will present this amendment to the people for their acceptance or rejection. Shall we raise ourselves above the people and say: "You shall not vote upon this question; it is not good for the State?" Why should we submit it? For the very reason that 700,000 people of our State have, by petition, presented to us here, asked us to do so. I ask you, sir, in all fairness and in all candor, whether, if any other question were presented to this Convention, coming from 700,000 people, you would pause a moment in giving it your vote and your support? But I believe that a majority of the gentlemen in this Convention are too honest, too fair and too just to permit, after the case that the women have made, that they shall be non-suited. I will ask you lawyers if you have ever tried a case before a judge and jury and been non-suited? Did you ever leave that court-room feeling that half-justice had been done you? You have said to yourselves, "Why didn't he allow me to go to the jury?" and in many cases you have gone down into your own pocket and paid the fee for printing in order that you might go to the General Term. But these women have no General Term to go to — unless it be the next Convention, some twenty years hence, and of the women all about us to-night, that have worked and labored in this cause, how many of them will by that time have gone to their kindred dust?

I do not know that I can say anything more to you, gentlemen of the Convention than has been said by the women themselves from that platform. They made their arguments there, and, as I have already said, the arguments against suffrage melted like snow before a mid-summer sun. Gentlemen, I feel and I say, in all truth and candor, that if I refused to raise my voice in this matter, I would be false in my trust to the State and to the oath I took there on the eighth day of last May.

Gentlemen, if you will bear with me a few moments we will review the various acts that have been passed in the last fifty years for the benefit of the women of our State. The gentleman who preceded me has gone into the matter so fully that I will just briefly speak of one or two matters. In 1846, when the question of the right of a married woman to hold property as a femme sole was agitated, we found then people who claimed that the whole of society would be demoralized and that great wrong would come. The act was passed, and what was the result? More than one billion of property in our State is owned by women to-day; they pay a tax of over one million dollars on that property — and, in the language of our forefathers, who established

this country, that taxation, without representation, is tyranny. The next act that was passed was in relation to women doing business in her own name. Gentlemen of the Convention, I will not insult your intelligence by asking you whether women were degraded or their status lowered by that act. We have the living evidence of its effects all about us. I have heard some members in this house say that they believed woman's place was at home, in the bosom of her family. I fully agree with them, and while in the bosom of that family, at the close of day, with her children clustered about her knee while they repeat the Lord's prayer, or be she of Hebrew faith and faces the setting sun to offer her devotions to the coming Messiah, it matters not; but I ask you, gentlemen, in all fairness, should not that woman have some voice as to who shall be the men that are to make the laws under which those children shall live and grow to manhood and womanhood? "Ah, but," you will say, "the father will take care of that." Very true. But let us review how he does take care of that. Take the last election, if you will. What did every gentleman in this Convention do — I myself no exception? We went to the voting booth, and as we entered and got our tickets and went into that closet, or chamber of reflection, which I think is a better name for it, and stood there alone with our God of our conscience, is there a gentleman in this room to-night that looked over his ticket and picked out the names of the men with reference to their qualifications for making the laws under which his children should live, when he himself would be no more? No; we were all alike, my friends; we looked to see if they were the nominees of our party, and we voted our ticket. You may say in answer to that that our candidates were all good, true and tried men. Be that as it may, but how often, in convention, have we nominated a candidate for a place on the ticket with the object, as we termed it, of strengthening it, when we would not have invited that candidate to that home where we left that mother at prayer with those children. Gentlemen of the Convention, I believe that suffrage to women would have a tendency to purify the ballot, and that both political parties in this State, if they desired a victory, would place men upon their tickets whose public and private character would stand the strongest rays of the search light. I have heard some members say that it would grieve them very much to have their wife come home in the small hours of the morning with a load of whisky and a black eye from a political meeting. Well, I have attended political meetings for the last twenty years, and I have never seen the occasion when it was necessary to come home in that condition; but those gentlemen know

their own wives best. I have heard some object to women voting and saying that when she could shoulder the musket she would then be entitled to vote; for the bullet and the ballot went together. But I am proud to say that I never heard an old soldier make such an expression. They have seen the work, and the labor, and the duty, and the service rendered by women for their country; you have seen them in the hospitals and on the battlefield; aye, you have seen women there with kind and gentle hands doing all in their power to aid the wounded soldier. Take the one who organized the sanitary commission in this country and ask to see what services she performed and the many thousands connected with that institution. Take the work of Florence Nightingale in the Crimea, of Clara Barton, the founder of the Red Cross society, a society that now encircles the civilized globe, and which has earned for the members of the Red Cross the name of angels of mercy. All governments have always discouraged the idea of women as soldiers. The records of the war department at Washington will show that during the war many women enlisted as men, served and fought bravely through the war, but the moment that their sex was discovered they were immediately discharged from the army. Take, if you will, the services rendered by Jean d'Arc, of France, who buckled on her sword and led her countrymen to victory, as a reward for which she was burned at the stake. It has taken France nearly four hundred years to find the value of Jean d'Arc, and to-day, throughout all France they are erecting beautiful monuments to her memory; and from the ashes of Jean d'Arc, phoenix-like will yet arise a new era in the lives of the women of France. Gentlemen of the Convention, I ask you, in all fairness and in all candor, for justice to yourselves and to your conscience. The Constitution of our country to-day blazes the star of hope above the cradle of every poor man's child. Should the lustre of that star be less bright on account of the sex of that child? Gentlemen of the Convention, the day has come when the women of our State do not seek your sympathy or ask your pity. They plead for justice.

Mr. Moore — Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention: During the sessions of this Convention we have received, signed by more than 600,000 citizens of this State, regardless of "sex, color, race or previous condition of servitude," etc., petitions worded as follows: "Gentlemen, the undersigned citizens of the United States, twenty-one years of age, residents of the State of New York and county of ———, respectfully pray your honorable body to strike the word

'male' from article 2, section 1 of the Constitution, and thus secure to the women of the State the right to vote on equal terms with the men," and the following questions were asked by the petitioners:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Constitutional Convention, you are respectfully asked to consider:

Upon what reasonable ground the disfranchisement of women rests? Is there not in moral, educational and sanitary questions a department of government which belongs to woman's sphere?

Is not one degraded, whether aware of it or not, when other people, without her consent, take upon themselves the power to regulate her affairs?

Is it not unnatural and unjust to impose restrictions upon human beings, which no age, no wisdom, no fitness and no effort can remove?

If, as alleged, women are already represented by men, when was the choice made, and do law and the Constitution recognize such representation?

Is not taxation without representation tyranny?

Is it not true that legislation is always in favor of the legislating class?

Will not the franchise give to women "equal pay for equal work?" Suppose that a majority of the women of the State do not wish to vote is that a just reason for depriving of her representation even one woman who is taxed?

Is not the usurpation of sex a form of caste, based upon the tyrannical theory that "might makes right?"

Have these questions been answered by the opponents of this measure?

In my opinion, Mr. President, none of these questions have been satisfactorily answered by them, and in speaking to this question, I desire to call attention to our present Constitution.

The principles upon which the government of this State is founded, is the government of all the people by a majority thereof. The preamble of the present Constitution reads as follows:

"We, the People of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, do establish this Constitution."

Upon the face of it, this preamble would seem to declare that all the people of the State had united in establishing this Constitution, and in section 1 of article 1, the same Constitution says: "That no member of this State shall be disfranchised;" and yet, section 1 of article 2 declares that "every male citizen of the age of twenty-one years, who

shall have been a citizen for ten days and an inhabitant of this State one year next preceding an election, and the last four months a resident of the county, and for the last thirty days a resident of the election district in which he may offer his vote, shall be entitled to a vote at such election in the election district of which he shall at the time be a resident, and not elsewhere, for all officers that now are or hereafter may be elected by the people, and upon all questions which may be submitted to the vote of the people."

Thus we see, Mr. President, in the first declaration invoking the name of Almighty God, and in the first section of article 1, declaring that no member of this State shall be disfranchised, in section 1, article 2, in defining the qualifications of voters, this Constitution enacted by the men people as a Constitution of the whole people, and professing to be anxious that no member of this State shall be disfranchised, literally contradicts itself in declaring that only male citizens shall have the right to the elective franchise. Beginning with the most hypocritical declaration of gratitude to Almighty God for our freedom, in the name of all the people of this State, but as eventually proven, only the men people, usurping the power and functions of the whole people, it proceeds immediately to limit and confine the most sacred functions of citizenship to the male citizen. Ignoring, by this declaration, the rights of the conceded majority of citizens of this State, depriving them of what, if not an inherent right, should be a right granted by the State to every citizen in it, regardless of sex, is it not time, then, that such a Constitution should be amended abolishing such a discrimination? (Applause.)

Mr. President, in the discussion of this question, which, in a nutshell, is really, shall the women of this State continue to be disfranchised in spite of the declaration in section 1 of article 2, that no member of this State shall be disfranchised, I take the ground that the question of sex has nothing to do with the problem. Is not a woman a member of this State? There is no greater reason, because she is a woman, if she comes within the conditions prescribed by law for the other qualifications of voters, that she should be disfranchised at an election for elective officers in this State than that she should be deprived of a vote at the meeting of stockholders of a company in which she owns stock, because she is a woman; or that she should be deprived of voting at a church meeting because she is a woman, except that the man-made law arbitrarily prescribes and limits the functions of voting at public elections in this State to male citizens of this State. The only persons who are excluded directly by law from exercising the right of voting

are those described in section 1 of article 2 of the Constitution which relates to bribery, and those guilty of the commission of any infamous crime, those making wagers, and persons described as lunatics and idiots; and yet, by limiting the voting to male citizens you literally make the section read:

Those guilty of bribery, of committing infamous crimes, of making wagers, lunatics, idiots and women shall not vote in this State. In the name of all that is decent, sacred and fair, why do you class your mothers, wives and daughters with these infamous, incapable and imbecile classes? We have as the organic law in the most solemn manner in our present Constitution a deliberate insult to our women, by classing them with these; an insult which if pressed upon one of them by any individual would be resented by you, personally, as a gross insult to the women of your household. Why the inconsistency? Why should we continue such a political classification. Honorable George William Curtis, one of the most distinguished men of this State, in his great speech in the Constitutional Convention of 1867, said upon this subject:

"I wish to know, sir, and I ask in the name of political justice and consistency of this State, why is it that half of the adult population, as vitally interested in good government as the other half, can own property, manage estates and pay taxes, who discharge all the duties of good citizens, and are perfectly intelligent and capable, are absolutely deprived of political power and classed with lunatics and felons?

"The boy will become a man and a voter; the lunatic may emerge from the clouds and resume his rights; the idiot, plastic under the tender hand of modern science, may be molded into the full citizen; the criminal, whose hand still drips with the blood of his country and of liberty, may be pardoned and restored; but no age, no wisdom, no public service, no effort, no desire, can remove from woman this enormous and extraordinary disability. Upon what reasonable grounds does it rest. Upon none whatever. It is contrary to natural justice, and to the acknowledged and traditional principles of the American government, and to the most enlightened political philosophy.

"The absolute exclusion of women from political power in this State is simply usurpation. The historical fact is that the usurpers, as Gibbon calls them, have always regulated the position of women by their own theories and convenience. The barbaric Persian, for instance, punished an insult to the woman with death, not because of her, but of himself. She was part of him. And the civilized English Blackstone repeats the barbaric Persian, when he says that the wife and husband forms but one person — that is the husband."

Mr. President, these eloquent words were true then — they are true to-day, but while Mr. Curtis, in 1867, could only claim one-half the adult population of the State, I now can claim them for more than 70,000 above the half.

Upon what, then, is this restriction founded? Obviously, upon the condition of sex only — the word "male" acting as a disfranchisement of women — is on the ground of sex. There can be no other possible for anti-female suffrage, and that is based upon the organic physical difference of the two sexes, and for no other reason. Simply because she is a woman. Not upon difference of character, intellect or property qualifications, and if not upon these what have you left but a sex basis?

Will you who speak against female suffrage, for the reason that a woman should not vote because she is a woman, tell me, suppose both men and women voted now at any general election would there be an organic difference in those votes, in those ballots? Could one be male and the other female because, forsooth, some of them were cast by women and some of them by men? Could the most acute, argu- eyed anti-female suffragist, who believes that home suffrage through the man is good enough for the woman, possibly discern between male and female votes, when they come to be counted, unless designated by statute by some arbitrary sign? Obviously not. The objection, then, to a female vote as such, is groundless, has no reasonable or even decent foundation to rest upon.

Is the objection, then, on the ground of her lack of intellectual faculties, perception, mental consciousness or want of capability to logically reason as to public measures or results molded in the casting of her vote? We say, Mr. President, that the educational history of woman does not bear out this assertion. Indeed, the intellectuality of women has been so far developed that in many instances they have exhibited reasoning faculties superior to those of men. "This is illustrated in the reports from Cambridge University (England), where there were eighty-three women students last year, and twenty-one of them carried off the first-class honors.

"In the mathematical tripos, Miss Johnson occupied the first division of the first class alone; no man being able to obtain that exalted rank. Another woman took a first class in moral science. In modern languages, six women were placed in the first class, and Miss Purdie is the most distinguished classical student in Newham College. It is observed that the proficiency of women in modern languages may be explained by their natural faculty in all languages, but that does not

account for their superiority in classics, which calls for the reasoning faculties into play and in the higher mathematics, which require logic."

I call upon the thousands of female teachers, of female newspaper writers and editors, upon authors, essayists, upon female mathematicians, upon poets, upon astronomers, upon inventors, of whom there are hundreds to-day (though they used to say a woman had no inventive genius), upon lawyers, upon doctors, upon ministers, upon that almost innumerable host of females, graduates of our common and high schools, seminaries and colleges, who have advanced in every profession and business requiring intellectual force and good judgment and tact as the motive of power for its successful achievements, to witness that the assertion of lack of intellectual qualifications as the reason for the refusing them the ballot is false, misleading and unjust. What do you want in the ballot opinion? It is not private opinion publicly expressed, intelligently dictated by an intelligent mind, and cast by the hand, the servant of such? And has not woman, as a class, all these qualifications? Do you want the property representation in the ballot? Do you say that she has not property, hence she ought not to vote? Let us see how that stands in this State, so far as statistics are available, from the following named counties:

expressed at the ballot-box? But take it for granted that the men have to do the fighting, how does that alter the case for women? Military age for the common soldier is from eighteen to forty-five years, and if that rule was applied to men in this Convention, "No soldiers, no vote," how many members of this Convention could vote? Mr. President, the argument, "No bayonet, no vote," is simply a subterfuge, and is not borne out by facts. Whenever, in the course of events, women have been obliged to take part in war, they have shown themselves capable of enduring longer marches, as in some of our Indian wars, defending Saragosa, in Spain and Jerusalem, in Palestine; managing artillery, as Molly Pitcher, at Monmouth, did in that revolutionary battle and as spies in war, making a success far beyond that of men, and more than that, of inspiring the men to renewed and often successful endeavors after the men had given up the fight. But women have shown themselves in our State, and the goodly year of to-day, as capable of bearing arms, going through the drills, marching, countermarching and performing military evolutions with even more celerity than an equal number of men of the same age. The object lesson is right over your heads, gentlemen, on the fourth floor of this Capitol. If you go up there you will find many photographs of the schools. One of the Fort Plain Liberal institute, and there you will see photographs of both male and female soldiers drilling as citizen soldiery are required to do. I was unaware of the existence of such an institution for the military co-education of the sexes, and I immediately commenced to investigate. An interview with the principal informed me that the women bore the fatigue of the drill equally as well as the men, and as such tentative soldiers they were a great success. A letter to the Secretary informs me: "That as far as the girls' ability to drill, it is equal to that of the boys, as was shown in a contest between the two companies."

But the opponents of this amendment say the place for the woman is in the home, hence she should not vote. Is it, indeed? As well might you say that the place of the man is in the store in the shop, in the field, in the office, hence he should not vote. Why, Mr. President, what is the State but an aggregation of homes which are the cause of all business.

As has been said by an able writer, Rev. Samuel J. May, "The true family is the type of the State. It is the absence of the feminine from the conduct of the governments of the earth that makes them more or less savage. The State is now in a condition of half orphanage. There are fathers of the State, but no mothers."

As there can be no true private home without the womanly influence, so the great public home—the State—without that influence of women in conjunction with men, loses by lack of it, the full complement of intelligence, loyalty, patriotism and public interest in the State to which it is entitled, and which can only come from the exercise of full citizenship by all the members of the State.

Ours will be the State of the women and the men, Mr. President, when they can say with the men, we are voters; we have the same rights, the same power as voters as the men. The interest a man takes in the State is in proportion to his right as a voter under its laws, and he that is any less than a voter is simply a vassal, subject to the will and caprice of somebody, and from whom he has absolutely no redress, and to whom he owes allegiance. His interest is gone. The State is not his, but the other man's. But give him a voting chance and all is changed. Under the mantle of citizenship there falls upon him a sense of power, responsibility and pride in his State, as his. Just so will it be with woman. Give her the full enfranchisement and with it will come the added public interest in public affairs for better laws, better morals, greater elevation of character in both private and public life, which alone make the true life of the State possible and continuous.

Mr. President, a letter addressed to me and signed by such men as Russell Sage, Dr. Charles H. Eaton, Dr. Faunce, Frederick R. Couderd, R. Heber Newton, Edgar Fawcett, William Dean Howells, John D. Rockefeller, Thomas L. James and many others, sympathize with what I have said upon this subject in even stronger terms.

"The women of this State pay taxes upon hundreds of millions of dollars, yet have no voice in directing the expenditure of public funds.

"The women of this State contribute by their industry to the wealth of the community, yet constantly work at a disadvantage when competing with political superiors.

"The women of this State have the same vital interest in public affairs as have their fathers, husbands, brothers and sons. They have been emancipated from personal and legal subjection to the men of their own families, and they are not willing to remain subjected to the political sovereignty of all other men. Their personal rights have been secured to them by successive acts of legislation. They now pray for civil rights, which are the natural complement of personal, industrial and legal independence."

The public press have also within a few days spoken in no uncertain tone, and I beg to quote only two or three.

The Albany Journal warns the Convention not to reject the amendment. The New York Recorder speaks its mind most decidedly, as follows: "It has been decided by the Committee on Suffrage of the Constitutional Convention to report adversely on the petition of the most intelligent women of this State that, as women, they shall be admitted to equal privileges with men along the whole line of citizenship.

"This action of the committee is not in the interest of better, purer and higher government of all people. It is, on the contrary, a block argued threadbare, and every plea presented against it has been left without a logical leg to stand on. There are few departments of human endurance in which woman is not now proficient to act. In brain power she is the equal of that sex which arrogates to itself fellowship and supremacy.

"The Recorder advocates full suffrage for women, because it believes that the conferring of it will exalt woman and give us in the next generation, and in the generations to follow, the highest type of citizenship the world has ever had. In these seething days of unrest and revolution of all kinds, the best and most conservative course in all society should be invoked to save, rescue and redeem it. That influence is the influence of women. At the present time, she is the great conservator of religion, no matter what the church to which she belongs may be.

"Her influence in the State would be equally beneficent, but to give it full scope and swing she must be emancipated from the vassalage in which she is held. The moral force that has saved the church must be utilized to save the State. The Convention should put this report of its Suffrage Committee in the waste paper basket and submit the question to the people." (Applause.)

We have in that grandest of all word-painting the picture of a complete civilization in the Revelation in Holy Writ of the Holy City, "and the length and breadth and the height of it are equal," nothing of its component parts left out, and small wonder then that the walls "were of jasper and the city like unto pure gold and the foundations precious stones, and each several gate one pearl, and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it, and they shall bring the glory and honor of the nations into it."

That day and city so long foretold is coming, Mr. President. The climbing of the race towards this ineffably glorious civilization is slow, but individuals and communities are fast learning that the day and the

city will hasten only as each goes onward in the march for human rights and human progress for all the members of the State.

I ask this Convention for itself, for the State as a State, not to delay the coming of that perfect civilization by clinging to the dead ideas of the dead past, but to take this long step forward now — which is equal rights for every member of this State.

Permit, then, this great question to go to the people. Men of this Convention, you are making history now, for the politics of to-day is the history of the future. See to it, then, that you make it on the side of the better citizenship, which this measure will certainly insure. (Applause.)

Mr. Cookinham — Mr. President, there are several gentlemen who have manifested a desire to address the Convention upon this subject. They do not desire to speak this evening. As the hour is late and by special order, this matter will be before the Convention to-morrow evening, I move that the Convention do now adjourn.

The President put the question on the motion of Mr. Cookinham, and it was determined in the affirmative, whereupon, the Convention adjourned to August ninth, at ten A. M.

EVENING SESSION.

Thursday Evening, August 9, 1894.

The Constitutional Convention of the State of New York met in the Assembly Chamber in the Capitol at Albany, N. Y., August 9, 1894, at eight o'clock P. M.

The President called the Convention to order.

The President — The special business before the Convention to-night is the further consideration of the adverse report of the Committee on Suffrage, on Mr. Tucker's amendment.

Mr. McKinstry — Mr. President, the cause of woman's enfranchisement has already been so ably presented in this chamber by women, that it seems like a wanton waste of time for us to renew the argument, for we cannot improve upon the manner or the matter of the advocates who have been before us. If ever a disenfranchised class earned the right to have their political disabilities removed, these women have earned it. Their symposium of addresses will go into history and will become more famous and resplendent each succeeding year as present prejudices melt away. Only upon the ground that a decent regard

for the opinions of our associates requires some statement of the reasons for our action, can this debate be justified.

My vote is ready to be cast for any of the propositions presented for equal suffrage, upon the plain principle of equitable right. I will not say natural right, because that proposition is fiercely disputed but I defy any man who prizes his right to vote, to give any good reason why the average, intelligent, conscientious, law-abiding and taxpaying woman has not the same equitable right to a voice in the government that he insists upon having.

I will not argue upon the question of expediency, although there is abundant argument at hand, founded upon experience and existing conditions; upon the fact of woman's most wonderful advancement during the last fifty years; upon the fact of her brilliant success in the walks of art, science and literature, in great works of charity and reform; also upon the fact that to-day there are more young women receiving what is called a liberal education than there are young men receiving such an education. I repeat: The equitable right of every capable woman in this State to vote is equal with our own equitable right to vote. There is not one of the tenets of our theory of government which justifies your claim to recording at the polls your will as a freeman, which does not guarantee in theory the right of every free woman to record her will at the polls.

We have a class of American citizens these days who are disposed to undervalue their right to vote. They have enjoyed this right so freely that they do not pause to consider what it cost. They forget the struggles of humanity since the days of Magna Charta and Runnymede, for the right of self-government; they forget the sufferings, wounds, disease and death our forefathers endured to establish for us a government without a king; they are the class who are already forgetting the sacrifices of the brave Union soldiers to save that government; but notwithstanding this indifference to their blessings, should you pass an act to disfranchise them, their protest would be immediate and emphatic.

I once saw a man's vote challenged at a primary election on the ground that having served a term in State prison, without pardon, he was not an elector. The challenge was soon withdrawn out of pity, for the expression on that man's face indicated that all he had suffered in wearing prison stripes, in performing prison labor, and enduring prison hardships were as nothing in severity with the penalty of having ceased to be a voting citizen of this great Republic, having become, in sense, a man without a country.

Another incident made an equally vivid impression. Some years ago an eastern lawyer with more zeal than knowledge, and with more initials to his name than the law requires, published an elaborate opinion that under some provision of our colonial charter which was never abrogated, women had still a right to vote in this State. I saw a dozen ladies undertake to exercise what they had been advised was their right. The inspectors, by advice of counsel, refused to receive their votes, and the ladies quietly turned away. While the discussion was going on, an old town pauper stood by, intently interested in the proceedings. His large family had been a charge upon the town for years. These very women had given of their time and money to preserve that family from cold and starvation; had paid taxes year after year to enable the poormaster to honor the drafts of the old pauper to keep him alive through the winter. And yet as those ladies sadly turned away with their ballots still in their hands, the face of the besotted old brute was wreathed in smiles. He had been declared their superior before the law. All their knowledge, their piety, their philanthropy, their ardent patriotism, went for naught in the scale when weighed against the attribute that he was a male. No depth of mental, moral or physical degradation could disfranchise him. No height of learning, refinement, loving service to humanity or peril for their country, could by any possibility enfranchise them. And when I saw that old wretch laugh and realized the outrageous injustice of the law, I decided that while I had a voice and a vote, they should be given at every opportunity to terminate that wrong.

But I call myself to order, Mr. President, when I recall that this Convention is not asked to confer the right of suffrage upon anybody. We have no such power. Those miles of petitions, collected in the Assembly parlor, do not ask us to change voting conditions. They simply ask us to allow those who already have their franchises in this State, to say whether they are ready to do justice to a great class of worthy and deserving fellow-citizens who have it not. The submission of no other proposition before this Convention has been prayed for by so many people nor by so many voters. Of the nearly 700,000 names attached to those petitions, I am proud to say that 12,571 were signed in Chautauqua county — the county where the seat of the great People's College is located, the center of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle, whose members come from every State and even from foreign lands to find there their Alma Mater. Those 12,571 names represent a population as intelligent, as cultivated, as advanced in all the arts and refinements that glorify civilization, as any equal division

of population upon the face of the globe. And I am proud to add, sir, that I was informed by reliable canvassers who circulated those petitions in the vicinity where I am best acquainted, that ninety per cent of the male voters solicited, promptly placed their names upon the petition and very frequently with expressions of good will and God speed.

In addition to these petitions is the memorial of the State Grange of the order of the Patrons of Husbandry, an organization having 50,000 members in this State, the men and women who live upon the farms and who make the State a vision of beauty to all who travel through its hills and valleys. This order is the first order that ever placed its women members upon an absolute equality with the men members. I regard their memorial as of special significance, because it represents the conclusions of men after twenty-five years of actual experience in an order where women freely hold office, serve on committees, take part in debates and vote. I am proud of Chautauqua county that so many of her citizens promptly signed in favor of this request that seems so fair; these women asking that the settlement of their right may be submitted not to a jury of their peers, but to a jury of which no woman in all this great State can be a member. I wish delegates would consider seriously the following suggestion:

Great solicitude has been expressed here lest the work of this Convention, like that of its predecessor, should be repudiated at the polls. It has even been urged against submitting any woman's suffrage proposition, that its unpopularity might weigh down the other work of the Convention. If some of the propositions go in that I have heard urged here, the heavier load will be in the other end of the bag. But, gentlemen, there is such a thing as being too conservative. You may submit a Constitution which will show such slight advance, which will excite so little discussion, that it will die of inanition. We have heard from Mr. Marshall recently of a constitutional amendment that was voted upon by only about ten per cent of the electors who voted that year, and might easily have been beaten by a few interested parties. We have no other issue before us upon which every voter in the State has an opinion and is eager to express it. The submission of a woman's suffrage amendment as a separate proposition will bring out the largest constitutional vote ever cast in this State. It will not only be a full vote; it will be an intelligent vote. It will aid the political party that generally fails by reason of a light vote. The campaign will be short. Only six weeks intervene between the limit of this Convention and the date of the grand assize in November.

Let us have one question submitted that will interest all the people. Let us have a square issue joined before a full jury — not a jury of 170 men in this chamber, but one composed of the great body of electors in the Empire State. To their verdict we will most humbly bow. (Applause.)

Mr. Blake — Mr. President, I shall occupy the time of the Convention but for a few moments.

We find ourselves, gentlemen, confronted by a great social and political problem. It is one that must be solved sooner or later by the people of this State, and I think there is no more propitious time than the present. We are met by a question that we must decide sooner or later by the agencies established by our laws, and I ask you, why not now; why not now and by the people themselves, who are the source and depositaries of all political power. To those who put their trust in the civic virtue, the wisdom and the patriotism of the American people, the path of duty seems to me plain; for these are the reliance of a free government. These are the source of inspiration to a free people. They give to free institutions their stability, their strength and the hope of perpetuity. For the correction of every abuse and defect, whether of administrations or of government, for the wise determination of all proposals to amend the Constitution that work a wide and radical change in our laws and our system, prudence and wisdom and patriotism alike dictate that resort should be had to the fountain-head and spring of all political power, namely, the people themselves. In that course alone is there wisdom, in that course safety. I care not how complex the problem may be, nor how momentous the question, the people will know how to solve the one and decide the other. If they are incapable of that responsibility and duty, then are they incapable of self-government. In grave emergencies, when new and untried experiments are attempted, when after a century of trial our system of suffrage is sought to be changed by the introduction of what I confess to be a novel and startling experiment, but which is asked for by hundreds of thousands of people, citizens of this State, who, unless it be the people, shall be made the arbiters and the final judges of the issue?

Gentlemen, for half a century now, this question has thrust itself into the forefront of political ethics and problems. It has been during that time a live and burning question, sometimes, indeed, overshadowed by other and important issues temporarily, but always retaining no inconsiderable vitality, and if the truth must be told, developing with the passing years increasing numbers and strength. If you shall

refuse to send this question to the people, what will you have gained? What will you have accomplished? You will simply have postponed the inevitable. The cause will feed and grow upon its very resentments and disappointments. Behind this act of indiscretion and unwisdom upon your part will remain distrust, discontent, dissatisfaction and above all, gentlemen, the reproach that you dare not trust the people who are your masters and of whom you are but the servants. You will have but smothered the fires. You will not have extinguished them, and they will break out afresh each year, and a few years hence, perhaps, will burst into a consuming conflagration that shall sweep over this State, destroying all opposition, invincible and irresistible.

Do not misunderstand me, gentlemen. I am not in favor of the principle of woman suffrage, although I must confess that I am not so strongly opposed to it as I was. It is a conviction born not to-day nor yesterday; but whatever my convictions were they were the product of deliberate thought and study. They were conclusions reached by conscientious effort to find for myself at least a just and correct verdict. I may be mistaken; God knows who is right and who is wrong, but with the light that He has given me, with my poor, limited faculties, I have been unable to reach any other conclusion. But no matter about that. The exigencies of this case, and of the situation, and the question in the shape in which it comes before this Convention do not require that I should discuss that question. No matter what may be my opinion or your opinion. However curious and interesting it may be that is not the question; but the real, live, burning question is, and it is a question that must needs be answered if you would remove it from the realm of doubt and speculation; what do the people of the State of New York think of this proposition? Not what shall be the deliverance of 170 gentlemen or thereabouts, who, after they shall have completed their labors here, represent 170 votes, no more and no less; but what is the calm, cool, august judgment of more than a million of voters, this magnificent electorate of this great commonwealth of ours? That, sir, is the issue as I conceive it to be. That is the issue, and no decision by any body less potential, or by any tribunal of a character inferior to the supreme court of the people, can answer that question or eliminate the doubt.

Now, gentlemen, is there a man here who doubts that this question overshadows all other questions calculated to engage the attention of this Convention — any doubt that it, of all others, occupies the public mind to-day, and that none other is so universally discussed in the

home circle, by the fireside, in every walk of life, by society, by the pulpit and the press? And is this the question, gentlemen, that you are going to determine here and now? Is this the question that this Convention proposes to determine and to decide for itself? If there be one question more than another upon which I fancied that I was irrevocably resolved when I came here, it was to give my voice and my vote to the determination and decision of this question by the Convention, and I was fully prepared to take the responsibility of that act. That was my determination then. I had strong convictions, and, I thought, abiding convictions. On the main question they are mostly with me yet. They have undergone very little change; but I have seen voluminous petitions come in here from every quarter of the State, from every county in the State, signed by thousands and hundreds of thousands of our citizens. They were showered upon this Convention. Never, I venture to say, from the foundation of our government until now, in any legislative body or in any Convention, has the eye of man witnessed a similar spectacle. And whatever may be said of the cause, gentlemen, I say the exhibition that repeated itself here day after day, for weeks, was something magnificent. It was sublime. A vast number of citizens came here knocking at our doors. Some gentleman, I think it was Mr. Titus, stated the number at seven hundred thousand. But whatever the number may be, it was a fair and goodly army. They came here and, with one voice and one prayer, they said to us few gentlemen assembled here: "Gentlemen, do not you, we pray you, determine this question. Let us go to the sovereign people. Do not you stand between. That is all we ask. Do we ask too much?" My conscience and my judgment say, no. With the responsibility of the oath which I have taken here, and with the full sense of my duty pressing hard upon me, I say that your demand is fair and just; and so far as my voice and my vote may assist in this work of justice, they are yours now and they are yours forever. (Applause.)

It has been our privilege to listen to these ladies who argued for their sex with so much ability, and I think we are all agreed that they presented their case with rare tact and intelligence. I have no prepossession nor prejudice, either for or against the lady champions on either side, but still I am constrained to declare it, as my judgment, that for intelligence, for singleness of purpose and high honor, for every trait that can adorn and dignify grand and noble womanhood, these ladies who have appeared here and presented their case with so much eloquence and ability are — I will not say the superiors, but I

do say, in every essential particular, the peers and equals of the noblest and best of their sex. Some of them, perhaps, are of stronger mold and cast than their weaker sisters, and I know it is the fashion to call such, strong-minded women. Well, sir, without admitting the correctness of that position, I do not forget that it is the strong-minded of either sex that stand always in the van of human progress, for the uplifting and for the betterment of the human race. I have seen one such here; in form and face venerable. Time, whose ravages no spell nor art can stay, has yet dealt kindly and gently with her. With her three-score and ten upon her, like some aged oak of the forest, she still stands proudly erect, unharmed and unbent by the fury of life's storms and tempests; and yet we see the frosts and snows of winter are fast gathering about her brow. Her sun of life speeds swiftly to the west, and, not far distant, she may almost see her last resting place, her last home, where the silent majority await her. And to you, gentlemen of a faith differing from mine, her name, her history, should be a most sweet and precious memory. Some surely there must be among you to-night who can recall days when the voice of Susan B. Anthony (applause), coming like the voice of inspiration and prophecy, rang out, nay, flamed across the continent, from the Atlantic wave to the Golden Gate, setting myriads of hearts afire for her cause. She was then one of a despised band. On the moral side of the question, the sympathies of all good men went out to her. But your party and mine clung to the Constitution, because that was a great constitutional question; but she and her little band stood outside the ramparts, outside the Constitution; stood for humanity. It is Lowell, I think, who said:

He is a slave who dare not be
In the right with two or three.

She was in the right. The God of battles, our common Father, who loves all his creatures, whether white or black, of whatever race or creed, blessed her cause. And is it not best so, gentlemen? And now she comes here and she prays you, and her heart and soul are in the prayer, to let her appeal to the jury of the people. She appeals to you who belong to the party of Lincoln and Grant, of Seward and Chase and Sumner (applause), a party that, I confess, has done much for the cause of humanity, and, in other days, never hesitated to make its appeal to the people, and, I trust, will not now. She appeals to you to do this act of justice to her, to the cause she represents, and to the six or seven hundred thousand people that come here knocking at our doors.

Does she ask too much, gentlemen? Why, methinks if she stood alone she would not be unheard by you. Will you stand between, and say: "No, no, you shall not reach the people?" I know not what may actuate you, gentlemen, but I think it would not be republican. It would be most unjust. It would be in contravention of the principles that underlie popular government, and it would expose you and all of us to the charge now heard in murmurs, but then to be thundered through the State, that we dared not trust this cause to the popular verdict. And to you, my fellow-Democrats, you of the Democratic fold, you who subscribe to the immortal principles of Jefferson, the chief of which was a sacred regard for the rights of the people; you who still cherish the memory of Jackson, Douglass, Marcey and Tilden; you who belong to a party that sprang from the plain people, which has always jealously defended and guarded the right of the people to be heard upon all great questions that concern their vital interests; will you deny the people the right to decide this great question? Do you think it is the better course? Do you think it is the wiser course? Do you think that you can so check this movement and scatter its forces? If that thought be in your minds, I tell you you woefully mistake; you will most miserably fail; because, stung by a sense of wrong and injustice, this cause will take on new life and impetus; it will gain fresh strength; it will gain accessions from all people whose sympathies go out to those whose reasonable and just demands have been denied. Remember, gentlemen, that this is no ordinary case; it is a very extraordinary case, and it is not to be judged by ordinary rules.

I admit, gentlemen, that upon the ordinary proposal to amend the Constitution you would have the right to constitute yourselves a court of last resort. I cannot foretell what propositions, one or more, you may submit to the people for their decision; I think you will submit one or more, but tell me, is there one here, is there a single proposal before this body that has behind it the prayer of so many people, that has behind it the sympathy and support which are behind this movement?

And to whom do these ladies ask that the appeal shall be made? To a new and untried tribunal? No, sir, not so; but to the same puissant court to which the appeal has ever been made from the foundation of our republic; to the sober, intelligent and incorruptible electorate of this great State, upon whose shoulders, in part, rest our free institutions and this admirable system of government of ours. Again I ask you, to whom do they make the appeal? To your sex,

to your own sex. And if the electors of this State are, indeed, opposed to woman suffrage, why do you hesitate, why do you fear to intrust them with the decision of the issue? What have you to fear? Let us act the part of men let us be just and fear not. You have it in your hands to decide this question here, and now I admit, and you may turn a deaf ear to that mighty voice that is sweeping down upon you and thundering here at our doors to be heard; you may interpose your veto if you will, but are you sure that your acts will meet the approval of your conscience and judgment? I have heard it rumored and whispered about that no man has a right to vote for submission to the people who is opposed to the principle of woman suffrage. That contention, gentlemen, is not worthy the name of argument. From the foundation of our government up, it has always been the custom of legislative bodies and Conventions to hearken to the voice of the people, to bend to the popular will. What do you want the Senate in Washington and the House of Representatives to do now? I recall a time, and it is only one of hundreds of instances, when a great Senator from the west, George Pugh, I think, of Ohio, from his seat in the Senate, made an admirable speech against the majority, and then, after having made his speech, voted for the measure, because he was so instructed by the Legislature of his State. Do you tell me that if the people of this State came here now in vast numbers with their petitions, asking that the gubernatorial term be extended to four years, that, forsooth, because we believe it ought to remain where it is, that you would shut your ears to that voice, to the overwhelming demand of the people? Why, this argument scarcely deserves and is scarcely worthy of an answer.

Now, Mr. President, I had only intended to say a very few words upon this question, but I want to say this, that if the people shall be permitted to make the decision, whatever that decision may be, all will be well. Every interest will be satisfied. No one will have the right to murmur, not these ladies, not you nor I. The people will not complain because we submit the question to their judgment and decision. All will bow to the judgment of the free people of this goodly State, as to the voice of God himself; for, gentlemen, the voice of the free people, so expressed, is the voice of God. (Applause.)

Mr. Maybee — Mr. President, I do not intend to enter into any discussion that involves the question of woman suffrage. It is a question upon which men have the right to differ. I have that right, and every delegate in this Convention has the right to his individual opinion. But whatever may be said on the question of woman suffrage, it can

hardly be denied that it is the most important question that is before this Convention for its consideration and determination. It was said that where McGregor sat was the head of the table, and when the woman suffrage question appears, all minor question retire to the background, unnoticed and forgotten. It is a question, too, that demands settlement and solution. It will not be stifled, it will not be suppressed, like Banquo's ghost, it will not down. You might as well attempt to smother the volcanic fires of Aetna as to try to keep this question from settlement and solution by the American people at some time or other. Whether we settle the question here and now or not; whether in the year 1894 the great State of New York shall attempt the solution of this question, so far as its citizens are concerned, or not, the time will come when, as the great world spins down the ringing grooves of change, as Tennyson puts it, women will have the ballot and exercise it upon equal terms, and as freely as her brother does at the polls.

