

knowledge is throwing timely light upon every phase of the woman question. In its entirety, that question involves the meaning of the socialization of one-half human kind. Of necessity, law must be brought abreast of this new knowledge.

SUSIE E. OILL.

Toronto, Ont.

AN OPINION FROM WENTWORTH COUNTY.

Should the suffrage be given to women? Should it, indeed? This question has perplexed the Legislators of many nations, and is one that is being asked by all thinking people. Several governments have already answered it in the affirmative; many more, including the English and our own Parliaments, are still replying in the negative. But what do we think about it?

Certainly women should have the franchise if they want it, and it seems very apparent that they do by the efforts they are putting forth to have it. To say that such actions do not speak in favor of the wisdom with which they would use it if they had it, does not in the least prove that they would abuse the privilege. It has always been the case, that when men are very much in earnest to pass a necessary measure, they will go to much greater lengths than the suffragettes have. This was shown by the intense excitement which prevailed at the time of the extension of Manhood Suffrage in England.

Why should women not vote?—but first we had better take up the positive side; the reasons why they should.

At the very first, we have the argument that the woman bears an equal share with the man in making the home. She does at least half of the work; spends herself, in many cases more than the man, to keep the home together; and bears a great deal of the responsibility. Then why should it be, that when the time comes to choose the lawmakers, one-half the citizens should have the privilege and the other half be deprived of it? As has been said, keeping the suffrage from woman is one of the last traces in our Christian civilization of the dark days, when she was little better than a servant or slave. It is not even necessary to go back to ancient times to find such conditions. They still exist to a large degree in India and Turkey. The Chinese woman's lot is greatly improving with the awakening of that country.

Does it seem fair, that, though women may own just as much property as men, they are not allowed to vote on it—with a few exceptions? When they break the law, they suffer equally with the men, although they have no voice in framing it. They bear equal responsibilities in every way, yet they must not vote. Does it seem fair?

The very strongest reason why women should have the franchise, is that, in all probability, they would pass temperance measures. This is admitted by even the opponents of the movement. Women, as a sex, are more in favor of total prohibition than men, and it would surely be but a little while until we had it, if women could express themselves in any way. We see this tendency for prohibition in the very active part women took in the great temperance campaigns in the United States. Though they could not vote, they exerted a tremendous influence over the elections.

Perhaps many women do not want to vote. Such is said to be the case, yet we cannot believe that they would not if they could. Can they not choose and vote for candidates with as much wisdom as men? I believe that much of what is said about women not wanting the vote is not true; that, in reality, they do not wish to appear too eager to have it. No doubt they are ashamed of the manner in which some of their sex are endeavoring to get the franchise, yet if they had it, it would be as wisely used as when in the hands of men.

Women are now taking every position occupied by men. They are seen in almost every office, filling every position, on an equality with men. Women are as able mentally as men, they can always accomplish as much brain-work, they are surely as sensible. Why, then, can they not vote, that is, as far as being intellectually fit is concerned? Such a question is absurd, it is too foolish to consider.

The point has been urged that it will

dull the finer temperaments of women, and to some extent lower them to mix in politics. Why should this be so? On the contrary, would not the purity and truth, all the beautiful characteristics of the fairer sex, help to uplift politics and make a higher standard? We believe so.

Again, it is often said that women need not vote, that they can influence their male friends to vote the way they wish, and thus secure their representation in this way. Perhaps this is true to some extent, but (it only applies to married women, and those who live in homes of their own. There is, however, in our Canadian and in the American cities, a vast army of girls, young women, and unmarried ladies, who are living entirely independent lives. They earn their own living, and are not dependent on any man for assistance. These women do not have any representation whatever. They are valuable citizens, but not being in homes of their own have no voice in political affairs. This is the class that would be benefited most by the suffrage; they would perhaps appreciate it more than married women, and certainly need it.

One of the points urged by the opponents of the movement is that politics will so occupy the woman's time that the children will be neglected, and her home will suffer. This appears unreasonable on the very surface. How long does it take a man to go to the polls and mark his ballot? He never thinks of the time it takes, and, in any case, it is too unimportant to notice.

