

Votes for Women

A NEW RECORD

Albert Sidney Burleson, forty-eighth postmaster general, has the unique distinction of being the only occupant of that high office to actually turn into the treasury of the United States a surplus from the postal service. Congress gives the postmaster general authority to use the postal revenues in meeting running expenses. If the revenues are insufficient it is the duty of the secretary of the treasury to make up the deficit from the general revenues. With painful regularity he has been called to help out, for not since 1883 has the postal service been run at a profit until the fiscal year 1913. The small surplus accumulated by Postmaster General Gresham 30 years ago was swallowed up the following year in helping to meet a deficit occasioned principally by the cut from three to two cent letter postage. A surplus for the fiscal year 1912 was promised, but when suspended expense items properly chargeable against the revenues of that year were paid the promised surplus took on the familiar features of a deficiency. The postmaster general, and Governor Dockery, who as the third assistant postmaster general is in direct charge of the fiscal affairs of the postoffice department, entertain some very practical views as to when a surplus is a surplus. They believe that a surplus for a year is a surplus when the debts of the service for that year are paid or amply provided for and there is real money left over. An academic estimate is not a substitute for actual cash. During the closing days of June, the governor set about his financial house-cleaning and soon was able to convey to the postmaster general the cheerful news that he was prepared to turn over to the secretary of the treasury \$3,800,000 in part settlement of the postal surplus for 1913, as well as \$2,675,000 from other sources of income. Then followed a condition at once amusing and perplexing which for a time baffled the combined genius and experience of the third assistant's office as well as of the accounting officers of the treasury department. How was a surplus to be handled? Clerks who had grown gray in government service were bewildered that such an anomalous condition could arise. Any of the messengers in the governor's office could give an interesting discourse on the cause of a deficit and how to handle one, but the wisacres were altogether at sea when confronted by the proposition of disposing of a real surplus. "Miscellaneous receipts" of the government was the caption finally selected under which Postmaster General Burleson on June 27th turned into the treasury of the United States his handsome contribution to the general revenues. W. J. BRYAN.

The biggest wheat crop in the history of the country has just been harvested, and prices quoted are satisfactory to the producers. As a rainmaker the democratic party has scored a success more than equalling those triumphs that its much more experienced predecessor, the republican party, achieved.

SENATOR SHIVELY

The following statement has been given to the Indiana democrats:

Senator Shively is a tower of strength in the administration, and it is of the highest importance that he should be returned to the United States senate. He has rendered signal service in the support of all the policies championed by the administration. As the second democrat on the senate foreign relations committee, and acting chairman in the absence of Chairman Stone, he is brought into close touch with the department of state, and I feel, therefore, a personal interest in the success of his senatorial campaign. It will give me pleasure to render him any assistance within my power. W. J. BRYAN.

THE FIGHT AGAINST PRIVILEGE
 The privileged classes of mankind have no conscience on the subject of their privilege. History does not adduce one instance in which a nobility or even a monopoly, entrenched in precedent and custom, has ever voluntarily made restitution to society of the rights of which she had been despoiled. The iron jaws which clasp the marrowy bone of privilege never relax until they are broken.—Ridpath's History of the World.

thusiasm are on the side of those who favor woman's suffrage. Organization is an evidence of earnestness, as well as of a comprehension of the subject. People do not associate themselves together to secure a given end until they have reached a definite conclusion in regard to its desirability and feel that its accomplishment is worth the effort for which it calls. It is quite evident that those who disinterestedly desire woman's suffrage are willing to make greater sacrifices to secure it than those who disinterestedly oppose woman's suffrage are willing to make to prevent it.

As for myself, I am not in doubt as to my duty. It is not my purpose to discuss the subject with elaboration at this time, but I desire to present the argument to which I give the greatest weight. Without minimizing other arguments advanced in support of the extending of suffrage to woman, I place the emphasis upon the mother's right to a voice in molding the environment which shall surround her children—an environment which operates powerfully in determining whether her offspring will crown her latter years with joy or "bring down her gray hairs in sorrow to the grave."

The Creator has placed upon the mother a burden which she could not shift if she so desired and He has given her the disposition to bear it. Her life trembles in the balance at the child's birth; her active years are given to the care and nurture of her children; her nerve force and vital energy are expended in their behalf; her wealth of love is poured out upon them. Because the wealth of her existence is bestowed upon them, they are a part of her very being—"where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." When one considers the cost to parents, especially to the mother, of raising a child, it seems impossible that any one would attempt to lead a child astray or rob its parents of the priceless regard to which they are entitled; and yet there are in every generation—aye, in every community—those who are inhuman enough to deliberately lie in wait to make a wreckage of the lives of young men and young women. They lay snares for them; they set traps for them; and the men who ply this ghastly trade for gain are allowed to use the ballot to advance their pecuniary interests. I am not willing to stay the mother's hand if she thinks that by the use of suffrage she can safeguard the welfare of those who are dearer to her than her own life.