Mr. President, the question and the only question which we are to determine, is simply this: Shall the male voters of the State of New York, under existing conditions, at the general election in the fall of 1894, decide the question whether or not at the general election in the next succeeding year the question of the right of women to vote shall be submitted to the male voters of the State? We are not asked to pass upon the merits of the question of women suffrage. We are not even asked to refer this question to the people; we are simply asked to give the people themselves an opportunity at a general election to say whether the question shall be referred at a subsequent election. Petitions have come up to this Convention signed by some five or six hundred thousand names — the exact number is not material. It is a fact which no one can dispute that a large proportion of the people of this State have asked us in the most solemn and deliberate manner possible, to submit this question to a vote. We are here as the representatives of the people. Dare we deny the prayer of this petition, the equal of which was never presented to any representative body? Dare we ignore the petition of six hundred thousand of our fellow-citizens who ask us to submit this burning, this important, this paramount question to solution and settlement by the voters of this State? For my part, I think we should be derelict to our duties, false to our trust, unworthy the confidence of the people, if we rejected the prayer of these petitions, if we refused to allow the sovereign people to say whether or not this question should be settled for the next twenty-five years. It is certainly an important question, one of the most important questions that can be considered, affecting the right of enfranchise-

ment of half the adult population of the State, a population intelligent, able to exercise the right of the elective franchise, who have been educated up to the high demands of the age and the century. Why not submit the question to the people whether or not that class of citizens, the women of the State, shall have the right to vote? I believe the question ought to be submitted. I believe the time and occasion demand its submission, and I shall give my vote, now that the initiative has been completed, the petitions have come up here, in favor of the great referendum to the people of this important and mighty question. (Applause.)

Mr. Cornwell — Mr. President, I will promise not to overtask the patience of the Convention by extended remarks or discussion of the merits of the subject under consideration, as it has been very fully considered in all its bearings by the able gentlemen who have preceded me. The principles of suffrage in this country, although slow of growth, like the giant oak of the forest, yet have assumed such proportions that they have been almost universally adopted so far as the male population is concerned; their roots are imbedded in the hearts of the people and are deeply grounded among the foundation stones of the republic. It is safe to say that they give life and strength and vitality, not only to the great principles of universal citizenship, but also strengthen the bulwarks of the State. To my mind the next step in the right direction is to adopt and carry out the principles of equal suffrage in its entirety, applying its provisions to women as well as to men. It would seem to a casual observer, as exhibited by the action of the Suffrage Committee of this Convention, that the growth of sentiment of granting the franchise to women on the public mind had been slow, and its fulfillment very remote — yet I sincerely believe it cannot be long delayed, is sure to come — and when it does come and is a fixed fact, the wonder will be that the franchise was ever given to men and denied to women.

Mr. President, I have the honor, in part, to represent in this Convention the Twenty-sixth Senatorial district of this State, composed of the counties of Cayuga, Ontario, Tompkins, Wayne and Yates. There have been presented to this Convention petitions from these several counties, numbering 9,925 males and 15,657 females, total 25,657 persons, of twenty-one years of age and upwards — asking that the word "male" be stricken from article 2, section 1 of the Constitution, and thus secure to the women of the State the right to vote on equal terms with men. It will not be questioned that the right of petition is an inherent right guaranteed to every citizen of the broad land. These

petitioners represent, so far as I know and believe, the most enlightened and cultured class of citizens of this section of the State. I feel, Mr. President, that I would be recreant to my trust, recreant to my duties as a delegate of this Convention if I did not make some effort to carry out the wishes of my constituents in this regard, provided there were no insurmountable objections to their requests. I have no doubt that the hundreds of thousands of other petitions from all portions of this great State, presented to this Convention on the same subject also represent the best and most patriotic elements of the several communities from which they came. These petitions show and prove that there is a very deep and widespread feeling among the people on this subject, which to my mind should be respected by this Convention. The proposition is a very simple one, and it seems to me should be acquiesced in by every reasonable man.

It will not be claimed that women are not as well qualified to vote as men; neither will it be urged that they are not as greatly interested in the affairs of government, in the making and administration of the laws, in the general welfare of the people, in all that goes to make up good government "by the people and for the people," neither will it be urged that they do not form a part of the citizenship of this great State, entitled to all its privileges except, perhaps, to vote. The question arises, what reason can be given for this state of things? The answer comes, none whatever, except custom and prejudice. If it were fashionable for women to vote, they would all vote as a matter of course. In times past there may have been some good reasons why women should not share with men in public affairs. The past few years have demonstrated that women are capable of going to the front in all matters that pertain to business. They are outstripping men in many of the avocations of life and man, in place of being jealous of woman, should be willing to extend to her a helping hand, and more than willing to extend to her the privileges of the ballot, if by that means she might be enabled to improve her condition.

Gentlemen, to my mind, this is a matter above expediency, above policy, above politics, above every consideration, except the matter of right. If we believe that the giving of the ballot to women is right, which no one will deny, then it should be done. If we believe it would improve her condition, better enable her to take care of herself, better prepare her to cope with man and with the world, then by all means she should have it. It will not be denied, and the history of the past will show, that woman has been the slave

of man; her condition has improved only step by step. The time has come for woman to take her place by the side of man, his equal before God and the world, his equal before the law.

Mr. President, although this subject has been dwelt upon largely by speakers, both in and out of this Convention, and I deemed it almost superfluous to add anything to what had already been said, I felt that I would not be doing my whole duty to the 25,000 citizens of the district I in part represent, whose petitions are now on file in this Convention in favor of these great principles, did I not raise my voice openly in favor of this righteous proposition. I sincerely hope and trust the adverse report of the committee will not prevail. (Applause.)

Mr. Powell — Mr. President, the position in which I find myself placed by the subject before this Convention is somewhat peculiar. Personally I am in favor of granting the right of suffrage to the gentler, the more patient and the more loyal sex, and yet if that question were before this Convention to-night for final determination by our vote, I should cast my vote in opposition to what is known as female suffrage. I should do this because it is my belief that the majority of my constituents are apposed to granting the right of suffrage to women, and I believe that under circumstances such as that it would be my duty to humbly subordinate my personal judgment to the judgment of those whom it is my privilege to represent in this body. I can readily conceive, sir, of circumstances where I might deem it my duty to vote in direct opposition to the sentiment of those whom I represent, or of a majority of them. If the question under consideration were complex, if it were one that required peculiar investigation and I had made that investigation, if I was convinced that my judgment was superior to that of those who sent me here, then I should exalt my judgment above theirs, and vote according to my own sentiments and not according to those of my own constituents. But this, sir, is a simpler question, as concrete as a question can possibly be, and, therefore, I should deem it my duty, under the circumstances to which I have just referred, to vote according to the wishes of my constituents as I have been best able to determine them.

But, gentlemen, the question before this Convention, as has already been well suggested by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Blake), is not the question of female suffrage. The sole question is whether or not this Convention has the courage, whether it has sufficient confidence in the common people, to submit this question to them for their determination. Why, sir, should we not submit it to the great com-

mon people of the Empire State? It has not been suggested, neither will it be suggested, methinks, by anyone who shall oppose this measure, that this question is not of sufficient importance to merit his attention. What mean these six hundred thousand petitioners who have come here and knocked at the door of this Convention, demanding the right to hear the voice of the people of this great State upon this matter? What mean these long weeks of consideration and deliberation during which our Committee on Suffrage, so patient, so gentle, so kind, so illogical in their ultimate conclusion; these long weeks during which they have been grappling with this Titanic problem? What mean these public sessions of that committee, when this room has been packed in its every path until standing room could no longer be secured? And these occasions, when this committee has met together by itself, and summoning up all of its genius and all of its intellectuality and all of its logic, has fixed and concentrated its every mental faculty upon this question of woman suffrage. In the face of all these facts, if this Convention, by its final conclusion, were to proclaim that this matter is not of sufficient importance to go to the common people, it would stultify, and grossly stultify itself.

It has been, however, suggested by some members of this Convention, that we have no right to submit to the people any question unless we voice our own opinions upon it. That is, unless we recommend it. That is undoubtedly true, gentlemen of the Convention, to ascertain extent. It is certainly true with two classes of problems; those which are extremely intricate, and also those which require special knowledge, which must be derived from careful investigation. Take, for example, the report which will soon be submitted by the Judiciary Committee, one which will deal with all our courts, from the highest down to the very lowest, one which will deal with our methods of legal procedure, one which will define the rights of juries and judges, matters which we have no right to submit to the people unless we recommend that which we do submit. As an illustration of the second class, take the report which will soon be submitted by the Committee on Charities. That committee, under the lead of its most efficient chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Lauterbach (applause) — I am glad to see that the appreciation of him extends beyond the narrow confines of our committee room — that committee under his leadership has traveled all over this State, from New York to Buffalo, investigating our charitable institutions. And with the knowledge derived from that investigation, as it will be laid before this Convention, the Convention has no right to submit any proposition to the people unless it believes that it is for the advantage of the people to adopt it.

But here is a question distinct and simple, the ability to pass upon which depends only upon the intelligence of those who act, and their ability to form a right judgment. And for this Convention to say that it is not right to submit such a question without expressing an opinion, is simply to stultify itself. It is an act of the extreme egotism. It is the assumption on the part of this Convention that it knows more about this question, which has nothing peculiar about it and which requires no special investigation, than all the rest of the citizens of the State combined. Then, gentlemen, as I have come in contact with the members of this Convention, I have discovered that there are some belonging to the majority, like myself, who find themselves suffering from a dread fear that if we submit this matter in any form to the people we shall ruin the rest of our Constitution. They recognize, as I recognize, that there is a peculiar responsibility resting upon the political party which is in the majority in this Convention. It is this, while you who belong to the minority are individually responsible to constituents, we, who belong to the majority, are not only individually responsible to ours, but in addition to that there is a party responsibility, the responsibility of the Republican party which the people of the State of New York has placed in power in this Convention. It has even been suggested to me by a gentleman who is prominent in the councils of the majority, that if we submit this matter to the people in any form it will lead to a sort of opera-bouffe campaign. Now that rather startled me. I know what opera-bouffe is. I have been there. It is suggestive of blazing lights, somewhat scanty attire, and a good deal of jolly merriment. I have been through political campaigns and I know what they are. But when you take the two words, "opera bouffe," make a compound adjective, and hitch them on to the word "campaign," I confess that you have created something which it is rather difficult for my mind to conceive of. But I took this problem as it was presented to me and grappled with it. Esteeming the intelligence of the gentleman who used the expression, and knowing that his words are ordinarily very wisely chosen, I deemed it my duty to ascertain, if possible, what an opera-bouffe campaign was like, so I started out and thought of all the political campaigns that had ever occurred in this country. I went backward step by step along the line of the years, and at last, in the first political campaign of which I have any recollection it seemed to me that I found a regular genuine opera-bouffe political campaign. And, gentlemen, to my astonishment

I found that it was that opera-bouffe political campaign which lifted Abraham Lincoln to the presidency of the United States. (Applause.)

If you are inclined to discredit my word, go back and read the story of that campaign over again. Examine the illustrated papers, see the coarsely brutal semi-humorous caricatures of that great and noble man. See the references that are made to him as some kind of a degraded animal. Read again the allusions to his rough face, his long arms, his lanky limbs; in all that you have an opera-bouffe campaign.

Gentlemen, if all the opera-bouffe campaigns of history would only give us results which will half realize those obtained in that campaign, then I say let us have an opera-bouffe campaign in every year of the history of this commonwealth. And if the campaign which shall occur if this question be submitted to the people will only produce one-tenth part of the magnificent results of that campaign, then let us determine to submit this question as soon as possible.

It has also been suggested by gentlemen who are prominent in the majority, that this campaign will lead to undue excitement. Is not that marvelous? Too much excitement! Gentlemen, has our statesmanship been reduced to a careful utilization of chloroform and ether and opium pills? Is there anything to fear from wholesome excitement in a republic? I say no. Give us all the excitement you can, so long as it be of a wholesome character, so long as it relates to questions of right and of wrong. I believe if you submit this question to the people—I know that we shall have abundance of excitement—I believe that if you will submit it to the people, its intelligent discussion of the right and wrong of those great principles which lie at the foundation of republican institutions will act upon the people of the Empire State as a moral and political tonic, and the sooner we give it to them the better.

Some of our friends also are anxious to have a calm, placid, peaceful, summer-like, non-tempestuous campaign, when they set their little constitutional boat upon the waves of the great ocean of public opinion, started out to meet its destiny; some of our friends are afraid that this excitement will divert the attention of the people from the weightier matters which they will propose. In the first place, that is all wrong. In other words, their theory is that the best way to interest people in the Constitution is to keep them as far away from the Constitution as possible. Their theory is that if you set people to discussing constitutional questions, they will at once

cease to have any interest in the Constitution at all. I submit, sir, that the very moment you arouse interest in one part of the matter thus proposed in connection with the work of this Convention, you arouse interest in every other part. Let these women go about and stir up the community. They will lead men to think of the Constitution who have never thought of it before, and who would not think of it in this coming campaign, were it not for them. And with this one feature of constitutional law brought to their attention, they will read the Constitution, they will examine the proposed amendments, and we will not only have the largest vote, but we will have the most intelligent vote that was ever cast upon such matters in the State of New York. (Applause.)

I want to use an illustration. We had an election in the city of Brooklyn last fall; it was the most heated election that we have ever had over local municipal affairs. Now I can imagine some of these gentlemen who are so afraid that the attention of the people may be diverted from something, coming over to us in the city of Brooklyn in the heat of our campaign, about our mayoralty, and a dozen other matters that refer to the city government, saying, now you fellows just keep cool. You don't want to say a word about the city of Brooklyn in this campaign. You must not say a word about its government; you must not refer to the question of who shall be its mayor, or raise any questions about it, because the very moment that you do, that you will divert the attention of the people from other matters. Did it divert the attention of the people? Go read the record of the election that fall, and you will find that all the municipal excitement simply aroused the people upon other matters, and brought out the grandest vote that the city of Brooklyn has ever given in her whole history. So will it be with this matter, if you will submit it to the people.

No, no, gentlemen, that is not it. You are afraid, as my friend, Mr. Blake, from New York, suggested. You are afraid of the people. Record it here by your votes, and then go back and blush when you meet your constituents. Afraid of the common people? Shades of Lincoln and of Sumner and of Seward, the great Republican party ashamed and afraid of the common people!

Gentlemen, I decline to subscribe to any theory which casts the slightest slur upon the integrity, ay, the infallibility of the people of the State of New York. I am not afraid of them. I proclaim my absolute trust in the common people, and unlimited and unflinching faith in their intelligence, and in the integrity of their judgment. And

because I believe in the common people, because I trust the common people, I shall vote to submit this matter to their determination, and vote against our deciding it here. (Applause.)

Mr. Platzek — Mr. President, I rise to support the report of the committee. It requires considerable courage. Last night, when I heard my eloquent and very good friend, Lauterbach, I had fears as to of how I would cast my vote. I was under the spell of his eloquence. But I have slept since, and I have performed a day's work in this Convention, and my mind has been cleared again. And, notwithstanding the sweet influences that surround us, I will still express my views against the right of women to vote. Last night I was impressed with the halo of glory that Mr. Lauterbach threw around, and about the oath that he took when he entered this Convention, and I was very much reminded of myself, when I have stood before a jury defending some man for a heinous offense, and tried to frighten them into an observance of their great responsibilities when they sat upon their oaths in the jury box.

Now, there is a secondary proposition which has become primary, that of the referendum. I am not afraid of the people, neither am I afraid to go back to my own district and face my constituents again, if I have discharged my duty here like a man, even though some of them may disagree with me. If I did other than that, I would be unfit to serve them, and I should be ashamed of my American citizenship.

Now, this is no new question. Ever since 1867, woman suffrage has been a live issue, not alone in the State of New York, but throughout these great United States. On the platform, in the pulpit, in political campaigns, in every legislative hall, this question has been discussed learnedly and eloquently. Long before I accepted my nomination as a representative in this body, the ladies of New York were heard in the press and in the drawing-room; and after my nomination, I was deluged with correspondence and inquiries from the fair sex, as to how I would vote upon this question, because many votes might depend upon the reply; and whenever I was interrogated, I said: "I will answer that question on my oath in the Convention." And I am here to-night to do it. And I am going to tell them that I intend to vote against the right of woman suffrage.

Now, as to the fear of the people, I say that this question is familiar to every man and woman that can read and write, and that every person that voted for me on election day, knew that this was a live issue that would be presented in this Convention, and I was made

one of 171 referees to come here and to determine that proposition upon my oath and my conscience; and I say to you gentlemen, especially those of the bar, that when you are appointed as referee by a court of proper jurisdiction, and you accept your fee to discharge your duties, it is cowardly, with the fee in your pocket, to go back to your client and say, I have got your money in my pocket, but you must decide your case for yourself, otherwise I may not get another referee fee from somebody else hereafter. That is the question on the referendum. The proper, courageous, manly act to do is to rise up and discharge your duty, not for the sake of being selected to some other office, but because it is right to do what you were sent here to do. And I say to you that you were not sent to this Convention for the purpose of wasting the time of the people, taking their money and arguing broad questions, and then say: This is important; I am against the proposition, but, nevertheless, in order to satisfy both sides, I will announce myself as opposed to the question, and send it back to the people that sent me here, and shift the responsibility upon their shoulders, because I have not the courage of my convictions to do what I was sent here to do. And that is all that I shall say upon this question of referendum.

Now, I hardly know whether it is at all necessary to discuss the main proposition. I assume that all of you, like myself, in the conscientious discharge of your duty, have read all the literature that has been handed to you relating to this question. I will say in all honesty and earnestness that I have, and I have been very much interested. I have done more; I have listened to every word that came from the lips of the ladies who addressed the committee upon this question. I was never absent. I was an attentive listener, I was an admiring listener. I am not here to say ought except in praise of a woman. We were all enchanted and charmed by the women that came here to, and did enlighten us. Many of them have grown gray in the service of womanhood, every silver hair in their heads being a decoration of honor for the principle they fought for, and the conscientious manner in which they discharged that duty, and I honor and admire them for it. They have done more; many of them have been in this Assembly Chamber as frequently as I, have been regular daily attendants, aye, even at the evening sessions. I say that these ladies sacrificed their homes, their husbands, their brothers, their sisters, their sweethearts and their children, in the conscientious endeavor to show their earnestness of purpose, and their desire to achieve the object they had in view.

But, notwithstanding all that, they do not represent all the women. There are a few ladies, even within the State of New York, who are not here in person, nor by petition, clamoring or asking for the right to vote. And the assumption is a reasonable one, that those who are not here by petition or in person, have no desire to knock at the doors of this chamber and ask for the privilege to vote. I may be asked, why should women not be allowed to vote; and I would answer, first, that no woman that was near or dear to me would I want to hear of having gone to the polls over in New Jersey, at an election where the ladies voted and participated in the unseemly wrangle that took place there, resulting in some violence. I say that we men who really admire woman for her worth, for her sweetness, for the gentle influence that she brings into the home circle, will stand here battling against her right to cast the vote, and to participate with us at the polls on election day. Why, sir, there is a proposition now before us, urged with a great deal of force, to compel the educated voter to come to the polls. Sir, the so-called refined American citizen finds it so obnoxious to come to the polls, that it has been deemed necessary to introduce a law here to compel that man to come to the polls, or find some way of punishing him for a failure so to do. And it seems to me that when men fear to go to the polls, women ought not to go.

Now, I have another very serious objection, and that is, if we grant suffrage, it must be universal. We are now laboring in every State in this Union from the evil effects of a pauper and ignorant vote. These men have that vote, and no Constitutional Convention, nor the citizens of any State, will ever be able to take that vote away from them, except by a revolution. Now, if we allow the women to vote — and we have the figures here from the ladies themselves, claiming seventeen or eighteen thousand more women voters in this State than men — I say we double that evil, and we endanger the stability and safety of the State. Now, will the advocate of woman suffrage say: Well, then affix a qualification to our right to vote; make it intellectual, or property, if you please. I say that the man who would do that would degrade a woman, because, if the colored voter in the south, or the ignorant voter in the north, without property, has a right to vote, why should we ask intelligent women to possess of property, to have that qualification, and, unless that qualification should be made, then the suffrage would be universal, and this ignorant vote, if you please, this pauper vote, if you like, would be doubled and the State would be at the mercy, not of its best, but probably of its worst citizens.

Again, the argument is continually heard, taxation without representation. I know of no weaker argument. Paying taxes has nothing

to do with voting. There are millions of people that vote that never pay one dollar of taxes. A tax is not imposed to vote; taxes are paid for protection to life and limb and property, and for no other purpose. And if there are women possessed of large means, and they pay taxes, they only do what men do who possess property.

And then, again, if woman receive the right to vote, she must take upon herself and assume all the duties of citizenship. I am not going to argue the question of force, the ballot and the bullet. I do not want the ladies of our land to carry the gun and fire the bullet, and I hope that they do not want the ballot, or, if they do, that they will never receive it. I will not argue the question of physical force and power, but I will say this: If you enfranchise the woman, she must assume many of the duties of citizenship. She will be entitled to every office in the gift of the people. We will see her sweet face and refining influence in the jury box, on the bench in our Supreme Court, occupying a chair when the next Constitutional Convention meets, and probably as satisfactorily, sir, as you or I could discharge that duty. (Applause.) But the time is not yet ripe. We must hold on to the reins of government, not for our own sake, but to protect woman against herself.

I have spoken at greater length than I intended. In conclusion, I will take the liberty of calling attention to something that I heard, and with which I disagreed at the time. It came from the lips of a very distinguished and admirable lady who spoke here. She told us, in answer to an inquiry, I think, of our distinguished friend, Mr. Bigelow, asking how she explained it that so many women were arrayed against woman upon this question. I thought the answer was uncharitable, because it was that they were like the slaves; they were subjected to the influences of their husbands; they were dependent beings, and that those who are dependent must obey and cannot assert themselves. Therefore, the ballot was to lift them from this condition of dependence to one of independence. And you will remember how graphically the lady illustrated the argument by reciting the anecdote of the colored man on the farm of Henry Clay.

Now, I say that that is not the condition of woman, whether she has the ballot or not, or whether she asks for the ballot or not. It is a mere difference of opinion between one class of women who say, "We do not want the ballot," and another class who say that they desire it. But an American woman is and always has been, and always will be, free, and it is an insult to American women to designate any class of them, because they differ one with the other, as slaves.

Another thing I heard which impressed me very astonishingly, and that was the statement as to the visit of the lady to the Governor of this State, to inform him of his treatment of a minister from Troy, who called to complain of election frauds. Well, that certainly was a most womanly act, to first tell the Governor and then come here and inform us. But there is a moral in that story which impressed me differently than it did many of you, probably, and I want to set it forth here. The lady said that the minister from Troy, after the election troubles, called upon the Governor; that he gave him a deaf ear; that shortly thereafter a distinguished Senator, who lives in that same city, called upon the Governor, and he was properly received, and nothing was done. Then this good lady met the minister, and he inquired of her why it was that the Governor did not give him a hearing, and she, familiar with the power of the ballot, told him that he had no votes behind him; that no one but women were in his church, and, therefore, the Governor did not heed his voice.

Now, I say that that calls to my mind a danger, a menace to our free institutions. Let the minister preach from the pulpit. Let him administer to my soul and to my spirit, but in the name of God, do not again drag the pulpit into politics. Do not join church and State when we are here trying to separate them. I say it with all becoming respect to every man that wears the cloth and preaches from the pulpit, because I admire them in their place. I tell you that that would be one of the greatest dangers that we would have to confront. Leave these men in the pulpit. They are good ministers, useful in their calling. Do not take a useful minister from the pulpit and make of him a very poor politician.

Mr. President, there are others that ought to speak, and I have no doubt will. Before taking my seat, I desire merely to re-emphasize the fact that no man in the hearing of my voice, holding his place by the vote of the people, and who is here upon his constitutional oath, should be afraid to cast his vote in favor of this adverse report; and I appeal to you not to be carried away by the argument that it is only a vote in favor of sending the matter to the Committee of the Whole, and then, possibly, to the people for their final determination. We have been sent here to decide this question, and if you believe that woman is entitled to vote, then strike the word "male" from the Constitution here and now, but do not shift a responsibility from your shoulders and throw it upon the shoulders and upon the consciences of the people that sent you here to represent them. (Applause.)

Mr. C. A. Fuller—I have, upon this question, endeavored to divest my mind of the prejudices and consider the matter upon its merits, and to foresee the actual workings of the so-called reform; I have read the speech of Curtis in '67, listened to the arguments and pleadings of Miss Anthony, Mrs. Blake and Mrs. Jacobi, and the other bright and charming speakers for woman suffrage. Last night I was not indifferent to the power and brilliancy of the effort of the very able advocate of the cause, and still I must confess that I do not believe in the movement. I think that its adoption, in this State, at this time, or before the organization of the next Constitutional Convention, would be a serious blunder. I know the face value, the ostensible magnitude of the prayers of men and women for the proposed change that would make New York the pioneer among the great States permitting general female suffrage. By request, I presented the Chenango county contingent of petitions. While I did not examine the matter within the covers, I presume that the footings were correct, and that subscribed to the heading of the petition there are some 3,000 names, about equally divided between males and females. While petitions are not to be wholly ignored, and sometimes imply much, every delegate to this Convention knows how easy it is to procure names to a list once started, in particular if it is presented by a pretty woman. I will not assume to characterize the quality of the petitions from other counties, but so far as Chenango county is concerned, from personal knowledge, I make bold to say that it would convey a wrong impression to assume that the number and the names appearing represented the sober, deliberate, intelligent desires of all of the people there recorded. It has come to my knowledge, from the admission of the signers themselves, that many persons whose names are upon that petition do not desire to have the question even submitted to the people. In reply to my inquiry why they allowed their names to falsely sustain the momentous question, the reply has been that it was the quickest and cheapest way to get rid of the canvasser for names. In my own town I know of names to the petition against, regretted their act, and wished it had been upon the petition against.

It is my judgment that the number of women in most localities who really want the ballot, is exceedingly small. The ballot, once granted, could not be confined to the Anthonys, Willards, Blakes and Jacobis. In self-defense, it would drag the overwhelming majority of women, who protest against the imposition of this new duty, away from their homes and business, into the caucus, the

convention and to the polls. To extend the franchise as demanded would, in the great centers of population, where now the chief menace to the purity and integrity of elections exists, add a large contingent to the absolutely corrupt and purchasable vote. I shall be apprehensive of the day when, in these cities, all sorts and conditions of women, over twenty-one years of age, may go to the polls and help determine the personnel of the city government. The ballot, in my judgment, would not advantage the worthy women. As it is, in every good way, their interests have been and are cared for, advanced and promoted. All avocations are open to them (except as policemen and soldiers) as to property interests. They stand equal, or with special advantages in their favor. They are not differently taxed. Men are, as a rule, in their conduct towards women, fair, generous, courteous, chivalrous. They will fight for and protect them; they revere, honor and love them; they regard them in their special spheres as their equals or superiors. It would tend to change this benign condition and adjustment for women to be plunged into the fierce, bitter fight of political contest; quarter would not be asked or given; once arrayed on this or that side of the fighting line, the women would hurrah with the victors and wear their share of the scalps of the enemy taken in battle, or they would abide in the camp of the defeated, crushed and disconsolate.

This experience would not promote the development of that which makes woman most lovable and influential. Now she has a mighty power in shaping men and measures. It is my deliberate judgment, good for what it may be worth, that voting would not enhance the power, best influence or happiness of woman, but, on the contrary, would vex, harm and oppress her. As I would vote against the proposition, in Committee of the Whole, I believe it proper to attempt to defeat the measure here and now.

Mr. Cassidy—Mr. President, I have no desire to entertain or dazzle this Convention with sentences braided out of sunshine, or to play hide and seek with its honor, as did my friend, Platzek, who is the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, but I do desire to speak briefly on this question.

In what I shall say I do not expect to enlighten any member of this Convention. I speak as the farmer boy whistles, merely for my own amusement and satisfaction. I believe, Mr. President, that every reason that ever has been advanced, or can be advanced, why

men should vote, can be advanced with equal power and force why women should vote. (Applause.) But I do not believe all men should vote. I believe that the monumental blunder of the nineteenth century was made when the elective franchise was given to all male citizens. Do you ask me then how I can consistently support a measure giving the franchise to all female citizens. My answer is this: That while a monumental blunder was made in granting the elective franchise to all male citizens, a greater blunder would have been made had it been denied to all male citizens. And so, Mr. President, while I myself am in favor of an educational qualification for female citizenship, rather than to say that the noble women of this country shall not have the elective franchise, I am in favor of giving it to all; for if forced to choose, I would rather do wrong to some, than to do an injustice to many. I do not believe that this Convention ought to raise a barrier against citizenship that will prohibit all women from ever exercising the right of the elective franchise. If you say that she shall have ten thousand dollars worth of property, it is possible for her to qualify herself and fulfill the requirements of citizenship. If you say that she shall have the culture and brain of a Webster, it is still possible for some women to pass even beyond that limit, and be qualified for citizenship. But when you say that a person must be a male citizen before he or she is qualified for citizenship, you have raised a barrier over which no woman, however qualified she may be, can ever pass. (Applause.)

I believe that the elective franchise should be granted to our wives, and our sisters and our mothers, because I believe in an educated and patriotic motherhood. I believe if society is ever to be regenerated and uplifted, it is to be regenerated and uplifted through an enlightened and patriotic motherhood. This nation is in need of educated and patriotic mothers. I believe that when Johnny comes home from school perplexed with the problems of civil government or political economy, we should make it possible for him to go to his mother and receive some information. The last person that a boy or girl ought to be ashamed of in this world is his mother; especially if that shame is due to ignorance on her part. She ought, at all times, to be in sympathy with her children, and able to give them information and education; and for this reason I believe that the elective franchise should be conferred upon the mothers of this country. I believe that the elective franchise should be given to woman, because I believe that the home is the unit of civilization,

and that the home finds its protection in the mothers and wives of this country. Under all government is society, and under society is the home, and the home is made possible by the sanctities of womanhood. And unless woman is given the power to protect the home and to make potent the sanctities of womanhood through the ballot, we have robbed her of half her usefulness. When she has made home beautiful, she has beautified and exalted society, and when she has uplifted and exalted society she has purified and exalted government. And for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the right of elective franchise should be conferred upon our women. I know that those who take this position are called sentimentalists. I have reluctantly expressed my opinion, this evening, because of the fear that I should be called a sentimentalist, but, Mr. Chairman, rob life of its sentiment, and you have taken from it all its beauty and aroma.

I believe, Mr. President, that if we give to woman the right to vote, the darkness which sometimes overshadows our national life will disappear, and that, under a clearer sky and purer atmosphere our national life will grow stronger and nobler, sanctified more and more, consecrated to God and to liberty by those who fall in the strife for the just and the true. (Applause.)

Mr. Kerwin — Mr. President, unlike some of the delegates who have spoken heretofore, I rise to say that I believe in voting for this question, not merely to get it before the people. But, I think, it is right to advocate the question, because I believe in it honestly, that it will tend to purify the ballot of this State. (Applause.)

Mr. President, I sat here to-night and listened to the members of this Convention who say that the signers of certain petitions here merely signed them to get rid of the people who presented them. Mr. President, I will state in relation to the city of Albany, that there are twenty four organizations represented in the Central Federation of Labor in Albany, to which this question was sent for a referendum vote, and one question that came back with the unanimous vote, the unanimous support of every one of the twenty-four organizations, was that of universal suffrage for the woman. (Applause.)

Mr. President, I have heard it stated upon this floor, to-night, that they cannot go to war and into the battlefields. I ask the delegates in this Convention, who did better work from 1862 to 1864 than the noble women of this country; who went in and did everything in their power on the battlefield?

Mr. President, I do not propose to detain the Convention any longer. I do not propose to usurp its time; but I speak for the working people of the city of Albany, who asked for my nomination, and who sent me here as their representative, that the question most important and uppermost in their minds was that of universal suffrage.

Mr. President, after listening, last night, to Mr. Lauterbach, and listening to all the speakers down to Mr. Cassidy to-night, I believe the ground has been fully covered. All I desire to say is that I heartily indorse this amendment, not because I believe in getting rid of it and sending it to the people, but because I believe it necessary, and it is right. (Applause.)

Mr. Griswold — Mr. President and gentlemen of the Convention, there is one proposition that has been made here, and that is that whatever may be the views of the majority of the Convention, at all events this question should be submitted to the people to determine. That involves the duty of the delegates who compose this Convention. We are sent here to perform certain duties, and, as I understand the principle of our duty here, it is to examine the various propositions that may be presented to the Convention, and then select certain ones to be embodied in the proposed Constitution to be submitted to the people, and to reject the others. Now, each minority that comes to this Convention with propositions however wild, the same argument can be used by it. They say: "Oh, submit it to the people. Surely you can submit it to the people." Do not determine it yourselves, but submit it to the vote of the people." That certainly is plausible upon its face, and yet I submit that it is not the true rule of action for this Convention. I submit that the delegates to this Convention were selected from all over the State to here perform certain duties, among which is to present to the people of the State such propositions as the majority of this Convention shall approve. Otherwise, you would have a hundred or two hundred different propositions to go to the people, upon which it would be impossible to vote intelligently. I understand the rule upon which this Convention is to act, to be that only such propositions shall be submitted to the people as a majority of this Convention decide ought to pass into our organic law. So that when we submit a proposition to be adopted by the people, it stands as recommended by the majority of this Convention, and, therefore, I repudiate the rule of action that has been suggested here, that it shall be submitted to the people, though the majority of the Convention oppose it, and thus delegates to shirk and avoid the responsibility that devolves upon them under their oaths of office.

Now, I believe that every delegate here is sincere upon this question. I believe this is a most important question, which should be treated seriously by every member of the Convention. I recognize the fact that the females of this generation are to be the mothers of the next generation. I recognize the fact that if you degrade and demean the females of this generation, it so far tends to degrade and demean the whole people, the men as well as women. The females of to-day must be the mothers, not only of the female, but of the male people of this State. Believing, as I sincerely do, that this proposition to give to the female population of this State the right of suffrage, and to impose on them all the obligations of that right, is one wrong in principle, radically wrong, one opposed to the natural laws of creation and of the Almighty who made them.

With the various minds of the people, as they are constituted, it would seem that there is no proposition so radical, so wild, that if you can find a few individuals to agitate and preach it with earnestness and fervor, it will find some followers. Now, there are three classes of women. They may be classified as, first, the matrons, the mothers, of whom I will have a word to say hereafter, and who, it is claimed, should have the right of suffrage. Another class is the women who labor and who have none to care for or to support or to maintain them. It is said that they should have the right of suffrage. I have asked a few of them the question: Do you desire the right of suffrage? Yes. Well, why? One says, I want to vote so that I can get the same wages that a man gets, if I do as much work. Another lady, who was here from Wyoming, wanted the right of suffrage to that class because they were engaged in the sweat shops, I think she called them, and only earning three dollars per week. Now, how are they going to regulate wages by voting? Do they expect by law to fix the price that they shall receive for their wages? Do they expect to compel their employer to pay a certain price? Do they expect to deprive him of the right to employ those that he sees fit, and at such price as he will agree to pay? There is no answer to this.

There is another class that they say ought to have the suffrage, and that is the tax-paying woman; and a statement has been brought in here of quite a number of tax-paying ladies of the counties of Albany and Rensselaer. I should like to have had them state how much property each owns and pays taxes on that she did not receive from her dead husband or father, but I pass over that as immaterial. But where is the grievance on the part of these tax-paying ladies? Is anyone taxed one farthing more than anyone else in proportion

to her property? Is anyone taxed any more than she would be taxed if she voted? No more. "Oh, but it is the principle of the thing," they say; "taxation without representation." And I heard one of these lady female suffrage advocates citing the language of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, as one of the grievances of which the colonies complained against Great Britain, that they were taxed without representation, and extolling him as that "great and good man," and this has been repeated over and over in the writings and speeches of those ladies. Now, I have always supposed that that document was a political document accepted and sent forth by Jefferson and other signers of it in the weak condition and crisis of the colonies, which were then likely to be crushed by the overwhelming power of England to obtain the sympathy and aid of France, Spain and Portugal, and the rest of the civilized world, and had reference to grievances of the colonies as a people.

Does any intelligent man or woman suppose that "that great and good man," or his associates, when that document was written, had any reference to or thought of female suffrage? If they did, they must have been most consummate hypocrites, for otherwise they should immediately have proceeded to give their wives, mothers and daughters the right to vote to set them free; to "have emancipated" them, in the language of these ladies.

But this is a representative government, as everyone must be, except one that is in the nature of a monarchy or an oligarchy. I come here to-day to represent whom? I represent those that voted for me in my district. Nearly an equal number voted against me, and yet I represent one as much as the other. Here is a Convention to-day with a majority of one political party, elected by a small majority over the other. That party controls every question here that it sees fit, and it represents not only the members of that party, but the opposing party that voted directly against it.

The right to vote is not a natural right. It is a political right. It emanates from and is conferred by the body politic, the political body, the State. As well might one of those ladies come into this Convention or go into the Legislature and claim the right to vote or go upon the judge's bench and claim his seat, or to be an associate. All these rights are of the same class; they are political rights which are conferred by the body politic, as deemed best by that body for the State, for the greatest good of the greatest numbers. Now, see the failure of the axiom, that the right to vote is a natural, God given or alien right.

Oh, this fancied female grievance of taxation without representation. Can't the father or the husband, the brother or the son, represent the wives, the mothers, the daughters and the sisters, and do they not as legitimately represent them as I represent those in this Convention, who voted against me, or as the majority in this Convention represents those who voted against it? There can be nothing in that argument, which has been harped over so much.

Now, then, what I object to, and what I will never consent to vote for, is to degrade and demean the womanhood of this State. I believe the conferring the right of suffrage upon women will tend to do that. I believe it takes them out of their proper sphere, and that it is not for their own good; and instead of these gentlemen standing here as the champions of the female sex, I insist upon it that those who are opposed to female suffrage, and to dragging them down, are the real true champions of womanhood in this State. Do members of this Convention believe that it is necessary for their wives, their sisters and their mothers to cast a ballot in order to be protected in all their rights? Do they claim they would do it?

Some of these pioneer original woman's rights women, I think the Claflin women were the first and (most of you know who they were), asserted that man was the natural enemy of woman, and that there is an irrepressible conflict between the two sexes. Why, sir, you can't keep them apart after they arrive at the age of fifteen years. (Applause and laughter.) I now, sir, again speak of those women of that class to whom I first referred, but who, as I said a few days ago, were regarded in the elegant and classic language of one of these advocates of female suffrage, as cow-women. That is because they are domestic, docile, because they are matrons and mothers, refusing to follow these strong-minded women who are making this crusade.

Why, sir, over this whole broad land, in the rural districts, the hamlets, the villages and the cities, these matrons and mothers are found. They are caring for their children; they are giving to them the first moral impressions to guide them in after life. They are instructing and controlling their boys, educating and guiding their girls from infancy to womanhood, the queens of their homes and households, the best, the noblest and happiest women on earth. Sir, to these, sooner than any human beings on this, God's planet, I would bow down with reverence.

I talked with a lady not long since who had brought up a large and intelligent family of young men and women. I asked her if she did not have enough to do in caring for and bringing up her family without voting and attending to politics. She replied, "I tell you

I have my hands, head and heart full. I don't want to vote. I signed that petition, and I am sorry I did it. I was coaxed into it. We must look to the majority when we legislate, and I do not propose by my vote, at the instigation of the few, the small minority, as I maintain they are, to drag down and degrade that other class equally and a great deal more important." Oh, say these women advocates: Are we not as good as negroes? Are we not as good as Polanders, Hungarians and all the rough elements that go to the polls? Are we not as good as they? Yes, you are as good as they, and a hundred times better. Better than any of them, and we don't propose to drag you down to their level, nor to permit you to go there if you want to. (Applause.)

