

sponsibilities. This was the origin of man's exclusive prerogative in state matters, and this to-day is the underlying cause of hesitation on the part of right thinking men in conceding to women the right to meddle in political affairs. It is not that any one fears the influence that women would exert upon politics—it would undoubtedly be, in the main, pure and elevated; but we fear the influence which politics would have upon women. This is, indeed, a vital and most important consideration for society.

Excluded from the political arena what an immense influence woman now exerts upon the affairs of the world! Her gentle hand soothes the brow of pain. Her loving words wake the first tokens of intelligence in budding childhood, and guide the young mind and heart through the varying developments of age into the character which fixes the man's relation to society. She is the undisputed Queen of Home, and what bears comparison with that pregnant word, Home, in its tremendous relation to the character of the race. Her influence softens the asperities of life, mollifies the coarser tendencies of men, purifies the social circle, and sheds moral grandeur upon the advancing stages of human civilization. Above all, she evokes love in the heart of man, and by this love she inspires the noblest achievements of the race. She fulfils the yearnings which she creates. She is the nurse of childhood, the guide of youth, the sweet companion of manhood, and the solace of age. With woman discharging such functions in the world, wise men will think carefully before they consent to plunge her into a new sphere which may, and probably must, diminish the influence of her finest and subtlest powers, and not lift, but lower the lofty plane in which she now moves and acts in the world.

The theory upon which certain women seek the right of suffrage is, that men make the laws to suit themselves, and that these are so adjusted, in a spirit of selfishness, as to put men on a better footing in the world than women. This is a fallacy. In the laws upon the statute books of every civilized country, women receive even-handed justice, and their interests have been protected as fully as their brothers'. Male legislators have voluntarily passed Acts giving married women control over their earnings and property acquired by them in any way whatever. Husbands are allowed, when solvent, to place all their property in the hands of trustees for the exclusive benefit and under the sole control of their wives. Even the Common law of England, which is the Common law of all English-speaking nations, gives the wife a third interest in the real estate of her husband during her lifetime. The laws of inheritance are made as free and as liberal in relation to women as to men. A husband may bequeath all his property to his wife, even ignoring his own sons. In the event of a man dying intestate his widow is as well regarded by the law as any relative he leaves behind him. There is not a statute among the laws of any civilized state that metes out unequal justice to women—that makes an act penal for her, and not equally penal for men. Indeed, the balance is in her favor, for she is, in most countries, not compelled to give evidence against her husband, and in some cases she is relieved from the consequences of voluntary acquiescence in his crimes.

But the advocates of woman suffrage will revert to social laws and claim inequality. It is so common to hear it proclaimed in tones of lofty and majestic indignation that there is one law for men and another for women in relation to