The mother can justly claim the right to employ every weapon which can be made effective for the protection of those whose interests she guards, and the ballot will put within her reach all the instrumentalities of government, including the police powers. If she is a widow, there is no one who is in a position to speak for her in this matter of supreme importance; if her husband is living, she can supplement his influence if they agree as to what is best for those under their joint care; if they do not agree who will say that only the father should be consulted?

For a time I was impressed by the suggestion that the question should be left to the women to decide—a majority to determine whether the franchise should be extended to woman; but I find myself less and less disposed to endorse this test. Samuel Johnson coined an epigram which is in point here, namely, that "no man's conscience can tell him the right of another man." Responsibility for the child's welfare rests primarily upon the parent; the parent receives the largest measure of blessings that flow from the child's life, if that life is nobly employed, and upon the parent falls the blow with the severest force if the child's life is misspent. Why should any mother, therefore, be denied the use of the franchise to safeguard the welfare of her child merely because another mother may not view her duty in the same light?

Politics will not suffer by woman's entrance into it. If the political world has grown more pure in spite of the evil influences that have operated to debase it, it will not be polluted by the presence and participation of woman. Neither should we doubt that woman can be trusted with the ballot. She has proven herself equal to every responsibility imposed upon her. She will not fail society in this emergency. Let her vote! And may that discernment which has through the ages ever enabled her to quickly grasp great truths—made her "the last at the cross and the first at the sepulchre"—so direct her in the discharge of her political duties as to add new glories to her and through her still further bless our race. W. J. BRYAN.

The voters of Nebraska will, at the election next November, adopt or reject a proposed amendment extending suffrage to women on equal terms with men. As a citizen of that state it will be my duty to participate in the decision to be rendered at the polls. I have delayed expressing an opinion on this subject, partly because I have been seeking information, and partly because my time has been occupied with national questions upon which the entire country was acting; but now that the issue is presented in my state, I take my position. I shall support the amendment. I shall ask no political rights for myself that I am not willing to grant to my wife.

As man and woman are co-tenants of the earth and must work out their destiny together, the presumption is on the side of equality of treatment in all that pertains to their joint life and its opportunities. The burden of proof is on those who claim for one an advantage over the other in determining the conditions under which both shall live. This claim has not been established in the matter of suffrage. On the contrary, the objections raised to woman suffrage appear to me to be invalid, while the arguments advanced in support of the proposition are, in my judgment, convincing.

The first objection which I remember to have heard was that as woman can not bear arms she should not have a voice in deciding questions that might lead to war, or in enacting laws that might require an army for their enforcement. This argument is seldom offered now, for the reason that as civilization advances laws are obeyed because they are an expression of the public opinion, not merely because they have powder and lead behind them. And as we look back over the past, we may well wonder whether the peace movement might not have grown more rapidly than it has had woman, who suffers more than man from the results of war, been consulted before hostilities began.

Second. It is urged by some that woman's life is already full of care and that the addition of suffrage would either overburden her or turn her attention away from the duties of the home. The answer made to this is that the exercise of the franchise might result in a change of thought and occupation that would relieve the monotony of woman's work and give restful variety to her activities. And surely the home will not suffer if the mother, "the child's first teacher," is able to intelligently discuss with her family the science of government and the art of successfully administering it.

Third. Many well meaning men and women affirm that suffrage would work a harm to woman by lessening the respect in which she is held. This argument would have more weight had it not been employed against every proposition advanced in favor of the enlargement of woman's sphere. This objection was once raised to the higher education of woman, but it is no longer heard. The same objection was offered each time she sought admission to a new profession or ventured to enter some occupation previously barred to her, but each time the door has opened and woman, instead of suffering degradation, has risen.

These objections, however honestly advanced, have proven impotent to retard woman's progress. May not these fears, sincerely entertained by the opponents of woman's suffrage, be found to be as groundless as those that once forced the widow in Eastern India to ascend the funeral pyre or as those that now exclude Mohammedan women from the social benefits and responsibilities which the women of the Christian world now share?

And are not the second and third objections above stated refuted, to some extent at least, by the fact that in the states which have adopted woman's suffrage (and in the other nations that have adopted it) there is no agitation for a return to the system under which man has a monopoly of the right to vote? Is it not fair to assume that an effort would be made to correct the mistake if woman's suffrage had really failed to give satisfaction to the people where it has been tried?

If one were in doubt as to which side of the controversy to take, he would be justified in giving weight to the fact that organization and en-