I maintain boldly that women in general, from their impulsive and excitable nature, are unfit to enter the political arena; to them are assigned duties in a different sphere. This proposition for female suffrage is a political heresy. It would not be for their own good as the good of the State.

The majority do not want it. If it were submitted to a vote of the women of the State, I have that confidence in the good sense, the sound second thought of the women of the State, that when the question should be reasonably discussed with them, and its consequences explained, they would bury it by a majority vote so deep it would never have a resurrection. The time is not yet ripe for this radical change in this country, and I think we should be wrong if we make it now, a wrong a little less than a crime. That being my opinion, I shall vote to sustain the report of the committee. (Applause.)

Mr. Lester—Mr. President, it is not my purpose, sir, to make any extended argument upon the merits of this question, which has already been so exhaustively discussed in this Convention. Yet, it is a subject which I recognize as one of such great importance that I deem it due to myself to defend my position in regard to it. The question has been frequently pressed upon my attention during many years, in fact, since the last Constitutional Convention in this State, when two of my relatives, sitting in that Convention, gave their earnest support and their votes to the proposition that the women of the State should vote—one of them making in the Convention of 1867-8 the most finished and powerful argument in its favor on record, prior to the able arguments that have been heard in this house within the past forty-eight hours. This speech was lately printed and circulated as a campaign document among the members of this Convention by the advocates of female suffrage.

Notwithstanding these circumstances, that seem to indicate my action upon the question, I am constrained by strong convictions as to my duty, to break through their influences and to assume a contrary attitude. I cannot believe the time has arrived for such an amendment as that which has been proposed. I cannot believe that it is the duty of this Convention to go beyond the recommendation of such amendments as the Convention believes are demanded by the present conditions of the State. I cannot believe that this Convention was intended to be a device for ascertaining the sentiment of the public upon questions of public policy. I cannot believe, sir, we are here to launch the government into a sea of untried political experiments. I do believe that there are certain necessities in the direction of constitutional amendment, principally in matters of detail, for which the people of the State have called us together. Let us attend to these necessities and return to our homes, and the commendation of the people will follow us. Let us build a new foundation out of political theories, however substantial they may appear to us, that have not been subjected to the test of experience, and endeavor to substitute this foundation for that upon which the prosperity of the last half century of our existence has rested, and the people will turn from this Convention and all its work with distrust, and stamp it with their condemnation at the polls. I am in favor of the report of the committee, and hope that it will be sustained.

Mr. Goodelle—Mr. President, we were very much in hopes that this discussion could be brought to a close this evening, and a vote be taken upon it, but I am aware that there are some gentlemen who desire yet to be heard, and the probability is that it would be at an exceedingly late hour that we should go to a vote this evening. I, therefore, at this time, desire to make this motion: that the discussion upon the question now before the house, and the vote thereon, be taken on Tuesday evening next, after the close of discussion. I do not desire to have this understood to be a motion for adjournment at this time, because if other gentlemen desire to speak, I shall be very glad to have them, and they may use as much time, this evening as possible; but I think it well, at this time, to take the sense of the Convention upon the proposition which I have made.

The Chairman put the question on Mr. Goodelle's motion, which was determined in the affirmative.

Mr. Kellogg — Mr. President, I am compelled to ask consent, at this time, to be excused from attendance at the Convention to-morrow. The reason I ask it now is, that I have an important message which calls me to my home, and I shall have to take the eleven o'clock train.

The Chair put the question on the request of Mr. Kellogg to be excused, and he was excused.

Mr. Sullivan — Mr. President, I have only a few words to say on this subject. I desire to say them now. In listening to the able, interesting, and I may say dramatic, presentation of this question in behalf of the suffragists, by the gentleman from New York, last evening, I was attracted by a statement he made with respect to the petitions that have been presented to this body. Let me quote. "That is their petition, that you, having the power to destroy the rights of women, should not exercise it. You have had the power from time immemorial. You have exercised it in your own way and your own fashion. It has been consistently exercised against the rights of women."

Now, I for one, protest against any such statement. It is true, that under the common law, when her personal rights, the rights of her property, the rights and privileges of her person and of her children, were largely, almost absolutely, under the sway and the authority of her baron or her guardian; under that law, which confiscated all her personal possessions; under that law, which subjected her person to corporal punishment by the rods and switches in the hands of her guardian and her husband, true woman had much to complain of. Of that law, the great Sir William Blackstone said, after reviewing all these restrictions and disqualifications, that they were intended, not for her harm, but for her protection and benefit, and he then adds by way of rhetorical period: "So great a favorite is the female sex of the law of England."

But, sir, no longer is woman wronged in her possessions or restricted in her personal freedom and privileges; and no longer is her virtue exposed to the slanders of malignity and falsehood, for he who with impunity proclaims the pure maid or chaste matron to be a meretricious or incontinent person, now falls within the animadversion of our temporal courts. Sir, no longer in our State is womankind hampered or wronged in her worldly possessions. No longer are her personal rights and privileges restricted. I say now

that no class, no number or form or manner of persons or of rights or interests are so well, so fully, so liberally, so ably guarded and surrounded by the protection of the law, as women, not only in its letter, but in its spirit, interpretation and administration; sir, I say now, and challenge any controversy, than womankind no greater favorite is known to the laws of the State of New York. In behalf of my district, the Thirtieth Senatorial district of this State, I will say that the unanimous sentiment of the voters of that district is against this movement, against submission to them; and I say this as a respecter of woman, as a lover of woman. The gentleman asks that we submit this question to the jury. What jury, pray you? As I understand the principles of democratic government, it is government by the majority. The will of the majority is made manifest through the exercise of the ballot, the suffrage; and one of the greatest evils that we have to contend with to-day is that citizens — aye, citizens, the representatives of historic families — will not, do not, enter into the spirit of the duty of that privilege, and do not exercise it. Now, sir, what are we about to do? We are to impose that duty — that moral duty — would that I might say that it were legal and compulsory — upon a vast number of persons; and do they want it? Do a majority of the women of the State of New York to-day come here and demand of us that they be given this privilege, and that we impose upon them this duty? I say I cannot believe it; and, sir, if they do not, we have no right to impose it. Whatever might be the result if this question were submitted to the woman's constituency that I represent — if I read their heart aright, instinct tells me that it is noble and true; but I confess that the range of my intellect is too narrow to know woman's mind, they might determine in the affirmative. But I say if this question were submitted to the votes of the male constituency that I represent, and they should vote upon it at the next election, it would bode your cause no good. Do you wish to submit this question in this manner? If you have truly the purpose of acquiring for woman the right of franchise at heart, do you want to risk it upon this hazard? Do you want upon the record the verdict of the great State of New York that will be overwhelmingly against you? If you do, there you stand, and this record will ever stand before you wherever you attempt to secure this privilege, no matter in what field; the great Empire State will stand — I feel it, I know — four-fold against you. For this reason, and in behalf of my constituency, I must support the report of this committee, not only against this Convention's granting the right to woman, but also against submitting it to the vote of the people.

Mr. Mereness — Mr. President, upon a question which has been the subject of so much oratory, it is with great hesitancy that I arise to take up any of the time of this Convention by a contribution to the literature upon this subject, which, I am convinced, will probably not influence the vote of any delegate upon this floor. And yet, sir, as the discussion is so general upon this question, I suppose that it is very appropriate that those who feel called upon to speak are at liberty to do so.

Now, sir, the first great subject that seems to be at the threshold of all this discussion, is the subject of the petitions which have been presented to this body. I am not here to assume that those petitioners are acting in bad faith. If I understand that question correctly, there are some 300,000 actual petitioners upon this subject. We are told that in addition to that, there are organizations represented here to the amount of several hundred thousand more; but as to whether the individuals of those organizations are also included in the written petitions, we have no evidence; so that at the threshold of this discussion we are unable to say how much repeating has been done in the interest of this movement. So far as I am concerned, sir, in the county that I have the honor to represent, we have at least 15,000 adult persons. I believe, if I am correctly informed, it is claimed there are some 1,100 petitioners out of that 15,000. With the industry that has been shown by these solicitors of names, I am bound to assume that nearly every adult within my county has been asked by some fair damsel, or otherwise, to sign these petitions, and as there is only one in fifteen recorded in favor of the movement, I think I can best represent my constituency by voting in favor of this report. In addition to that, sir, I have seen the names, as far as I have examined this little petition from our county, of a number of gentlemen who have told me privately that they did not want woman suffrage, but that when the petition was presented to them they had no time to argue with the fair canvasser, and so concluded that it was easier to shirk the matter off on us at this Convention. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for any sincere believer in the doctrine of woman suffrage. If the arguments in favor of that doctrine have convinced the mind of a fair-minded man or woman, I have the utmost respect for his or her opinion, and would be always glad to see them stand up and defend the principle. But, sir, with all due respect to some who, I fear, are members of this Convention, I have no sympathy with those who are absolutely opposed to the proposition, and propose to shirk it off on to the

Mr. Cassidy — Mr. President, may I interrupt the gentleman for a moment?

Mr. Mereness — Mr. Cassidy will have abundant time, I trust, and I think this not a catechism —

Mr. Cassidy — I simply want to ask a question.

Mr. Mereness — I decline to give way to the gentleman at the present time. A little later on I shall be glad to be catechised by him or any other gentleman.

Mr. President, while I say we ought not to assume that these petitions are presented in bad faith, I think that we, as reasonable men, should apply our experience to the subject of petitions generally, and when we have arrived at a conclusion upon that subject, we should give them such due weight as we think they are entitled to receive.

Another fact, so far as the question of petitions is concerned. Mr. President, there is no petitioner represented before this Convention upon this subject, who has any official responsibility upon that subject. On the other hand, every delegate in this Convention is charged with official responsibility, and while they come to us with a siren-like voice and say, "Please, please let us submit it to the people," if we vote to submit, how long will it be, fellow-delegates, before these fair ladies will go out to the people and say, "Oh, those 170 representatives of the great Empire State, comprising a large portion of the intelligence of the State, and all, or nearly all, of the male virtue of the State, have adopted this solemnly; and in the discharge of their official duty they have decided that it is wise to put into the Constitution of the Empire State a provision opening the door to a million and a half of new voters, and, therefore, you people who do not know as much as the delegates, have no business to set up your judgment against theirs; and, therefore, you must adopt it." Now, sir, the question, as it occurs to me, is this — whether upon this showing we are to add to the electorate of this State a million and a half of voters, without any assurance, or without any evidence, except such as rhetoric affords, that there is to be any improvement in the quality of that electorate. Mr. President, it is with some hesitancy that I refer to a very specious argument, as I regard it, upon this subject, because when this point is made, many gallant gentlemen say: "Oh, the women are a great deal more honest than the men, and, therefore, if you let them vote the quality of the

suffrage will be very much improved." I am not here to raise any question as to the honesty or the virtue of woman; but I am here to say that I believe that God has implanted in man as many of the virtues and good qualities as he has in woman, and I do not say that he has any more. Now, sir, they have had female suffrage in a number of places. They have a practical test; and has anybody presented a scintilla of proof that in those places, where female suffrage has obtained, that women are any better off, or that government is any better off, than it is in the State of New York? If any such evidence as that has been presented I have not heard it read, and I have listened, sir, to every oral argument that has been made upon this subject on this floor; and I have read — my time has been limited, and I could not read them all — but I have read acres of argument in favor of the movement. But they say that the argument is all in favor of the proposition. Why, Ignatius Donnelly has written volumes of argument upon the subject of Bacon and Shakespeare. He has woven beautiful theories to the effect that there never was such a Shakespeare as we know of. But has he convinced anybody that there was not? Col. Robert G. Ingersoll has held thousands and hundreds of thousands of people in thrall, I may say, if that is a proper word, upon the proposition that there is no God. But has he established the proposition? His argument is beautiful, so far as rhetoric is concerned; but it fails to convince. Now, sir, I will not attempt to answer the very eloquent gentleman who opened the argument upon the side of the women on this question. I would not attempt, sir, to arrogate to myself any such distinguished ability as to be able to do that; but I was a little surprised that he was not able, or was not willing, to concede that people who did not believe with him, were actuated by good motives, and that possibly there were some things which appealed to us so far as our judgment is concerned. Sir, the wife has charge of the household. If the human race is to be perpetuated in its purity, it is woman who must take care of that; and for one, I am not in favor of adding to that burden the burden of taking care of the politics of the country besides. I think, sir, that I have spent time enough upon this question. I suppose a good deal more could be said, but at this late hour I think it is hardly worth while. I will only say this, that while I disclaim any intention to answer the able argument of the foremost exponent of that measure, if I may be allowed to characterize him upon the floor of this Convention, I will yield to him nothing as to the honesty of my intentions, and if I had a thousand votes upon the floor of the Convention, they would all go to sustain the report of this committee.

Mr. Cassidy was recognized by the chair.

Mr. Cassidy — Did I understand the gentleman to say that fifteen per cent of his constituency were hypocrites and liars?

Mr. Mereness — If the gentleman so understood me, his hearing must be very defective.

Mr. Dickey — Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Mereness — Yes; I am very willing to furnish entertainment for Mr. Dickey. He seems to need a little.

Mr. Dickey — I would like to ask the gentleman how many people who live in his district have told him that they lied when they signed that petition for woman suffrage.

Mr. Mereness — I am very happy to say, sir, that I represent a constituency to none of whom the term used by the gentleman applies.

Mr. Dean — Mr. President, while there is a sufficient number of people here to carry the motion, I move that the Convention do now adjourn.

The Chair put the question on the motion to adjourn, and it was determined in the negative.

Mr. Lewis (M. E.) — I desire to send to the clerk's desk and have read an article clipped from a daily newspaper of this date, bearing upon this question.

Mr. Cassidy — I object to that, on the ground that it assumes that what you see in the newspaper is truthful; unless the gentleman can verify the truthfulness of the statement, I object to having it injected in here.

Mr. Moore — I object to it — I arise to a question of privilege.

The Chair — The secretary will read the article. It may save us a long speech. We will allow this to be read.

The secretary read the following extract offered by Mr. Lewis:

"MARRIAGE AND POLITICS MIXED."

"Minneapolis, Aug. 9.—A paper published at Forman, N. D., brings out a romantic incident in connection with the nomination by the Republican State convention of Miss Emma F. Bates, of Valley City, to be State Superintendent of Schools.

"Miss Bates had charge of her own canvass for the nomination, and found formidable opponents in John H. Devine and Prof. J. H. Holland. She was able to side-track the latter by making herself solid with the Young Men's Republican League. She then entered into negotiations with Mr. Devine, first demanding unconditional surrender. This he refused.

"After further negotiations, it is said, he agreed to pull off the track provided she would, if elected State Superintendent, make him her deputy, and marry him into the bargain. After some deliberation, she agreed to do this, provided he would stump the State for her. This was also agreed to. As he is a powerful speaker, Miss Bates is conceded to have made the shrewdest political deal yet known."

Mr. Cassidy — Mr. President, I move a vote of thanks of this Convention be extended Miss Bates.

Mr. Lewis (M. E.) — I move that the Convention do now adjourn.

Mr. Cochran — I do not understand that the President rules the motion to adjourn to be in order before any other business has been transacted.

The Chair — The Chair does not understand that the motion to adjourn was seriously meant.

Mr. Maybee — If it is not, I make a motion to adjourn, and ask for a rising vote. I think the lateness of the hour indicates the necessity of an immediate adjournment.

The Chair then put the question on Mr. Maybee's motion to adjourn, which was determined in the affirmative by a rising vote, 46 to 32.

EVENING SESSION.

Tuesday Evening, August 14, 1894.

The Constitutional Convention of the State of New York met in the Assembly Chamber, in the Capitol at Albany, N. Y., August 14, 1894, at eight P. M.

President Choate called the Convention to order.

The President — The special business for this time is the special order, the consideration of Mr. Tucker's amendment on suffrage.

Mr. Bigelow — Mr. President, at an early period in our deliberations here, I had the honor to submit to the Convention an amendment proposing to confer upon the Legislature the power to extend to the female sex all or any of the powers, privileges, immunities, responsibilities and exemptions to which they would be entitled, or which they would incur if the word "male" were stricken from the Constitution. My motive in presenting that — and I would say here that it was presented without knowledge of the amendment that I think had not yet been presented by Mr. Tucker, and which is now under consideration — my motive in presenting that was, to state it very briefly, that I thought it was as well in the existing division of public sentiment upon this question that it should be handed over to the Legislature to have it considered more deliberately than it would be possible for us to consider it here, and also because none of us had been elected upon this issue and could not pretend to have come here with any particular instructions upon this question; that if remitted to the Legislature, the best light of the country would be attracted to the discussion of the question, and we should find new points of agreement, either with one side or the other, and less points of controversy than seem to exist now without as well as within the walls of this Convention.

But, Mr. President, it seemed to be the judgment of the able and distinguished phalanx of ladies, who have been representing the interests of their sex at this Convention so ably and becomingly; it seemed to be their preference that this question should be sent by the Convention directly to the people for their judgment. I have always found that I was more apt to be right when I agreed with the ladies than when I disagreed with them, and I have concluded that what little I have to say or do upon this question shall be said and done in favor of the amendment which they all seem to prefer, and, therefore, I shall ask those, if there are any — I know there are some who prefer that this matter should go to the Legislature — I shall ask them to do as I propose to do, and support the amendment now under consideration.

Before I enter upon the merits of this question, I wish to separate this Convention from any portion of responsibility for one argument which was presented before it by one of the learned counsel who represented, by authority, the adversaries of female suffrage.

The ladies who have opposed the extension of the franchise to their sex, with a sagacity and tact for which the sex has always been renowned, wisely declined to appear here in defense of their own case. Wisely, I say, not that there were not enough and to spare of ladies who could have presented it with quite as much ability as the other side was presented; who have not all the eloquence and the logic that would be necessary to do justice to their cause but they realized that the very strength and ability with which they presented their case would be fatal to it. It would be undermining the ground on which they stood, titling of the old fable of the woman who found that the garment she had been weaving all day was all unravelled in the course of the night.

Well, they sent some lawyers here to present their case. One of those gentlemen — a gentleman for whom I have personally the very highest respect, both professionally and personally — in the course of his speech, used this language:

"The number of prostitutes in the city of New York alone has been estimated at from thirty to fifty thousand. Every city in the State adds its quota to this disreputable army. These women, who live by selling themselves, soul and body, would, of course, sell their votes. There is no class among the present voting population" — please mark these words — "There is no class among the present voting population analogous to this degraded and unfortunate army of lost women."

Mr. President, I would not like to have uttered that sentence. What is the implication? That the female sex, your mothers, your sisters, your daughters and your wives are endowed by nature with vicious tendencies and propensities exceeding any ever experienced by fathers and brothers; that they are capable of gravitating into depths of wickedness which man has never fathomed; that from their birth they are distinguished from our sex by the extent and complete incurableness of their capacities for depravity. The least that can be said of this language is that it is blasphemous.

Now, Mr. President, if there be any class of people in this world entitled to more of our commiseration than any other it is the women who have strayed from the path of virtue. But there never was a woman who strayed from the path of virtue who had not a male

co-respondent more wicked than herself. When our Saviour said to the woman taken in adultery: "Go and sin no more," what did He say to the men who accused her and who wanted permission to stone her? He did not say to them, "Go and sin no more." He only said: "You who are without sin, cast the first stone." And they all retired, from the first unto the last, in silence. Far be it from me to presume to interpret the ways of God to men, but I will venture to say that one of the reasons why the language used was so different in the two cases was that, to have said to the men, "Go and sin no more," would have been a waste of words. And He also knew, for He knew all, that when He said to the woman, "Go and sin no more," that His advice would not be wasted.

And yet it is upon this distinction that we are asked and expected, by our vote here to-night, to proclaim from the Capitol, and to write it in the Constitution of the State, that the sex from which we derive our being are so incurably depraved that they cannot be trusted with the franchise; that our mothers, who, even before reaching voting age, were deemed competent to choose as companions for life, the fathers of our families, are not competent to choose a school commissioner to watch over the institutions for the instruction of our children, nor legislators to make the laws they are required to obey.

It was the contention of the learned advocate of the anti-suffragists, that people who sell themselves are not fit to be voters, and as all women have an incurable propensity to sell themselves they were not fit to have the franchise.

Mr. President, let us test this doctrine and see what it involves; let us see where the line must be drawn between the competents and the incompetents under this rule.

While we have been sitting here we have heard that the captains of police and their assistants, in the city of New York, have been found selling themselves for various considerations, and great scandal has arisen in consequence. If you were to draw the line at all those who are unfit to be captains of police, you would reduce the male franchise very considerably.

We heard from one of the eloquent speakers to-day a good deal about the Tweed charter of 1871. It is but a few years ago, according to the authority of an eminent Republican judge in the city of New York that Mr. Tweed carried that charter through the Legislature of this State by the votes of Senators who sold themselves; that six of them received each \$10,000 for his vote, \$5,000 more for votes on kindred subjects, and \$5,000 more for their votes the next year. Now,

then, shall we draw a line on the class from which we select our legislators? But wait. While we have been sitting in this Convention, Mr. President, the Senate of the United States has been subjected to an humiliation to which no other parliamentary body of corresponding rank in all the civilized world ever submitted; compelled, under oath, to purge itself, and not with entire success, either, of having sold itself, not for "soap," but sugar. (Applause.) Will you draw your line upon your candidate for the upper house of our national parliament? You will remember a Vice-President of the United States who was driven into coventry for allowing himself to be sold to a corporation. Some of you may, perhaps, suspect that I am not going to stop there. If any of you think I am going to disturb the treacherous ashes of partisanship in this assemblage by pursuing this inquiry farther for the lessons to be drawn from the election of 1876 you will be disappointed. But I will say this, that if you are going to draw your line against the present voting class who sell themselves, I commend to you the advice which the farmer gave to a man about cutting off his dog's tail: Cut it off right behind the ears. (Laughter.)

It is the misfortune, not of one sex; it is the misfortune, not of one class, not of one rank in society, to be under influences which more or less bias their political judgments. None of us are free from it. I am not sure that the exigencies of our political system require that we should be entirely insensible to such considerations, but, at all events, none of us are, and the idea of proscribing our wives and our mothers for offenses from which none of us are entirely free, is not only weak but wicked.

It has often been mentioned in my presence that the admission of women to the franchise would effect a fearful increase of the vote, which is excessive now, but that if you double it you would make it twice as bad. Well, I am not going to waste many words upon this objection, which was first broached on this continent by the Tories in our revolution, and is only repeated now by those who, if they had lived then, would have been Tories also. I will say simply this: In twenty-five years, according to the best statistical authorities, the vote of this State will be doubled; and then what are you going to do about it? Why, you will do just what you always have done when the male vote has been increased; you will put up more booths, you will print more tickets, you will have a few more inspectors, and spend a little more money to get out the vote of a few more people. That is all you have to do now. A simpler problem was never presented to a Legislature.

One of my colleagues a few days ago said to me that he found only one difficulty in the way of giving the suffrage to women, which was that he was fearful that the incidental privilege of holding office would lead to domestic dissensions of a serious character. When I told him that my mind was clear upon that point, he asked me if I would not refer to it if I should participate in this debate. As there may be others besides him who have the same difficulty, which is very probable — because I remember that it was the first difficulty that occurred to me when this question promised to become a subject on which I would have to vote here, I will allow myself a few words upon it.

There are at least two good answers to this objection. In the first place, we have never thought it necessary to pass a constitutional provision, or to legislate against allowing men to marry women of a different religion. Now, every one knows that differences of religion are very much more difficult to reconcile than political differences, because they involve the questions of conscience, about which people who are serious and in earnest feel that they cannot compromise. Political differences are not of that character. Why should it be more difficult, why not less difficult, to harmonize on political differences than it is upon religious differences?

But I would ask in the next place, how do we get along with the fathers, the brothers and sons of a family who do not happen to agree in politics? We do not make any law to prevent a son from differing from his father politically, or against their having conflicting political aspirations. Is there any reason in the world why a man and his wife should quarrel about an office any more than the father and his son or brother?

The fact is, Mr. President, that men will be men and women will be women, whatever may be the provisions of the Constitution or the laws under which they live; and the man's power over the woman, and the woman's power over the man will continue to be just what it is and always has been from the foundation of the world, with the vote or without the vote, in office or out of office; and when the husband says he does not want his wife to run for an office, he will be most infelicitously married if he does not have his way. And, in such a case, all I have to say is, that if they did not quarrel about that matter they would be sure to quarrel, and just as fiercely, about something else.

One of the lawyers who presented the case of the anti-suffragist here, presented the somewhat singular theory that the foundation of government was force; and inferred from that that women, not being

as strong as men, were not fit to participate in the government. That, I believe, was the logic of the argument, so far as there is any logic possible in such a proposition. I would like to have asked that gentleman what force is? Did he ever feel force? Did he ever see cuts off his arm, and his force ceases. In due time, in the language of Job, he will lie down in the dark, and where then is his force? The author of the Nebular Hypothesis, as it is called, demonstrated to the satisfaction of the scientific world that the sun is the ostensible law-giver to all the forces of this earth. The air, the earth, the water, are all subservient to his light and heat, but at the same time he was obliged to admit that force must have preceded the sun. If you want to learn what force is, you have to learn what infinite power is, for all force comes from the source of all power. Did you ever hear of any such thing as sex in connection with force? I take it upon myself to say that, in every language that is written, except our own, force is feminine; in our own it is neuter. Now, the idea that a question of this character is to be settled by the difference in the force or the physical strength of the sexes, I almost feel I ought to apologize for referring to. To deal with it more seriously would be to debate whether the two most noted bruisers of our own time, Corbett and Pete Jackson, should not be the fittest candidates of the two great parties of the country for the chief magistracy.

The point has also been made here and elsewhere that the women do not want the suffrage, and that it would be cruel to impose its inevitable burdens upon them. I will say, in a word, all that need to be said upon that subject, without admitting or denying the fact stated, that women do not want the suffrage, although the evidence before this Convention shows the contrary. There has never been a time when an addition has been made to the suffrage, from the foundation of the world, upon the petition or the solicitation of the party receiving it. I defy any member of this Convention to name an instance in which the sovereign or voting power has yielded the suffrage to any class because that class wanted it.

It has always been given because one party or the other of the voting class wanted the votes of the disfranchised, in the hope of strengthening their party thereby; and, in that way, the suffrage has been continually increased, but always for the benefit of, and in the interest of, those who have the suffrage already. And now, as to the cruel aspect of this question. It has been contended here that it would be very cruel to impose upon women the duty of voting and

holding office. Mr. President, I never found any inconvenience about voting. I never voted against my wishes. I think I have always, since I have been of age, voted upon State and National questions, but I do not remember to have once voted against my wishes, nor wished that I had not voted, or considered it a burden; and I venture to say that the same remark could be made of every delegate in this Convention. They would not have voted if they had not wished to vote; nor did they ever begrudge the time it took.

Therefore, the question remains, would the liabilities and duties that attend voting be oppressive to the women? No, except in precisely the cases where it is oppressive to the male sex, and that is, when they want other people to vote for them who do not want to vote for them. There is where the burden of the franchise weighs heavily, but it weighs just as heavily upon the male as upon the female sex. It is the people who want others to vote for them or their party who have to work so hard at the polls. But the voter himself, who has nothing to do but to go and deposit his ballot, has no more trouble about it than he has in smoking his after-breakfast cigar.

This cry about the cruelty of imposing the hardships of the ballot and office-holding upon women reminds me of a dialogue that I read in one of the public prints the other day: "Johnnie," said his mother, "your little sister has been hauling you on her sled for half an hour; why don't you get off now and haul her a little while?" "Mamma," says little Johnnie, already an inchoate anti-suffragist, "I am afraid she will take cold." Little Johnnie's solicitude for his sister's health, I fear, was precisely and the only kind of solicitude that is felt for the women by those who hesitate to impose upon them the burdens of the franchise. (Laughter.)

Now, then, one word about the effect of the ballot upon the female sex. It is apprehended that if women are allowed to vote and be candidates for office, the consequences will be disastrous alike to them and to society. Precisely what those consequences would be, no one, I believe, has succeeded, if even attempted, to define. Neither have I been able to conjecture what they would be, but we are assured that they would be something awful. Now let me ask those who are disturbed by such apprehensions, whether the very fact that a woman aspired to fill a public office would not of itself constitute a guarantee that does not exist to-day, that she would be loyal to all her duties as a wife and a mother? Though I should be very far from desiring to encourage or recommend it, and far from apprehending that women would generally want offices of any particular importance, still I am

satisfied that if they did, the responsibility resting upon them; the possibilities of exposure to criticism, would operate to make them, not only more circumspect in their conduct than men are, but more circumspect even than they themselves now find it necessary to be. Instead of exerting a deteriorating influence, their sharing with men the responsibilities of sovereignty could not fail to be wholesome and elevating. On the other hand—and this is itself of some importance—were any aspersions cast upon woman's character in the discharge of her public duties, the resentment that would follow, if they were undeserved and unjust, would in itself be a great protection for her.

Now, Mr. President, I hesitate to occupy any more of the time of the Convention in the discussion of a subject upon which, I suppose, we are all pretty much determined how we shall vote, but before taking my seat, I would like to ask you all individually: Do you wish, do you dare go home to-night and say to your mothers, you who are so fortunate still as to have mothers, or your wives, you who are so fortunate as to have wives, "I have proclaimed to-night in the capitol of this State, to be read of all men, that you are not fit to have the franchise, to vote for a school trustee that is to educate your children, to vote for legislators who are to determine your rights and the rights of your husband and children?" No, you dare not, and I will answer for it that, if the question lay between you and your families alone, there would not be a single vote cast here this evening against this amendment.

We have heard much good advice, as well as bad, from lawyers upon this subject, and I will conclude by quoting one other opinion, given by an eminent lawyer who flourished some eighteen centuries ago, and some of the lawyers in that day had as level heads as any of our own time: There was an effort making to stone and kill two innocent men who happened to differ in their religious opinions from the Hebrews of that period in Palestine. He said to them, in substance: "I counsel you to go slow." He referred them to two or three cases where they had attempted to take the law into their own hands, and were finally persuaded to yield to better counsels, with gratifying results. He concluded by saying: "If this thing is of men, it will come to naught, but if it is from God, you will be overthrown." The turbulent crowd finally agreed with Gamaliel, and thereupon they "beat the apostles and let them go," says the historian. Now, Mr. President, we, following the example of these Hebrews, have already beaten the women in the Suffrage Committee room.

Now, let us continue to follow their example and let the women go — let them go to the people, and let the people say whether they are entitled to the franchise or not. (Applause.)

The President — Mr. Lauterbach desires to present a petition.

Mr. Lauterbach — Not to make a speech, Mr. President. I desire to present what will probably be the final petition to be presented to this Convention in favor of the prayer to strike the word "male" from the Constitution. The petition represents the additional petitions from New York, Erie, Cayuga, Monroe, Washington and five other counties, signed by 1,215 women and 493 men, making a total of 1,708. Barring some inaccuracies that may have occurred in computing the number of signatures, I am informed that the total signatures and indorsements to date represent 626,627. (Applause.)

The President — The petition will be received and placed in the archives.

Mr. Mantanye — Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks that have been made here by the various gentlemen on the two or three preceding evenings, and also to those that have been made here to-night. It seems to me that they are hardly, as we sometimes say here in the Convention, when calling somebody to order, that they are hardly germane to the proposed amendment and report under consideration. The gentlemen have discussed the question as to the right or wrong, or the propriety of striking the word "male" from the section in question in the Constitution, when that is not the question here at all. What we seem to be considering here is a way in which we may dodge that question. All of these impassioned speeches that we have heard here from gentlemen who have, with clinched fists and with closed eyes, appealed to the sense of justice and manhood in this Convention, when we come to compare their speeches and apply them to this proposition, seem to be very much like the travail of the mountain, to bring forth a very small mouse. For this is not to say whether we believe that the right of suffrage should be given to women or not, but it is to evade that question and to send it back to the people who sent us here to render some sort of decision upon that matter. Now, I honor and respect the gentlemen of this committee which made this report. They have first decided that it is their belief, founded upon their knowledge of the wishes of their constituents that they are here to represent, that the people do not want the word "male" stricken from the Constitution at this time.

And, therefore, I say that, if they have arrived at that conclusion, we have no right to turn around and say that, believing that, having the knowledge that gives us that belief, we will submit it back to the people to vote upon, when we already know and have declared our knowledge of what they wish in that matter. It seems to me that it is entirely wrong. It is beneath the honor and the dignity of a Convention of this kind to do such a thing as that, and I hope the gentlemen of this Convention will sustain the report of this committee upon this proposition, as it seems inclined to do and willing to do upon the main proposition. I say, seems inclined to do and willing to do, because those who pretend and claim that they are in favor of woman suffrage by their speeches have not taken and brought up for consideration here an adverse report upon the proposition to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution, to which question the speeches they have made here would be entirely pertinent. But they have chosen this proposition solely that they will not act upon that proposition, but that they will send it back to the people for them to vote upon and to pass upon. Now I think that if we do that we discredit ourselves; we lessen the respect that the people have for our work here, and for the Constitution that we may propose and submit to them. I should not hesitate, with the report of the committee upon this proposition voted down, and my vote recorded here in favor of this report, to go back to my own people, because I believe that they never would honor a coward, one who had been afraid to stand up for his opinions, and to have the courage of his opinions. They would feel, if I had voted against this adverse report, that I was afraid that I had been dodging the question, that I had been cowardly and dishonest in this matter. Even those of my constituents — those who are in favor of universal suffrage — would think better of me, than if I should merely cast a vote in favor of this matter of submission. Now, as I have said, I do not understand or think that the question is before this Convention now on the consideration of this adverse report, as to whether it is proper at this time to extend the suffrage to women. That is not the question here. Still, if that were the question; if we had no reason to doubt our belief, which we have expressed, which has been expressed by this committee, that the people do not consider it proper to make this change at this time — if we had any reason to doubt it, when we come to consider these very petitions themselves and the manner in which they are made up, I think that we could clear up all doubts of that kind. I have been examining the minority report made by the gentleman from New

York (Mr. Tucker), in which he states that in these petitions that have been presented to this Convention and the memorials, they are signed by 171,449 women. Now, that would be, perhaps, about ten per cent of the number of women in this State that would be entitled to vote if the word "male" was stricken from this section of the Constitution in question; about ten per cent, and this after a thorough canvass has been made. There are also the signatures of 119,074 men. That is less than ten per cent of the male voters in this State. This report also says that, in addition to those, are the names on the petition presented by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, amounting to 73,000. But nearly all those names are on the other petition, so in making up this large number that is paraded here, those names seem to be counted twice. Then it is stated, in addition to that, is a resolution, or what purports to be a resolution or certificate, to the effect that the State Grange, which represents 50,000 more men, is in favor of it. Now, we have not the signatures of those members. I do not know whether the members of the Grange are in favor of it or not. I have heard from Mr. Woolston, who is one of the leading officers of the State Grange. When his attention was called to the fact, through the papers, that such a memorial was presented, he said it was a surprise to him; that he had attended the meetings, and that he knew that the members of the Grange were not in favor of it as a body, and that many of the members of the Grange were not in favor of it individually. I find, on examining the petition from my own county of Cortland, that there are upon that petition about 3,800 names. From the town of Cortlandville, which is mainly made up of the village of Cortland, a village of 10,000 inhabitants, are 1,669 names of women. From other towns, in which an equally thorough canvass was made from house to house by a committeeman from each town, there were only found 435 women who would sign, out of a total of 4,600. About ten per cent of the women in the country, in the rural districts, have signed that petition, and in that county of Cortland I think there are five local granges, besides the county Grange; so that it would seem from that, that the members of the Grange could not be very strongly in favor of this matter of female suffrage. Now, while there appears upon this petition from the town of Cortlandville 1,669 signers, women, and 1,052 men, I will say this: That no man, woman or child in the town of Cortlandville, or in the county of Cortland, has ever said one word to me in favor of woman suffrage, and I have seen them often ever since this Convention commenced its sittings. On the contrary, I have been

approached by a great many, both men and women, in regard to the matter, who have spoken strongly in opposition to it and urged upon me action against it. The men put it upon the grounds that we have often heard urged here, that the women of the households don't want it. They do not wish to have this duty and burden put upon them. They prefer to continue such duties and such rights as they have had. They believe that their influence will be greater than it would be if they are put upon the level with men. That they stand now above them. That men listen more to their advice than they would if they were put upon the same level and thrown together in the same arena of politics. They say, also, that they do not feel that it is a burden or a duty which belongs to women any more than it would to go upon a jury, or to go into a field behind a plough, or in the corn-field to work. That there are certain duties for men and also certain duties for women in making up the social and political fabric that we call government. Women have expressed the same view to me. It is said that all the women who labor and are in business desire this suffrage. I have called upon those who are in business and I find that they are not in favor of it. They use these same arguments against having the suffrage. As I have stated, I have had no one say one word to me in my county, or in my home, in favor of suffrage for women.

But now suppose that this amendment that is proposed here should pass. What would be the effect of it? This is to submit this matter to the people to be voted upon by them, and when it goes to the people, sent there in this way, the argument would perhaps be used, and undoubtedly would be used, that it was a sort of indorsement from this Convention, and that would be used as an argument in favor of it, when it was not intended as such by the Convention. Further than that, by what rule would we be governed? Now, Mr. Marshall has introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution in regard to the submission of future amendments to the Constitution. It was agreed in the Committee of the Whole, where the matter was discussed and looked over, that it was a very proper provision, because it provided that there must be a larger vote — that these amendments should be voted upon by at least a majority of those who are qualified to vote upon that question. But that provision only applies to future amendments which should be submitted through the Legislature, or which may be submitted by a future Constitutional Convention. Those provisions, if they become the Constitution of the State, by adoption this fall,

would not apply to the submission of this matter, because it does not come within either of those classes which are provided for by that section as to the adoption of future amendments, and, therefore, there might be men withholding their votes, and it might be passed when less than twenty thousand votes were cast upon that question; some small number, insignificant number, which would not express the wishes of the people at all. True, it may be said, that if the people allow it to be passed in that way, by default, by a few votes, without voting, they impliedly consent to it. But that is one of the very evils we desire to guard against as to future amendments that are to be brought in here. It is conceded that it is an evil that provisions can be adopted in that way. So I say it will be a dangerous matter for us to have this proposition submitted to the people in that way, when there will evidently not be a full vote and expression of the people upon it. I say we are not here to refer matters back to the people. We are here as the representatives of the people, upon the supposition that we may know and ascertain what the people want, and we are to act upon our belief as to what they wish done in the matter of the Constitution, and that we will formulate it, put it into the form that we think they desire to have it put in, and then submit it to them for adoption. They do not want us here to dodge our duty, to play the coward or play any dishonest tricks with the Constitution or constitution making, by doing anything of this kind, by leaving the main question, refusing to pass it, as we must, because the main question has not been brought up here by any objection to the adverse report of any committee to strike out the word "male." It is only brought here, as I say, by this weak and feeble amendment providing for leaving it to the people and evading our duty. I say let us not do that. It will bring discredit upon our work. It will not only hurt us, as to this very matter, but as to all other matters that we submit. Why, even now it is being talked of all through the State of New York, for this matter was discussed here last week, and the discussions have gone out through the papers. The people have read about it. We hear these irreverent young men who represent the public press say: "Why, the Convention is jollyng the girls now." I mention that simply as showing the contempt we are liable to bring upon ourselves by doing this thing; the remarks that will be made in regard to our work. Let us stand up like men and say that we will do according to our belief; that we will either strike the word "male" out of the Constitution which we submit to the people for their action, or else we will not,

men let us stand by it and not seek to evade the responsibility. When we go home, the suffragists, and anti-suffragists, alike, our wives and our mothers and our sisters, will regard us with more honor than they will if we do this thing which is here proposed, for all men and women alike do never honor a coward. (Applause.)

