



Easter-tide.

Oh, rare as the splendor of lilies,
And sweet as the violet's breath,
Comes the jubilant morning of Easter,
A triumph of life over death;
For fresh from the earth's quickened
bosom
Full baskets of flowers we bring,
And scatter their satin soft petals
To carpet a path for our King.

In the countless green blades of the
meadow,
The sheen of the daffodil's gold,
In the tremulous blue on the mountains,
The opaline mist on the wold,
In the tinkle of brooks through the pas-
ture,
The river's strong sweep to the sea,
Are signs of the day that is hasting
In gladness to you and to me.

So dawn in thy splendor of lilies,
Thy fluttering violet breath,
O jubilant morning of Easter,
Thou triumph of life over death!
For fresh from the earth's quickened
bosom
Full baskets of flowers we bring,
And scatter their satin soft petals
To carpet a path for our King.
—Margaret R. Sangster.

The Roundabout Club

Literary Society Study IV.

The papers judged best in Study IV.
were written by the following:
Subject: "Should the Suffrage Be
Granted to Women?"—S. E. Oill, To-
ronto; "Taps," Wentworth Co., Ont.;
Mrs. W. Buchanan, Grey Co., Ont.

Subject: "Criticism of Poetical Selec-
tions."—J. E. W., Durham Co., Ont.; "A
Lesser Spark," Bruce Co., Ont.; J.
Kemp, Grey Co., Ont.

Very good papers were also sent by
Mrs. A. Whiddon, Rainy River District,
Ont.; "A. F.," Prince Edward Co., Ont.;
"Vic," Russell Co., Ont.; T. J. Ruther-
ford, Grey Co., Ont.; Sherard McLeay,
Perth Co., Ont.; "C. H. P.," Kent Co.,
Ont.; "Ree," Welland Co., Ont.; "Lady
of Captainsville," York Co., Ont.

A few of the papers on "Woman's suf-
frage" are given to-day. It may be of
interest to note that of all who wrote
on this question, but one was adverse to
granting the suffrage to women. Al-
though his points were too few in number
to admit of his taking a place among
the prizewinners, his argument will ap-
pear at a later date.

Should Women Have the Suffrage.

In view of the present-day discussions
over this topic, a debate on the question
comes at a very opportune time. Waiv-
ing any formal introduction, I shall pro-
ceed at once with my reasons for think-
ing that women should have the fran-
chise.

The first justification for this subject is
on the point of taxation. No one can
refuse the claim that taxation and rep-
resentation should go together. If women
are good enough to bear the burden of
taxation, they should have a voice in
saying what should be done with the
money. Women should also have a voice
in making the laws she has to obey.

Women wish to stand side by side with
men, in working out the grandest destiny
of the race,—a task which men alone
cannot accomplish, since they do not
represent women fully. Representation
necessitates voluntary choice on the part
of those represented, and if men are to

represent women, women should have a
right to choose the men who are to rep-
resent them.

Women have proved their fitness for
taking part in municipal life; they are
equally fitted for Parliamentary life. The
results of women's work in the muni-
cipality are seen elsewhere. One refer-
ence, to the struggle for local option, will
suffice. Anyone who follows the move-
ment will agree with me that it would
never have received the impetus, and
never have met with such glorious suc-
cess, but for the women.

It is a reproach, that while we open
our arms to the admission of aliens,
largely the off-scourings of Europe, and
in due time confer upon them the rights
of citizenship, we still withhold those
rights from pure and noble women who
have contributed so largely to the great-
ness of our country.

Imbecile males, criminals, and females,
are prohibited from voting. Is it just
that such women as Frances E. Willard,

"equals" then. Is that justice? Woman's
vote would change that.

From the home where there are seven
sons, eight votes go out on election, no
matter how ignorant and wicked father
and sons may be. From the home where
there are seven daughters, only one vote
may be cast, no matter how cultured and
pure mother and daughters may be.

James Jones is twenty-one. Mrs. Smith
is the lecturer on History and Ethics in
the University from which James has
been expelled. He votes, she may not.

Women ask for the vote because men
and women were created equal in rights
and responsibilities, and they wish the
privileges denied them. "God made
woman not from his feet to be trampled
upon, not from his head to be ruled over,
but from his side to be his equal."

