

to the very important question of manhood (as well as womanhood) suffrage which again involves the "one man, one vote" principle; questions that men themselves are divided upon so that it cannot be said, if any should think so, that man is firmly arrayed against woman in the suffrage question.

In the discussions of all the ramifications of this intricate question there is another principle which is sometimes laid down. The claim is that if any property is taxed, the owner, be he man or woman, has a right to a voice in its expenditure, and it finds popular expression in the oft-repeated words "no taxation without representation."

To this it is replied that government is akin to a joint stock company who undertake to do a certain thing—provide suitable roads which all can use, for instance—upon the payment into their hands of a certain sum. It is a bargain, and if government does what it agrees to do, when the persons served pay for the service that is all they have a right to—that having fulfilled their agreement, the joint stock company have a right to conduct their own affairs in their own way. Now, it is evident there are individuals in the state—those under age, as an example—who are in this position of paying into the state treasury for just such a purpose. This is seen in the law of Prince Edward Island—and I think a similar law exists in most if not all of the other provinces of this broad, or long, Dominion—which compels a young man over sixteen years to perform statute labor, while he does not enjoy the franchise until he is twenty-one.

This brings us to the question of what under normal conditions, should constitute the voting unit. Society is composed of men and women, but these do not exist as independent units—they bear a certain relation to each other. That relation is seen in society's goal, the married state, and this involves offspring with a season of tutelage. In the family is the social unit under normal conditions. It is almost im-

possible to conceive of a sound reason for any other premises. Do you say that some may prefer to remain single—as individual units—yes, but the laws in place of facilitating such a course should rather be framed to frown upon it—to throw obstacles in the way. The tendency to some extent now is, since the sphere of "woman's usefulness" has, rightly or wrongly, been widened as a result, partially at least, if pride and ambition are allowed to step the purpose for which man and woman was created—to thwart nature; yet both reason and revelation stamp their signet ring upon the foregoing principles. If then the family is the social unit then in this should the voting privilege of the body politic lie. And this follows the universal law of units—they can combine to make higher numbers but they can also be broken up into parts—into fractions. How should such a unit cast a ballot in a normal state of society? by a calm consideration at home of the questions at issue and a marking and depositing of the ballot by either member of the parental combination in accordance with the conclusions arrived at.

But it is stated in reply, your principles are for a normal state of society; are they not out of place under the present abnormal condition? Or, it might still be contended, nay, insisted, that the man and woman, whether as unmarried or married, should be looked upon as individual units—each a social factor in the commonwealth. Under this view it is claimed there is danger that women when exercising the franchise may become "unsexed." What is there in this argument? What is it to be unsexed? to become like a man in nature. What effect has our political system had upon the average man? Man is the bread-winner of the family; he has ever before his eyes the fact that he has to "provide for his own household." When the political briber, therefore, at an election comes to a man and offers to buy his vote the temptation is intensified by the fact that he is the provider of the family. Were