Mr. Towns — Mr. President, a painful injury, received about the time this amendment was reported from the Committee on Suffrage, has caused me, much against my will, to remain the passive friend of woman and the inactive foe of her enemies, until to-night. I had not intended to lift up my voice to urge, at your hands, the dispensation of tardy justice to her. I thought the question was so plain that even he who ran might read. But the courtesy which you have shown me, you of this Convention who seem desirous of urging, with lightning speed, this most momentous question through this deliberate body, I graciously thank you for.

I am proud, Mr. President, to stand where Plato stood; where the friend of Kant, Heppel, stood where Disraeli, John Stewart Mill, Whittier, Lincoln, Chief Justice Chase stood; and there I will forever stand until all the Buckleys, all the Matthew Hales, all the Goldwin Smiths, and even our worthy Chairman, find some arguments that do not appeal to prejudices, dusty with the time of ages; but attack these questions coolly, calmly, and with the logic that knows and believes that justice is on its side.

None of those gentlemen, the great controversialists upon this question, has found time and words to refute the sad truth that disgraces this great commonwealth; the sad truth, I say, that one-half of its population, that half doing more than half of the labors of the day, and enduring all its sufferings, that half of our glorious population, in this, the end of the nineteenth century, is put upon the same base strata with the felon and the idiot; for the Constitution guarantees the rights of participation in government to the most lowly, the most unworthy, the most weakly equipped for the service, and only denies it to our mothers, our sisters, our sweethearts and our wives. None of the mighty controversialists, on the side against female suffrage, have advanced, sir, any argument against their right to vote, save those contained in special pleas of expediency and appeals to the passions, our passions and prejudices. We are told by Goldwin Smith, he a proselyte from the divine faith of woman's rights, Goldwin Smith tells us that government is force, and that woman being the weaker vessel, could never participate in its administration, for she could not enforce the decrees of State. There

might be something in this argument of the worthy philosopher, the embittered man who writes polemics against creeds and beliefs, who would drive the Hebrew away from us, and every one who differs from him and his particular small faith. I say there might be something in this argument of his if we were about to abdicate to woman all the functions and powers of our governmental administration. That we are not about to do, sir; though we might go to that extent without great injury to the commonwealth or to ourselves. While woman may not be fitted to do police justice duty, panoplied with the protection of the freeman's ballot, she would be able, sir, to resist becoming the enforced tributary of a mercenary police and a dishonest government. She, of course, cannot bear arms. She was made to bear children, to bear children that the word of God, and that this country, might live upon the face of the earth. But, sir, the cause of right and justice is not won by the gun or the rifle, and it is not by the resistance of serried legions that any just cause ever triumphed. Take away from it the moral support of the mothers and daughters of the land for which battle was waged, and that country has gone down into defeat and into oblivion, in the history of ages.

The relation of the sexual differences between man and women, sir, has nothing to do with the right of voting. Has the ballot ever made man worse or more depraved? Ask the workingman of England what lifted him from the slough of political degradation, and gave to him the first certificate that he ever had of his brotherhood with man.

But Professor Cope, who expounds that woman and man are different sexes, and that the peculiarities of women unfit them for government; he urges this in a pamphlet of many pages, with great casuistry and small fairness, and by solemn arguments. But, professor though he be, emeritus in Latin philology and philosophy, he lives outside of this world of ours. If he walks he moves with the step of a sonambulist, the dreamer; for if he but looked around him in this world of ours he would see that woman is not only qualified to administer, to govern and to act, but that she does govern, administer and act in nearly every function of life and government in America, and throughout the civilized world. In finance he has, perhaps, never heard of Hetty Green, or Burdett Coutts; in philosophy, of Eliza Gannon; in literature, of George Eliott; in medicine, of Mrs. Mary Putnam Jacobi; in the humanities, of Florence Nightingale; in patriotism, of Barabara Fritchie; in devo-

tion, of the good wife of Ulysses Penelope; and in government, of that woman who has put the button upon the church steeple of womanly perfection, the honored, the revered, the almost worshipped specimen of her sex, Victoria, Queen of England. In all the walks of life they are active, discreet, intelligent, reflective. Woman's labors never cease. They continue from sun to sun, and the world, I am almost moved to exclaim, would cease to revolve in its firmament were the activities of woman, the very mainspring of humanity, to cease but for a single day. Women may not be able to march as far as men, or endure the physical strain of the stronger sex, nor have they now to do so. They can ride on bicycles, whose rolling feet put them on an equality of locomotion with men. (Applause upon bicycles run by electricity, and mounted with motors throwing death-dealing projectiles a dozen miles, will not march fearlessly into battle against their country's foes, and defeat them. Sir, the reason they have never yet done military duty was that these possibilities did not exist. But they have been subjected, sir, at the hands of man, to more hazardous, death-dealing, destructive and burdensome occupations than the firing of cannon or the bayonet's point. He did not make them soldiers, sir, because it was necessary to leave them at home to supply the thinned ranks of the warriors; to feed and to clothe them, to nurse them and to administer their affairs when they were doing battle or robbing a sister country. And you may depend upon it, sir, in spite of all their boasted chivalry, and masculine devotion, that when the time comes for woman to do battle upon these bicycles, if you please, chivalric man will hide himself behind her fluttering petticoats and send her to the front. (Laughter.) This is no exaggeration.

Her first issuance into history, sir, is in the libelous statement of our abject progenitor when he said to an irate Deity: "The woman gave me the apple to eat." But now appears upon the scene great Matthew Hale, the corporation attorney, special pleader, learned and versed in the sophistries and quibbles of the law, he is a veritable Chinese warrior, and wages against women vociferous flagellations and lifts up his voice in dreadful alarums. His weapon against them, like that of the pig-tailed warriors of the Celestial Empire, is the tom-tom and the stink-pot, and he tries to demoralize our judgment and obscure the situation by the stench and noise of his wails as he marches into battle against poor woman behind the bedraggled skirts of forty thousand fallen women of New York, who, he claims, would

revolutionize history and subvert the government if they were allowed to vote. Why, sir, it has been many years since the Dutch took Holland; and this gentleman, who I am told lives in this old Dutch town of Albany, seems to be ignorant of the fact. In spite of his alarums, the ballot-box would be just as pure as it is now, with the miserable wretches masquerading as men, supported by these poor creatures from whom they levy tribute, voting, governing—yea, defying us, as in the greatest city of this State. And last comes that worthy divine, Dr. Buckley, who kindly sent, through Watson Gilder, advance sheets of his article against women to the worthy chairman of the Suffrage Committee, and says, "Chivalry"—spell it, gentlemen of the Convention, with a big "C"—"Chivalry, with its refined influence, would pass away from the face of the earth if the shackles, the golden shackles of woman's bondage were stricken from her." Chivalry, the name would never have been known but for women. What sins have been committed in its name. The name never would have been invented, no, never mentioned in legend or lore but for woman, whose gentle character, whose superior intelligence, whose virtue, whose patience, whose sublime devotion turned the Frankish barbarians, the Anglo-Saxons and the Normans into something besides fighting monsters, civilized them and endowed them with feelings of compassion, and mercy, and pity. Again, woman regenerated man. Again, she led him into the paths of perfection as she had done, sir, at that time in the history of the world when she reigned supreme, and had all the masculine gender at her feet. The very beards that we wear, and I say this upon the authority of Darwin; the very beards that we wear, the gaudy plumage of the peacock, the mane of the roaring lion, are but the excrescence of masculine excitement endeavoring to please the female to whom he made courtship. Ancient chivalry, gentleman, with its miurre singers, its troubadours, its jousts and its tournaments, has long since passed away, if it ever existed, save in the imagination of the poets and the bards. If the act of suffrage is going to put the quietus on such chivalry as we have to-day, on such chivalry as we claim we have to-day, or such as the Rev. Dr. Buckley says will be exterminated from the face of the earth if women are allowed the privilege of depositing a piece of white paper about two inches by four in the ballot-box once a year; if such chivalry as we have in these last days of the nineteenth century, if woman suffrage is going to eradicate the hog and hominy knights of the South, the codfish knights-errant of the East, and the buck-wheat nobility of the West, I say let it come, and let it come to-night.

Away with such chivalry, whose principal tenet is to rise with politeness and give some woman a seat, and who, the next moment, he wishes to mash, or to look upon with lecherous gaze. Away with the chivalry that pampers one or two of the sex and rocks them in the cradle of luxury, while with tyrannical heel it crushes the life out of the millions of poor suffering wretches who have to earn their daily bread by the sweat, not of their husband's brows, but of their own sweet brows.

But, says Dr. Buckley, the ballot would deteriorate women in their moral tone. I ask that worthy man of God, that most eloquent preacher, no doubt, though I never yet heard his dispensation of the word how to reach eternal life; I ask that worthy divine, who preaches no doubt, to plush cushions on the Sabbath and moves on the inner or outer crust of the 400, which is the most destructive to the moral tone of men and women, the emotions, struggles and intrigues of the so-called leaders of society, the low-necked and short-dandy and blase statesmen, listening to his compliments and equivocal bon mots until her very senses reel with excitement, or the modest mother and sister who goes to the ballot-box on election day and deposit the freeman's weapon in the cause of their liberties? No, reverend sir, if the debacle of society comes, it will come from the direction where lascivious music sounds its pleading tone, where highly seasoned food, terpsichorean occupations, French manners and fashions ruin and corrupt the female's gentle heart, not from the loom, the working-benches, the country home, the hut or the hovel. Sir, the women of the middle ages, who inspired the twang of the troubador's guitar and taught the modest bard to sing, have perished from the face of the earth. Woman lives to-day under another dispensation. To-day it is the song of the shirt; it is the crack of the task-master's lash; and I ask you gentlemen who have been trying to rush this momentous question through this Convention, I ask you, sirs, Democrats and Republicans, I ask you in the name of justice, I ask you in the name of Him who witnesses the fall of the smallest sparrow, I ask you in the name of that chivalry which Dr. Buckley has conjured up, if there is manhood enough, if there is chivalry enough, in this body of 170 wise men of the State of New York, like the noble knights of old, to go down into the cave, not of the wicked dragon, but into the caves of the industrial and political dragons, and pull out woman, fair woman; pull her up from her darkness and degradation and make her free. (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, I well remember that day in June; it was the first time that I came to regard you with seriousness; to study those perfections of feature and intellect with which our common God has endowed you. I saw, sir, you sitting there in the center of that symposium of intellect, of virtue, of motherhood, of this great State, and it seemed to inspire me, to inspire me with hopes which, if rumor is true, will be dashed to the ground. But there, sir, nevertheless you sat —

Jove like, exquisite, debonair,
You heard with languid, lordly air,
Brave women make their piteous plea.
I saw the touch of pity trace
Compassion on your noble face,
And hoped that woman would be free.
But when you spoke to El-i-hu,
My hopes took on a darker hue.

For El-i-hu, though he a sage is,
Prejudice, dusty crust of ages,
Had hardened him at head and heart;
He has not heard their piteous pleading.
Nor seen their wounds from shackles bleeding,
In a lifetime spent in slavery's mart.

So up he spoke the mighty leader,
Wily lawyer, special pleader:
"Oh! Chief close up your ears and eyes,
We must not for a single hour,
Divide with them our supreme power,
Nor give up aught of the franchise.

"Why, sir, 'twould kill this Constitution,
And all the problems whose solution
Have cost me sleepless nights and days,
With petticoats before the people,
Flutt'ring from platform, stump and steeple,
Would not be in it with skirts and stays.

"The article ju-di-ci-a-ry,
Creating courts unnecessary,
To help us lawyers to our fee
Would go into the paper basket,
If the voter's sweetheart asked it,
And called on him to make her free.

"There'll be no time to set up school
To teach the ideas of home rule
Set forth in Jesse Johnson's scheme,
And even the labors of Louis Marshall,
For the judges to whom he is partial,
Would be an iridescent dream.

"And eke, sir, the apportionment,
By which the Democrats are sent,
To Coventry for years, I claim,
Would be forgotten in the scuffle,
And lost forever in the shuffle,
If woman's playing in the game.

"You, sir, and I must give to party,
Not to mankind, our effort hearty,
Disenfranchised, woman must remain,
'Twould mean for us 'the debacle'
If we struck off a single shackle,
Linked in her bondage's golden chain.

"Put Cochran in his regimentals,
To terrorize the sentimentals,
Get Gilder to help Goodelle out,
Let swing and crack the party lashes,
Let party thunder roll its chases,
Till every female's put to rout.

"Turn loose the jammers of dry rot,
Decaim against the female ballot,
Fill every heart with dreadful fears,
Regard not justice, mercy, pity,
Kill the measure in committee,
And woman's slaved for twenty years."

Albany, August 14, 1894.

This question, in all earnestness, Mr. Chairman, has been urged with undue haste in this Convention, rushed through the Committee on Suffrage upon outside pressure and influence, precipitated upon our councils and driven through this deliberative assembly with great haste. There has been a well-organized cabal, in which I am sorry to say, one of my colleagues from the Second district has been conspicuous, not in his regimentals, with the decoration of the valiant Thirteenth Regiment corruscating upon his manly bosom, but in civilian attire, this son of Mars, or, perhaps, in deference to the ladies, I ought to say this son of Mars, who never smelled powder save upon his lady's cheek, has acted as scout and picket for the enemy, He has been the most ubiquitous, cantankerous, agitating perambulator and perambulating agitator this controversy has produced.

The Chairman, God bless his gentle soul, has sought to scuttle this beautiful ship in a milder way, but not less effectually. He has appeared to me like one in a dream, battling for a cause from the justice of which his conscience told him he was many miles away. Why, sir, do you know I have met him in the corridors of this

Capitol with a misty sheen upon his countenance, muttering prejudices against the logic of the situation, and creating witty apothegms to combat the arguments of poor woman. And feeling like Hamlet, I thought that I would approach this Polonius, and I addressed him in the language of Shakspeare, I said to him "Good morrow, worthy sir, how goes it with fair woman to-day?" It seemed to stun him. He deigned no reply, but addressed me in language which my stenographer took down; I did not understand it; "Adam per Evam deceptus est, non Eva per Adam." "Why," I said to him, "Pray address me in the language of my country, the United States; what mean you, sir?" "Why," he said, "I have just heard it; have you heard it?" "What is it," says I. "Why," he says, "I have just heard; how I pity poor Father Adam; I have just heard that Adam, when he from his grassy couch arose, he learned that his first sleep was his last repose." (Laughter.)

The gentleman was so pregnant with this vast subject, that armed with the advance sheets of Dr. Buckley's polemic against women, he sought the secluded fastnesses of the Adirondacks to quiet his nerves and compose that speech of forty-six hundred words which will go tingling upon the clapper of the bells of time until their brassy tongues melt with the heat of this discussion. There, sir, mid the vast solitudes of lake and mountain, undisturbed by any sound save the discordant screech of the weary and lonely loon, or the wail of wangdoodle mourning the loss of her first born, this great production of the chairman of the Committee on Suffrage, whose chivalry has caused him to deny what never yet in the history of the ages has been denied to women, the right of having the last word in a discussion (laughter) was conceived, and will be delivered here to-night under the midwifery of Messrs. Cochran, Cookinham and others. You are, I know, gentlemen, impatient for the sacrifice. But before I close let me warn you, let me remind you, gentlemen, of the fate of that assinine quadruped who once adorned himself with the skin of the king of beasts. Let me tell you, gentlemen, you who are going to vote against this question, that you need not lay the flattering unction to your souls that you are of the race of those who held the pass at Thermopolae, that you are the Casabiancas of this misled Convention, or that you are, perchance, of the blood of him who held the bridge at Rome. No, gentlemen, you who are seeking to stem this tide are the long-lost brothers of Mr. Ike Partington, the posthumous progeny of that old woman who sought

to sweep back the waves of the Atlantic ocean with a broom, and you are engaged in just as unprofitable a task. This question has come to stay. Chase her out with a pitchfork, she will come again. Gentlemen, I wish you joy in the occupation; and you, Mr. Chairman, the embodiment of grace, the mould of fashion and the perfection of form, in the words of the Roman Gladiator, I exclaim, "Ave imperator morituri te salutatus." (Applause and laughter.)

Mr. Cookinham — Mr. President and gentlemen of this Convention, I do not rise to-night to talk to the gallery. I do not rise to address you to-night as a criminal lawyer addresses a jury, when he has neither law nor fact upon his side. I will address you for a very few moments in the line of common sense, in the line of logic, in a line that will, I believe, aid you, fellow delegates, to do your duty to-night. I shall first address myself to the gentleman who opened this debate. It was put into his mind somehow, I do not know how, to state in the Convention that this committee was made up unfairly to the women. I say to you, fellow-delegates, I open to you no seventh seal when I say it is the only committee named by the President of this Convention upon which delegates were placed because it was known what their vote would be when they came to pass upon any question. Four members were put upon that committee that they might vote in favor of woman suffrage. I ask you, suppose the New York Central Railroad had asked to name four members of a committee? Would these halls have held the chorus of condemnation that would have been poured upon such a proceeding? The proposition would not have been thought of for one moment. The gentleman saw fit to criticise the action of the committee. I say again, that I am opening no seventh seal when I say to you that no one on that committee, and no interest passed upon by that committee, received a thousandth part of the consideration that was accorded to the gentleman who opened this debate and to the question which he championed. I say, moreover, that he has charged some one with being sharp parliamentarians. I do not know to whom he refers, but I do know that the four gentlemen upon that committee who favor woman suffrage, were asked to present this question in any form they saw fit, in the form in which it would command the greatest number of votes, and we would report it in that form to this Convention. I say to you, Mr. President and gentlemen, that every amendment reported adversely to this Convention was reported, with the exception of one vote, and excepting this amendment, by the unanimous vote of the Suffrage Committee. I do not betray the secrets of the committee

room when I say the gentleman who opened the debate voted with the majority. I do not betray the secrets of the committee room, because it is no secret in this Convention, that the gentleman who last addressed the Convention, Mr. Towns, also was present and voted in the same manner. I desire to know when the change of heart took place in the last gentleman who addressed the Convention. When the Convention assembled and he sat in counsel with us his heart was right. He was with the majority of the committee. But I noticed, not long afterwards, that upon a certain seat in this Convention, upon that side, there appeared every morning a beautiful bouquet, and I have never been able to ascertain whether it was the arguments of the ladies or the bouquets that changed his heart.

Now, Mr. President, I did not rise to make a speech. The chairman of the committee will do all there is in that direction. But I did rise, to present the case as viewed by the committee. We have heard very many speeches. We have heard them from men and from women. Speakers have come before us, as they have before this Convention, and have stated that five or six hundred thousand separate petitioners, men and women, desired that this proposed amendment should be submitted to the people. Their arguments are founded very largely upon that proposition. If that is true, it is entitled to some consideration; if it is not true, if this number is grossly exaggerated, if it is magnified to an extent to make it absolutely ridiculous, then it is not entitled to credit. I have in my hand a part of this so-called great petition. There it is. It consists of three or four pages. There are five or six names upon it. And yet, fellow-delegates, you who are wavering as to how you shall vote on this question, I ask you to consider what I say. That paper (exhibiting paper) is said to represent 211,396 of these petitioners. You have been led to believe that the names of 600,000 petitioners, or, as the gentleman from New York gave it to you to-night, 626,627 men and women, had asked to have the proposed amendment submitted to the people. Is that true? I say that you are obliged to strike off 211,396 names, because they are presented solely by the President and secretary of certain organizations putting their names to the petition. Again, we are told that 50,000 voters, or voters and those who would like to be voters, women, have petitioned on behalf of the State Grange. I do not know how they got the exact number of 50,000, but, Mr. President and gentlemen, that (exhibiting paper) is the only paper before this committee or before this Convention. Upon that paper you are asked to give credit to the request of 50,000

men and women. That is a paper sent out by one person. His name is Goff, and he signs himself as secretary of a little meeting held in my own city, when were assembled a few farmers. I say a few farmers, and, perhaps, fifty or sixty people present, all told. They assembled in the city of Utica in a small hall and passed a resolution upon the subject. We are now asked to consider that paper as representing the petition of 50,000 men and women. That is the only paper which they present to the committee or to this Convention. That disposes of 261,000 of their petitioners. But I am not quite through with these petitions, and, fellow-delegates listen to what I say and then see if this petition, that has been trumpeted through the State as representing 600,000 men and women, is worthy of the consideration that the two gentlemen, with extended arms and vociferous utterances, declared to you it was entitled to receive. I hold in my hand the petitions from Oneida county, which I represent. I may say, I do not claim for my constituents that which I have no right to claim when I say that for intellectuality, for culture, for education and morality, no county stands above her. That as a home of statesmen, lawyers, doctors, ministers and teachers, there is no county which stands above the one which I represent. And yet I hold in my hand all the petitions from that great county. I heard upon a certain occasion one of the foremost champions of this cause address a meeting in my own city. I heard her say that they would go into every city, town and hamlet, no matter how insignificant, and they would produce petitions to be presented to this Convention, and that they expected from that county alone to present here petitions signed by 30,000 men and women. It is true that the petitions were circulated in every town, in every hamlet, in every quarter of the county, and behold the result! In the county there has been obtained the signatures of 1,043 women and of 582 men; total, 1,625. Whereas, the vote in this county is more than 30,000. Now, Mr. President, that is not all. I find in taking up the first book that these names do not appear once only, but they appear twice, and in some instances they appear three times. On the very first page the name of one person appears twice, and upon the very next page it appears the third time. It chances to be a minister of the gospel. Now, Mr. President, he did not, in my opinion, sign that name three times, and yet somebody did. I find also page after page in these books in the same handwriting, and no explanation of it. I call attention to these matters and what is true in this case, I say is characteristic of all the petitions. I have examined them very carefully. That is not all. I turn to the figures and I find that it is said that 171,000

women and 119,000 men have petitioned. I turn now to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union petitions. They present here, as they say, a petition a half a mile in length. I examined that petition. I have taken the general petitions from the towns in my county and have laid them side by side with this petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and I find that the same names appear on both petitions. I do not mean that they are absolutely identical, but I find that there for the fourth time many of those names appear. Now, fellow-delegates, you who believe that there has been a representative body of men and women of five or six hundred thousand in number asking you to vote to submit this question to the people, remember that the statement is not true. There are not to exceed, in my opinion, from the best figures that I am capable of making, 200,000 subscribers, men, women and children. When you consider that every city, ward, township, village and hamlet in the State of New York has been canvassed upon this subject, and no more petitioners than this is obtained, am I not right when I say it is a lamentable failure and that it is a great assumption for them to come here and say that the women or men of this State ask for woman suffrage? Why do we speak against it? I have not constituted the gentleman from New York (Mr. Lauterbach) or the gentleman from Brooklyn (Mr. Towns), to speak for me as a champion of woman. I deny their right to stand upon this floor and say that they represent woman. No, sir, it is not the minority of this committee that represent woman. It is the majority of this committee. (Applause.) The gentleman from New York (Mr. Lauterbach) or the gentleman from Brooklyn (Mr. Towns) may weave a crown ever so beautiful, they may emblazon it as they choose, and they will find the majority of this committee will gladly place it upon the brow of woman; but, fellow-delegates, we are not here to champion the cause of woman. That is right in its place, but it has no place here. The solemn duty imposed upon every gentleman who has taken an oath in this body, is not to champion the cause of a few women. It is to vote according to his judgment for the interests of the State, and nothing more. The arguments, so called, of those who champion the woman suffrage amendment —

Mr. Lauterbach — Will you permit me a question? You say that you are arguing for the State; kindly tell us who is the State? (Applause.)

Mr. Cookinham — I will be very glad to answer the question of the gentleman from New York. He has always been courteous in our committee, always courteous upon this floor. I will be very glad to

answer him. The State is a corporation. It is made up of men, women, boys and girls. The living part of it. I speak for the whole. The State demands something. The State demands that we should guard its interests, not alone the interest of woman, but the interests of men, women and children alike. I have heard every speech made in the committee and out of the committee on this subject. I have heard not one single argument—I have not heard the question mentioned—that it would be for the best interests of the State that women should vote. Every speaker in the committee and out of the committee has appealed absolutely and entirely to men in a manner to excite their sympathies for woman. Not one of them has mentioned the subject of what the interest of the State demanded. If it were not for the lateness of the hour I would be very glad to talk upon the subject. (Voices: Go on.)

I would be very glad to talk on that branch of the subject but as there are two or three speakers to follow me, I must forbear. I will state this, that I expected when I was elected to this body to vote to submit this constitutional amendment to the people. My mind was changed by the arguments of the suffragists themselves. A prominent member of this committee came to this Convention with a fixed opinion that he would vote to submit it to the people. He has changed his mind in consequence of the character of the arguments of the suffragists themselves. I fail to see any force in the argument that has been made in their behalf when I consider that I was called upon to exercise judgment as to the propriety of submitting this amendment to the people. They start from a different standpoint; their aim is different from ours, and they, therefore, reach a different conclusion. Their aim is different from ours. They appeal to our sympathies for the arrest of a woman, a large property owner. A tenant had been evicted from one of her houses and she had threatened to shoot him. He appeared at the justice's office and drew his own affidavit for her arrest. The affidavit ran as follows: "Whereupon the said Elizabeth Bradstreet took a double-barreled shot gun, loaded with powder and shot, aimed it at the deponent's stomach, and swore she would blow deponent's brains out." (Laughter.) Now, fellow-delegates, that illustrates the manner of those who speak for woman suffrage. They start with what woman wants. Then they say she pays taxes, that she is intelligent and moral. We simply file a demurrer. The statement of facts is all true, but it has nothing to do with suffrage. If I were to discuss this question on its merits I should say that there

are but two propositions to be considered. First, would it be for the benefit of the State to confer the right of suffrage; second, would it be detrimental to woman? The first proposition has never been argued before the committee or before this Convention, and that is, in my opinion, the sum and substance of the whole thing. For that reason those who hold to the views that we hold to have said but very little upon the subject in this Convention. We may say to the other side that you do not make out your case. We demur to your pleading. I am one of those who would like to believe upon this question as I would like to believe upon the subject of capital punishment. When I heard the eloquent gentleman from New York (Mr. Blake) discuss that subject I sat near him. I longed to be convinced that he was right in advocating that the death penalty be abolished, but could not be. When I heard the gentleman from New York (Mr. Lauterbach) deliver his speech the other evening, no one enjoyed it more than I, but I could not be convinced. I believe that we would entail upon the State and upon woman an untold injury should we confer upon them the right of suffrage. I, therefore, believe it is illogical and unreasonable to say that we shall vote to submit to the people an amendment that, in our judgment, should not be adopted. The gentleman from Brooklyn (Mr. Powell) tried the other evening to draw a distinction between amendments. I fail to see any. There are but two ways, under the Constitution, that amendments can be submitted to the people. One is by their passage through the Legislature upon different years; the other is that this Convention shall approve them. recommend them and submit them to the people. There is no third way. No matter with what reservation you vote, when this amendment or any other comes before the Convention upon the third reading, you are to vote then in favor of or against the amendment.

Mr. Maybee—May I ask the gentleman a question? Was not precisely that thing done in Oregon?

Mr. Cookinham—A great many things have been done in Oregon; I am talking about the State of New York. The State of Oregon is not acting under our Constitution. Our Constitution provides two ways of submitting an amendment and but two, and this is neither of them.

Now, Mr. President, I do not propose to detain this Convention longer. I simply desire to say this: It has been circulated about this chamber that someone would vote against the report of the committee; solely that the amendment might go into the Committee of the

Whole. It has been hinted that someone would vote for it simply to satisfy the request of somebody else. Is that acting up to the duty imposed upon us when we took the oath of office? Are we to trifle with our votes in that way? I say that the report of this committee comes before you and you are asked to say whether or not an amendment shall be submitted to the people allowing women to vote. We conscientiously believe, as I have no doubt a majority of those present believe, that it would be detrimental to the State to allow such submission. (Applause.)

Mr. Kellogg — Mr. President, I am glad, sir, that the discussion upon this question has been thus far conducted with candor and fairness and in a spirit of lofty patriotism. It is, indeed, with great reluctance, that I rise to speak upon the question under consideration. That I do so, is not in the slightest degree for any personal gratification of my own, but, sir, I feel compelled to respond to what I believe to be the overwhelming sentiment of the great constituency which I have the honor to here represent, and oppose with my voice and vote, not only woman suffrage as a principle, but likewise its submission to the people of this State. In arriving at the conclusion, after conscientious and mature deliberation, to vote to sustain the report of the able committee which has so patiently and impartially considered this question, I have not considered it, sir, from its sentimental policy or partisan standpoint, neither have I wavered in my convictions because it has been stated that the party in the majority is the great party of Lincoln, Seward, Grant or Garfield, or because it is the party of free men, free thought, free speech, of equal rights and human liberty. I have rather kept in view the solemn oath which I took upon myself the opening day of this Convention, in the fear of Almighty God, according to the best of my ability, to discharge the great trust confided to my care as should best subserve the interests of the people of the great State of New York. Instead of shirking the responsibility of my oath and of my duty to the State, as I understand it, I assume it. We have heard so much during this discussion of the submission of the question of woman suffrage to the vote of the common people, of the sovereign people, in obedience to the petition of a small minority of the inhabitants of the State, though three or four hundred thousand in number, it be, that I deem it my duty to refer to it. Who are the common people? Who are the sovereign people? Where in our State, under the grandeur and glory of American institutions, does any one reside who is not common and sovereign? He who advances such argument, it seems to me, sir, builds a man of straw for the purpose of knocking him down to amuse himself.

What becomes, I ask, of the protest of the hundreds of thousands of the virtuous and intelligent mothers, wives and daughters, which has come up to us from every portion of our great commonwealth? Before you drag them down into the dirty slough of politics, or put them in jeopardy of having to assume the responsibility of citizenship, are they not to be considered? Are they not, also, the common and sovereign people? What do you say to the opposition of more than a million of our fathers and sons, all of whom, as you and I know, are unalterably opposed to the invasion of the sanctity and purity of their homes and firesides by the discordant elements of politics? You women knocking at the doors of this Convention for submission, may well pause upon the threshold of what you believe to be the promised land, unless the feeling predominates in your breast, "I am holier than thou." It may be that you proceed upon the theory of the preacher who, in reading his text, turned two pages at once: "And when Noah was one hundred and twenty years of age, he took unto himself a wife," "which was three hundred cubits long, fifty cubits wide, made of gopher wood, and lined with pitch inside and out." Reading it over again to verify it, he turned to his audience and said: "This is the first time I ever read that passage in the Bible, but it only shows how fearfully we are constructed."

The apple which Mother Eve held in her hand was tempting; so, perhaps, is woman suffrage to you; but if the mighty protest which is going up from the women of this State is turned lightly aside by you, I warn you of the neglect to heed the voice of conscience in the Garden of Eden, which resulted in bringing untold suffering upon the human race, ever since the angel of wrath appeared at its entrance with a flaming sword. Oh, woman, poets have sung of you, and men gone mad over thy beauty, but before you decide to divorce yourselves from the sphere over which you have held undisputed sway from time immemorial, let me remind you of the sweet words of John Howard Payne — "Home, sweet home; there is no place like home." Let me recall to you, before you further pursue the empty baubles of ambition and fame, of the immortal words of Gray:

"The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,
All that beauty, all that wealth ere gave,
Awaits alike the inevitable hour.
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

It is said, however, that a woman convinced against her will is of the same opinion still, and I repeat as a consolation for the adverse report of the committee, the priceless stanza —

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear;
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

No, Mr. President, the true glory of womanhood is not in sitting upon the jury, not in being clothed in judicial ermine, not in being sent to the halls of legislation, not in following the example of the Publican, who prayed aloud in public places to be seen and heard of men, but rather by such fond devotion in that sacred place where she stands as a queen in the eyes of all mankind, unrivaled and unsurpassed, as will enshrine her forever in the hearts of the father, the husband and the son. Their pathway to enduring fame is in teaching their daughters lessons of virtue and their sons to be manly, self-reliant and independent. Would the sons of Sparta have been more heroic or patriotic had their noble women possessed the ballot when they uttered the historic words, "Come back rather upon your armor than without it?" Would the influence of the noble women of the late war, God preserve the memory of their heroic deeds, have been more refining had they been educated in the mire of politics? Would it have added delicacy to the touch of the hand upon the fevered brow of the dying soldier? No, Mr. President, a thousand times no! It would have robbed the flower of its beauty and fragrance.

With my last breath will I defend from the realm of politics and partisan strife, the institution which has cost untold suffering, heroic sacrifice and the priceless blood of patriots to establish and preserve. Let us forever be delivered from the possibility of a McGregor sitting at both ends of the table! The home is the hope of our country and the foundation stone of American institutions.

But, Mr. President, after reading a deluge of pamphlets and papers carefully, and listening attentively to many adroit speeches from the friends of woman suffrage, at last we have it from the lips of their ablest advocate, the one thing which is hoped to be accomplished by it. Give the ballot to the working woman so that her wages may be raised to the level of those received by men. This is the burning question in their opinion, and let me say here with the greatest of respect, this sentence was applauded by dainty gloved hands. My eloquent friend from Greene, Mr. Griswold,

rightfully asked the question: "How do you expect to raise wages by legislative enactment?" Give her justice, is the cry in this respect. Having the right of dower, the responsibility of the husband for the debts of the wife, her present right of alimony and counsel fees, the right of action for breach of promise and betrayal, together with a long list of other rights not now claimed or possessed by men; wages is evidently the only question in the entire realm of political economy which they wish to have adjusted.

In the name of our great State, let me ask, are there other great questions which demand consideration? Are we not struggling in this Convention with the great problem — "Home rule for cities?" Have we not prison reform to accomplish? Are not the people calling for proper restrictions upon legislative enactment? Does not the sectarian school question agitate our citizens from the metropolis to Lake Erie? Shall we not heed the cry for judicial reform and speedier justice? Taxation, canals, the difficulties between labor and capital, and other complex questions confront us. You might as well the deep caves of the ocean fathom, or attempt to gather the foam from its topmost billow, as to try to solve, by constitutional or legislative enactment, all the problems which confront the State and the nation.

But in view of all these questions, and in consequence of the splendid recognition accorded woman in the past from the Empire of States, great in its charity, great in education, great in wealth, great in its industrial interests and great in the marts of commerce, can you not afford, as to this one right, or, indeed, as to others, if any there be, like Lamartine, "To place your frail bark upon the highest promontory of the beach and await the rising of the tide to make it float?"

Taxation without representation is a sweet morsel which the advocates of woman suffrage roll under their tongue with evident satisfaction and pleasure.

If the right to vote were a natural right, then, indeed, the argument might carry with it the force of weight and conviction.

But, as I understand it, the elective franchise is a high privilege conferred by the State, by reason of the ability not only to bear arms for its support and protection, but it implies the power to secure peace, insure domestic tranquility and command respect for the flag at home and abroad.

To participate in the burdens of taxation is the duty we all owe the State, because of the guarantee contained in the supreme law of the land, that all alike, men, women and children, the rich, the poor, the great, the small, the weak the powerful, the farmer, the mechanic, the merchant, the banker, the artisan, the capitalist, shall enjoy to the fullest extent, life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, Palsied be the tongue which seeks to take a single jewel from the crown of woman. They share our joys and sorrows, are our companions, and wise counselors in the days of adversity, and are the guiding star of our lives. They soothe pain and heighten enjoyment.

But, Mr. President, the days of chivalry have not yet passed away, and God grant that the time may never come when woman, by her own act, will turn down the hand which gladly shields her from the rough and stormy waves which sweep over the political world, and which will ever protect her rights, her honor and her virtue. It has been stated upon the floor of this Convention, by one of its most distinguished and respected members, that the slavery of women has been gradually lifted since 1846, in this State, and that now complete emancipation is proposed by suffrage. I refute the assertion. The emancipation of women began long before the Magna Charta was proclaimed, years prior to the preservation of American liberty by the patriot Wadsworth, in the famous Charter Oak at Hartford, centuries before the fathers of the republic signed and proclaimed the Declaration of Independence. I refute the star of Bethlehem, which aroused the drowsy shepherds of the east, and the words of Him who spoke as never did man, was the dawning day for their purity and independence.

Women of the great State of New York, was the ballot can possibly do. Let the hand which rocks the cradle teach the coming young men and women of America the Lord's prayer and the Ten Commandments, and you will do more for your emancipation and for every right which you may possess in the whole realm of human rights, than you can do with both hands full of white ballots.

Do this and it will not be necessary for you to teach them political fight for you and die for you. Do this and they will love you, country and love their flag. Do this and they will love you, A few of the excellent and worthy women who are in this Convention demanding the right to vote I concede would do so. There are

thousands of bad women who would also vote, at least, upon some questions, thus enforcing upon millions of modest and retiring wives and mothers responsibilities from which they shrink, and rightly so. Upon authority which I am compelled to believe, I make the assertion here, that the result of female suffrage in Wyoming has not changed the general result of elections, neither has it accomplished a single reform. At the same time, it has doubled expense.

Mr. President, I maintain that woman suffrage, at this time, would be not only a folly, but that it might precipitate upon the State questions fraught with the greatest danger to its safety and welfare.

For a number of years the best minds of our State have been engaged in solving the question, how shall we purify our politics, how best can honest government be attained, and how shall we defend the suffrage against bribery and corruption. That some progress has been made in the right direction, I think all good men will admit. But, sir, before doubling twice over the voting population of the State, with its untold possibility of corruption, before we burden our taxpayers with a great expense to pay for such extension of the suffrage, let rather, this Convention, under its solemn oath, taken to support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the great State of New York, use its time and bend its efforts towards purifying the Augean stables which we now have to contend with, rather than to incur the possibility of new evils which we know not of, and which it is not possible for the wisdom of man, at this time, to comprehend.

Gentlemen of the Convention, let us not, at this time, by woman suffrage, or by its submission to the people, but rather by such wise efforts for entire religious liberty, for the diffusion of knowledge and the maintenance of our institutions of learning, for dispensing the greatest charity possibly consistent with the cause of good government, by demanding the strictest honesty in the discharge of all public affairs and by defending the sanctity and purity of the fireside; preserve this lovely land, this glorious liberty, this priceless legacy of freedom transmitted to us by our fathers. (Applause.)

