

ing is altogether out of the question. They make out that the horses have too much to do or some other such excuse. And what do women want to go ranting around for, anyway? They ask, "Why can't they stay at home where their places are?" Such men are no better than bores, and I pity the lot of any intelligent woman who is forced to live with such a man.

Then there is the argument that women could not take their places in time of war. Can they not? What about Florence Nightingale, and all the noble staff of nurses who belong to the Red Cross, and who go out to relieve suffering? It is more blessed to relieve suffering than to inflict it, even in fighting for one's country. In the old days, when might was right, when countries and kingdoms and governments were sustained by physical force, there might have been good reason to exclude women from politics; but now it is different, when the citizens of countries hire others to fight for them; when Dreadnaughts are built, and soldiers and sailors are paid out of the taxes which are imposed on women equally with men. Such taxation without representation is tyranny, and at the present time women all over this fair country of ours are ranked in the same class politically as lunatics, idiots, criminals and infants, and all because of sex; or, in other words, we are looked upon as infants all our lives.

Our sons grow up, and at the age of twenty-one they are considered men, and are supposed to know more than their mother, who is perhaps twice their age, or their grandmother, who is three times that. If a woman's husband dies, and she has property qualifications, she is allowed to vote in municipal elections. Is her brain any clearer, or is she more intelligent, because she is a widow? I trow not. Some will say her husband voted for her in the past. Even so, what about the sons? Did he not vote for them, too? That is where the rub comes in. A married man votes for the whole family, a single one only for himself. Then there is the alien and the foreigner, many of them undesirable, who only come to this country to make enough of the needful to go back to their own countries, if possible, and live in comfort; yet such men who have no interest in this country's welfare whatever, are put before, and given the privileges over Canadian-born and British women who have their country's interests greatly at heart.

A few years ago, I saw two pictures in an Old Country paper. One was of a gentle and refined woman. You could see her hand stretched out as she bent forward rocking the cradle. There was lace on the sleeve of her dress, and a wedding ring on her finger, while her hair was smoothed back from a very intelligent-looking forehead. The other was that of a drunkard sitting beside a table on which was a bottle and a glass of whiskey. His whole attitude betokened dejection; you could almost see his hand shake as he stretched it forward to take the glass, and the question was asked, Which is most capable to vote, she with the cool head and clear brain and steady hand, or he, the shattered wreck with the unsteady hand and the muddled brain? And right here I will say that I don't think the temperance question will ever be properly settled till women get the vote. The man-made laws in the past in connection with prohibition have never amounted to much, and for why? Because they are made to suit themselves. A great many of our legislators like "a wee drappie o't" themselves. The Dunkin Act did not accomplish much, neither did the Scott Act, because they were not properly enforced, and as for myself, I will say that I have not much use for local option, because people can still get liquor by going a few miles or sending out for it. I think it is downright silly to allow a thing to be made, and license it to be sold, and then haul people up because they drink too much of it. There is no other agency in the land to-day (nor has been in days that are gone), that is so demoralizing as either the spiritual or physical or moral life of the nation as strong drink, and it has done more harm already than all the pestilences and famines and wars that ever have been. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States has declared that nothing short

of constitutional and statutory prohibition of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors as beverages will be satisfactory. That, admitting that the use of strong drink causes crime, the use of it cannot be realized without sin. And the Methodist Episcopal Church has declared that the liquor traffic is so pernicious in all its bearings, so hurtful to the homes and to the church, and to all that is precious in life, that the only attitude for Christians towards it is relentless hostility.

The majority of the murders committed, and of the crimes and iniquities brought up in our police courts, are caused through drink. In the Toronto police court for 1908, there were 19,000 cases tried; 8,930 of these were caused directly by strong drink. Directly and indirectly, there were 17,000, out of the 19,000 cases, caused by indulgence in strong drink. There were also between two and three millions of dollars spent over the bars in Toronto in one year, that ought to have been spent in the homes.

If women had anything to do with prohibition, or with spending that money, would it have gone where it did? I have a lurking idea that is why some men do not want women to have votes. Their liberty might be taken from them in that respect. Some people boast of a free country, and of being able to do as they like. No man or woman having want of control, or who cannot restrain themselves, ought to be allowed to do as they like. Take Blythe, the murderer, for instance. He drank whiskey because he liked it, and he beat his wife because he liked to do it; yet the law never stepped in until he had killed her.

play thrown in. The intellectual woman has to take time to read and consider things. If she cannot get much time, like myself, she can think hard while she is working. If she does not get knowledge herself, how can she teach her children? She ought to go to church regularly, and to other meetings in connection with the church, if she can; and to a picnic or entertainment, and to town occasionally, and to the Women's Institute. She may also drop in and pay the taxes in the fall if her husband is busy, and why could she not, if an election was on, drop in and put her mark opposite the name of a good man or woman, one who, she knew would do his or her best in the interests, and for the good and honor of her country?

The present position of our fair Dominion has been won, to a large extent, by our pioneer settlers, who, by their unremitting toil, cleared the forests and built themselves homes, and none bore a heavier part in the building of those homes than did the women, who raised their families and took a share in the actual manual work as well.