As for woman not being interested in politics, and not sufficiently understanding government to take any part in it, we believe that when she is given the power to vote, she will prepare to do it intelligently. When she realizes the gravity and importance of electing proper representatives—as she is bound to do—she will vote as wisely as the male citizen.

Wentworth Co., Ont.

A GREY CO. OPINION.

Should the Suffrage Be Given to Women?

Yes; undoubtedly yes, for the following reasons: Because no race, or class, or sex, can have its interests properly safeguarded, unless such race, or class, or sex, has a voice in the making of the laws of its country; because, although in the past women's place has been considered to be in the home, the nation is but a larger home, and the idea of social service, of direct and personal responsibility to the community is more widespread to-day than ever it was before, and women equally with men need to take an interest in the larger human life outside the home; because lawmaking affects them greatly in many ways, and because I think every true woman ought to have a responsible interest in that which affects herself and family.

It is not for women's rights altogether that I intend to argue, but for the welfare of the race as a whole. Legislation in the past has made many laws which do not grant equal privileges to man and woman. Because they are wholly made by men, they are made from man's standpoint, and to suit themselves. Such questions include: Morality, The White Slave Traffic, Temperance, The Care of Women and Children in Reformatories, The Housing Problem in Large Cities, Education, The Death Rate of Infants, Vaccination, The Employment of Children, Playgrounds for Children, Sweating, The Labor of Married Women, The Care of the Aged and Feeble-minded, The Peace Problem, and many others. In the past, too many men have considered women as a parasite, a mere hanger-on, a sort of a slave, to bring forth children and minister to his and their creature comforts. He is the guardian of the children according to law, but she it is who has to bear pain and labor for their very existence, she it is who has to care for their small bodies, and feed and nourish them, both in sickness and health. She has great responsibilities, and also great opportunities. But why is it that women who are mostly responsible for their children's moral and religious upbringing have no say in their public or social life? A great deal has been attributed to our influence, and it goes a good way,

but it is not everything, for in a great many ways our hands are tied. We are told by Institute workers and others to visit the schools and see what reforms are needed there and try to accomplish something, but how are we to go about it? By influencing others? Would it not be a great deal better if we could have a say as to who was to be put in as trustees, or in being trustees ourselves? Oh, I suppose somebody will laugh at that. Well, I have known of cases where men put in as trustees and secretaries of school boards, and their wives had to do the work for them. Why could not the women have been put in at first? We women are tired of sending "deputations," and praying his "lordship-man" to condescend to let us have this or that needed reform, which they will promise to give their best attention, and then laugh at us behind our backs. Only the other week, deputations from nearly all the Provinces waited on Mr. Borden at Ottawa and prayed for his influence to be used in prohibiting cigarettes being sold to children (it seems this evil is increasing by leaps and bounds). Well, he only promised to consider it. Why could he not have knocked it on the head at once? "If it had been a mad dog, it would soon have been muzzled." A thing like that is wrong, and everybody knows it, and I don't think it needed consideration. Where women have become voters, reforms have proceeded more rapidly than before. Take California, for instance. They soon settled the temperance question there, and they would, too, in other places.

If, as some think, woman's place is in the home, that does not imply, surely, that she should for ever stay there. She needs to go out occasionally for change and relaxation, for the good of her health, and to get her ideas broadened and stimulated. She goes to church and to town and other places. If she has small children, she has either to take them with her or leave them at home in somebody else's care, but she cannot stay at home for ever. One might as well say that the farmers ought to stay at home to look after their stock and other things, that the merchants ought to stay in their offices, and the mechanics at their benches. No true woman will neglect that which is of first importance, her motherly and wifely duties—her maternal and inborn instincts prevent that—but women have not yet taken their places where God intended they should, as help-mates and equals to man. If the woman is not without the man, neither is the man without the woman, and the battle is now for us all in whatsoever sphere we find ourselves, but it will be with the pen more than the sword, and the head more than the arm, and our intelligence more than our physical strength. In the East and in the West, women are asking for the opening of the doors of intellectual advancement, and claiming a large share in the world's work. In the Orient, where in the past women lived as virtual slaves, and gave passive obedience to their husbands, they are clamoring for education, and getting it, too. During the last decade or two, English, French and German governesses have been constant companions of ladies of the harems, and many Western ideas have found a place there. In Turkey, India and Egypt, it is the same. Wherever European governesses and missionaries have gone and scattered knowledge, and books and journals, there is a keen desire for more, and a wish for greater freedom to develop and use the intellectual faculties to the fullest extent. The women of China are allowing their feet to grow, and the Japanese are asking for more teachers, sending their girls to high schools, and discarding the ancient costumes of their ancestors. And will we in Canada be behind? No. We have passed the chrysalis stage, and soon, very soon, we will be spreading our wings in the full light of human intelligence, and taking our places beside the men we love, to sink or swim with them, in all affairs of national importance, as well as in our homes.