Mr. Roche — Mr. President, it seems to me that when the debate upon this subject began, on Wednesday evening last, with the magnificent address of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Lauderbach), that it also then ended. Without intending to disparage in any manner the remarks of any of the gentlemen who have since addressed the Convention, I make bold to say that no addition and no answer has been made to the demand which that gentleman then

so eloquently presented. We should then have taken a vote upon this question, but gentlemen upon both sides have chosen, instead, to discuss it. The simple question is, whether this Convention shall undertake to say that a proper opportunity shall not be given to the voters of the State to pass upon a question which is of deep interest and which has been agitated for many years? With the light that I now have, I am not an advocate of the extension of suffrage to women. While firmly believing in the doctrine of manhood suffrage, I maintain that the exercise of the elective franchise is not a natural right. It is one which is to be regulated or withheld by the people, and it is to be conferred in such manner as will best promote the interests of the State. My judgment is that it will not be conducive to the welfare of the women of the State, and, therefore, not to the State itself, that women should be drawn into the arena of politics and the heat and differences and excitement of great political campaigns. But that, sir, is a question far removed from the one before us. Thousands of excellent men and thousands of equally good women believe that the addition of a large force to the electorate of the State by conferring the franchise upon women will not only be an act of justice, but will greatly tend to the improvement of our political methods and the purification of our public life. They believe that in an age of Christianity, civilization and the arbitration of international disputes, there is no necessary relation between the right or privilege of voting and the ability to handle or fire a Gatling gun. These people have exercised the great American constitutional right of petition, and have come here with their petitions, signed by tens of thousands. They have been heard in this chamber and have advocated their cause with a modesty, a brilliancy and a force that charmed all who listened to them. They were replied to by their opponents at a later meeting. There was no comparison between the two gatherings. (Applause.) Or if one should be instituted, that of the opponents, when set up against the other, was as the pale, dying moon to the warm, cheerful and effulgent rays of the rising sun. (Applause.) These women ask that the men who compose this Convention, will permit the question of whether women may also go a single yes or no upon the question of whether women may also go to the polls. You and I may believe that they should not; that they would be better off for staying at home and leaving the affairs of State and the activities of politics to be looked after by the fathers and husbands and sons. But, sir, because we believe this, is it just, is it fair that we should deny to this great body of our fellow-citizens

the right to be heard before the tribunal of the people? They ask for their day in court. Shall we sit here and, because we have the power, arbitrarily refuse to grant it? Who are the petitioners? Why, the modest and intellectual women who addressed the Suffrage Committee in this chamber, and whom we were proud to recognize as the products of our American schools, our American liberty and our American institutions. (Applause.) They spoke for thousands of others of their kind throughout this great State. They are the class of women who have the care of the youth in the schools of the State; they uphold the charities, do the work of the churches, bless the homes, are to the front in every noble public endeavor in the days of calamity, amidst the distresses of war organize the hospital service and the sanitary corps to care for and relieve the suffering soldier. They are part and parcel of the great body of patriotic, educated and virtuous women who have helped to make this State of New York the foremost commonwealth on God's footstool. (Applause.)

They may be mistaken, greatly mistaken, in what they ask, but the force with which they ask it, and the sincerity which characterizes the request are both undeniable and demand our respectful consideration.

Gentlemen, this question cannot be smothered. It cannot be killed by a simple refusal to strike the word "male" from the Constitution. It will not down at your bidding. You cannot keep it out of the halls of legislation, nor silence debate in the press or upon the forum. The hooting of Phillips and the mobbing of Garrison only served to strengthen the movement for the abolition of human slavery. (Applause.) The danger of flood, the decimation of fever, the journey through unknown lands, the fierce encounter of the Saracen, only strengthened the heart, nerved the arm and steeled the purpose of the crusader of old to reach and redeem the Holy Land. Such it ever has been with a people who unselfishly battle for what they deem to be a great principle. I mistake the intelligence and character of the women who are leading this movement, if your negative, no matter how decided, shall not result in their renewing the onslaught, with greatly increased numbers, and a brighter prospect of a more successful appeal.

The legislatures have encouraged these women in their efforts. If we do not give heed to their request, it will be made to Legislature after Legislature, until it receives sanction in some form, and is presented to the people. They have been given the right to vote for school trustees. It was attempted to confer upon them the

right to vote for school commissioners, but the attempt was defeated by the court. In some localities, for several years, they have exercised the right of voting upon questions which affect the taxpayers of those localities. They have felt, to a limited extent, the power of the ballot, and they ask for more. You but sharpen the demand when you turn a deaf ear to it. The true way to dispose of this matter, to stop the ever recurring agitation, is to let the people themselves pass upon it in our great court for the settlement of public question, and decide it once for all. We have authority for this in the present Constitution, and I respectfully call the attention of the gentleman from Oneida (Mr. Cookinham), to the fact. The judiciary article that was adopted by the Convention of 1868, and approved by the people in 1869, provided for an elective judicial system; but it also provided for the submission to the electors in 1873, four years afterwards, the question whether judges should be appointed instead of elected. This was done in deference to the views of a respectable and influential body of men, who believed that better results would be secured by an appointive than by an elective system. It was debated in press and magazine. The people thought it all over. They voted upon the question, and wisely decided by a large majority to retain the power in their own hands. The result is that since that vote, that question has been considered as settled; it is not even broached in this Convention to-day, and the subject has been removed from the realm of agitation and discussion. The same Constitutional Convention of 1868 provided for submitting to the people in separate form a proposition as to whether a property qualification should be required from men of color in the exercise of the elective franchise; and I want to say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Platzek), who spoke the other evening that the men who composed the Convention of 1867 and 1868, acted under the full obligation and with the full sense of their responsibility and their oaths; they did not undertake to say that men of color who did not possess property should not vote, nor that men of color who did possess property should vote, but they left it to the people themselves to pass upon the question of whether the elective franchise should be conferred upon men of color, with or without property; and to-night we debate and we haggle upon the question of whether the great intelligent, educated patriotic women of the State of New York shall have the question of giving them additional rights and

privileges submitted in separate form to the people of the State themselves.

In 1883, the Legislature submitted to the people the question of whether contract labor should thereafter be abolished in the prisons of the State, and in 1894 the question of whether a rapid transit system shall be built in the imperial city of New York at public expense, is to be passed upon by the people themselves at the polls. Why, the very law which provides for the election and assembling of this Convention contemplates that you will submit propositions separately to the people, and, further, that you may provide for these propositions taking effect at different times. Just let me call your attention to the words of the statute, section 10: "Said amendments or revised Constitution shall be submitted by the Convention to the people for their adoption or rejection at the general election in 1894. The said amendments or the said Constitution shall be voted upon as a whole or in such separate propositions as the Convention shall deem practicable, and as the Convention shall, by resolution, declare." It then goes on to provide that these propositions, if adopted by the people, shall take effect from and after the 31st day of December, 1894, "unless the said Convention shall prescribe some other time in which the same shall take effect, and the Convention may, in its discretion, by resolution, fix a time other than the foregoing." Mr. President, it seems to me that if gentlemen desire to oppose this matter, they should put forward some ground that has a better foundation in the law and common sense, than the argument that we are to sit here and absolutely determine what shall go into this Constitution, and that that, and nothing else, shall take effect, if approved by the people, on the thirty-first day of December next. (Applause.) Can it be that the citizens of this State will arraign this Convention, because the Convention submits it to them to determine this question? Can it be that the citizens of this State will be so angry with this Constitution this fall that they will vote it all down, because we propose to let them pass upon another feature of it at the following fall election? Is that the idea that gentlemen have of the intelligence and discrimination of the electors of this State? I should judge it was from the remarks of the gentleman from Oneida (Mr. Cookinham). I should judge it was, too, from a little pamphlet which I received this evening; and I can hardly forgive the writer, who hails from Kingston, for

addressing it to me as simply "Mr. Roche, Troy, New York." It is headed, "Some Reasons Against Woman Suffrage." It is a printed pamphlet, and one of the reasons, the second, reads as follows: "Any advantage arising from the vote of women who are intelligent and high principled, would be utterly lost in the evil wrought by the ignorant and degraded women voters. Such women are the majority." And for fear there would be any mistake about it, the words "Such Women are the Majority," are printed in italics. Gentlemen, is this true? Does the Convention adopt these reasons? Are they to be put forward to sustain the adverse report of this committee? Do you believe in this, shameless, libelous indictment of the womanhood of this State of New York?

Now, I wish to say to the gentleman from Oneida (Mr. Cookinham), that I think some of us may be a little too arrogant. We may assume too much when we undertake to speak for the State. I shall expect, Mr. President, to find that a gentleman who speaks for the State as he said, men, women, boys and girls, all, except 200,000, would have such a sense of weighty responsibility upon his shoulders that he would speedily become round-shouldered. And yet, I find the gentleman stands up straight and prim, in his address before this Convention. Mr. President, permit me to suggest that it is the gentlemen who are in favor of this Tucker amendment who speak for the State of New York, who express their confidence in the people of the State of New York, who have that much faith in Democracy and Republicanism that they are willing to leave this great debatable question to be passed upon by the people themselves. (Applause.) Mr. President, I find that the Republican national convention of 1876, in its platform, expressed its approval of the advances which had been made for equal rights of women, not only with reference to their property, but also their appointment and election as superintendents of charities, education and other trusts; and continued in these words: "The honest demands of this class of citizens for additional rights, privileges and immunities should be treated with respectful consideration." Are the distinguished Republicans who are responsible for the work of this Convention willing to carry into effect that national declaration of their party by submitting this proposition to the voters of this State? If not, why not? If the concentrated wisdom of the Republican party from Maine to California thought that this was a just and sensible thing in 1876, in God's name, what has occurred in the State of New York since that time that would justify the intelligent and able and clear-

headed representatives of that party in this Convention in refusing to give even slight effect to the national declaration of their party? (Applause.)

Mr. President, we can afford to give women this hearing. They have come here in number sufficient to justify their request. I notice that an attempt has been made to pull these petitions to pieces, and the gentleman from Oneida (Mr. Cookinham), after a thorough examination (and I understand that the clerk of the committee was engaged several days in making a most critical inspection of these petitions), found the duplication of, I believe, five names, and they were all from his own county of Oneida (laughter), and I regret very much that they had a ministerial heading and approval. The mountain labored and produced, not one mouse, but five mice.

Mr. Cookinham — Mr. President, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Roche — Certainly.

Mr. Cookinham — Mr. President, will about five names?

Mr. Roche — I understood the gentleman to say that there was a duplication of five names.

Mr. Cookinham — I said no such thing, or anything that possibly could be construed in that way.

Mr. Roche — Well, what was it?

Mr. Cookinham — I said there were triplicated and quadruplicated.

Mr. Roche — To what extent?

Mr. Cookinham — To thousands, tens of thousands.

Mr. Roche — Oh, tens of thousands! Well, it happens that the people of this State do not all have separate names, and the gentleman has been looking through colored glasses. I think it would be better, and more in accord with what we owe, and what we believe we owe, to the honest people of the State, to assume that there are many men with similar names and many women of similar names, and that what appears to him to be the same man or the same place may be accounted for by the fact that there are a good many men of the same name living in the same locality.

Now, Mr. President, I said that we could afford to give the women this hearing. What excuse is there for not doing it? Gentlemen, let me ask you a question. Do you believe that the people will be with them? Do you believe that and still refuse the hearing? If you do, you thereby confess the justice of their case and your own cowardice. (Applause.) Do you believe that the voters will be against them? If so, why hesitate to let that be determined, and thereby remove this subject from the realm of agitation. This is no mere species of crankism. It is no proposition for the invasion of personal liberty. It is not an utterly ridiculous thing that comes here, backed by a mere handful of people. If it were, it would receive short shrift in this Convention. On the contrary, tens of thousands of the best and most highly educated citizens of the State of New York believe that it is another step forward in the paths of progress that have been blazened by the men of the Empire State. In the words of the poet:

"Men, my brothers; men, the workers,
Ever reaping something new;
That which they have done
But earnest of the things that they shall do."

Let us have the courage, let us have the fairness to submit this question at the proper time and in the proper form to the people of the State of New York. Let us show our faith in them in their intelligence and discrimination, and all good citizens will abide by the result. (Applause.)

Mr. Hirschberg — Mr. President, I shall speak in accordance with my convictions and not in opposition to them.

The question before the Convention is whether or not we will adopt the report of the committee. The report of the committee is adverse to the proposition that the question of woman suffrage shall be submitted to the people at the general election immediately succeeding the adoption of our proposed Constitution. Directly involved, therefore, is the question of the justice, propriety and expediency of universal suffrage in this State, and no man can conscientiously vote against the report of the committee, unless he is honestly of the opinion that the time has come when women should be required to actively participate in political life. The advocates of this extended suffrage have indeed endeavored to obscure the real issue by the adroit suggestion that as only the question of submission to the people is presented, a delegate might vote for such submission, even although he is opposed to the alleged

reform; but it will at once occur to the thoughtful that this Convention can only submit questions to the people — that such submission is the sum of its province and its powers — that it cannot itself adopt anything however meritorious — and that, therefore, submission of a question to the people necessarily implies that the question submitted has first received the approval of this body. In this same connection, it is also urged that the suffrage question is one on which the people are as well informed as the Convention; that its determination requires no scientific, expert or technical knowledge, and that, therefore, a delegate may safely intrust its decision to the people without paying the slightest heed to his own views or judgment. But, sir, are not the people equally well qualified to judge and to pass upon the merits of each and every other question which may come before this body for preliminary determination? Does not the law which compels the submission of our entire work to the people for their intelligent approval or rejection, necessarily imply that they are competent to decide? And, are we relieved from the duty of considering and deciding a question simply because it is easy of solution? Can we evade our responsibility by the mere assertion that the matter is one of which the people can judge as well as we? I do not, sir, for a moment admit that the suffrage question is so easy of solution. On the contrary, I think it is one which peculiarly requires thought, study, investigation and deliberation, and that no man should assume the responsibility of fastening by his vote to-night so radical an innovation upon our political system, as is now contemplated without the most mature and thorough examination of its probable working; but whether it is an abstruse or a simple question, it is very clear that our duty requires us to decide it now upon the merits, just as we decide everything else which comes before us. (Applause.)

The argument is specious, is unsound, is dishonest, which would betray us into voting as members of the Convention contrary to our convictions, in order merely to enable the electors of the State to rebuke us at the polls. Let us vote, then, as we believe. If in favor of female suffrage, we will reject the committee's report. If we approve such suffrage, we will sustain the report. We will present to the people for their acceptance only what we approve, and so acting, we will have honorably discharged our trust, and we will not be placed in the false position of apparently lending the great weight of our affirmative support to a measure, of the wisdom and propriety of which we are in doubt.

Besides, sir, we must not forget that the people can always dispose of this question without our aid or intervention. If there is a general desire on the part of the people to vote on this question, the law is broad enough to enable them to do it. The Legislature, in obedience to public opinion, will cause a submission of this question to the people, whenever public opinion on the subject is strong enough to make itself felt. So submitted, it will be presented as a separate and independent matter, entirely apart from a general revision of the Constitution. But such a separate submission made at a separate election, is precisely what is contemplated by the measure now before us, and, therefore, in adopting it, we, in a limited sense, may be said to usurp the proper province of the Legislature.

The suggestions made by the advocates of the measure, that we should submit it separately, and not as an inherent and component part of our work, but at an independent and different election, and should disregard our personal and individual convictions in doing so, seem clearly to me to involve a confession of devious, unmanly and indefensible treatment of a great question, whose ill-advised decision may be fraught with infinite mischief and injury to the interests and welfare of the State. (Applause.)

Now, Mr. President, I have listened to the speeches which have been delivered here by the supporters of this movement, and on the merits of the question remain unconvinced. The burden of the case rests with those who would disturb the existing order of things and, to my mind, nothing has been urged by them which should carry conviction. There has been considerable inflammatory declamation, a great deal of emotional sentiment, some rhetorical denunciation, a little good-natured poetical and trenchant buffoonery; but of pure and powerful argument, calculated to satisfy the sober judgment that the State is ripe for female government and control, there has been nothing. No advocate of the measure has demonstrated that active participation in the affairs of the State can be assumed at this time by our female citizens without injury to both. Until that is done — until it is shown that woman may become a politician without losing something of the precious charm of her personality, and that the State may exact her services in that capacity without imperilling its stability and tranquility, it is surely the conservative course of wisdom to retain the existing conditions under which we have achieved our great happiness and prosperity.

The present position of woman in this State is most enviable. She has education in its fullest and highest development. She has the

absolute and unfettered ownership of her property. Every avenue of trade for which she is physically fitted is freely opened to her, and in the enjoyment of her rights she is protected by equal laws, which are jealously and even sympathetically enforced for her benefit. Never has there been a time in the history of the world when her happiness has been so assured, her advancement so stimulated and encouraged, or her independence, within the limits of her physical possibilities, and the necessity of a continuance of her domestic dominion so ample and so protected. In the domains of science, of art, of literature and of charitable and religious labor, her position is that of a specially invited and favored worker. And with it all she is still permitted to retain her essentially sweet and feminine qualities, which draw to her the respect, the deference and the homage of man, commensurate, in its nature, extent, intensity and chivalry, with the ennobling advancement of our civilization. She rules at the fireside, in the school room, by the bed of pain and in the temples of charity; and her powerful influence pervades every department of human endeavor, industry and enlightenment, unmixed with baser matter. She is recognized as the great and tender ameliorating factor in every relation of our complex life. She sweetens and glorifies prosperity; she soothes and alleviates adversity. "Poverty is not felt amid the consolations of her companionship, and sorrow ceases in the presence of her smiles." I would not drag her down from this high and favored position, at the instigation of thoughtless agitators, to take her chances in the turmoil of our political life, without the clearest evidence that it is necessary for the maintenance of her independence and the preservation of her happiness. I would not endanger partisan strife to the fuel of domestic discord. I would not endanger the quiet of our homes by an additional element of disruption, of contention, of bitterness and animosity, under circumstances in which, if there is union, the same voice would still be uttered at the polls, but in which, if there should be independent and differing thought and action, the house would become inevitably and forever divided against itself. (Applause.)

Should the time ever come when woman herself, by a fair preponderance in number, demands the ballot, and public opinion supports the demand with an unmistakable voice and emphasis, and should the time also come when party politics shall be so pure that the presence of woman at the polls would not be incongruous, and party feeling so subdued that opposition from those we love could be freely tolerated by our better natures, the experiment of female suffrage might possibly be safely tried; but until then let woman be content with her

present exalted and advancing sphere; developing to the fullest degree, within the lines and limits of her sexuality, all her capabilities for the good of humanity; rendering her share to the sum of civic happiness in the practice of the domestic virtues; freed from the burdens of State, which she is unfitted to endure, either in its defense in war or in its police in peace; not directly shaping its policy or framing and enforcing its government, but exercising an influence both powerful and benign in the education, the nurture and the training of its youth; depending for her advancement on the strength of her innate womanly power, and for her protection on a manhood which has as yet never failed her; guiding our lives by the gentleness of her nature, the purity of her impulses, the sweetness of her disposition, the uprightness of her principles, the tenderness of her heart and the magnetism of her love, and thereby wielding a control beyond the potency even of the ballot; and finding at all times and in all places, and in every walk and relation of life, her truest, and highest and holiest dominion in the effect of spotless precept and example,

"Filling the soul with sentiments august,
The beautiful, the brave, the holy and the just."

Such, sir, is the high and congenial place assigned to woman in the social and political fabric of the State, and such may it remain as long as the American heart shall throb to the music of domestic harmony. (Applause.)

Mr. Alvord — Mr. President, this question is, by the rule which has already been adopted, made the special order of business upon each legislative evening until it is finished. Very many of the gentlemen present to-night have been under the necessity of arriving here in the middle of the proceeding to-night. To-morrow, our three sessions a day will begin. It is asking too much of human endurance, in my opinion, to remain longer in session on this occasion. I, therefore, move you now that the Convention do now adjourn.

Mr. Becker — Mr. President, I merely wish to have it understood one way or the other, whether the three sessions a day begin to-morrow or day after to-morrow. I understand from the minutes they begin day after to-morrow.

The President — The gentleman understands it correctly.

The President put the question upon the motion of Mr. Alvord, that the Convention do now adjourn, whereupon it then adjourned to August 15, 1894, at ten A. M.

EVENING SESSION.

Wednesday Evening, August 15, 1894.

The Constitutional Convention of the State of New York met in the Assembly Chamber in the Capitol, at Albany, N. Y., August 15, 1894, at eight P. M.

President Choate called the Convention to order.

The President — The matter under consideration to-night is the consideration of Mr. Tucker's amendment.

Mr. Tekulsky — I move, Mr. President, that we take a recess for half an hour. There seems to be no quorum present, and no one seems ready to go on.

Mr. Cochran — Mr. President, if there is no quorum, we cannot take a recess.

Mr. Hill — Mr. President, we object to taking a recess, unless the time be extended for those who are in favor of sustaining the report of this committee.

The President — The Chair has no power to extend the time at all.

Mr. E. A. Brown — I move a call of the house.

The President — The Secretary will call the roll to ascertain whether there is or is not a quorum present, the Chair being in doubt.

Mr. Goodelle — Mr. President, I ask that unanimous consent be given that the call of the roll be dispensed with, and that the question of a quorum be not raised. I ask the gentleman who made the point to withdraw it.

Mr. E. A. Brown — Mr. President, I do not desire to take the time of the Convention with the calling of the roll, and I, therefore, withdraw my motion.

Mr. Goodelle — Mr. President, I move that we proceed with the regular order of business.

Mr. McClure — Mr. President, I did not until to-day contemplate making any remarks, certainly not indulging in anything longer than a speech of a few minutes upon the subject now before the Convention, and I would decline to be heard at all were it not for the fact that having been a member of the Committee on Suffrage, before which committee this subject has been pending for several months, I have thought it perhaps not improper that I should make some suggestions by way of an explanation of the position which I am disposed to take upon the pending question. As I understand this question, Mr. President, it is whether we shall abdicate the functions and the duties which have been put upon us by the people of the State of New York, in regard to the question of woman suffrage, or retain the responsibility and discharge it, the same as in respect to every other matter which comes before us as delegates to this Convention. The great important article concerning the judiciary of the State, the important matter of canals, the matter of the preservation of the State forests, of our charities and of education, of the government of the State, are deemed of sufficient importance by the members of this Convention, so far as I have heard, that the Convention shall act in accordance with the spirit of the act of the Legislature, calling this Convention together, and decide upon the amendments which are to be submitted to the people bearing upon those subjects, carrying with them the approbation of this Convention. I cannot appreciate the consistency which actuates the advocates of the proposition now before the house with reference to woman suffrage. Either the question of woman suffrage is an important question, Mr. President, equalling in gravity and in responsibility, so far as it weighs upon the members of this Convention, the great subjects to which I have referred, or it is not. If it is not of great importance, if it is not a subject so sacred as it has been represented to us as being, then the time of this Convention should not be taken up with any suggestion or recommendation that the matter should be submitted to the people for their decision. If it is an important question, ranking with, and going side by side with, those to which I have referred, then the judgment, the discretion, the action of this Convention should be had upon it, and if submitted to the people with the amendments proposed by the Convention on canals, government of the State, judiciary, cities and other important questions, it should have attached to and connected with it, and sealed upon it, the positive approbation of the delegates of this Convention. Mr. President, this is not a new

question, entitled to be taken and treated in a way different from the other questions that are presented to us. This year of our Lord 1894 is not the first year in which the suggestion that suffrage should be given to women has been heard. It is a subject that has been presented to the Legislatures of this State for many years, and action by those Legislatures looking towards an amendment to the Constitution has been sought; and I do not remember, within my time, that there has ever, in the years that are gone, been such an uprising of the people of this State in favor of woman suffrage as called for extraordinary action on the part of any legislative body. And this is extraordinary action on our part that is asked. We were not elected, Mr. President, for the purpose of receiving suggestions from portions of the public of the great State and submitting those suggestions to the people without action, decisive and positive, on our part. The act which brought this body together provides that we shall submit to the great people who are our constituents, not queries, not conundrums, but shall submit amendments, proposed, not by people sending up petitions here, but proposed by us.

Mr. Root — Will the gentleman give way for a moment? Mr. President, I raise the question of no quorum. There is not a quorum present.

The President — That has been raised and withdrawn. The Chair rules that Mr. McClure is in order.

Mr. Root — I wish the members of the Convention to listen to anything that the gentleman from New York has to say. I think he is entitled to it.

The President — The President will enforce the orders of the Convention, if he has the power to do so. Mr. McClure has the floor.

Mr. McClure — I was saying, Mr. President, that we were not elected here for the purpose of avoiding the full performance of our duties. We might as well, if this proposition now before the Convention is carried, adjourn; allow the clerk to receive propositions and proposed amendments, have them duly printed and submitted to the people for their action, without any action being had, pro or con, upon the merits of such propositions by this Convention. I have taken occasion here, Mr. President, once or twice in my place, to urge upon this Convention that we should not present any proposition looking to the amendment of the Constitution of this State unless there accom-

panied it the indorsement of a large proportion of the members of this body. Not alone a bare majority, but such a vote as would assure the people of this State that the wisdom, the industry and the intelligence of the Convention had been exercised upon the proposition and the full indorsement of the Convention accompanied it. I think the people of this State have the right to expect from us that we shall take the responsibility here of determining whether woman suffrage is a wise thing to be engrafted upon the laws of this State, or not; and I, for one, Mr. President, do not desire to avoid any responsibility. My convictions are clear and settled upon this question. I have never had any doubt about the propriety of my action in this regard. If I believed that woman suffrage is a proper measure, I would be ready to say it by voting to strike out from the Constitution the word "male." As I do not believe that; as I am not prepared to go to that length, I am willing to shelter myself in safety behind a proposition which enables me to say that I have not taken any position upon the question, and that I have submitted the responsibility to the people, who have not asked me to submit it to them. The proposition relative to woman suffrage before the people when we were elected to this Convention was, should there be granted woman suffrage, or not? And the Convention was elected to, in part, positively determine whether it would recommend woman suffrage or not. We were not elected to say that we would dodge the question and submit it to the people; we were not elected to say that we had no convictions and no opinions upon the question; and I consider that we are avoiding our duty when we seek to shelter ourselves behind this referendum proposition.

That brings me, Mr. President, to the question, which is behind it all, and I am prompt to declare that in my judgment woman suffrage should not be engrafted upon the Constitution at this time. Suffrage is not a right. The right of suffrage does not rest in anyone. It is an obligation; it is a trust; it is a duty, which the State, when it thinks it wise, imposes upon its citizens; and the citizens who have the duty imposed upon them of deciding whether or not it shall be given, must perform that duty intelligently, influenced in their action by their knowledge of the subject and their convictions as to whether or not it will be for the best interest of the State to grant that suffrage. I believe that it would be unwise at this time to say to the woman population of this State that, "You shall be, whether you see fit or not, whether you desire it or not, you shall be invested with this duty of exercising the

right of suffrage." Why, Mr. President, the last time that I made any set remarks upon this floor, it was in opposition to the proposition made in this Convention, in all soberness, that the male citizen should be coerced into and be compelled to exercise the right of suffrage; that the State should take into its hands the operation of his conscience in the matter of voting, and should say to him that in a political campaign, whether he conceded the propriety of the election of either one of two candidates or not, that he must by reason of his obligation to the State, see to it that he deposited his vote for either one of them, or lose the right of franchise; and yet, shortly after that occasion, we were asked to pass an amendment to the Constitution which contemplates that another large body of our citizens shall be compelled, in self-defense, perhaps, or in the performance of a solemn duty, to exercise the right of suffrage. Mr. President, I believe that the women of this State do not desire that this duty, this obligation, shall be thrust upon them. I have not in my own life, in my own business circle, in my own social circle, met any woman who desires it. Of course, there are petitions here. Petitions can be gotten for any purpose whatever, to any extent that the ingenuity, the industry and the persistency of manhood or womanhood can go; but many of the people, no doubt, who have signed those petitions, have signed them as a relief from the persistency of those who sought the signatures; and the great body of women of this State, the wives, the mothers, the daughters, those who form part of and beautify the home circle, so far as my knowledge goes, do not want, and would consider it a mortification, an annoyance, almost a degradation to be called upon to exercise the right of suffrage. Because, Mr. President, it is not, as some of my friends have said, who favor this amendment, the mere dignified going to the ballot-box and placing in it a ticket—that is not a fair and intelligent exercise of the right of suffrage, or a performance of the obligation, any more on the part of a woman than of a man; but the proper performance of the duty requires that there shall precede the act of depositing the ballot, the attendance at the convention and the caucus, the taking part in the selection of the candidate. Are the women of this State who desire that this trust shall be confided to them willing simply to vote for the candidates that the men shall present to them, or do they propose, Mr. President, that they shall exercise intelligently and to the full the obligation, the trust and the duty which will be put upon them, if suffrage be given to them? If men are indifferent and indisposed to the full performance of their duty in

going to the caucus, convention and ballot-box, manning the polls, canvassing for delegates, seeking the suffrage of the citizens, how can women, real refined, retiring women, be expected to welcome the performance of such a duty? It is because woman does not desire, will not perform, this duty and this obligation to the full, and, therefore, ought not to possess the right and with it the duty of exercising the suffrage, that I am indisposed at this time to give to them that right. It is said that we are flooded with petitions, and that a great many people come to this chamber anxious that this boom shall be given to woman. Mr. President, I have noticed in the city of New York that the women who favored female suffrage, speaking in the different districts in the city, were, without exception, the same speakers, the same half dozen; ten or twelve ladies enlisted in this cause moved about New York city like a judge in the olden day on his circuit, issued certificates to the effect that, speeches having been delivered by these ladies, the meetings resolved that the delegates representing the several districts should be requested to vote for woman suffrage. I have not seen in this chamber asking for this privilege, any but the faithful few. I made some remarks this morning, which I intended to apply solely to the question of woman suffrage, and I repeat that since this Convention met, the most persistent attempts have been made to induce the members of this Convention to agree to the amendment desired; and it did occur to me, Mr. President, that if woman could be so persistent in seeking within the halls of this chamber, in the seats of delegates, in the aisles and corridors, this boon of woman suffrage, what would happen to us when women so persistent should have the rights to seats in the Legislature, would be great influences and factors in conventions? I only find, Mr. President, a select few anxious for woman suffrage. I do not find the body of men, or the body of women of the State, to any great extent, desirous of this duty; and, therefore, upon the main question — and I do not hesitate to reach it at once — I am not in favor of submitting this question to the people as to whether or not woman suffrage should be given. I am not in favor of saying to the people that I approve of woman suffrage, either directly or indirectly; and I take it to be the most courageous act of a member of this Convention to promptly say that the reason why he is not willing to delegate the performance of his duty to someone else is, in the first place, that he is not disposed favorably towards the relief desired; and, secondly, he is not willing to avoid the performance of his duty.

Now, Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended. I do not wish to deprive anyone else of the opportunity of being heard on this side of the question. I only say that I have not heard any arguments or suggestions sufficiently strong to induce me to deviate from the course that I have set out to pursue in this Convention. I desire, Mr. President, that the work of this Convention shall be a success. I have sought to contribute to it, and shall so seek to the end as far as lies in my power. I want a complete Constitution, or a complete set of amendments to go out, behind which every member can take his stand and position and say, "This was in part my work, and I propose to submit it to the people of the State for indorsement." But I cannot indorse the giving of woman suffrage, and I think it the best performance of my duty to refuse to vote in favor of submitting to the people the proposed amendment. (Applause.)

Mr. Church — Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I arise in my place to occupy the time of this Convention with remarks upon this great question of woman suffrage. But as I have studiously avoided in the past occupying the time with talk, I may be borne with for a very few moments.

I have, Mr. President, very firm convictions upon this question, and the people of the Thirty-second Senatorial district, composed of the counties of Chautauqua, Cattaraugus and Allegany, have spoken in no uncertain terms upon the matter. The petitions which are filed here show that the county of Chautauqua, in 1893, cast a vote of 13,993. Five thousand eight hundred and seventy of those voters have signed this petition asking that the word "male" be stricken from the Constitution, and 6,628 women of that county. The county of Cattaraugus cast, in 1893, a vote of 11,514. Four thousand five hundred and five of those voters have signed this petition, and 6,210 women. The county of Allegany, sir, which county I more nearly represent, has spoken still more strongly upon this question through this petition. That county cast, in 1893, a vote of 7,759. Three thousand nine hundred and seventeen of those voters, more than half of them, have signed this petition asking that the word "male" be stricken from the Constitution, and 5,019 women. I, therefore, feel safe, sir, in saying that the county of Allegany is fairly committed to this proposition. It has been asserted upon this floor, at least before the committee, who had this matter under advisement, that it is fair to assume that those

who have failed to sign this petition are against it. I am credibly informed, sir, and I believe it to be a fact, and state it as such, that in the county of Allegany, the petition against this proposed amendment was as vigorously circulated as was the petition in its favor, and I am informed that it met with such poor success, so few were willing to commit themselves upon that side of the question, that that petition has not been filed here. I, therefore, think it safe to assert that not only those of the county of Allegany, who have signed this petition in favor of striking the word "male" from the Constitution, but those also who did not sign it, can be said to be in favor of it.

Now, sir, I desire very briefly, if I am able to do so, to emphasize the point made by Mr. Lauterbach, and alluded to by Mr. Titus, in their remarks the other evening. I assert, sir, that the male citizens of this State have brought about the conditions which make it right and just for women now to demand the suffrage, and which make it unjust and tyrannical for men now to refuse it. Whatever theory may have been held when our government was organized as to the suffrage, whatever theories may be held now, the conditions which exist in the State of New York to-day are so entirely different from the conditions which existed when our State was organized, that those theories cannot prevail, it seems to me. When the common law of England was the law of this State, and married women had no identity, they were merged in the husband, had no property rights, it might well be said that they had no reason to demand the suffrage. But, sir, beginning in 1848, the male citizens of the State of New York, not at the clamor of women, as I understand it, but actuated by a sense of justice, began to remove the disabilities under which women labored at that time. Gradually from that time on, as the years went by, the barriers have one by one been stricken away, until at last, in 1893, I believe, the last impediment, the last inequality between a husband and wife as to their property rights, as to their control over children, were removed. Now, sir, keeping abreast of this movement, which has enabled women to go out into all the avenues that men occupy in the world, enabled them to acquire property in all the methods by which men acquire property, the doors of education have been opened to them, and to-day no man claims but that the women of the State of New York stand the peers of men in respect to education, as they stand his equal in respect to property qualifications; and I believe it is conceded that they are his superiors in point of moral excellence

and all those attributes which have been extolled here by the opponents of this movement. Now, sir, we propose, after having done all this for woman, after having brought about the conditions which make it absolutely necessary for her, as it is for man, to have the ballot for the protection of her rights, we propose to stop here and refuse her the one thing that all men, all classes of men, in this country, have demanded and received for their protection.

Again, sir, it has been asserted that the burden of proof rested upon woman to show that if the ballot is conferred upon them it will result in good to the State. Mr. President, I deny that proposition. I do not believe that it is true that this great body of women should be called upon now to show, conclusively or otherwise, that the extension of suffrage to them will bring good to the State. Was that question asked of the white male citizens of the State of New York when the property qualification was removed from them? Was it asked when the property qualification was removed from the colored voters of the State? Was it asked when the suffrage was conferred upon four millions of ignorant black men just released from the bondage of slavery? No, sir. In every instance, I believe, and I say it to be a fact, the suffrage was conferred upon those classes of people, not upon the theory that it would confer a benefit upon the State, but that it was absolutely necessary for the protection of those persons themselves in the rights that had been conferred upon them. I say that that is true of women to-day. Situated as they now are, they need the ballot as much as men need it; it is as much their right to demand it. But, sir, if it be conceded that the burden does rest upon the women to show that the extension of the suffrage to them would result in good to the State, I believe it is susceptible of proof. I think it is conceded, in fact, it has been practically asserted upon the floor of this chamber, that women are more moral, that they are more God-fearing, that they are more conscientious than men. If that is true, then the next proposition which I shall state must be beyond dispute — it must be true that, in a republic, the people who take part in the affairs of the government must influence its destiny along the lines of their natures. If the two propositions are true, what other conclusion can be reached, sir, than that the extension of the suffrage to this great body of citizens will result in benefits to the State? Now, sir, in conclusion, I assert that if one million men of the State of New York, to whom the suffrage had been denied during all the years that this State has been in existence, were situated as these women are situated, and should

present to this Convention a petition, not of 600,000, but of even 100,000, the members of this Convention would not dare — on their lives they would not dare — to refuse to confer the suffrage upon them, or to submit the question to the people of this State to pass upon it. And I assert, sir, without reference to any of these matters of expediency — my time is too short to go further — that we have no right to refuse to send this question to the people of the State of New York to pass upon because of any questions of expediency, or political or party policy. (Applause.)

Mr. Phipps — A number of proposed constitutional amendments have, as we know, been submitted to this Convention, and in turn referred to the Committee on Suffrage, and not even one, in the judgment of the committee, has seemed to have sufficient merit to permit them, as a committee, to submit it to this Convention. Of all the proposed amendments this one, I think, is entitled to consideration by this Convention in Committee of the Whole, and I trust it may not be said of this Convention that on this question, which has called forth the petition of 600,000 people of this State, we, the delegates of the people, have allowed this, as well as other proposed amendments, to be decided by the committee alone.

It is not my purpose or desire to speak at length on this important subject, nor do I feel that mere words at this time will prove of effect. I feel it my duty, however, as a member of this body, and with pronounced views on the justice of the submission of this proposition, I should add my voice and influence in advocating this measure.

The discussion has been extended, and able arguments presented, and at this time it is unnecessary for me to discuss the merit as to the extension of suffrage to that portion of the people of the State who, while permitted to pay their proportion of the expenses of our government, have no choice whatever in saying who shall, and who shall not disburse the money raised by taxation upon their property. They need no champion in me, for they themselves have presented their case in a clear, logical light, much more ably than I would even attempt.

I desire to ask your indulgence for a few moments to a consideration of this subject as it appears to me. Permit me to draw a picture, or rather a comparison of the difference between petitions. The petitions, on the one hand, of 600,000 to this Convention, meeting in the interests of the people of the State and not to convene again for twenty years, and the petition, on the other hand, of say less than fifty citizens of a town, praying that questions of minor importance to be

placed before the people, not at a general election, but at a special meeting of the voters of the town called for that purpose. To-night there is being counted, in the town from which I hail, the ballots of the voters on a question of appropriating a certain sum of money for road improvements, and the decision as to the sale of a certain stretch of sandy beach. This special meeting of the voters of the town was called upon the petition of less than fifty citizens, and has been held at an estimated expense of \$2,500.

On the other hand, we, the delegates of the people of the State of New York, in Convention assembled, have had presented to us a petition of the people of this State to the number of hundreds of thousands, praying that that which is now, and has been for years, a burning question be presented to the people for their decision. The advocates of this measure have, in season and out of season, presented their case and ably argued its merits, and now ask that boon, which we can grant, of going before what I consider a higher tribunal than this Convention, the voice of the sovereigns of the State.

It is claimed that if we submit this question to the people, we endanger the work in which we are engaged; that is to say that the people will rise in their might and rebuke us for the crime of countenancing the cause of woman suffrage by submitting to the people to say whether they shall have it or not.

I give the people of the Empire State credit for too much good common sense to think for a moment that they would take any such action. We will, I believe, present to the people this year a Revised Constitution which will merit and meet with their approval, and to say that the judgment of the voters upon the Revised Constitution will be influenced by the submission of a separate proposition, is a poor compliment, indeed, to their intelligence.

For sake of argument at this moment, let us admit that there is merit in their claim.

Cannot we also imagine that by ignoring the petition of 600,000, we place ourselves and our work in a position not altogether enviable? Have the petitioners no voice, no influence? Will they, after years of earnest labor, submit without reproof to our adverse action?

The number of petitioners has been attacked on the ground that many were not honest in their signatures; that is, they did it to oblige, they did it without thought, or they have changed their views. I am perfectly willing to cut down the number for argument sake, and so we may say that one-half did not know what they were doing, and, to help along still further, say that one-half of the 300,000 have

changed their views, as expressed in their petition; we must admit that the balance did not know what they wanted and were intelligent beings. I hold that if this number desired to exercise the influence which they possess they could and would control a great number to reprove us for ignoring the petition of their greater number. I do not say they would seek to use their influence in this direction; neither will I admit that voters of this State, on the other hand, would take the same course to rebuke us for submitting the proposition. But I do say that if there is any merit in the argument for one side, there is the same weight of argument on the reverse side of the proposition.