And will the women of the present be behindhand? No; I am sure they will not. In these days, when brains are used more than brawn, and when we have all sorts of advantages over those which our mothers and grandmothers had, more will be required of us, so it is our duty then, to try in every way to do all we can for the uplifting of our homes and country. At election time, when the men who are running for office put a card in the papers, they usually put at the end, "Your vote and influence are solicited." So, ladies, while we are waiting and

women of Ontario. In a great many countries the women are already allowed to vote, and in New Zealand, for instance, the late Hon. Richard Seddon lost no opportunity of impressing upon the public the fact that women suffrage had been an entire success in that country. There is also a State in Russia entirely governed by women. There are seven villages in the State, each presided over by a mayoress, the whole under the superintendence of a lady, who acts as president. There are women magistrates, women preachers, and women policemen. Women also carry the mails, and sell milk and do manual labor.

And here is what Prince Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, said of women suffrage: "What I am, I have become through my wife. I respect every woman who elevates us men, who teaches us religion and morality, upholds our ideals for us, and weaves roses of heaven into our earthly life. It was my desire to draw women into politics, but we are not ripe for that yet; we are still only in the schoolroom. Our Queen Louisa was a politician, but one with a pure heart. She wished to make her fatherland great, rich and powerful. No one on earth have I revered more. In her salon, she brought together the wise and noble spirits of all nations. If only the cultured women of our aristocracy would be politicians of that kind. They should not trespass upon man's preserves, but lead him to good."

Then we all know that the late Hon. W. E. Gladstone depended greatly on his wife, and there are lots of other cases I could quote, but I will only mention one more. Our late Queen Victoria the Good; she proved herself a capable ruler, and a successful business woman, and at the same time, a very efficient and careful wife and mother and homemaker. At the time of the International Congress last year in Toronto, Canon Welch gave a very interesting discourse in St. James' Cathedral. He reviewed the Congress, and said: The position which women now have in the world, and which makes such a gathering as the International Council possible, is due to the influence of the religion of Jesus Christ, and, in the second place, the motive to do such work, and the strength to do it, was also given from above.

If the motive to do such work, and the strength to do it, was given to the members of the International Council of Women, will it not also be given to us here in our own little Convention in the County of Grey, if we only ask it?

"Honor and fame from no condition rise. Act well thy part, there all the honor lies."

Mrs. Bacon's Address at the Women's Institute Convention, Toronto.

Madame President, Mrs. Huestis, and Ladies,—On behalf of the Women's Institute of Ontario, I beg to say that these kind and gracious words of welcome from one experienced in the work of women's organizations and fraternities, have warmed us with a responsive glow. They have made us feel that we co-operate with all who would place humanity on a higher plane, and that in all essentials we are one with them. We feel encouraged to know that while we are busy with the work of our homes, other women are performing duties which are out of our reach, but are quite as necessary for the upbuilding of a wise, good and happy people, and a great and beautiful Canada. The Institutes warmly appreciate the privilege of meeting in the University Convocation Hall. Most of us have pleasant associations with the Toronto University. Some were here during the Quinquennial Congress two years ago, and carried away a share of the inspiration that came from that great gathering. Representing, as our organization so largely does, the rural population of Ontario, we have contributed from our homes the bulk of the University students. Moreover, we are in league with its aim and work. Fundamentally, the work of a university is to produce good citizens, trained for their life business. Fundamentally, the function of the home is the same. Our motto, "For Home and Country," means this first of all. If we are loyal to a motto so patriotic, so wide in scope that it embraces almost



An Attractive Bedroom.

Note the arrangement of fireplace and windows, and the bare floor. (By courtesy of Suburban Life.)

In my opinion, the law was to blame for allowing the whiskey to be sold.

If the Government would only do with the liquor traffic as they did with the poor dogs last summer, and clap the muzzles on, as it were, such a howl would go up throughout the length and breadth of the land, and yet strong drink has caused more suffering and sorrow, one thousand times over, than all the cases of rabies or hydrophobia that have yet developed.

Then there is the white-slave traffic, which goes hand in hand with drink. Such dens do not often exist where there is no whiskey sold. This traffic, I am sorry to see by all the papers, both in the old land and in this, is increasing. Should women have no say in that which concerns the very lives of some women, and more than their lives? I ask you women here. What do you say?

There are lots of other things which I could bring up, but I will not, for it is could bring up, but I will not, for it is too large a subject to deal with all at once; but I will say that it is not unbecomingly to vote. No true woman would attend to her home or children less. But she is not a true woman who attends to their creature comforts only. The body needs more. The intellectual part is the needs more. If we do not cultivate part that counts. If we do not cultivate it, we are only on a level with the beasts, it, we are only on a level with the beasts, who eat, and work, and sleep, and eat, and work, and sleep again, with perhaps a little

working and doing our duty quietly, and waiting patiently for the time when we shall no longer be classed with lunatics and infants and irresponsible persons, let us use our "influence."

I wonder how many of us know how much meaning there is in that one word, Influence. We all exercise an influence over others to a greater or lesser extent, some for good and some for evil. It is claimed that man lost Eden through the influence of a woman, and John the Baptist lost his head through the influence of a woman. Those are only two cases; there are scores of others where woman's influence was for evil, but there are just as many, or more, where it has been used for good, and I would hope that all the women here to-day are exercising their influence for good in every way.

Most animals are easier led than driven, and man is one of them. My old father used to say when things went wrong, "Tis the kindly way." Try persuading. Try persuading your husbands when you want anything very much. By persuasion and love and counsel; yes, and flattery, most women can, metaphorically speaking, twist the men around their little fingers, and induce them to do anything, even to voting for the right man. Last spring, the members of the Women's Institute of Forest, passed a resolution and sent it on to Sir James Whitney, through their representative, asking him to extend the franchise to the