For it's coming yet an' a' that,
When women folk the world over
Will get the vote an' a' that.

MRS. W. BUCHANAN
Ravenna, Ont.

[Since these essays were written the franchise has been given to women in China.]

Hope's Quiet Hour.

The Power of His Resurrection.

That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection.—Phil. iii. 10.

St. Paul's longing to know fully the power of the Risen, Living Christ, is not out of date. Men and women still find all earthly gains and pleasures are unsatisfying, their hungry souls still reach out for better and higher joys. The other day someone asked me the old question: "Why don't the men go to church?" and I answered: "I am surprised that so many do go to church." Why am I surprised, when I am sure that the soul of every man is really—though perhaps unconsciously—thirsting after God?

My surprise springs from the fact that they have gone so often, and found no Risen Christ there, that they must be discouraged and hopeless of ever finding Him.

Is that His fault? Has He broken His promise to be "in the midst" of any little company (even a company of two) gathered together in His Name? Never! He is certainly there; so, if anyone goes to church and comes away again imagining that the only persons in the building were the congregation and the minister, it is because he was too careless or faithless to find the Loving Lord of the Church. As it was long ago, the multitude is thronging and pressing close to the living JESUS, but only a soul touching Him intentionally and with conscious purpose, gains health and strength by the close contact.

We are still taught spiritual truth by parables. Consider that familiar yet mysterious power that we call "electricity." Suppose that invisible, mighty force should say to a wire: "It is your mission to light up the darkness of a room, you can move heavy street-cars swiftly, you can drive machines, you can supply heat for ironing." The wire might reply: "How can I supply light, power and heat? I am only lifeless, cold, black iron. I cannot even warm myself or light up my own blackness, or move myself the width of a hair. I cannot supply to others what I do not possess myself."

But the iron can and does supply light, power and heat as required, not from its own resources, but by keeping in touch with the source of supply. The moment it is connected with the dynamo, the light, heat and power flash through it to light a room, drive a car, or iron clothes.

So Christ says to the members of His Church: "Ye are the light of the world."—S. Matt. v. 14. That does not conflict with His majestic declaration of His own Divinity: "I AM THE LIGHT of the world." In fact, it is just because He is the Source of Light that men and women are able to supply light wherever He has placed them. Like the dead wire, which is rightly called "a live wire" when it is in vital touch with the storage battery, they can supply light and power (which is not their own) by keeping in vital touch with God.

Doctor Schofield—a doctor of medicine—says he once received a letter in which the writer said: "I used at one time always to be wanting things for myself . . . sympathy, appreciation, culture of talents, etc. Now I feel as if I wanted absolutely nothing, and suddenly I find myself rich in all that is worth having; and able to GIVE, and GIVE, and GIVE to all I meet who are in any need." The doctor goes on:

"How can I illustrate this? I have a pipe that brings water down from a small cistern that holds a gallon. Such a cistern is soon emptied. But if it be connected with a lake miles long, I find, to my surprise, that the cistern, though it still only holds a gallon, has suddenly become inexhaustible. My heart is the gallon cistern, and soon runs dry; but once connected with God it never can, and I am able to give, and give, and give to all."

He also reminds us of the description of the City of God in Revelation xxi—a translucent cube 1,500 miles in every direction, with the glory of God and the Lamb in the midst of it. No wonder it is possible for the nations of them which are saved to walk in the light of it."