To borrow words, "This is a condition, not a theory, which confronts us." It would, no doubt, have been more to the peace and comfort of this Convention had the subject not been introduced, but introduced, as it has been, we should meet it manfully, without fear of punishment or hope of reward.

Looking at this subject of submission to the people in its practical light, as it is given me to comprehend, I contend that we should not ignore the prayers of these petitioners, but present their case for the decision of the people of the State, and whatever that decision may be, I am convinced that it will be for the good of all concerned. (Applause.)

Mr. Fraser — Mr. President, I have listened intently to the remarks of each speaker who has addressed this Convention upon the subject now under consideration, expecting to hear some reasons which were, at least, plausible why this amendment should not be submitted to the people.

Having observed the strong sentiment in the Convention against the submission of this proposition, it was but natural to expect that reasons, having some foundation in logic and in justice, could be advanced in support of this sentiment. But if any such reasons have been given, they have escaped me.

We have, upon the face of this proposition, standing out in bold relief, unanswered, and, as I have come to believe, unanswerable, the fundamental doctrine upon which this government is based, that all just power is derived from the consent of the governed.

And can it be maintained, in the face of this principle, embodied in our Declaration of Independence, for which the revolutionary heroes fought, that laws which control the action of every citizen, which impose a tax upon every property holder in our commonwealth, but in the enactment of which one-half of our population

has absolutely no voice, derive their just power from the consent of the governed? We have listened to learned arguments here, maintaining that the right of suffrage is not a natural right, but is a privilege accorded by the government to certain of our citizens. But who, in this country, constitute the government? This is a government of the people, by the people, and not until a majority of the whole people shall impose a limitation upon the right to vote, will that limitation have any foundation in right or justice.

I am a Republican by inheritance and by conviction, and it has been urged, in the private discussions, at least, relative to this matter, that the responsibility for the submission of this amendment by this Convention will rest with the Republicans, they being the majority here, and that it will injure the party — that it is not good party policy to let this matter go to the people at this time. In answer to this allow me to say that I have yet to learn of the Republican party sacrificing principle to policy. Our party, at its inception, was the very embodiment of principle, and of the very principle which is here involved, that of liberty and equality before the law. It was Pilate who, from policy, washed his hands before the people and permitted the murder of the Man of Gallilee, an example we should have no ambition to emulate. But I do not understand that the party lines are drawn upon this issue, or that it can be made a party matter; for it enters every home, and should appeal to the sense of justice which I have faith to believe can be found somewhere in the heart of every man. If this matter is submitted, it certainly will have the effect of calling out a full vote, and so obtaining an expression of all our citizens upon the issues and candidates to be presented at the coming election, and this we do not fear. Again, it is urged that many of the best women of the State do not wish the right of franchise. This has nothing to do with the principle involved. The fact that there were those in revolutionary times who did not wish to dissolve the relations with the mother country, in no wise clouded the plain principle for which the colonists contended. And if there is one woman within the confines of this State who desires to give expression to her judgment at the ballot-box, upon the living issues of the day, it is manifest injustice to deprive her of the right. We have heard, in this chamber, an eloquent and just characterization of those men who do not care to exercise their high prerogative; and when woman shall be accorded this privilege, either now or hereafter, for we nearly all concede that the time is coming, then strictures will be entirely proper upon that pseudo-

delicacy which impels some who are bound to be ladies, even if need be at the expense of their womanhood, to say they do not care for this privilege. Life is real, life is earnest, for woman as well as man, and when the ability to render effective aid to a right cause shall be placed within the reach of the purer and better half of mankind, they will prove recreant to the God-given sentiments of pity and mercy and love, that ever swell from the heart of woman, if they do not embrace the privilege; and I believe that on all matters involving moral questions they will be found eager and anxious to exert their power; for they are ever alive to right. Go through the jails and the penitentiaries and the State prisons of our State, and you will find that the vast majority of the criminals are men; go through the churches, and you will find the vast majority of the members are women. And where you find a woman criminal, if you trace her history, you will almost invariably find that the hand of a man guided her in her first downward step. Many of the most glorious achievements recorded in history were accomplished largely through the instrumentality of women, and women whose delicacy and refinement have never been questioned. It was the pen of Mrs. Stowe that gave world-wide entrance to the cabin of the slave, and to her must be attributed more, perhaps, than to any other person, the proud distinction of awakening the great moral upheaval which called to arms the hosts of the north.

"All through the conflict, up and down,
Marched Uncle Tom and old John Brown,
One ghost, one form ideal,
And which was false, and which was true,
And which was mightiest of the two,
The wisest Sybil never knew,
For both alike were real."

It was largely through the influence and counsel of Josephine that Napoleon the First, fixing his eye upon the rugged icy steps of the Alps, muttered, "It is not probable, it is barely possible," gave the command, "Forward," and in a few weeks his cannon thundered on the plains of Italy; but when his fame became world-wide, he divorced his faithful, loving wife, and from that moment the star of his prosperity began to wane, until, at last, it sunk in the far distant sea, a lone, barren isle, in utter darkness. Victoria, queen of England, riding in state, with the wreath of immortalles at her side in sacred memory of her honored dead, furnishes an illustration of constancy and faithfulness never equaled

by man, and who shall say that when her reign shall cease, and her noted — I had almost said notorious — son shall succeed to the throne, his accession will be the signal for an uprising which shall herald the morning sun of liberty.

It is further urged that as woman cannot perform military service or do police duty, therefore, she is not entitled to the ballot. This argument is based upon the assumption that brute force governs the world. There was, no doubt, a time when this was the fact, but that time has long since passed away, and the tendency of this age is toward that time of which Tennyson sings,

"Where the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

Even in the athletic world of to-day, science triumphs over simple strength. Corbett can knock Sandow out in one round. Mrs. Cleveland, miles away, with her finger touches the button that starts the ponderous machinery at Chicago, and there is a suspicion in the minds of many that to her gentle hand might well be committed the guiding of the ponderous and laborious pen of her illustrious husband.

Another reason urged is that the bad women will exert a powerful influence upon the ballot. But until the evil women are more potent than those of the mothers and the wives of the land, this argument can have no force.

The claim that polling places are not fit places for women to frequent has little foundation in fact; but where this condition does exist, the introduction of women would be the most effective remedy that could be applied, for the native chivalry of the American man would never permit, at the polls, that which would jar roughly upon the sensibilities of their sisters and their mothers. Does anyone believe that the scenes of riot and bloodshed enacted at Gravesend, at Troy, and at other places in the last election, would have occurred if there had been women present at the polls?

All the conditions would be changed; and where riot and crime now exist, law and order would prevail. And if there is anything in reason and justice, in present conditions or in the signs of the times, to indicate that the ballot should be withheld from woman, I fail to see it; and I am, therefore, opposed to the report of the committee. (Applause.)

Mr. Arnold — Mr. President, had the advocates of woman suffrage insisted upon the Convention striking out the word "male" from the Constitution, their proposition, in my opinion, would have met with

defeat. They have wisely modified their request into asking for a separate submission of the vital question, shall the word "male" be stricken from the Constitution? No question then arises as to what our individual opinions may be upon the merit of the subject; we can only differ, if at all, upon the interpretation of our duties as public servants. I conceive it to be my duty in this case not to use my vote arbitrarily to deprive the people of the right to pass upon this important question, since so large a number of citizens of the State have asked an opportunity to let the people decide it. If I fail to correctly understand the duty with which I am charged, who can accuse? Not the people, for to them I leave the determination. Who then, only those who are opposed to woman suffrage, and in their opposition are unwilling that at some time, in some manner, the women may go to the jury composed of the voters of the State, and there submit their case? To deny them this opportunity would be unjust. It may not be entirely out of place for me to call attention to some facts which have influenced my opinion that an extension of the franchise would be too vast an experiment to be tried at this time. The common good of the people must be the first incentive for this, or any other political change, and the burden of proof is upon the woman to show that an extension of the suffrage, which shall ignore sexual differences and home life and duties, and compel an innovation in governmental policies, shall be accepted. Upon the question of common good, no proof can be obtained of any value.

Wyoming has been referred to as the only State where some positive evidence has been procured as to the result of woman suffrage. Bryce, in his "American Commonwealth," speaking of elections in Wyoming, says that from a trustworthy source he learns that, "After the first excitement is over it is impossible to get respectable women to vote, except every two or three years on some purely emotional question, like prohibition, or other temperance legislation. The effect on family life seems to be nil, certainly not bad, but after a year or two it is found that the women of the lower class are those that most regularly go to the polls."

It must be borne in mind that there is a vast difference between the character, manner of life and other conditions of the people composing the State of Wyoming, and those composing the State of New York.

The experience of every delegate who is at all familiar with public school matters, is in harmony with the statement that women will

not, to any great extent, exercise the right of suffrage, if granted to them. Since 1880, when they were given the right to vote for school trustees, they have voted so infrequently that it is a rare instance to have a single vote by a woman at school meeting, and without any positive proof then, by which to determine the effect of woman suffrage, we are left, therefore, to the claims of the suffragists themselves as to the supposed advantages of more than doubling the present vote of the State.

A newspaper clipping put the matter in better shape than I can: "The men of New York have been tested and minutely studied for a hundred years. Who can predict, from year to year, how they will vote? After almost every recent election the general feelings has been one of surprise with regard to the outcome of all these uncertainties. And yet we are assured that when, for the first time, more than a million entirely untrained and hitherto uninterested women are called to the polls, we shall not be surprised—we shall foresee how they will act and shall know that their actions will be distinctly for good. We should not know. We cannot dare to predict. We can only guess—in this case it would be hard to overestimate the magnitude of the risk. It would mean an innovation of unparalleled significance with regard to the future of our women and our men; with regard to our political course, our social conditions and the status of the home and family. And it would mean an innovation affecting not merely our State, but the country at large. "No restriction is placed on a woman in regard to business. There is every position she may be found in increasing numbers. There is no calling for which she is physically fitted in which she is repelled, and all this has been done without politics, and done by and for women not in politics and who do not wish to be. "Whatever may be said by the advocates of woman suffrage relative to the need of woman's voting, it cannot be successfully urged, and, in fact, it has not been urged very strongly, that they need the ballot for any practical purpose."

Mr. President, I believe the foundation of every government must necessarily, and as a last resort, rest in force. The advocates of woman suffrage undertake to ignore this proposition, referring to the peace congress arbitration, and other amicable arrangements of either national, State or individual differences, as indicating the tendency of modern thought to drift away from force and to seek the gentler ways of peace.

Proof, however, that it would not wholly be safe to disband our armies and militia and to resort entirely to arbitration has been found in the repeated necessities for calling on armed intervention, not only in this State, but elsewhere; and whether it be always necessary to resort to arms to enforce a decree of State, no edict will be binding force on the minority unless it be known that the majority have sufficient strength to compel obedience to their mandate. It is an undoubted fact that women are physically incapable of carrying into execution any law she may enact, and woman suffrage, under certain conditions, becomes government by women alone on every occasion where a measure is carried by the aid of women's votes.

Several times in the history of our nation a vote for candidates has been conceded a declaration of war. It has been said, suppose a proposition for prohibition, in some form, was before the people; a majority of men voted against it; a minority of men for it; a majority of women voted for it, a minority of women against. The numerical majority might then be for prohibition. Would the majority of men submit to the decree enacted by the minority of men assisted by non-combatants?

I do not attach much importance to the argument that to refuse women the right to vote means taxation without representation. All property must be made to bear its just burden, and aliens, infants and lunatics must all contribute to the cost of maintaining and enforcing the law. No distinction is made in any case, and if property alone were the basis of the franchise, the millionaire should have a thousand votes if the man taxed for one thousand has one. The individual is the representative, and we give the right to vote because it goes with the duty of enforcing governmental decrees.

The people of the State of New York will be carefully watched, and should the franchise be granted to the 3,000,000 women of the State, or such of them as shall be qualified voters, it would have a very important influence beyond the limits of the State; and in this connection it may be profitable to note what other States are doing for and against woman suffrage. I find, in 1891, municipal female suffrage bills were defeated in thirteen States; in 1892, in eight States, and in 1893, in fifteen States.

In not a single State where amendments have been submitted has there been a majority of females. In this State the women outnumber the men by 44,000, according to the census of 1890. The States voting against amendments for woman suffrage, and the dates when such amendments were voted down, the male majorities, according to the same census, are as follows:

Michigan, 1894, majority of males.....	89,000
Minnesota, 1878, majority of males.....	63,000
Nebraska, 1882, majority of males.....	86,000
Oregon, 1884, majority of males.....	50,000
Washington, 1889, majority of males.....	86,000
South Dakota, 1890, majority of males.....	32,000
Wyoming voted for majority of males.....	18,000

Colorado, in 1893, voted for female suffrage, the majority of males being 79,000. And in Kansas, where the amendment, as I understand, is to be voted on this year, the males exceed the females 78,000.

I have studiously avoided the sentimental side of the question, and it is not necessary for me to enter into and furnish discussions of the merits of the controversy. Arguments as strong as genius and ability could make, and forcible as language could express, have been presented to the Convention upon this subject; but this fact still remains, that this benefit to the people rests in theory alone, and no argument can anticipate results. I believe, however, that when the question is submitted to the people, that men will be left to perform the duties inseparably connected with voting, and that women will be undisturbed by political duties in their undisputed sway over our homes — "useless each without the other." (Applause.)

Mr. Campbell — Mr. Chairman, I rise to this question simply, perhaps, for the purpose of explaining my vote. I mean to vote to disagree with the report of the committee, and to say a few words in explanation of my course.

The main argument advanced against extending to women the right to vote, is the assertion that it would be a grave and serious danger to the State. That argument, if based on facts, is entitled to the earnest consideration of the delegates assembled here. If the character of the danger were specified, or if any facts were brought to your notice by delegates, then, indeed, it demands attention.

But no such thing has yet been done, and we are left to imagine wherein the danger lies, and we ask ourselves the question, is it possible that a wider interest in, and a fuller knowledge of, the science which has no other end than the material well-being of a people, are dangerous to that people? That would be impossible, unless the State is not a government of the people and by them and for them.

But it is such a government, and while we live, and for ages to come, let us hope that this State will be always the State of, and for, the people.

That fear, then, is groundless. What, then, is the hidden danger? It may seem to be, and it is, a paradox, but the paid advocates of the opponents of woman suffrage would have us believe that the more people there are who are vitally interested in the making and execution of just laws, then the more corrupt will become the means to that end.

They assert that there are many, dangerously many, corrupt voters now, when men alone do vote, and they would have us infer, as a necessary conclusion, that when women do vote, the corrupt vote would then be doubled. But they give no proof, show no facts, but, like a lawyer with a hopeless case, abuse the other side.

And thus, one of the many distinguished pleaders who have been allowed to speak on the subject here, makes the statement, without evidence to support it, and points out to you exactly where he thinks the danger lies. He estimates the addition to the corrupt vote, he pretends to give the almost nameless thing a local habitation and a name. I refer to the statement made by Mr. Matthew Hale in this chamber. He has published his statement and sent it broadcast to the world. You will find it in the Forum of June, 1894. With your permission, I will read it:

"Republican institutions are threatened by the prevalence of bribery and corruption more than by any other cause. Is there any reason to believe that any less proportion of women than of men will be subject to such influences? In answering this question, an unsavory fact must be plainly stated and squarely looked in the face. The number of prostitutes in the city of New York alone has been estimated, at from 30,000 to 50,000. Every city in the State adds its quota to this disreputable army. These women, who live by selling themselves soul and body to-day, would, of course, sell their votes."

If the one-tenth of what Matthew Hale here says be true, then the city of New York richly deserves the fate of the cities of the plain. It is time for the avenging and purifying fires of heaven to descend and blot her from the earth. But let us put this monstrous slander to the pitiless analysis of figures, not figures of speech, but cold, hard numerals of commerce, the figures that tell no lies, and follow me as closely as you please.

I find by the eleventh census of the United States (pp. 755 and 756) the only one which gives the necessary factors, that in 1890 the city of New York contained 389,000 females between fourteen and forty years of age, the only ones to whom the falsehood can apply, call it 400,000, if you will, by adding 10,000 for the benefit of

Matthew Hale and his story. He says that 50,000 of these women and girls, he estimated, are prostitutes. In other words, one woman out of every eight maids and matrons of our city are hopelessly lost, dead to everything that man and woman holds most dear, but living among us, festering centers of moral and physical corruption.

Can this monstrous, hideous thing be true? If any portion of what he says be true, then a condition exists there unparalleled and unheard of in the modern or ancient world. It is impossible. The figures confute the slander. Am I wrong when I say he is answered? He is dishonored. At the time this unmitigable slander was uttered it was allowed to pass unheeded. It then needed no more attention than the yelping of a mangy cur by the wayside, but since our honored colleagues have intimated that there is some hidden danger to the State if the suffrage is extended to women, and since they may be wrongly charged with having admitted by their silence, that this is the danger, I think, in justice to them, it needed an answer before this debate is closed. I know they would be the first to indignantly repel the imputation that they believed him, and their eloquent tributes to woman's purity and virtue uttered here from their hearts, testifies to the world that there is no place in their manly bosoms where the vile slander can take root.

But the charge he makes is specific, and directed alone at the city of New York.

That city is my birthplace and my home, the home of my ancestors and of my children, the home of my people. I love her as a patriot loves his native land. I have lived there for over fifty years. She has honored me by sending me here, one of the humblest of her delegates, and I cannot sit here and hear her fair name maligned without a protest.

She has sent here a body of delegates, myself, perhaps, excepted, the peers of any in the wide world in intellect and in culture, in honesty and in purity of life.

Could they and their wives and children live and move and have their being in such a moral charnel house? I speak to my fellow delegates from that great metropolis. Do I state more than the naked fact when I say that there are hundreds of thousands of women there of whose loveliness and whose purity and virtue the most eloquent praises to women that have been uttered on this floor would be nothing but the literal truth, united to and beloved by men whose integrity and manliness, and whose spotless lives make them worthy to be the husbands, sons and brothers of such women? On

their behalf, my fellow delegates, I rightfully demand for you and for myself, and for my city, that whoever reads or hears the foul slander against her fair fame will deny it with all the power of his soul and defend its virtue as he would his life. (Applause.)

Mr. McKinstry — Mr. President, in my remarks last Thursday evening I placed considerable stress upon the memorial of the New York State Grange, presented to this body in behalf of equal suffrage. Last evening a gentleman challenged that memorial as representing a very few persons — that it was not the voice of the members generally. I simply wish to say in this Convention that the gentleman is mistaken. Possibly the memorial presented may have been agreed upon by a few persons. It was the composition of one person, a talented lady of Chautauqua county, but it was formally adopted by the State Grange in its twenty-first annual session, and it represents the sentiment of that body as repeatedly expressed in years past.

The State Grange is composed of the masters and past masters of the subordinate granges throughout the State, over 600 in number. Delegates are also sent, so that the annual State meeting comprises about a thousand members, a large proportion of those members being women. You can see how absurd it would be for a male member to rise in his place and argue that these women were able enough and good enough to hold any office, no matter how exalted, in their beloved order, but not able and good enough to vote at a general election. I have attended many meetings of subordinate and county granges, and I never have heard a member advance such a proposition, or say, even in private, confidential conversation, that he regretted that the order was founded upon the basis of absolute equality between the men and women members.

The grange has been a great educator in the line of recognition of the capacity of women for organized proceedings. Its effect upon the women members has done much to convince me that all women would be improved by having a voice in public affairs. I have been astonished at the development of women in their capacity to fill various grange offices, including that of master, and at their skill in debate and their efficiency upon committees. I once heard a plain pioneer woman read to a county grange an original address, which would have been creditable to any member of this body. I had the honor of being a charter member and Lecturer of the first grange ever established, and we celebrated its quarter centennial last year.

During the past twenty-five years I have been very familiar with the membership and sentiments of the order, and I assert, most positively, that the memorial we have received does represent the overwhelming sentiment of the 50,000 members in this State, and they should be counted here as praying for the submission to the people of a constitutional amendment making men and women equal before the law — not only equal as subjects of the law, but equal as makers of the law. In saying this, Mr. President, I would not cast any reflection upon Mr. Cookinham's candor or desire to be fair. There is no more conscientious and justly disposed man in all this Convention than Henry J. Cookinham, nor one upon whose statement of a fact I would more absolutely rely when he states a fact of his own knowledge, and not upon information and belief. In this matter I simply claim that I am in a better position to know the facts than he is.

Mr. President, we were challenged, last evening, to give an argument showing wherein woman suffrage would benefit the State. I have testimony bearing exactly on that point. Two years ago I was making an excursion through California, and one morning found myself seated in the same section of a sleeping coach with a gentleman and his wife from Cheyenne, Wyoming. A more charming lady I never met, and I had conversed with her some time before it occurred to me that this lady was a voter; that I had actually been talking to one of those horrible monstrosities into which universal suffrage would convert all our women, if the theories of some of our wise men of the east are correct. The sudden realization of my proximity to such a frightful product almost took my breath away, but I managed to say "Madam, residing in Wyoming, you must be a voter." "Oh, yes," she replied, "I have voted nearly twenty years, and I would not live where I could not vote. I expect to vote for President this year," and she seemed to grow an inch taller as she said it. There she was, a refined lady, and a bright, delightful companion, and yet she not only voted regularly, but prized the opportunity as her dearest right. She was of the class who, according to the statements of gentlemen on this floor, do not want to vote and would not vote if they could. I immediately turned to the husband of this lady and, while my wife engaged her in conversation, I asked him, confidentially, what he thought of woman suffrage in Wyoming. I want to say right here that there was nothing of the sentimental dude about him. He was a sensible, intelligent, practical man, and,

as I afterwards learned, has considerable wealth and extensive business interests, and takes an active part in politics. He weighed 250 pounds, was six feet high and well proportioned. Talk about chivalry disappearing when women vote! I should like to have seen a man treat his wife disrespectfully, or insult any woman in his presence. The offending loafer would have been literally mangled. But to the Wyoming gentleman's testimony. It was simply to this effect: That the fact of women voting in that State had long ago ceased to be a matter of discussion. It was accepted as a matter of course; that their women kept well posted on public affairs and were inclined to be strict partisans. They nearly always voted the straight ticket of whichever political party they favored, and were not numerous at caucuses and conventions, "but," said he, "if either party puts up a notoriously bad man, the whole body of women will spot him every time." "And," he added, "it makes both parties mighty particular whom they nominate to important offices."

Now, gentlemen, is not that a desirable influence to have in every State? To have a large body of voters somewhat removed from politics, and yet ready to vote only for good men. The great curse of the State is the extent to which bad men get into office. We are deluged here with propositions and contrivances to keep rascals in office from defrauding the people. Such measures are always a failure. The only effective safeguard is to keep rascals out of power, and then you will have good government under any code. To the gentleman who last evening challenged us to mention a benefit that might accrue to the State by doing justice to the women of the State, I commend this testimony from Wyoming.

Mr. Lincoln — Mr. President, the question before this Convention is whether the proposed constitutional amendment introduced by Mr. Tucker, with an addition made by the Committee on Suffrage, shall be put into the Committee of the Whole. That, I understand, is the effect of disagreeing to the report of the committee. While the question is directly upon agreeing to this report, those who vote against agreeing to the report, thereby vote to put this amendment into Committee of the Whole, where it may be perfected, if not already perfect, by those who favor the general proposition, and where amendments may be offered to it of such a character as to fit it for final submission to the people, if a majority of the Convention shall finally be in favor of that course.

Now, I take it for granted that every delegate here who is in favor of submitting any proposition to the people, will vote to disagree to

the report of the committee, whether it be the proposition of Mr. Tucker, whether it be one submitting the question to a vote of the women themselves, whether it be an amendment to submit to the people next year, or in whatever form delegates may think best to submit a question of this sort to the people, they will vote to disagree with this report, so that they may put this entire question where it may be modified and made satisfactory to a majority, if a majority are in favor of a submission at all.

Now, I beg to make this suggestion, that in the interest of economy of time, for considerable time has already been consumed upon this question, it will pay this Convention to vote to disagree with the report of this committee. A large number of delegates in this Convention are in favor of submitting some proposition in some form. Whether we agree with this one or not, is not material, but I think I speak for those who favor a submission when I say that if the report of the committee is disagreed to, and this whole matter is thereby put into Committee of the Whole for general consideration and amendment, the whole subject will be there discussed and disposed of. But I think I also may safely say that if this report is agreed to, the general consideration of this question will be brought before the Convention again, and the opponents of woman suffrage, if voting to agree to this report, simply for the purpose of saving time, will waste their votes and will waste time, because when the general amendments offered by the Committee on Suffrage come before the Convention, in Committee of the Whole, for consideration; for instance, the first section of article 2, or the section relating to registration, or the section relating to the educational qualifications of voters, which the committee suggest, to some one or more of those amendments, amendments will be offered on the line of the thought embraced in the amendment now before this Convention. That is why I say that every one who is in favor of disposing of this question in the shortest way will vote to disagree to the report of this committee, so that we may have it where we may agree upon a form of amendment to submit to the people.

Now, I am free to say that I am not quite satisfied with the form of this amendment, but I shall vote to disagree with the report of the committee for the purpose of putting it where it may be perfected, and if this is not the best form, then some other form may be made. I believe, Mr. President, that a majority of this Convention are in favor of submitting some form of amendment to the people upon this question; whether it shall be the proposed Tucker amendment, which

will be a rider attached to section 1 of article 2, or whether it shall be an independent proposition, is a question which we can dispose of if we get into Committee of the Whole; but, of course, we can make no amendments here. My own thought is that it would be better to submit this question as an independent section; either an independent section providing for the submission to the question next year or some other year, or, what I think may be done, submit a proposition directly for the vote of the people next year or some other year, so that if the delegates favor eliminating this question of woman suffrage from the proposed Constitution which we may submit to the people this year, that may be done. I think this Convention has complete power to take that course, because this Convention is a sovereign body, and if we submit an amendment to the people to be voted upon next year, without the people first voting for it this year for the purpose of submitting it next year, then, if that question is voted upon and ratified by the people, it becomes a part of our fundamental law.

It has been urged here, I think, by some who are opposed to any submission at all, that it is inconsistent for us now to vote to submit a proposition for amendment independent of section 1, which is the general article relating to suffrage. We have very high authority, Mr. President, for submitting an independent proposition. The members of this Convention will recall the fact that, in 1846, the Constitutional Convention perfected the section relating to suffrage but it did not give equal suffrage to colored persons. The Convention provided for a separate submission of a separate section to be voted upon separately with the provision that if a majority of the votes upon that separate submission were in favor of equal negro suffrage, then that that section should stand so far as negro suffrage was concerned, instead of the one that was finally perfected and placed in the body of the Constitution itself; that submission was made accordingly, and the separate vote was not in favor of equal negro suffrage. The same proposition was submitted in substantially the same form by the Constitutional Convention of 1867.

So that, Mr. President, we have two Conventions offering us this precedent that we may perfect our article on suffrage and make it a part of the body of our fundamental law as finally submitted by us to the people, and then submit an independent question to the people with the provision that in case a majority of the votes are in favor of the question submitted by the independent proposition, it shall have the effect to nullify and set at naught the other propo-

sition which stands in the body of the Constitution. It seems to me there is no constitutional or legal objection to the submission of this question in the form suggested either by Mr. Tucker's amendment or some other of a similar character, and so I say that all who are willing, even, that this matter should be considered in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of perfecting a possible amendment, should vote to disagree with the report of the committee. I have voted at least twice in this Convention to disagree with the report of a committee where I was not in favor of the proposition reported adversely by the committee, but I was in favor of the principle involved in it, and for that purpose I was willing that the advocates of the measure should have their day, should have an opportunity to perfect their scheme if they might, and get it in shape where it would be agreeable to the majority. So I appeal to the generosity of the Convention in favor of the advocates of woman suffrage who are in favor of submitting some proposition to vote to put this question where these people, these advocates of submission, may have the opportunity to put their amendment in proper form. Enough upon that.

I have listened, Mr. President, very attentively to every speech that has been delivered so far in this woman suffrage debate. I have listened with great expectancy, but in vain, for some reason why suffrage should not be extended to women. We have not yet heard from the chairman of the suffrage committee. What thunderbolts he may have in reserve I do not know, but we shall probably hear to-night. I suppose that according to ordinary parliamentary practice it would have been his duty to open the debate, and give the other side the benefit of an opportunity to reply to his arguments, if he had any. But he has chosen to take the other course, quite unusual in deliberations of this kind, and chooses to close the debate, so that whatever he may have to say, in a carefully prepared and written speech, as I understand, will be without reply by the advocates of submission.

A good deal has already been said upon this general question, and my time is too limited to permit me, if I desired, to go over this ground again, but there is a suggestion that I desire to make. All the suggestions, all the arguments, if they can be called arguments, in opposition to the submission of this question, and in opposition to the extension of the elective franchise to women, have been arguments based upon expediency only. Now, an argument of expediency is the argument of tyranny always; because it is based upon the sugges-

tion that persons who have the power may deem it expedient, or inexpedient, according to their sweet notions, whether they shall extend any power to others or not.

The question of the right of this matter has not been touched upon here, as I have observed, by any of the opponents of woman suffrage. Whether it may be alluded to by the distinguished chairman of this committee, we are yet to hear.

Last night the gentleman from Oneida (Mr. Cookinham) took pains to say that it was not for the interest of the State to have the suffrage extended to women. He was interrogated as to the definition of the word "State," and he replied by saying that the State included every man, and every woman, and every boy and every girl. Now, it struck me with great force at that time, Mr. President, that the definition destroyed his argument; because when he says that it is not for the benefit of the State, and that the State is composed of these various component parts which he has mentioned here, his argument, if there is any, leads to the conclusion that a part of the State shall determine what is best for the remainder of the State, who are the constituent elements of it. (Applause.) A more consistent definition of the State is that given by Louis XIV, who said, "I am the State." Is that what the gentleman from Oneida means when he said, "We, that is, the opponents of woman suffrage, the majority of the Committee on Suffrage, are the State?" The French king spoke more truly in the sense in which he understood it, and in which it was understood at that time, than it is now declared by this member of the Suffrage Committee, because when he said, "I am the State," he spoke that which was literally true with him, because, in his day and in his government, there was in him absolute and complete authority over every subject in his whole dominion.

I heard with surprise last night the gentleman from Oneida say further upon this question: "We," as I understood him, "the majority of the Committee on Suffrage, represent the women of the State of New York." I would like to ask when they received their power of attorney? (Applause.)

Now, if civil government were to be reorganized, upon what basis would that reorganization take place? Would it be reorganized upon a basis that would give women a proper status in political society? While Robinson Crusoe lived alone upon his island, he could truthfully say that he was monarch of all he surveyed, and his right there was none to dispute. But when the second man came upon that island there was presented the problem of civil government, and one of four things must have occurred; one or the other of those

men must be killed or driven from the island, or put himself in subjection to the other one, or else there must have been a compromise. There was a compromise, and, Mr. President, the whole complex machinery of modern civilization is simply a network of compromises. On another day another person — a woman — comes to the island, and now another question is presented. Will these two men divide their power and authority and compromise further by giving the third person one-third of the powers and privileges which they have created and agreed upon for themselves? That would seem to be the logical result of the situation. Here is a creature coming upon the island who has the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. She has the right of self-defense. No, they do not do that; they put their heads together and they say: "This woman, poor thing, is a weaker vessel. We can overcome and subdue her. We won't divide power with her. We will compel her to be a servant for us, and she shall only share such things as we may see fit, in our generosity and our charity, to give her." So upon that arrangement, woman receives her status in civil society, not as matter of right, but by might. And ever since that day, ever since society was organized, woman has occupied that position, with here and there a solitary exception.

And now comes the question, shall authority be extended further? Shall woman be raised to the same place as men in the political organization which we call civil government? Is there any right which she is not entitled to, which men may enjoy? If she owns property has not she the same right to protect it that man has? If she wants to go out into the world and do business, has she not the same right to the protection of the law which man has? You say yes, but she lacks one thing. Let me state the situation as it now is in modern society. Here is a family where a boy and a girl are growing up together. The girl takes advantage of the educational facilities which we have accorded to her. She grows up into womanhood, she outstrips her brother in the race for education; she goes out into the world and tries to engage in one of the professions or one of the classes of business now open to her, but she goes handicapped by the lack of the protecting power of the ballot. That she has a right to just as much as her brother has, cannot be denied. Mr. President, it is not worth while to pursue this argument, because the exclusion of woman from the right of suffrage cannot be sustained for a moment on principle. It is purely a question of expediency, as has already been suggested by the opponents of woman suffrage, and when they talk about expediency, they rest upon the power which they now possess. They have the power, I admit.

Suppose I should ask one of these gentlemen who represent the majority in the Committee on Suffrage, where did you get the right to vote? Why, they say the Constitution gives us the right! Who made your Constitution? Our fathers made it. Who authorized your fathers to make the Constitution for men only? Who gave them the power to make a Constitution in that form? They took it, and they have exercised it ever since.

And so I say, as I said before, that the argument of expediency is the argument of tyranny, and ask this question: Why cannot the opponents of woman suffrage be candid and admit that the secret of their opposition to the extension of the elective franchise to women lies in the selfishness of power? That is where it is. You say that women are not fit to vote, that they are not educated up to it, that it would be wrong for them to vote, that it would divide families, and make trouble in society. Let us see. Men and women own their property separately, do they not? Is there any quarrel about that? Does that divide families necessarily? The mother has as much right to speak for the guardianship of her children as the father has. Has that disrupted families? They may buy and sell land together. They may buy of each other and sell to each other, they may give notes to each other, they may form partnerships for business purposes with each other. They do all these things, and the family is not disrupted. We have gone so far as to permit them to vote for school officers, a matter in which they are very much interested. The family has not been disrupted on that account, has it? Not at all. And if they can vote for school trustees, is the family in danger if they vote for a supervisor? And if they can vote for a supervisor, is the family in danger if they vote for Governor? Not at all.

But, Mr. President, my time is nearly exhausted. I say this: Woman suffrage is the inevitable result of the logic of the situation of modern society. (Applause.) It must come. We cannot stop it. Every man in this Convention may vote against submitting any question of this sort to the people; we could only hinder, we cannot prevent it. (Applause.) If universal suffrage is a mistake, that mistake was made ages ago; because if women are not to have all the rights which the logic of the situation gives to them, then we ought to have kept women in subjection, in the same subjection in which the Roman women were kept in the early days of Rome, when she surrendered her person and her property and every interest she had to the possession and dominion of her husband. Women ought to have been kept in the situation in which they

were placed by the old English common law, which we have been accustomed to boast of so much. But when we opened the door, we opened it to all this growth, all this progress, and all this improvement, and we have brought society to this one point now where nothing is lacking for the complete enfranchisement of women, except the ballot. The despot who first yielded an inch of power gave up the field. That power could never be recalled. Reforms do not go backwards. Everything goes forward. We, to-night, stand here upon the threshold of a great opportunity, to push this movement still further forward, and not try to avert the natural and irresistible result of all this improvement which we have fostered up to this present moment. We cannot stem this tide, but the tide is irresistible. Canute may forbid the rising of the tide, but the tide rises. Xerxes may whip the Hellespont to subdue its raging, but its raging goes on. (Applause.) What are the feeble efforts of man against the resistless energies of the universe? We are simply standing here now, possibly in our own light, certainly in the light of the best interests of the State of New York, when we stand in the way of this forward movement. And I say that we ought to get out of the way and permit this movement to go on, and not to resist further this claim for enlargement, for improvement, which the women demand, and which every man, I believe, in this chamber to-night will admit that the near future will bring. Carlyle says that "the moment is the mother of ages." It has been so, often in the history of the world, when the decisions of a moment have changed the destinies of nations, and of the world. This moment may be the mother of ages. Many times in the past has that saying of Carlyle proved true. It was at Runnymede, when King John gave to the barons of England, and to us, immortal Magna Charta. It was so at Concord Bridge, when that shot was fired that was heard around the world. It was so in 1861, when the boom of the first gun fired in Sumter sounded the death knell of human slavery. It may be so to-night if we rise to our great opportunity. Pass some amendment which shall give to the people of this great State the right to express their own judgment, in their own way upon this transcendent question, and this moment may be the mother of ages, ages of a more exalted womanhood, ages of a nobler manhood, ages of a broader civilization, and ages of a loftier patriotism. (Applause.)

Mr. Goeller — On this question of female suffrage as it is pending before us in various propositions, I desire to address myself to one part of it, the proposition to send it to the people.

The delegates of this Convention have been sent here by the people to formulate principles. You are the doctor to prescribe for the patient, but by sending this question in this manner to the people you bring forth the anomalous position of the patient being asked by the doctor to prescribe.

Voters have made you their agents to do this work, and for the confidence they have shown in your intelligence you make return by doing nothing on this momentous subject.

Now, gentlemen, right here you must act. Say not, "We know not how." You were sent here as architects to design this structure of suffrage, or design something material, something of substance. You are here to decide and the people to pass upon your decision.

Shirking is not doing a duty. My vote and influence are for a policy, to pursue which means that this Convention is to decide, and not send the question to the people.

I am against the policy to send the question to the people, and will vote that we now decide whether women shall or shall not have the ballot.

"Tis ours the chance of fighting fields to try" (Applause.)

Mr. Lauterbach — Mr. President, I regret that I will not be able to know what the arguments of the other side are. They are yet to come.

I do not consider that the usual confectionery that is afforded to women on every occasion in which their rights are discarded, such as was given to the women in lieu of their rights last night in a very ornate and beautiful speech, is argument. That is the usual method in which their requests are treated. There was no argument of any other character that I know of. There has been none presented which cannot be answered, that I am now conscious of.

I have a few minutes, or perhaps a minute, in which to address the members of this Convention. I ask both parties that are represented in this Convention to carry out the boast that has characterized them from the beginning of this session, to be absolutely non-partisan and fair. I ask that upon this question, in which the rights of women, the wives and sisters and daughters of Democratic members and of Republican members alike, are involved, the boast that has been made that there is no partisanship, shall really prevail. This is a question that should be without partisanship, a question that should be considered absolutely upon it merits if any question here should, and yet I feel that the only reason that will prevent

if any reason shall prevent the women from receiving the poor boon of presenting their claim to the people of the State in November, 1895, is that of political expediency. (Applause.)

The President — The floor now belongs to those who are in favor of sustaining the report of the committee.