Woman represents the home, and the
home should be represented in the State.
The fiends who ruin the sons and daugh-
ters of the home may vote. The
mothers of those sons and daughters

in national life. The larger the voting
power of a home, the greater its influence
becomes in moulding the laws by which
homes are to be governed.

Voting will ennoble womanhood, and
qualify woman for truer motherhood.
Henry Ward Beecher truly says: "In
the augmentation of her liberty and the
enlargement of her sphere, she has for-
saken no duty of home, and lost no grace
of tenderness and love. She has become
a better mother, a better wife, daughter,
sister, friend, by just that enlargement
which it was predicted would unsex her.
A woman is better fitted for home who
is also fitted for something else."

In the occupations and opportunities of
life, woman has never, until recently,
been regarded as the companion and
social equal of her husband,—she has been
his slave, his drudge; at certain times in
history she has been hunted like an ani-
mal, and bought and sold like a chattel,
in marriage transactions. Emerson has
a sentence somewhere to the effect that
if we tie one end of a chain around the
neck of a slave, the other end will
sooner or later wind itself around our
own neck.

As regards the qualification of bread-
winners, for the voter,—women in many
cases are bread-winners, and in some
cases a woman is the sole bread-winner
of a family. In the vast complex ma-
chinery of our industrial life, depending
so largely as it does on the labor of
women, I contend that there is no class
which has so great an interest in the
security, liberty, and peaceful prosperity
of our country as that of women. Why,
then, should they be denied what men
enjoy?

Woman, like man, is a creature in
whom progressive civilization develops
higher capacities and new aptitudes.
Man has no right to limit growth that
God meant to be infinite.

History proves conclusively that men
have always risen to a higher dignity of
manhood after being entrusted with the
ballot. The result would inevitably be
the same in the case of women. The
sense of responsibility would define and
strengthen her character.

Factory Acts have been passed with a
view to meeting the requirements of men
and men employers. Women's votes will
be the only means by which a radical
change will be effected in women's griev-
ances, and especially in the conditions in
the sweat-boxes of our land where young
girls are giving their very life-blood, drop
by drop, while the law allows the em-
ployer to turn the screw down harder
and harder.

Woman's mental nature is different from
man's; God made it so, but he made the
one the complement of the other. Per-
fect unity is wrought out of different, but
harmonious elements. Legislation will
be essentially one-sided until man's ideas
are balanced by woman's.

Henry Ward Beecher says: "It will
scarcely be denied that men are superior
to woman,—as men; and that women are
immeasurably superior to men,—as
women; while both of them together are
more than a match for either of them
separately."

Tennyson says: "The woman's cause
is man's, they rise or sink together,
dwarfed or godlike, bond or free."
Again,—

"Everywhere
Two heads in council, two beside the
hearth,
Two in the tangled business of the
world,
Two in the liberal offices of life."

Longfellow says: "Woman suffrage is
undoubtedly coming, and I for one expect
a great deal of good to result from it."

In conclusion, I may say that the re-
cent remarkable progress in sociological



Easter Lilies.

Laura Secord, Jean Blewett, and Jane
Addams, should be classed with idiots
and criminals?

The presence of women purifies politics,
as is proved by a reference to any coun-
try or state where they exercise the
franchise. Political life is purer, and
dealings are straighter, than elsewhere.

Members of Parliament ask for and ac-
cept the political assistance of women,
and surely it is not right, with one voice
to gratefully accept this support, and
with another to deprecate woman's polit-
ical existence.

The laws of the land provide that a
man shall be judged by his peers. A
woman is not considered the peer of a
man, politically, yet, if she is up on
trial, she is judged by men,—they are

should help make the laws to protect
the home.

Woman's vote would protect children,
and better their condition. In New Zea-
land there is no such thing as a pauper
child.

Woman's vote would do away with the
double standard of morality for men and
women. The men would be forced to
raise theirs.

A man may prove unfaithful to his
wife, but she has no remedy against him.
So are the laws hedged round to protect
the man, that in nine cases out of ten,
he goes free, and the woman suffers.
Should not women have an opportunity
to remedy this injustice? Men never
will.

The home should be the vital element