

By those who wish to plunge us and our families into Female Suffrage it is argued that property held by women will otherwise be unrepresented. Such of them as propose to confine the suffrage to unmarried women will still leave the grievance of which they complain in great measure undressed. But it is strange that not only private citizens but legislators should sometimes be ignorant of the most rudimentary facts relating to the policy under which they live, and should appeal to principles as constitutional, to which nothing in the constitution corresponds. How much property is really represented? The minimum held in each case as a qualification for the suffrage, and no more. Suppose in a joint stock company the holder of one share and the holder of a hundred shares had each of them a single vote, everyone would say that ninety-nine shares were unrepresented. It is just the same with shares held in that great joint stock company, the State. If the man of one acre and the man of a hundred have each a single vote, ninety-nine acres are unrepresented. Property held by women, therefore, is subject to no peculiar hardship unless it is of a different character from all other property, so as to form a separate interest needing special championship; and this it certainly is not. It suffers no more from the absence of the political suffrage than property held by minors, which nobody supposes to be in any way aggrieved. At least if it is, it has not cried out; nor has the property held by women. Property is not, under our system, whether national or municipal, the thing represented or the basis of representation. A certain amount of it, together with a fixed residence is required by way of qualification, as a pledge of the voter's respectability; just as it is required that he should be of age, and in some communities that he should have received a certain education. Another qualification under the law as it stands at present, in almost all civilized communities, is sex; and there can be no reason in the nature of things why sex should not be a qualification for political duty, as it certainly is for duties equally important. Nobody doubts that it is a qualification for the duties of national defence and of police; few doubt that it is a qualification for the duty of a jurymen; as on the other side it evidently is a qualification for those maternal and domestic duties, which nature, like the "anachronistic fossil" that she is, obstinately persists in assigning to women. There are functions of various kinds which all of us save a few are precluded, if not by law, by inexorable circumstance, from performing, and our exclusion from which implies no inequality or disparagement. Circumstance practically shuts out the whole seafaring population and many of those employed in railroads, or in other migratory callings, from voting at elections, though their aggregate number can hardly be smaller than that of the widows and spinsters who hold property. So long as justice reigns, and the community as a whole is well governed, the sole object of the franchise and of all legislation relating to it is attained.

The study of history, while it makes us sceptical of Utopias, prepares us for change. The hour for a great sexual revolution, such as is proposed in that manual of the Woman's Righter, Mills' *Subjection of Women*, may have come. The "Bystander" does not shut his eyes to the possibility. But he maintains that of all revolutions, a revolution in the relations of the sexes and the constitution of the family is the most momentous, and the one into which society can least afford to allow itself to be hustled, either by the violence of enthusiasts or, by what is still less respectable, the party exigences of gerrymandering politicians. In these democratic communities, the tyranny of majorities is the constant subject of complaint, but there is such a thing as the tyranny of a minority also. Politics infect the general character of the people, and private men, though they are not like politicians in need of votes, dread unpopularity almost as much as if they were. As soon, therefore, as the leaders of any movement can succeed, by well organized agitation, in creating an impression that it is likely to become popular, everybody's moral courage gives way, and all emulously attach themselves to that which they imagine to be the winning cause; while the Press, which ought to act as ballast, and steady the lurching vessel, rolls with everything else to the wrong side. To this general influence is added, on the present occasion, the personal wheedling of the female leaders of the movement, which, as Mr. Meredith said, "mesmerizes" individual legislators and aldermen, who fear that they may offend the sex by refusing anything to a lady, though the fact, if they only knew it, is that they would do nothing of the kind. "There are so many young fools and so many old fools that I think Female Suffrage will be carried"—in that saying of an English Liberal lies much of the philosophy of this movement. In the United States a constitutional amendment is submitted to the people at large, and the influence of personal blandishments is thus in great measure excluded. Here, unfortunately, we have no safeguard of the kind.

THERE can be little doubt as to the motive which leads a Conservative politician like Sir John Macdonald to introduce a measure of sexual revolution. He has taken a hint, as he thinks, from the extreme section of English Tories, who, in opposition to the more moderate section of the party, vote for Female Suffrage avowedly because they think that the women will vote Tory. The assumption on which these Machiavellian tacticians act may be safe in England, but it is more precarious in the New World. We have here no Monarchy or Aristocracy to fascinate the female imagination, nor is the influence of the priesthood so great as it is in lands of long-descended hierarchies and ancient fanes. Mrs. Victoria Woodhull, Mrs. Cady Staunton, Miss Susan Anthony, Miss Lucy Stone, and the others of that stamp, will not vote Tory. Miss Helen Taylor does not vote Tory; in her opinions as well as in her language she outvies the most advanced males. The excitement of revolution fascinates as well as the romance of Royalty, and all the phenomena hitherto seem to indicate that when a woman breaks away from her sex she breaks away from it with a vengeance. The only thing that can be foretold with certainty as to the result of female suffrage is that it will render legislation and government less masculine and more feminine. It will make them more the expression of emotion and less of judgment: for nature, physical nature, must be completely reversed, before the female character can cease to be more emotional and less practical than the male. If people deliberately believe that this will be a gain to the community, they will do right in voting for female suffrage. The sole consideration to be kept in view, in the joint interest of both sexes and that of their children at the same time, is the probable effect of the measure on the character of government. That the question should be decided by the shifts of party strategy would be disgraceful. A lenient judgment may perhaps be passed, from a certain point of view, on the means which Sir John Macdonald has used through a long series of years to maintain himself in power, injurious to political character as they have been. It may be pleaded that they were the least objectionable at his command, and were in some degree redeemed by his own superiority to corruption; but when to gain a few votes for his party, he lays his hands upon sex and the home, the limit of such toleration is passed. This is one of the kind of questions with regard to which, if the Senate in any way corresponded to its ideal, we should look to it to steady the councils of the nation, check the blind precipitancy of faction, and afford us time for mature deliberation. But we might just as well look to Sir John Macdonald's butler.

THE German writer Bluntschli, in his great work on politics, has discussed the question of Female Suffrage in the broadest and most dispassionate manner. He concludes against the change on the general ground that not only law or custom but nature has made woman for the family, and man for public life. He urges with irresistible force, that if women are to be electors, they must also be capable of being elected, and that this would import a radical change of politics and a greatly increased influence of the emotional element in public affairs. He had demonstrated before that no abstract right to the suffrage could be pleaded against the interest of the community, since it is only by and through the community that the suffrage itself exists. He says in conclusion, "As things are, the moral and indirect influence of woman on public life is great and beneficial. The statesman finds peace, repose, and a renewal of his powers in his tranquil home. What would become of these happy effects if his wife were to enter the political lists with him? The statesman often holds converse with his wife as with his conscience; he recounts to her his projects, his dangers, his aspirations, his victories. It is on these occasions that women may represent moral duty in opposition to political necessity or the exigences of statecraft. Let us beware how we take from her this good part to give her one to which she is a stranger. The influence of women on public life would cease to be *pure* when it ceased to be *indirect*." As has been remarked in these papers before, power in whatever form and under whatever name it may be exercised is still power, and there are not only women but men who, without taking any part in elections, have by their writings and their conversation exercised a marked influence over the politics of their day.

Of the truth of Bluntschli's assertion that nature, not merely law or custom, has made woman, not for public life, but for the family, we have just had signal and decisive proof. There is one woman whom law and custom have done all in their power to divorce from the duties and interests of the family and attach to those of public life; whose name is actually cited on all occasions by the advocates of sexual revolution in proof that women are equally fitted with men, or even better fitted than men, for the work of government. That woman is Queen Victoria, long