Mr. Root — Mr. President, the courtesy of the chairman of the Suffrage Committee has accorded to me fifteen minutes of his time. I am opposed to the granting of suffrage to women, Mr. President, because I believe that it would be a loss to women, to all women and to every woman; and because I believe it would be an injury to the State, and to every man and every woman in the State. It would be useless to argue this if the right of suffrage were a natural right. If it were a natural right, then women should have it though the heavens fall. But if there be any one thing settled in the long discussion of this subject, it is that suffrage is not a natural right, but is simply a means of government; and the sole question to be discussed is whether government by the suffrage of men and women will be better government than by the suffrage of men alone. The question is, therefore, a question of expediency, and the question of expediency upon this subject is not a question of liberty, a question of the preservation of free constitutional government, or law, order, peace and prosperity. (Applause.) Into my judgment, sir, there enters no element of the inferiority of women. There could not, sir, for I rejoice in the tradition and in the memory and the possession of a home where woman reigns with acknowledged superiority in all the nobler, and the higher attributes that by common, by universal, consent determine rank among the highest of the children of God. No, sir. It is not that woman is inferior to man, but it is that woman is different from man; that in the distribution of powers, of capacities, of qualities, our Maker has created man adapted to the performance of certain functions in the economy of nature and society, and women adapted to the performance of other functions. One question to be determined in the discussion of this subject is whether the nature of woman is such that her taking upon her the performance of the functions implied in suffrage will leave her in the possession and the exercise of her highest powers or will be an abandonment of those powers and on entering upon a field in which, because of her differences from man, she is distinctly inferior. Mr. President, I have said that I thought suf-

frage would be a loss for women. I think so because suffrage implies not merely the casting of the ballot, the gentle and peaceful fall of the snowflake, but suffrage if it means anything, means entering upon the field of political life, and politics is modified war. In politics there is struggle, strife, contention, bitterness, heart-burning, excitement, agitation, everything which is adverse to the true character of woman. Woman rules to-day by the sweet and noble influences of her character. Put woman into the area of conflict and she abandons those great weapons which control the world, and she takes into her hands, feeble and nerveless for strife, weapons with which she is unfamiliar and which she is unable to yield. Woman in strife becomes hard, harsh, unlovable, repulsive; as far removed from that gentle creature to whom we all owe allegiance and to whom we confess submission, as the heaven is removed from the earth. (Applause.) Government, Mr. President, is protection. The whole science of government is the science of protecting life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, of protecting our person, our property, our homes, our wives and our children, against foreign aggression, against civil dissension, against mobs and riots rearing their fearful heads within this peaceful land during the very sessions of this Convention, against crime and disorder, all the army of evil, civil society wages it war, and governments is the method of protection, protection of us all. The trouble, Mr. President, is not in the principles which underlie government. Men and women alike acknowledge them and would enforce them, honor and truth and justice and liberty; the difficulty is to find out how to protect them. The difficulty is to frame the measure, to direct the battle, to tell where and how the blows are to be struck and when the defenses are to be erected.

Mr. President, in the divine distribution of powers, the duty and the right of protection rests with the male. It is so throughout nature. It is so with men, and I for one will never consent to part with the divine right of protecting my wife, my daughter, the woman whom I love and the women whom I respect exercising the birthright of man, and place that high duty in the weak and nerveless hands of those designed by God to be protected rather than to engage in the stern warfare of government. (Applause.) In my judgment, sir, this whole movement arises from a false conception of the duty and of the right of men and women both. We, all of us, sir, see the pettiness of our lives. We all see how a poor thing is the best that we can do. We all at times long to share the fortunes of others,

to leave our tiresome round of duty and to engage in their affairs. What others may do seems to us nobler, more important, more conspicuous than the little things of our own lives. It is a great mistake, sir, it is a fatal mistake that these excellent women make when they conceive that the functions of men are superior to theirs and seek to usurp them. The true government is in the family. The true throne is in the household. The highest exercise of power is that which forms the conscience, influences the will, controls the impulses of men, and there to-day woman is supreme and woman rules the world. (Applause.) Mr. President, the time will never come when this line of demarkation between the functions of the two sexes will be broken down. I believe it to be false philosophy; I believe that it is an attempt to turn backward upon the line of social development, and that if the step ever be taken we go centuries backward on the march towards a higher, a nobler and a purer civilization, which must be found not in the confusion but in the higher differentiation of the sexes. (Applause.) But, Mr. President, why do we discuss this subject? This Convention has already acted upon it, a committee, as fairly constituted as ever was committee, has acted upon it, a committee which had among its members four who were selected by the women who lead this movement, which had a much smaller number of gentlemen who were known to be opposed to it, the great body of which was composed of men whose ideas and feelings upon the subject were utterly unknown, has acted upon it, and reported to the Convention. The Convention has, by a unanimous vote, decided that it will not strike the word "male" from the Constitution. Now we are met, sir, by a proposition that instead of performing the duty which we came here to perform, instead of exercising the warrant given to us by the people to revise and amend the Constitution, we shall have recourse in a weak and shuffling evasion, and then throw back upon the people the determination which they charged us to make in this Convention. (Applause.) We are asked to do it. Why? To do it from good nature, to do it because my friend from New York, Mr. Lauterbach, is a good fellow, to do it because it will please this lady and that lady who have been importuning members about this hall for months to do it, heaven knows for how many reasons, but all reasons of good nature, of kindness, of complaisance, opposed to the simple performance of the duty which we came here to discharge under the sanction of our oaths. Mr. President, I hope that this Convention will discharge the duty of determining who shall vote; discharge it with manliness and

decision of character, which, after all, the women of America, God bless them, admire and respect more than anything else on this earth. (Applause.)

Mr. Goodelle—Mr. President, several proposed amendments in various forms were submitted to strike the word "male" from article 2, section 1 of the Constitution, proposing thereby that universal female suffrage should be established; such propositions have been supported by memorials numerous signed by both sexes from the different parts of the State, and those have been met by a larger number of memorials from women only, protesting against any change which would cast upon womankind the burden of elective franchise, and what it almost necessarily involves. Other proposed amendments have been submitted to so amend the Constitution as to permit of qualified or restricted woman suffrage; also to empower the Legislature to make laws looking to universal female suffrage; also, propositions to submit the question to the women of the State, to be determined by their votes alone; also, proposed amendment to submit to the electors of the State in a separate proposition, to be in that manner determined, whether or not universal female suffrage should be granted.

While various other amendments have been proposed and considered by your committee, looking towards securing the same objects, the foregoing may be regarded as embracing the scope of the propositions referred to, and considered by the committee on that subject.

The suffrage memorials and petitions have been confined entirely and exclusively to the main proposition, to strike the word "male" from the Constitution, and to grant universal suffrage to women, and the protests have been, likewise, exclusively directed against that proposition; no middle ground is sought or suggested by the voluminous petitions or protests.

Your committee, fully appreciating the gravity of the questions involved, and the great and widespread public interest taken therein, approached and considered these various propositions with unusual deliberation and care, every member being actuated only, as I believe, by a profound determination and purpose of conscientiously reaching a conclusion, which, in their judgment, should be for the best interests of the commonwealth, and all of its citizens. A large amount of time has been devoted to the thorough consideration of the question; many public and private hearings have been cheerfully accorded to the advocates of either side, and no one has been refused

or turned away unheard, requesting it. And we are happy to be able to state that upon the main proposition, to strike the word "male" from the Constitution, which was the line along which the contest was waged, your committee was unanimous in concluding that the proposed amendments, in that regard, should be, and the same were, unanimously rejected.

And upon all the other propositions a like result followed, with the exception of the bill, the adverse report of which is now under consideration, wherein it was determined, by a vote of thirteen to four, that it should be rejected, and one other to be considered, which was rejected with but one dissenting vote. I desire to say, at this time, that I was astonished to hear the gentleman from Chautauqua suggest to this Convention, when the adverse report on the amendment proposed by him was presented, that he had no opportunity to appear before the committee. I trust that reflection will convince him of his error.

And we hope it may not be inappropriate, at least, to make brief mention of some of the many reasons which actuated the majority of the committee in its determination of the questions involved.

It has been repeatedly claimed and strongly urged that suffrage is a natural and inherent right of all the citizens.

We are compelled to dissent from that proposition as one which, in our judgment, is wholly at variance with the theory and history of all political governments.

We think there can be no question but that the privilege or duty of suffrage (however it may be termed) is not a natural right of the citizen, but it is conferred by the State, and not for the benefit, or to gratify the wish of the recipient, but solely for the benefit of the State in all that the term implies; we prefer to call it, at least, a moral, if not a legal duty imposed upon the individual citizen for the reason that its exercise by him will make for the best interests of the whole community, a duty to be exercised kindred to that which compels men, unwillingly, to give up their property, their liberty, their lives on the battlefield, if the welfare of the State, the community, demand the sacrifice.

To that effect are the numerous decisions of the highest courts of this and sister States, as well as the federal courts, and we know of none to the contrary. Neither on principle or legal authority, then, do we think the question one open to discussion.

Whether or not a large number of men and women ask for female suffrage—whether women are taxed as to their property, or pay taxes, or not, are considerations of very minor importance, if not

irrelevant. The great paramount and controlling question to be ever kept in mind, in this discussion by the Convention is, is it so clear that the State will be benefited and so benefited, that we are called upon by the pressing demands of the State to undertake an experiment so revolutionary in its character, and as to which the utmost that can be urged is, that the effects upon the State and nation would be a matter of conjecture?

Shorn then of all irrelevant matter, the precise question is, not whether or not large numbers of male and female citizens ask for it, or protest against it, or are taxed or not, but is it for the benefit of the State, its institutions, and all its citizens that the proposed amendment should be adopted?

Would it make more secure the stability and perpetuity of our government and the free institutions thereunder, and would it increase the prosperity and happiness of the citizens of the State, and consequently elevate them in all those things pertaining to the good order and obedience to law which the State expects and has the right to demand?

One of the most eminent, and we think, the ablest, advocate of female suffrage at the present day, with great fairness, lays down the proposition that: "The advocates of female suffrage seek to change the relation of the sexes which has existed since the foundation of the earth."

Coming from such a source, the suffragists must, and doubtless do, accept the declaration with its full import. We must concur in the well expressed opinion of that eminent American and good friend of mankind, Horace Greeley, in his report to the Convention of 1867, as chairman of the Committee on Suffrage, wherein he held that the proposition to extend the elective franchise to women would be an "innovation so revolutionary and sweeping — so openly at war with the distribution of duties and functions between the sexes, as venerable and pervading as government itself, and involving transformation so radical in society and domestic life," that it should be rejected.

If then we are right, in concluding that suffrage is granted by the State, for the benefit of the State, as aforesaid, and it is sought "to change a relation between the sexes which has existed from the foundation of the earth," as the woman suffrage advocates declare, it follows that the experiment suggested is one decidedly revolutionary in its character — a change fundamental in the whole social function of woman to be engrafted into the organic law with all that such change involves.

This is not a question for frantic appeals or empty declamation, or where resort should be had to passion, prejudice or sympathy, but its consideration should be addressed, alone, to the judgment and intellect of this Convention, and disposed of, after calm inquiry, for the best interests of the State and its people, like others before us.

We believe that if all the sentimentality is laid aside, as it should be, and this question is considered with the seriousness which it deserves, we shall all agree upon the proposition which ought to be, if it is not, axiomatic, to wit: That this Convention should not enter this radical and revolutionary field, and change its organic law as suggested, unless well defined benefits to the State can be pointed out to result therefrom, and that such be reasonably well established; we might well go further and insist that before we consent to the proposition, so contrary to the consensus of opinion and of the political governments of nearly the whole civilized world, that the absolute necessities of the State, for the endurance of our government — for the maintenance of society, of law and order — are not only pressing, but demand a change; but be that as it may, it will not do for us, as prudent men, to undertake so revolutionary and what, at least, might be a dangerous experiment, in thus changing the fundamental law, if the apparent result would be indifferent, or when simply imaginary, speculative or vaguely defined benefit to the State may appear to come therefrom — but benefits to the State, and all its people, tangible, substantial, well defined, and, at least, reasonably certain from the logic of events, should, as results, be foreseen.

Neither of the advocates of woman suffrage, in their interesting and elaborate addresses, before your committee, or in their writings (upon whom the burden clearly rests), or by the arguments on this floor, or in any other manner, has it been shown that any certain, well-defined or tangible benefits would result, either to the State or to the women themselves by the adoption of female suffrage.

There appear no wrongs to woman that man has refused to redress, no provisions for her benefit that he has refused to make, no profession or business closed to her, no barrier interposed to her development and advance in any direction in which her sex permits her to direct her footsteps; and furthermore, from the State of Wyoming, where woman suffrage has existed for twenty-five years, a distinguished United States Senator, at the request of the advocates of the cause, appeared before your committee to inform

them, from his own observation, as to the practical results of universal suffrage in that State; although an advocate of the doctrine on principle, and having been elected to Congress in part by the female vote of the State, yet, with eminent candor and fairness, he confessed his inability to point to a single instance wherein the State or its womankind had been benefited by female suffrage. The most favorable inference for the suffragists that could be drawn from his statements, was that the result is indifferent in Wyoming; while others of equally high authority speak quite disparagingly of its practical effects in the State. And even Governor Waite, of Kansas, a populist and an avowed advocate of female suffrage, in a recent announcement, declared "It must be admitted that the effect which female suffrage will produce upon the State and nation is a matter of conjecture. In Wyoming, to my knowledge, no extraordinary progress has been made in the line of political reform that can be traced to female suffrage."

But however much of benefit might be claimed or shown from woman suffrage in that State, we would still regard it as of little if any consequence in determining the expediency of engrafting in the organic law of this State the enactment under consideration.

It could not be fairly claimed that Wyoming, with a population of scarcely 100,000, scattered over a territory in area twice the size of this State, with no cities of any considerable size, could furnish a precedent for the action of this Convention in revising or amending the fundamental law of our State, with its over six million of population, and its vast and densely populated cities—its seething caldrons of political heat and excitement, hotbeds of vice and corruption—developing swarms of criminals, with no regard for law or morality in the frenzied contest for party or personal supremacy so often recurring.

While, therefore, it has not been demonstrated and does not appear that any well-defined benefit would arise from the enactment asked for, and the experiment of twenty-five years (spoken of) where it has been tested under the most favorable circumstances, having produced but indifferent results, it follows, if our premises be correct, without further suggestion, that it would be unwise for this Convention to recommend, by its action, female suffrage, or the proposition under consideration.

But, to go further, it seems to us quite clearly, that instead of benefits, positive evil would result, not only to the State, but to womankind, by conferring suffrage upon females.

We cannot elaborate, but only suggest some of the more serious and fundamental objections. What is one of the dangers to the State? In our country the unit of society, of the State, is the home, or the family—the whole aggregation is called society—the State. And from those units the State derives its power, and government its stability, and in whatever way, or by whatever means, those units are weakened, so does the power of the State become impaired, and hence the stability of our government becomes impaired.

In other words, in proportion as this State, called the home within a State, is maintained in its strength and integrity, is the whole State strong, healthy and prosperous. It is the fountain of private and public morality—the source of life-giving blood of the State—and whatever threatens the destruction or impairment of the home is a direct menace to the State. If the mother and wife vote with, and under the direction of the husband, whether for good or evil, the vote of the husband is simply duplicated; if against him, and contrary to his wishes, what may follow?

It is a mere sophism to say that the elector begins and ends the exercise of suffrage by casting a ballot—that no harm to the well being of a home could come from the wife simply dropping a piece of paper into a ballot-box. But what of the effects, of the wife insisting upon voting and electioneering against the most intimate personal and business friend of her husband, urging and working for the passage of laws obnoxious to him. "And where there are children, striving against the other to capture recruits for their respective sides at the family altar, the table and fireside of the home, and at the close of the contest the defeated party to be met with taunts and sneers instead of sympathy?"

Such possibilities should not be considered simply with respect to families bound together with the strongest ties of reciprocal affection, which are found in our ideal homes, but should especially be considered in those cases where the family tie is weakest, whether from incompatibility, inexperience, suspected infidelity or estrangement from whatever cause; in these cases the strain upon the marital and family relation would be most keenly felt. Other illustrations without number force themselves upon every thoughtful mind.

With women enfranchised and in politics, assuming political leadership, striving for public office, aiding in primaries, electioneering at the polls, becoming ambitious orators on the stump; in short, doing what men now do in heated political contests of the

State, suggest too strongly, not only the possibility, but the probability, if not the certainty, of the introduction of political dispute and party work in family life, which would develop and increase estrangement, separations, infidelity and divorce, and the consequent destruction of home.

It would seem that this great danger to the home resulting in conferring the franchise upon married women was recognized in England two years ago, when the women in that country were demanding parliamentary suffrage, the bill then proposed in parliament confined the suffrage to spinsters and widows, thereby practically making thereafter marriage a cause for disfranchisement, a penal offense.

In that contest, there being no proposition to extend suffrage to married women, but only to the unmarried, Gladstone was appealed to, to give his views upon the proposed measure, by the women demanding suffrage, offering their support if he would declare himself in its favor, and although he had spoken as if he thought the change desirable, upon mature reflection wrote, viz.: "I speak of the change as being a fundamental change in the whole social function of women, because I am bound, in considering this bill, to take into view not only what it enacts, but what it involves. * * *

It proposes to place the individual woman on the same footing in regards to parliamentary elections as the individual man; she — not the individual woman, marked by special tastes, possessed of special gifts, but the woman as such — is by these changes to be plenary launched into the whirlpool of public life, such as it is in the nineteenth century, and such as it is to be in the twentieth century. * * *

A permanent and vast difference of type has been impressed upon woman and man, respectively, by the Maker of both. These differences of special offices rest mainly upon causes not flexible and elastic like most mental qualities, but physical and in their nature unchanging. I, for one, am not prepared to say which of the two classes has the higher, and which the other province, but I recognize the subtle and profound character of the difference between them. I am not without fear lest beginning with the State, we should eventually have been found to have intruded into what is yet more fundamental than statehood, the precinct of the family, and should dislocate or injuriously modify the relations of domestic life. * * *

My disposition is to do for her everything which is free from danger or reproach, but to take no step in advance until I am convinced of its safety. The stake is

enormous. The affirmation pleas are, to my mind, not clear, and, if I thought them clearer, I should deny that they are pressing. I earnestly hope that the House of Commons will decline to give a second reading to the woman's suffrage bill."

If Gladstone's fears for the well-being of the State, the family and domestic relations were well founded in regard to suffrage being conferred upon unmarried women, the evil results to the State and family of throwing the wife and mother into the maelstrom of politics of this country, can scarcely be doubted.

It will not do to assume that women will generally vote as their husbands do, and thus evil to their families be avoided, because that would be to renounce most of the considerations advanced in favor of the suffrage movement. It is said by an eminent writer that the "coherence and permanence of the family depend upon the difference in the mental and emotional constitution of men and women." The family is a union of two manifestations of a common human nature, masculine and feminine, of the soul as well as the body; molding, governing and guiding the children, each after its own manner, and diffusing through society the blended influences of wife, mother, daughter, sister and husband, father, son and brother. The bearing of these principles upon the relation of wives and mothers to the suffrage is, that to govern the State would unfit woman for her position in the family.

The writer forcibly argues the correctness of this proposition, claiming that feminine instincts will not preserve the woman, if she be plunged into politics, but that she will gradually be changed in her intellectual, moral and emotional sensibilities, according to the laws of evolution, environment and culture, approaching the character and developing the mental and moral constitution of man, to the disruption of the family and the detriment of the State.

And we think, furthermore, it would be harmful and pernicious to the interests of the State, as well as contrary to the fundamental principles of our political system to invest with controlling powers of legislation that majority of our citizens, which concededly would be unable to enforce their laws by physical force, if necessity required.

Nor would benefit accrue to the State by taking women from that special maternal sphere of duty and responsibility ordained by nature, the bearing and rearing of children, to perpetuate and replenish the population; the tendency, at least, would be detrimental to the welfare of the commonwealth, and to menace the peculiar conditions upon which the very existence of the State depends.

To confer upon women the right to vote, with all that it involves, in our judgment, would not be productive of good, but rather of evil to womankind also. For woman to plunge into the "filthy pool of politics" of this day and age, and to contend with the vicious elements in political campaigns, and in an atmosphere from which she has hitherto stood aloof—to subject her to the duties of police and of the jury—to compel her to bear arms for the protection of this State, and to perform the thousand and one other duties of offices now cast upon the electors of the State for its government and protection, seems to us so unnatural as to be abhorrent, and would tend not only to the degradation of female nature and instinct, but to divest her of that power which she now exercises and privileges she now enjoys by reason of her feminine charms and the chivalric spirit of the opposite sex towards her.

The greatest refining influence of society at the present day, arises from the respect shown to women, as such, by men.

The lessening or destruction of that sentiment would be unfortunate for women as well as men. It is too much to expect that in the bitter struggle of politics such sentiment would not be impaired or greatly weakened, if not wiped out, and we greatly fear that the special courtesy to women now existing, arising from that influence peculiar to them and a dependence on their part, would be swept away when they contend on the same plane with men in the political arena.

That she is not oppressed, but enjoys special privileges and advantages over the opposite sex, arising from legislation and common law, as well as from the courtesy universally conceded by the male population, will readily be conceded by every lawyer in this Convention, and cannot be denied. As, in times of common peril, her safety is first to be considered, whether in shipwreck, conflagration or from any of the countless disasters to which all are liable to be subjected.

That the government, courts and juries give to her rights, both of property and person, special protection, is also within the knowledge and experience of every lawyer. And many of us must concede the force of what an eminent writer uttered when he said, "In jury cases, at least, the difficulty is not for women to get justice against men, but for men to get justice against women."

To take away or to endanger the special privileges enjoyed by the 1,500,000 adult women of this State (although requested by a meagre minority of about fifteen per cent), by changing the relation of the sexes and placing them upon a common political plane with men, would not be just to the other large percentage of women who do

not ask, but protest against it, and would be not only against the interests of the State, but against the interests of all the women of the State.

And in concluding our consideration of the evil effect on woman-kind, we cannot refrain from emphasizing as well as supporting our views by reference to the words of Bishop Vincent, the founder of Chautauqua, a former ardent advocate of woman suffrage, which has just come to us. He says: "Years of wide and careful observation have convinced me that the demand for woman suffrage in America is without foundation in equity, and if successful, must prove harmful to American society. * * * The instincts of motherhood is against it. The basal conviction of our best manhood is against it. The movement is at root a protest against the relations and functions by virtue of which each sex depends upon and is exalted by the other. This is a theory of politics tending to the subversion of the natural and divine order, which would make man less a man, and woman less a woman. Woman now makes man what he is. She controls him, as babe, boy, manly son, brother, lover, husband, father—her influence is enormous. If she uses it wisely, she needs no additional power. If she abuses her opportunity, she deserves no additional responsibility. Her womanly weight, now without measure, would be limited to the value of a single ballot, and her control, over from two to five additional votes, forfeited. Free from the direct complications and passions of the political arena, the best women may exert a conservative and moral influence over men as voters. Force her down into the same bad atmosphere, and both men and women must inevitably suffer incalculable loss. We know what women can be in the 'commune,' in 'riots,' and on the 'rostrum.' Woman can, through the votes of men, have every right to which she is entitled. All she has man has gladly given her. It is his glory to represent her. To rob him of his right is to weaken both. He and she are just now in danger through his mistaken courtesy."

Many other considerations against female suffrage occur to us, which time will not allow us even to suggest. But the question of taxation without representation has been so strongly urged, and on this floor, as a gross injustice to women, that we feel called upon to barely allude to it.

We cannot accept the conclusion of those urging the proposition. We cannot concede that there exists any relation whatever, in fact or theory, between taxation and the voting power, but the contrary is true.

The property of aliens and minors is taxed with no voting power behind it. Taxes are not levied as an equivalent for the suffrage. The voting power of the elector in no wise depends upon his amount of property, or whether he is taxed, or has taxable property or not. The wealthiest elector in the State has no greater voting power than the poorest man who has not a place to lay his head. Each has one, and only one vote. All electors, as to the power to vote, stand upon a common level, with no property qualification controlling, modifying, or in the least affecting the right.

Taxes are levied and collected alike, and in the same proportion, upon the property of the voter and non-voter, of the sane and insane, of aliens and citizens, of adults and infants, of men and women, as involuntary contributions to the State, for the protection of the property, and for the benefit and advancement of the whole community.

Believing, therefore, that the exercise of suffrage is not a natural or inherent right, but a power or duty to be conferred by the State, solely for its benefit, that there is no wrong done to the individual, as such, asking it, by a refusal, that the proposed measure is of a nature revolutionary in its character, and before adopted by the State, through this Convention, well defined benefits to result to, and pressing necessities of the State, should be seen to exist, pointed out, and at least, reasonably well established, demanding the same; none of which in his case seem to exist or to have been established; but believing, on the other hand, that by its adoption great evil would result to the State and all its people, and especially to womankind, we were compelled to resort against all the propositions looking towards conferring suffrage upon females.

And because, from profound conviction, a few of the reasons for which we have given, we are opposed to female suffrage, so are we unalterably opposed to submitting to the people the proposition now under consideration.

The Committee on Suffrage have unanimously reported against granting it, by refusing to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution, which report has been agreed to by this Convention.

And by what logic are we now asked to recommend to the people to pass upon that which we have rejected, and by our action declared should find no place in the organic law?

We are for female suffrage or we are against it.

If we believe it right, wise, and for the weal of this commonwealth, and that it ought to be adopted, our duty lies clearly in the one direction, to give it an abiding place in the fundamental law.

If, on the other hand, we believe it is wrong — against the interests of the State — and a proposition so revolutionary in its character, that we dare not take the responsibility of giving it such a place, let us have the courage of our conviction, and by our acts declare that we will discharge the duties imposed upon us, which we have sworn faithfully to do, fearlessly, and to the best of the ability God has given us, and that we will not relegate to the people, to dispose of those questions, to us submitted, by us considered, investigated and rejected, thereby endangering the entire work of this Convention.

Was it for such purpose that we were elected? Shall we thus endeavor to avoid the responsibility thrown upon us, which we have assumed?

But this question I leave for others more fully and ably to discuss.

To briefly consider the main proposition, and to set forth some of the reasons for our position thereon, was our only purpose.

And we venture to add that reflection and study of this question have produced conviction so strong that we must frankly say, we do not believe that universal female suffrage will ever find a place in this State, circumstanced as it is, under our present form of government.

We think that the strength of the cause is at its zenith now; and as the subject has now become one of great magnitude, and has but recently claimed the attention and serious thought of the people, that as intelligent and reflective minds follow the investigation, it will be more clearly demonstrated and understood that there exists, and will continue to exist, under our form of government, underlying objections to its adoption which are insurmountable. It is certainly, as pointing in that direction, significant that the liberal and progressive Horace Bushnell, after protracted thought and serious consideration, was forced to the conclusion, contrary to his former conviction, that female suffrage would be a "reform against nature."

That John Bright, the steadfast friend of every measure designed to benefit woman, who in 1867 voted in parliament for woman suffrage, but many years afterwards, after a most deliberate reconsideration of the whole question, spoke against their enfranchisement, and in explanation of his conduct wrote the words so pertinent here that we quote them: "I cannot give all the reasons for the views I take, but I act upon the belief that to introduce women into the strife of political life would be a great evil to them, and that to our sex no possible good could be derived — when women are not safe under the charge and care of fathers, husbands, brothers and sons, it is the fault of our non-civilization, and not our laws. As civilization,

founded on Christian principles, advances, women will gain all that it is right for them to have, though they are not seen contending in the strife of political parties.

"In my experience (he adds) I have observed evil results to many women who enter heartily into political conflict and discussion—I would save them from it."

That the eminent scholar and thinker, Goldwin Smith, also, after voting with Mr. Bright for female suffrage, was led to change his opinion in 1892, in the consideration of the bill then pending in parliament, to give the spinsters and widows the right of suffrage in England, and in an exhaustive and elaborate essay, viewing the question in all its phases, took ground strongly against conferring suffrage upon the two classes of women specified in the bill, after considerations similar to those given by Mr. Bright.

That Herbert Spencer, also, after seriously reviewing the matter renounces his former convictions, favoring female suffrage, and concludes that his former position cannot be maintained, saying that he "discovers mental and emotional differences between the sexes, which disqualify woman for the burden of government and the exercise of its functions."

We have already alluded to a similar change of the views of Gladstone. It is especially significant that Bishop John H. Vincent, the founder of Chautauqua (whose present views we have already quoted), who, perhaps, has given this question more careful thought than any other American, whose energy and life have been devoted to the advancement of the interests of womankind, and after years of earnest advocacy of woman suffrage, and being its public defender, should, as a result of after years of wider and more careful observation and thought, have become persuaded against his former conviction, that the demand for woman suffrage in America is not only without foundation in equity, but would be most harmful to American society—harmful to the State, and that "both men and women would inevitably suffer incalculable loss therefrom."

When such intellects, devoted to the best interests of womankind, awake to every true reform to progress, the welfare of the State and society are, from their more extended observation and closer inductions, compelled to turn back upon their course and conclude that woman suffrage would not be in the direction of true reform, but a reform against nature, and contrary to the interests of the State and all its people, it leaves but small encouragement to the advocates of the measure.

And in closing, we beg leave, in behalf of the committee, to express and tender our sincere and profound sympathies to that noble band of zealous, sincere and intelligent ladies, who have so ably represented the woman suffrage cause, in their disappointment (if such exists) in its report, but the stern sense of duty to the State, and its conscientious discharge pointed the way, unmistakably, in the one direction which the committee followed, fearlessly, if regretfully.

We do not wish our position to be misunderstood.

We are opposed, strenuously, to any oppression of woman, but we just as strenuously insist that she is not oppressed, but enjoys special privileges and rights, as before suggested, forbidden to man, which we would have preserved to her.

We do not believe in the inferiority of woman, but rather, that she is vastly superior in all those fields and pursuits for which nature and God designed her. We do not believe in restricting her in progress, or in the acquirement of attainments, but rather in the fullest expanse, development, unfolding and exercise of every capability of her nature that can with the aid of man be given her, not only for her own welfare, but for the benefit of mankind.

But let such progress, expanse and development be along that line so distinctly pointed out to her by the laws of nature—always remembering that no true reform exists contrary to its laws, but must be found in pursuing in its pathway.

We would point her to that great domain of philanthropy, of charity and education, of the arts and sciences, and of society at large, wherein she has achieved, and may continue to achieve, such signal success for the benefit of the world, and for the glory of her sex, as should satisfy her highest ambition. (Applause.)

The President—The time has arrived for taking the vote.

Mr. Dean called for the ayes and noes, which were ordered.

Mr. Tekulsky—Mr. President, I move a call of the house so that every member of this Convention here shall be recorded.

The President—It will be a very long and elaborate affair, Mr. Tekulsky.

Mr. Dean—I rise to a point of order. The fact of no quorum must be determined by a roll call before a call of the house is in order.

The President—The question is whether the Convention will order a call of the house as moved by Mr. Tekulsky, if he insists upon it.

Mr. Tekulsky—Mr. President, I have been requested by a large number of delegates to withdraw the motion, and I, therefore, withdraw it.

The President—The question is on agreeing with the adverse report of the suffrage committee on Mr. Tucker's constitutional amendment, No. 195. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Abbott—Mr. President, I have listened not only patiently and courteously, as has been stated by the eloquent gentleman from New York, to the discussion of this question in committee and elsewhere, but with deep interest and with inexpressible admiration, to the elegant addresses of the noble women who have so earnestly advocated their cause.

I gladly bear witness to the force of their arguments, and to the fairness and honesty with which they have been presented, and in so far as their conclusions have been drawn from correct premises, I cheerfully coincide in those conclusions. I concede for their sex all that has been claimed for it on the lines of intelligence, of patriotism, of devotion to duty, of love for the race, and of desire to promote the best interests of humanity.

I go further. From an experience derived from the common school, from the academy, from a co-educational college, and from various affairs of life, I am willing to concede that so far as natural capacity is concerned as a sex they are our equals, and as to many of those qualities which go to make a more perfect humanity, they are our superiors. I concede that in its broadest sense they, with our fathers, were the founders of the State. That in all the emergencies of life, in times of great public peril which test the courage and patriotism of the race and demand the highest moral heroism, they have been found in the forefront of events. The typical American mother instills into the minds of her sons their first lessons in patriotism, in temperance, in unselfish devotion to duty and all that goes to make the useful citizen, the ruler of the State. No great man of the English speaking race but has been glad to listen to the prudent counsels of his mother or his wife. Indeed, I sincerely believe that

no great man, no man whose deeds are remembered in history, ever lived who did not inherit the elements which built up that character and made it great from his mother.

The one distinguishing characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race, so marked as to be noted by Tacitus in his *Germania*, is that "in all great matters they consult their women." That influence has always been felt in the affairs of this Republic, and will be felt so long as the nation exists.

To all this I bear willing testimony, but to my mind all this does not reach the vital point of this controversy. To the doctrine that suffrage is a natural right, or even an equitable right, as so clearly discussed by the gentleman from Chautauqua, I cannot subscribe. To the assertion so often made as applicable to this question, "that taxation without representation is tyranny," I cannot subscribe. If it be true that the ballot should depend on taxation, then the Goulds and Vanderbilts of this age might vote in every election district in the land, and we would soon degenerate into a government of wealth, that most inexcusable of all tyrannies.

Nor can I subscribe to the doctrine of Mr. Scott, that muscle is the supreme test; that government is necessarily founded on physical force. If this were so, we must take down our statues of Lincoln and Seward and erect instead those of Sullivan and Corbett. Behold their statues in our public squares and underneath them the legend, "This is the typical American!" What a lesson for American youths.

If, then, the suffrage is not a natural right pertaining to all citizens, if it is not founded on the theory of physical force, what is it, and on what equitable principle is its exercise based?

I answer that the suffrage is the foundation of popular government, it is the corner-stone of Republican institutions, and contains the spirit and essence of Democracy.

The ballot is the instrumentality of sovereignty, through its exercise the rulers of the nation indicate their will, as Whittier says, "The voter is the uncrowned king and the crowning fact, the kingliest act of freedom is the freeman's vote." The idea that this potent instrument of government is the personal right of the citizen, and, therefore, should be granted to woman, it seems to me, is the fundamental error of this movement.

If it is a personal right, the property of the individual, then the idea of the corrupt voter who makes merchandise of it to the highest bidder is a logical conclusion.

I prefer the contrary doctrine, that the elective franchise is a trust conferred by the State upon the individual to be exercised for the

benefit of the State, that in its exercise is evidenced the fact, that the voter is a sovereign selected to govern the State. That his is a solemn responsibility, that upon him is imposed a duty and a burden, and upon his wise, intelligent and honest exercise of that trust, depend the prosperity and even existence of the Republic.

What then, are the best interests of the State? This is the vital question to which all else should be subservient. Do those interests demand the extension of the suffrage to women?

Upon this question history throws no light. No government has ever so broadened the suffrage as has ours. No government has ever existed based on the idea of universal manhood suffrage until our own untried experiment.

The so-called republics of Greece and Rome, of Holland and Switzerland, were never broadened to make a ruling class not based on intelligence or wealth, or birth or land ownership. Their united populations were but a few millions, and "all of them," as Phillips says, "have gone down in the ocean of time." Our seventy millions with their diverse interests, are just trying the experiment, and it remains to be yet determined whether our institutions can bear the terrible strain.

The doctrine of universal suffrage embraces not only the intelligent, the patriotic, the honest, the men of character and of sense, but also the ignorant, the corrupt, the indifferent and the vicious.

Which shall prevail? This is the great problem of the day. How would the addition of the female sex to the mass of electors affect this problem? Would it be for good or ill?

I have every confidence in the ability, the intelligence and the patriotism of American womanhood, and if a majority of the sex were desirous, even willing to assume the serious burdens, duties and responsibilities of the suffrage, I for one would not hesitate to give them welcome.

The time may come in the not distant future when in order to protect republican institutions and preserve our national existence, the State may be compelled to impose these burdens on woman, and when that day comes I do not doubt that it will find American womanhood imbued with that same patriotism and love of country which they have ever possessed, ready to take up these additional burdens in defense of country and liberty. That emergency has not yet arisen.

To-day the great majority of the sex of this State are protesting against the imposition of this burden of suffrage. I cannot recog-

nize the right of the minority of women, however able, however earnest, however patriotic to insist on these burdens being placed upon their unwilling sisters. The number of indifferent voters is already dangerously large.

Until the majority desires the suffrage, I am opposed to the proposition. When that time comes I shall cheerfully support it. I believe the time will surely come when the intelligent women of this State will desire the suffrage, and when it comes, that it will be for the highest interest of the State to extend it to them. I believe a proposition should be incorporated into the Constitution providing for this action of the educated women of this State when the time and occasion arrive.

While, then, I am opposed to the proposition now pending I hope that the adverse report will not be agreed to and that this matter may be relegated to the Committee of the Whole where the amendment proposed by me on the lines laid down in this discussion and which now sleeps in oblivion may be resurrected and receive the favorable consideration of this Convention. I vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. Ackerly — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons therefor. Article 1 section 10, of the present Constitution, contains these words, "No law shall be passed abridging the right of the people reasonably to assemble and to petition the government or any part thereof." I suppose that we can consider ourselves at present as "a part thereof." On the petitions that have come into this house, considering that they are not more than half genuine, I do not feel like disregarding them, but I feel that this matter should go into the Committee of the Whole, and there have an opportunity for an amendment if the majority sees fit to do it. For that reason I shall vote to have it go there if possible, and I withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. Alvord — I ask to be excused from voting, and will briefly state my reasons. Permit me to say, Mr. President, that Supreme Ruler of the universe will punish this attempted violation of that higher law laid down in Holy Writ, and on Nature's page, which points out clearly and plainly the duties and province of the two sexes, those duties differ from each other, but when exercised as He intended, produce a harmonious whole.

I withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote aye.

Mr. Barhite — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting, and will take all the time allowed by the rule to explain my reasons. (Laughter.)

The President — That will be just three minutes.

Mr. Barhite — The distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Root) in the remarks with which he favored us this evening, has placed his opposition to woman suffrage upon the ground that the Almighty has endowed her with a peculiar nature which was intended to fit her for a different sphere in life. I say to him, and I say to the gentlemen of this Convention that to-day she stands side by side with her brother in nearly every department of human effort. Her peculiar nature does not seem to have troubled her at all. He says that politics is modified warfare. I say to him that the practice of the law is real warfare, and yet in the statute passed by the Legislature last winter, it is provided that neither color nor sex shall be a disqualification for the practice at the bar. As a man I note the inconsistency; as a lawyer I feel humiliated that the people of this State shall say that woman has the nature and qualifications which will permit her to practice law, but has not the nature and qualification which will permit her to cast a paper ballot. (Applause.) When the distinguished gentleman finds himself pitted against some keen, bright, courageous and witty woman lawyer, who meets point with point and argument with argument, I hope then that he will rise high in his place and respectfully protest to the court against allowing woman to present her warlike nature to the public gaze. Mr. President, I withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. Becker — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting, for the reason that I find upon the floor of this Convention so many men whom I love and respect so ardently embracing the cause of woman suffrage, that I should, in justice to my own views, briefly state my reasons for voting against woman suffrage or against submitting this question to the people in the manner provided by this amendment. I believe that the right to vote is merely a privilege, but when conferred, it becomes a duty. I believe that with the duty of voting comes the duty of holding office. As a lawyer, I read in the decisions of the common law that a failure or declination or refusal to hold office, when elected by the people, is a crime for which men have been punished. I believe that if a woman gains the right to vote she will be required to perform the duty of holding office and being a candidate for office, and I cannot

believe that, with that duty obeyed, it will be possible to preserve the unity and harmony of the family. For that reason, I am opposed to changing the law now existing on this subject. I am also opposed to this amendment as a lawyer, for the reason that it is in direct conflict with the provisions of our organic law. In the Constitution of the State, which we swore here to preserve and defend, the provision is, that this Convention is elected to revise and amend the Constitution of the State. When we say that we decline to do that and submit a theoretical, or it may be, a practical, question to the voters for their determination, without pronouncing our judgment about it, we violate that oath. For these reasons, Mr. President, I withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote aye.

Mr. Cassidy — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting, and will state my reasons. Unlike the gentleman from Utica (Mr. Cookinham), who addressed this Convention last evening, I do not speak for the entire State. I speak for myself and the small division of this State which I represent, which is about one-sixteenth part of this State, and in what I shall say I shall differ from the gentleman who spoke for the whole State in this, that I shall strive to tell the truth. I shall not stand here, before a Convention which knows to the contrary, and assert that I was in favor of this proposition, but by reason of hearing the arguments of the ladies here, I had been turned against it. I heard the gentleman assert before any arguments were ever made in this Convention that he was against this proposition from first to last, and he never would consent to allow the women of this State to vote.

I am opposed to agreeing with the report of this committee, because I am moved by the remarks which were made by Mr. Lauterbach when he spoke for the industrial classes of this State, and I find, Mr. President, that others have spoken for the industrial classes of this State. I have heard it asserted upon the floor of this chamber and outside, that the President of this Convention was not in sympathy with woman suffrage, and I stand here to-night to repudiate that charge and to assert that the statement is false from beginning to end, for no longer ago than last February I have his remarks before an association of the Woman's Working Society of the city of New York, in which the New York Sun quotes him as follows: "There is no more logical reason why a woman should receive only half a man's wages for work done as well as any man could do it than there is why she should not be allowed to vote. (Applause.) Although woman in the bright realms of art and literature has largely swept away the unfair discriminations of manual labor, the old and unjust oppression of sex still remains."

The President — Mr. Cassidy, your time has expired.

Mr. Cassidy — Mr. President, I want to say just one word.

The President — Your time has expired.

Mr. Cassidy — Mr. President, I have not occupied five minutes under the rule.

The President — The rule is three minutes.

Mr. Cassidy — Just one word, Mr. President; I want to say—

Voices — Vote, vote.

The President — The rule is three minutes, and Mr. Cassidy will take his seat.

Mr. Cassidy — I vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. H. A. Clark — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting, and will briefly state my reasons. The question arises on agreeing or disagreeing with the adverse report of the Committee on Suffrage. I have the greatest respect and admiration for intelligent and noble women, and while I do not think it wise for them to vote and assume the obligations which go with the ballot, still, if I believed that a majority of them desired to vote, and assume all the obligations and responsibilities which accompany the right of suffrage, I would yield to their request and vote to strike the word "male" out of the Constitution.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that a majority of the women desire to exercise this right, and I am well satisfied that in the locality from which I come a large majority of both sexes are strongly opposed to the proposition. It is proposed, by an amendment now before this Convention, to require each person entitled to a vote to exercise that right. If that amendment should be adopted and then the right of suffrage should be extended as is proposed, then we have imposed upon the women of our State this burden and responsibility without consulting them upon the subject.

My wife and sister insist that this right is not desired by them. I have consulted many of the intelligent ladies in the community where I live, and all have insisted to me that they do not desire this right and do not wish to assume the grave responsibilities which the privilege carries with it. A large majority of the male citizens of the same locality, I am convinced, are opposed to this measure.

In the face of these facts, I am opposed to drafting the women into the public service.

I am opposed to having the male citizens decide that the female citizens must enter upon public and political careers.

If the question was left to the women to determine, I am satisfied in my own mind that the right of suffrage would remain as it is now. The unit in this State is not and should not be individual, but the unit is the family. The husband and wife are one. He is bound for her support and that of their children. He is responsible to a large degree for the acts of all. He should be the head of the family. The proposition of woman suffragists is to create two heads to the family, to destroy the unity and place in its stead that present popular fad, a bi-partisan board, which will result in either conferring on each family two votes where it now has one, or in case the husband and wife do not vote alike, then one will cancel the other and that family becomes disfranchised. I am in favor of the greatest liberty in every way for the gentler sex. I will agree to grant anything which they or a majority of them ask. But until they do ask the right of suffrage, I do not feel like thrusting it upon them. I am, therefore, compelled to agree with the report and withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote aye.

Mr. Cochran — Mr. President, for the first time since this Convention opened I desire to avail myself of the privilege of saying a few words in explanation of my vote on this important question. I would say, sir, that I would not now have availed myself of this privilege if it had not been for the prominence, in this movement, which was given to my name in the very unbecoming and undignified remarks of a delegate on the floor of this Convention last evening. (Applause.) To those remarks, Mr. President and gentlemen, I do not desire to make any reply, for I deem them unworthy of recognition, and should I deign to reply to them, I would, sir, sink to the same level as I believe that the maker of them now has in the estimation of his associates in this Convention. I believe, sir, that when this Convention is over, and the gentleman thinks over his speech of last evening in calm and sober thought, his cheeks will assume a much more ruddy hue than any powder could ever paint the cheeks of any of the ladies whose cause he may have endeavored to advocate, but whose cause, sir, I think he debased. To my constituents, or to those whom I represent in this Convention, I believe that my vote needs no explanation, because when I vote against the extension of suffrage to women—

Mr. Cassidy — Mr. President, How about time?

The President — Mr. Cassidy will please take his seat. The Chair will take care of the time.

Mr. Cochran — As I was about to say when interrupted by the gentleman, in voting against the extension of suffrage to women, I believe I only vote as is desired by every resident of my district. I believe—

The President — Mr. Cochran's time is up.

Mr. Cochran — I vote aye, sir. (Applause.)

Mr. Crosby — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons. It was not my intention to take the time of this Convention by making any remarks upon this subject, but in listening to the suggestions made by the chairman of the committee as reasons why this question should not be sent to the Committee of the Whole, I am led to explain, and to give my reasons why I shall cast my ballot in the negative. One principal reason that was presented by him to this Convention was that the Committee on Suffrage is largely opposed to submitting the question to the people. With due respect for the committee and the opinion of that committee or any committee in this Convention, we are here charged with individual responsibility, and no report of a committee should influence a gentleman in his action upon this floor. We are told by him that he fears if it is submitted to the people it will endanger the work of the Convention. Endanger the work of the Convention, how? We have given to the female the right to our schools and our colleges; we have opened up to her the avenues of business, and we meet with her and compete with her in all business undertakings the same as we do with those of the other sex.

We have removed all the restrictions upon her property rights, aye, Mr. President, we have removed all the protection which the common law threw about her by reason of making the husband responsible for her torts, and she stands before the people of the State of New York to-day with every right and immunity, with every responsibility, except the right to protect herself by casting the ballot, which is the most sacred right of a freeman. Mr. President, can there be any question about the manner in which she will exercise that right, after having listened to the argument, to the presenta-

tion of the subject to this Convention, by the ladies who have addressed us? Is it not proper that the question should be submitted to the people in the manner proposed, free from every political question, free from the question of judiciary, the organization of the Legislature, the canals and all other questions? They are satisfied with the proposition, that it shall be voted upon separately by the People; and when we consider their overwhelming petitions, the millions of property, represented by them and the extent of their rights and responsibilities under the statutes and then insist that it is not safe to send the great question to the people, we make a serious mistake. I withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote no.

Mr. Dean — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting, and will briefly state my reasons. The State has a right to protect itself. It has a right to command the services, not alone of its men, but of its women, when society is in danger. The same right that allows us to draft men into the military service of the State, justifies us in imposing the duty of the ballot upon any part of the citizenship whenever such action is necessary for the preservation of the welfare of society. Our public school system is based upon the theory that the safety of the State demands the education of those who are to discharge its functions. These schools have been thrown open to women. The census reports shows that only six per cent of the women of this State are illiterate. The usages of society have established and insist upon a higher standard of morality for women than for men. The State to-day is in need of the infusion of this new life current of intelligence and virtue into the body politic. Therefore, the question whether this or that woman wants to vote or not, is of no consequence. The State has reached a point where it demands the services of the women whom it has been educating, and we have no right to interpose our personal protest. It is our duty to submit this question to the people, the final arbiters of the government. I, therefore, withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote no.

Mr. Dickey — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons. My vote on this subject is a somewhat selfish one, as I am more fortunate than many in the fact that I have a wife and three daughters. Just think what a pull I will have when we five go together to the primaries and the polls. (Applause.) But, seriously, I want my wife and daughters to have

at least as much to say about the government as the tramp that comes to my door. (Applause.) When I was a boy I was thrilled with the earnest words of Susan B. Anthony in favor of the freedom of the slaves. (Applause.) The seeds she sowed have brought forth fruit to-night. I gladly rise in my place to vote for her freedom and the freedom of her sex. We should always remember that we are the servants of the people and they are our masters, and while we have the power of a giant here through the favor of the people, we should not arbitrarily use that power as a giant and set up our judgments as superior and deny the people their right to vote on this question. If they will vote the proposition down, then certainly no harm is done to submit it, and if they will give a majority of votes for it then clearly it is our duty to allow them to do so. So many good, true and noble women have asked us to submit this question, I cannot find it in my heart to say nay to them. How any one could listen to all the pleas made by the ladies and oppose them is beyond my comprehension. The opponents, instead of the bread the ladies are asking for, have given them honeyed word, guff and taffy. As to the claim that women if given the right to vote should do their share of the fighting, I answer, the women, God bless them, it is a poor coot of a man who is not willing to do his own share of the fighting and the women's too. With dynamite guns and other modern enginery of war, wars are now so dangerous and destructive, we are not likely to have any more. This cause may not succeed to-night, but success is near, very near at hand; and it is as sure to come as that to-morrow's sun shall rise. Delegates, get on the car before it runs over you. (Applause.) I am proud, very proud, to be thought worthy of a place in this Convention, but the proudest vote I cast will be the one I now give in favor of woman suffrage, and against the report of the committee. I vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. O. A. Fuller — Mr. President, I am sorry to say I am paired with my friend I. Sam Johnson, but I want to say that I am heartily in accord with the report of the committee. I believe that the amendment —

The President — Mr. Fuller is not in order unless to excuse his vote.

Mr. Galinger — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons therefor. I have been urgently requested, both orally and in writing, and from both political parties

in my district, to vote against the pending question in all its phases.

If the matter had been left entirely to my own discretion I should have been inclined to favor its submission, but I cannot disregard the wishes of the constituency which I have the honor in part to represent.

I regret that some of my co-delegates from the Third Senatorial district, unmindful of the wishes of the constituency, should have succumbed to the blandishments of the sirens who have been so persistently haunting this chamber in behalf of woman suffrage. I ask leave to withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote aye.

Mr. Gilbert — Mr. President, as to whether or not the elective franchise is a privilege, I simply put one question: What would you think about it if anybody should threaten to take it away from you? That is all I want to say about that. One-half of the citizens of the State of New York are absolutely deprived of the right of suffrage, deprived of that privilege. They are deprived of it by the simple fact of sex.

Now, before we say that the people of the State shall have no opportunity of deciding whether or not this condition of things shall remain unchanged, it seems to me, that those who favor a continuance of that exclusion ought to present reasons that are clear, sufficient and conclusive.

I venture to say that the reasons offered have not been so conclusive as to make it our duty to withhold the question from the people, who for months have been earnestly considering it, with all the means necessary for a correct decision, which are at our command.

The gentleman from New York tells us, and others have said the same thing, that the women are so good and politics so bad that the former ought not to have anything to do with the latter. That is about the logic of it. Now, if there is anything that this State needs it is good voting citizens. One gentleman tells us politics is warfare. One would suppose, to hear his impassioned appeal, that our politics require the qualifications of the pugilist, without which woman ought not to be allowed to vote. They are intelligent, they are virtuous, and they are conscientious; they are interested in everything that pertains to the welfare of the State, but they cannot engage in such conflicts, and, therefore, they shall not vote. That is about what it amounts to.

Let me say further, Mr. President, that unity is one thing and uniformity quite another thing.

May it not be that in the very fact that woman differs from man we shall find the complete unity in political life which we have in domestic life?

This fact of difference, about which we have heard so much, leads her to look at public questions from a different standpoint from that which we occupy, and to see things which we do not see, and to determine things which we should not otherwise determine.

I believe that the thought and aspirations and judgment of women in some way expressed and made effective, are essential to the completeness of our political and civic life.

Let the voters of the State decide directly for themselves whether or not this expression shall be made in the exercise of the elective franchise, whether her will shall be expressed in the imperative or continue to be expressed in the subjunctive mood.

The President — The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Gilbert — I withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote no.

Mr. Holls — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons. I regret exceedingly to differ most radically with some of the members of this Convention, for whose judgment I generally have the very highest possible regard. But I wish at this time for myself to repudiate most earnestly the idea which my distinguished and honorable friend from New York (Mr. Lauterbach), seems to have, that this question will be decided by this Convention mainly on grounds of expediency. After my election to this body, and believing that this question would come up, I took pains carefully to study most of the so-called arguments in favor of woman suffrage, from the time of Ralph Waldo Emerson and John Stuart Mill down to the present. I found much edifying rhetoric and most attractive eloquence, but in my opinion all these efforts contain not one argument worthy of the careful attention of a serious man. My conclusion is that woman suffrage is wrong in principle, and that, therefore, it is necessarily inexpedient. I think it is wrong, perilous and peniculous in every respect, a step backward to barbarism and to anarchy; and for that reason I withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote aye.

Mr. Hottenroth — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting and will endeavor to explain my vote and briefly give my reasons. Next fall, in the districts which I have the honor to represent, we will

have submitted to us the question of rapid transit for New York city, the question of the greater New York, and possibly, and I hope a Constitution proposed by this Convention. Now, it is proposed to tack on to this an additional question, that of woman suffrage. I am opposed to universal suffrage, and I believe the people whom I have the honor to represent here are by a large majority opposed to it. I, therefore, feel that it will be impossible to get the sentiment of the people in connection with this question, truly and fairly, in the conditions that will prevail next fall. I feel, therefore, that it would be dangerous to submit it. I think, if it is advisable, to submit it at some other time, as is suggested by this proposed amendment, it may be done, and possibly will be done, if the emergency exists, by the Legislature proposing an amendment under the other provisions of the Constitution. I, therefore, ask leave to withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote aye.

Mr. Lauterbach — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting, and will briefly state my reasons. Women are a part of the State. The franchise benefits those who enjoy it. It is a privilege the availing of which is always beneficial. What would avail to benefit man in its exercise would benefit women to the same extent. That is an answer to the suggestion as to the benefit to accrue to women. As to the benefit to accrue to the State, if woman in her present condition, the home maker, the maker of an improved condition of the community, exercises her legitimate functions, the State must necessarily be benefited. The State can only be benefited by the addition of her keen, intuitive perceptions, of her greater honesty, of her greater carefulness in details and the greater qualifications which the opponents of women suffrage have accorded to women so fully and thoroughly. I do not speak of the women of the classes who have been represented by those on the floor, like my colleague from New York, who are amply protected by their husbands or fathers or others upon whom they are dependent; but I speak of the great independent laboring classes of New York, and for those women who have no husbands and no fathers and no one upon whom to rely, nothing upon which to rely except on the franchise, which would give them the only weapon of offense and defense that we possess in this Empire State. Therefore, it is for them that I plead, and for them I have pleaded, and it is no answer to say that because we can protect our wives and our children that these people, who have not been fortunate enough to have such defenders, shall be left entirely without protection.

And because I believe that, and because all the logic of this question is on one side, and all the justice of the question is on the same side, and because only might and power rest upon the other, and because I look with horror upon the exercise of that might and power against logic and justice and right, I withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote no.

Mr. Lyon — Mr. President, it is to my mind sufficient of itself to determine how I ought to vote upon the proposed amendment, that in my opinion the very great majority, I might say the overwhelming majority, of women do not want the right of suffrage.

Since the opening of this Convention in May, I have endeavored to ascertain the sentiment of women regarding this matter, and have talked with very many of them upon the subject, and particularly with women residing in the city and country from which I come, representing the various stations of life, and I have found the great majority opposed to the proposition and many women most bitterly opposed to it.

If I am right in my positive belief that the majority of women do not want the right of suffrage, I am right in the statement that the majority of women would not exercise that right if granted, excepting upon exceptional occasions.

Who will contend that women who do not want the right to vote would vote if the right were given them?

Who will say that women opposed to suffrage would take upon themselves the burdens, and perform the duties incident to party caucuses and elections, and the conduct of public affairs?

I am certain that the women who would not take part in politics would be found much more numerous in the great body of intelligent women than in any other class, and hence that while the result of this extension of suffrage would be to add to the intelligent vote, it would add in a much greater proportion to a vote which our government in its too great generosity has already extended by limits many thousands too large for the public interests.

I do not want to be understood as saying that I believe women generally have not the ability requisite for the exercise of the right of suffrage, for I believe that the average intelligence of women is fully equal to that of men, but what I do say is that with the present opposition to the measure, more of the women, intelligent and best qualified to exercise the right of suffrage would refuse to exercise it, than women of any other class.

I cannot, within the three minutes allowed each member in which to explain his vote, enter into any of the many arguments which have been advanced upon this subject.

It is, perhaps, proper to say that I have endeavored to give this subject as careful consideration which its great importance demands, and that with that end in view have examined with care the mass of documents which have been sent to me bearing upon this subject, as well as heard all the speeches delivered at public meetings of the suffrage committee held in this chamber.

It is also perhaps proper to say that I have been able to approach the consideration of this subject with a mind free from any prejudice, and with the purpose of determining for myself whether the proposed extension of the right of suffrage were in the interests of woman and for the public good.

However, as I have said, believing that the very great majority of women do not want the right of suffrage, and that granted under such conditions it would prove to be neither in the interest of woman nor for the public interest, I believe, Mr. President, that my duty lies in voting to sustain the report of the committee, I vote aye.

Mr. Maybee — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting, and will very briefly state my reasons. I am glad to know that there are gentlemen in this Convention who are intellectually so far the superiors of Ralph Waldo Emerson and John Stuart Mill that they cannot find in the deliberate utterances of those great thinkers anything worthy of their serious consideration. It is, perhaps, not surprising, that other gentlemen, who are fresh from the scene of the squabbles between Johnny Milholland and the Committee of Thirty, should look upon politics as a disgraceful warfare. But it may very well be, Mr. President, that if the elective franchise is conferred upon women, politics will lose much of the character of disgraceful warfare that it is now said to possess. I withdraw my excuse, and vote no.

Mr. Moore — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons if I can within three minutes. I believe, Mr. President, that this is a historical moment. I believe that we here are making history and that we are making that kind of history which will redound to our advantage or our disadvantage. In my judgment, Mr. President, the opponents of woman suffrage in this Convention have given no valid reasons for refusing to submit it to the people of this State. The Esquires in the English parliament smiled and laughed at the monster petitions of the Chartists

and yet to-day the principles of the Chartists are embodied in the British Constitution. Mr. President, as a Republican, since I have been on this floor, I have longed for the old spirit of the old Republican party, that brave and gallant giant which, in 1860, sprang into the political arena with the cries of free speech, free soil and free men. (Applause.) I have seen, Mr. President, in this Convention, constantly, a certain fear, fear, fear. You must not do this, and you must not do that; or you must not do this, and somebody shaking in his boots all the time. (Applause.) Mr. President, I desire to say that I am not afraid to vote for female suffrage in this Convention. (Applause.) Mr. President, as I have been accused of not being a Republican any longer because I dared to stand there, I say I stand by the side of the New York Press, that great Republican paper, the New York Recorder and hosts of other lesser Republican papers. (Applause.)

Mr. President, I ask to withdraw my desire to be excused from voting and vote no, and I should vote a thousand votes if I had them against the report of this committee. (Applause.)

Mr. Osborn — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting and wish to state briefly my reasons. On the eighth day of last May my eye was caught, Mr. President, by that shield behind your honored chair, in which two women uphold the shield of State. Looking at them through these long and somewhat weary weeks, I have been cheered when I felt sad, and encouraged by the remark which they whispered in my ear "Excelsior." For these reasons I have grown to love them, Mr. President. I feel that the least that I can do for them is to give them a complimentary vote. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. Pashley — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons why. I am in favor of giving the franchise to women, to the same extent as it is exercised by men. I had not the good fortune to be a member of this body when the proposition to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution was acted upon; but had I been, or were that the question under consideration to-night, it would have my unqualified approval and support.

Mr. President, when I first read the proposition now before us, it seemed to me to be eminently proper and unobjectionable; but on reflection I have reached a different conclusion. and I feel constrained to support the report of the committee.

I do not favor the submission of propositions, separate and apart from the Constitution that we propose to submit. There are before this Convention, numerous proposed amendments many of which are sure to be reported adversely. If then, we allow this measure now under consideration to be submitted separately, we shall establish a precedent and we shall be compelled, in all fairness, to allow the same privilege to the advocates of any measure reported adversely. We cannot grant to one portion of the community privileges that we deny to another. Upon this principle, I voted only last week, against a similar measure in relation to the abolition of capital punishment, and I cannot now consistently vote to submit this question separately.

I now withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote aye.

Mr. Powell — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting and will state my reasons entirely uninfluenced by my own predilections, so far as this matter is concerned. But because 600,000 citizens of this State have asked that this question may be submitted to the people, because the great laboring classes of this State, the men whose hands are hardened by honest toil, because this class, so far as we have been able to ascertain their views, are anxious that this question should be submitted to the people, because this question is simple and concrete, and not at all complex in its character, because I believe my constituents are wiser than I, even though I am a member of this august Convention, because I believe that the wisdom of the people of the State of New York is greater than the wisdom of this Convention, or even the Committee on Suffrage, great as is the wisdom of that committee, because I have, as I have already declared on this floor, an unlimited confidence in the integrity and the intelligence and the honesty of the people of this State, because, sir, of these reasons I am opposed to the report of this committee, and I withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. Putnam — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting and will briefly state some of my reasons. Mr. President, I believe that the philosophy of history teaches, if it teaches anything, that man was made by his Creator to rule the State, and that woman was made by her Creator to rule the home. (Applause.) Mr. President, I know that my constituency are opposed to woman suffrage. The women as well as the men. I feel that those noble christian women

who rule our homes, who wield great influence in the charitable institutions of our State, who instill patriotism and love in the hearts of their sons and husbands and brothers, are, in the main, opposed to woman suffrage. I would not add this duty to their busy and useful lives. Mr. President, for these reasons and for many others, I ask to withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote aye. (Applause.)

Mr. Smith—If we refuse to recognize the right of women to equal suffrage with men, then we should instruct the Committee on Bill of Rights, to report an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution, and make it conform to the truth; and as so amended it would read as follows:

We, one-half of the people of the State of New York, grateful to Almighty God for the subjection of the other half, and for the blessings of freedom for ourselves, in order to continue our own supremacy, do establish this Constitution. (Applause.)

I believe the right to vote to be a natural right. By the laws of nature men and women are equally endowed with the right of self-defense, in virtue of the right to live, and the right to defend themselves implies the right to make that defense as complete as possible, and hence it implies the right to unite with the other members of the human family for the same purpose, all standing together on the platform of self-defense for greater security; and such joining and standing together has been, from the beginning, nothing less than the organization of civil society, the organization of the State, the establishment of civil government. It is, therefore, upon this great platform of self-defense that government is founded, to defend and protect the enjoyment of human rights. In these circumstances the ballot is the only way by which the individual can be admitted to participate in government. The right to vote, therefore, is a right springing from the right of self-defense, and a natural right.

Neither men nor women should be denied the enjoyment of any right conferred by the Creator. (Applause.)

Mr. W. H. Steele—Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting, and will briefly state one reason. I have heard very much in this Convention about the members of the Convention being constantly button-holed by the ladies who are in favor of woman suffrage. I have seen nothing of it myself. I have simply heard it stated upon this floor and elsewhere, though I dislike to believe that

it has prevailed to so great an extent as some members of the Convention would have us believe; but, sir, I am in favor of this adverse report, as I was in our Legislature thirteen, fourteen and fifteen years ago, when the ladies did approach me, and also a great many other members, in this chamber, upon this question. I have one particular reason, and that is, I believe that my constituents are not generally in favor of it. I have been approached by but two ladies in the city of Oswego, asking me to support this question. After they found that I was elected to this Convention (they said nothing about it before), they desired me to pledge them that I would support the question allowing the women of the State of New York to vote. I believe, sir, that I was so much impressed by their pleas that I inadvertently said, at one time, that I thought I would say nothing either in favor of or against it. I have kept my promise, however much I may have desired to speak upon the subject. I have said nothing either in favor of or against it. But, sir, there is a strong sentiment prevailing against it along the shores of Lake Ontario and down the St. Lawrence, which, although I am not in accord with it, expresses quite well the sentiment of many of the male population in that section. By way of a little story. Upon the lake lives the honest wife of an honest fisherman, with seven noble boys but no girls. This estimable woman had devoted so much of her time to raising voters that she had found no leisure for considering her own suffrage. A lady neighbor called one day and said to her: "Mrs. Prolific"—we will call her by that name because that was not her name—"what a pity it is that one of your fine boys is not a girl." Down at the lower end of the table, the small boy, the irrepressible small boy, spoke up: "I would like to know who'd a bin 'er? Sam wouldn't a bin 'er, Bob wouldn't a bin 'er, Bill wouldn't a bin 'er, Jack wouldn't a bin 'er, and you can bet-cher bottom dollar I wouldn't a bin 'er. She wouldn't had no show in this fambly."

The President—The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. W. H. Steele—I withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and vote aye.

Mr. Storm—Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting and will briefly state my reasons, and will try to say something new if it is possible. It has been my lot through life to come into contact largely with working women, and I have had ample opportunity to ascertain and learn their own needs. I had the pleasure, to-day, of being presented to a lady upon this floor whom I knew by reputa-

tion for a long time by the name of Mrs. Blake, and she paid me the compliment, also, that she had known me for a long time, owing to a circumstance which occurred in a factory with which I am connected. I will briefly relate that incident because it touches this subject very closely. We had in that factory a hundred men at work in a certain department. One of those 100 men died in the course of time and left a wife and family. We learned that the man had taught his wife the trade which he was laboring at, and in order to give her an opportunity to earn a livelihood for herself and family, we offered her her husband's position. She accepted it, and we put her in a separate room, but, nevertheless, those 100 men protested against that woman as interfering or intruding upon their line of business. They waited upon us and put the matter in such a shape that either that woman would have to leave or that they would leave, would strike. We tried to reason with them, but it was impossible. The woman must leave or they would leave, and we finally allowed the 100 men to leave. (Applause.)

And thus we made it possible for one woman to triumph over 100 men, and when they did leave we told them that no one of them should ever come back again, and they never did. Now, Mr. President, notwithstanding that and the fact that I have stated that I know the needs of the women, and that my feelings toward the sex have not changed from that day to this, I am constrained to support the report of the committee, and, therefore, withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote aye. (Applause.)

Mr. Tibbetts — Mr. President, actuated by a desire to do everything which will elevate the elective franchise, if possible, I came here believing from my own personal knowledge that the ladies of my locality were bright enough, intelligent enough, able enough, to cast a vote. I came here thinking that, perhaps, it was the proper thing to allow them to do it. After I got here I heard grave and reverend delegates in this Convention say that, from personal knowledge, there were ladies who were not proper to cast a ballot, who should not cast a ballot; they were so bad, so low, that it would degrade the ballot. I have, Mr. President, the knowledge that in my own locality there were proper persons to be intrusted with the ballot. I have equal information from the other side that there are those who are not proper to be intrusted with the ballot. I am in a position of the defendant who answers that he has not sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief. Therefore, with the idea that in the Committee of the Whole we may be enlightened,

and that this matter may have such a light thrown upon it that I will not only have knowledge and information, but belief. I shall cast my vote to bring it there. I vote no.

Mr. Titus — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting, and will take advantage of the opportunity to state my reasons. I have supported this matter for the reason that I believe in the brotherhood of men, the sisterhood of women and the fatherhood of God. The members of this Convention who have voted aye on this occasion, it is my earnest wish and prayer that those who are fortunate enough to yet have mothers, when they look into their eyes and into the eyes of their wives and children, may reconcile their consciences with what they have done to-night. And further, that when they lay their heads on their pillows to-night that their conscience will tingle with that remorse which, I think, their action justly entitles.

Mr. President, I withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote no.

M. C. S. Truax — Mr. President, I desire to be excused from voting for the following reasons: I have paired with Mr. McClure, who was obliged to leave before his name was reached, and who, if present, would have voted aye.

Mr. Vedder — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting. I shall not discuss the question whether the hand that rocks the cradle should have the right to cast the ballot that defends that cradle; whether the spirit of chivalry has deserted the bosoms of the men of New York, and that they declare that the right of a woman to vote depends now, and forever will depend, upon her physical capacity or power as a warrior to hush the thunders and chain the lightnings of political wrath, except to say, that such sentiments are a slander upon the valor and manhood of the people of this State. (Applause.)

If war should be declared to-morrow, or at any future time, a million fighting men, sons of New York, would swear by the altar, and on the shields of their fathers, and keep the oath good; not only that our women should do no fighting, but that no sword would sleep in its scabbard so long as there was a woman to defend. (Applause.)

I shall not debate whether or not it is right that man should continue to chain woman to his political chariot wheels, and drag her, as a lifeless unpolitical entity, around the State, as Achilles did the

body of Hector around the walls of Troy; or whether or not it is ordained of God that sex and sex alone, shall determine the political dust out of which voters shall be made.

I shall not, at this time, enter any contention as to whether the wife who has been chosen by her husband to be the mother of his children, and may go with him into all other places where he, by right, may go, and share with him all other rights and joys, but shall not go with him into the American voting booth — that holy of political holies of American citizenship, the fortress of liberty and law, that sanctuary of the best hopes and highest aspiration of civilization on the western continent, because those mighty questions are not properly before us for decision at this hour. These questions are for another forum, the forum of the people — the ultimate judge.

The question now is not whether the women of the State shall have the right to exercise the elective franchise, but the supreme and only question before us is, whether we, the delegates to this Convention, shall, by our votes, permit the constitutional voters of the State to vote upon the question whether they will permit others to enjoy the same suffrage rights that they, the voters, now enjoy.

Many, very many thousands of the voters of the State, have exercised the sacred inalienable right of petition, and have prayed this Convention to be allowed to vote upon the question whether or not women might hereafter have the right to vote, and we, the servants of these voting people, have no more right to disfranchise them on this question than we would to vainly attempt to disfranchise them absolutely and unqualifiedly as to every other question. The State Constitution is a compact made by and between the citizens of the State to govern themselves in a certain manner. This State, therefore, is a government of voters by the voters, and the great question, as I have said, now before us, is whether or not these voters and governors shall have the right to enlarge the rights of those who are governed and to admit a certain class of them into an equal partnership in governing the State. It is a question of the highest privilege and governmental right, and as the people do and should rule, I withdraw my request to be excused from voting, and to vote this question to the people, I vote no. (Applause.)

Mr. Woodward — Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting, and will briefly state my reasons.

I have listened to many able speeches by men abler than myself, and with more powerful voices than I possess, who, with much of wit and pathos, have addressed you upon this question.

Some of these speeches have been uttered with very much of sound and fury, but with very little of argument. And they have forcibly reminded me of the words of a Latin classic, *Vox praeterea nihil — voice and nothing besides*, and I could but think of the poet's line:

"Hard is the heart whom charms cannot enslave."

And also of another line:

"In aught that tries the heart, how few withstand the test."

One of the gentlemen who addressed you gave us a good deal of very pretty and witty poetry, uttered with so much unction that he reminded me of some lines I had read in a book which was written by James B. Wiggins, of Boston. And as they come from a city sometimes called the "Hub," perhaps I will be pardoned if I quote them:

"Oh, a woman, bless her eyes,
Is a constant wild surprise,
To a man;
She will muddle all his wits,
She will break him into bits,
She will get him into fits,
When she can."

Judging from the wild earnestness of his delivery, and the fury of his utterance, the poetic frenzy to which he was wrought up, I should be inclined to question whether women, in the language of Wiggins, the great Boston poet, had not set him into fits. Yet, I must say, as you will all say with me, that I admired his eloquence, and as I watched his eyes in fine frenzy rolling I said to myself, he is a greater orator than Marc Anthony is represented to be in Shakespeare. His eloquence was splendid, his poetry beautiful, but his arguments seemed to me to be few and far between.

Now I would say with another poet:

"Yet let us ponder boldly,
'Tis a base,
Abandonment of reason to resign,
Our right to thought, our last and only place,
Of refuge; this at least shall still be mine."

I would also say with another poet:

"A thousand years scarce serve to form a State,
An hour may lay it in the dust, and when
Can man its shattered splendors renovate,
Recall its virtues back and vanquish time and fate."

Again, this is a representative Republican government. It is not a Democracy. In a Democracy all the people are to be called together to make the laws, and to decide upon the questions that concern the welfare of the State. Not so in a representative government. Under such a government, a few persons are chosen for their worth, integrity and ability, to represent the people and make laws for the State. Those representatives represent the men of the State whether they are voters or not, whether they are naturalized citizens or unnaturalized. They represent the women and children of the State. They represent not only their own mothers, wives and daughters, but all the mothers, wives and daughters of the State. If they do not do this, they are recreant to their trust, and their names and memory should be execrated.

I would like, for myself, to confer the right of suffrage upon the women of this State if I thought it would benefit them or be any real advantage to the State. But believing that it would be disastrous both to the State and our wives and daughters, I am not in favor of this new ism. Were I in favor of it I should be in favor of striking the word "male" out of the Constitution rather than of sending it to the people to be voted upon. If it is right in this State, it is right in all of the States, and the ignorant black women of the south should be at once franchised. But I have never seen or heard a logical argument in its favor. The standing argument put forth and iterated and reiterated in almost every printed document showered upon the delegates to this Convention, and in every speech made in favor of female suffrage upon this floor, is "that the women of the State are not represented."

This is a fallacy, and the arguments based upon it are fallacious, the reasoning sophistical. The right to the ballot is derived from the right to self-defense. Grant that a man has but a single right, the right to life, and following as a sequence from that right is the right to defend that right. Men are allowed to participate in government by the use of the ballot in order that they may defend their rights and the rights of their wives and children. Men are in duty bound to defend their wives and children, their sisters and mothers. They are to do this in the Legislature, at the polls, as well as upon the battlefield. Nature has placed this duty upon the male sex. What man that has any manhood about him will prove recreant to this duty.

Whoever is chosen to office or to make laws, or to execute them, is chosen, not to represent the male sex alone, but all the women and children in his locality. He is not chosen to represent his own

wife and children merely, but all there may be in his locality he represents. This he does. It, therefore, follows that the women are represented. Let the Legislature make any attack upon classes are represented. Let the Legislature make any attack upon your wife and daughter, or mother and sister, or upon mine, and how quick you and I would fly to the rescue. A man might tread upon my toes, perhaps, with impunity, but let me catch him purposely treading upon my wife's toes or any other of my female relatives, and there would be a war at once. I should fly to the rescue, and what man would not?

But suppose the right or wrong of suffrage should be given to the wife as well as the husband; if they both vote alike there would only be two votes to count instead of one — if they voted differently, the vote of one would neutralize the other. If they disagree in politics it would only be an apple thrown into the hitherto peaceful family circle.

In cities, where drunkenness prevails and where votes are sold by the hundred, it would only enable the drunken husband to sell his own vote and that of his wife and daughters, if he has any, and get drunk on the recompense received. And this is one reason why I do not wish to submit the question to the people. The lower down you go in our cities the more likely they will be to vote for it with the idea of selling the vote of self and wife and female relatives.

But 'tis said we must submit this question of female suffrage to the people, and that the people will decide it and decide it correctly. Some even say we must, out of deference to the ladies who have so eloquently addressed us, submit it to the people and they will vote it down. If, after all the eloquent speeches made here by the ladies and gentlemen pro and con, and after the bushels of printed documents pro and con that have been showered, without stint, upon us, we are incapable of deciding this question aright for the best interests of the State and the ladies, our wives, mothers and daughters and all our female acquaintances, how can we expect the people at large and the ignorant voters in our cities and villages will be able and properly prepared to decide it?

Will not the miserable drunken voters in many of our cities be inclined to vote for it for the reason that when he sells his vote he can sell the vote of his wife and daughter, if he has any. Will giving women the right to vote produce harmony in the family?

'Tis said persons differing in their religious views sometimes intermarry, and we have found it necessary to enact laws to prevent it. Shall we, therefore, pass laws to undo such intermarriages?

They are not now common, and yet many of them do produce discord in families. A Protestant marries a Catholic and, then, if there are children, the contest arises whether they shall attend a Catholic school or church, or a Protestant school or church. I know the female sex are desirous of doing everything that men do. Not content with attending the colleges established for young ladies, such as Vassar, Smith, Elmira College, or Wellesley, excellent colleges, where a first-rate classical education can be obtained, they are seeking an entrance into colleges established for young men. They are seeking positions as lawyers, doctors and preachers. And if the young men ride bicycles they must also have a bicycle and ride it through the streets, so as to be able to say to the young men, we are as big and smart as any of you. They are even claiming that they have a prior right to pantaloons, and that they first wore them and, therefore, have a prior right to them. Do not let us encourage all this insanity. It does not pervade the mass of women. It is only a few of them that has caught this wild fever. The marriage to good husbands would cure many of them of this fever; it is only an epidemic that prevails in some localities. The mass of our ladies, wives and daughters have not caught it.

One might almost be inclined to say of some of them as the little boy did of the female teacher who had punished him, he whispered, "I wish you were dead or married." I would not go so far as that, but would say of some of the leading women suffragists, "I wish you were married."

I withdraw my request to be excused from voting and vote aye. (Applause.)

The report of the committee was agreed to by the following vote:

Ayes — Messrs. Acker, Allaben, Alvord, Baker, Banks, Barnum, Barrow, Becker, Bowers, E. A. Brown, E. R. Brown, Burr, Cady, G. W. Clark, H. A. Clark, Cochran, Cookinham, Danforth, Davenport, J. C. Davies, G. A. Davis, Deady, Deterling, Deyo, Doty, Durfee, Emmet, Farrell, Foote, Forbes, Francis, Andrew Frank, C. A. Fuller, Galinger, Gibney, Giegerich, Goeller, Goodelle, A. H. Green, Griswold, Hamlin, Hawley, Hecker, Hill, M. H. Hirschberg, Holls, Hotchkiss, Hottenroth, Jacobs, J. Johnson, R. M. Johnston, Kellogg, Kimmey, Kinkel, Kurth, Lester, C. H. Lewis, M. E. Lewis, Lyon, Mantanye, Marks, Marshall, McCurdy, McIntyre, C. B. McLaughlin, McMillan, Mereness, Meyenborg, W. H. Nichols, De L. Nicoll, Nostrand, O'Brien, Ohmeis, Parkhurst, Parmenter, Pashley, Peabody, Peck, Platzek, Porter, Pratt, Putnam, Root,

Spencer, A. B. Steele, W. H. Steele, Storm, T. A. Sullivan, Tekulsky, C. H. Truax, Turner, Vogt, Wellington, Whitmyer, Wiggins, Williams, Woodward, President. — 98.

Noes — Messrs. Abbott, Ackerley, Arnold, Barhite, Blake, Campbell, Carter, Cassidy, Chipp, Jr., Church, Coleman, Cornwell, Countryman, Crosby, Dean, Dickey, Durnin, Fields, Floyd, Augustus Frank, Fraser, Gilbert, Gilleran, Hedges, Holcomb, Jenks, Kerwin, Lauterbach, Lincoln, Manley, Maybee, McArthur, McDonough, McKinstry, J. W. McLaughlin, Moore, Morton, Mulqueen, Osborn, Parker, Phipps, Pool, Powell, Redman, Roche, Rowley, Sandford, Schumaker, Smith, Speer, Springweiler, W. Sullivan, Tibbetts, Titus, Towns, Tucker, Vedder, Veeder. — 58.

On motion of Mr. Cookinham the Convention, at 11.24, adjourned to Thursday morning.

