

NOTICE.

Agents will please take notice that it is a great tax upon us to pay express charges upon small orders, and they will receive a great favor by remitting to us through money orders or registered letters.

"THE NEW CONSTITUTION."

Our neighbors "over the line" are very busily engaged just now in planning for their admission into the Union as the sovereign State of Washington. There are, among those who are agitating this measure, a few man's rights fossils, one of whom, under a cloak of piety as thin as it is flimsy, effervesces on the suffrage question in the Vancouver Independent, as follows:

"He (the pauper) ought not to be put down along with idiots and insane people, for what if a man is poor and out of luck? In this free country poverty is no crime. ... In this new country we can't well afford to disfranchise any white male citizens, although they be poor as Job's turkey." Then, by way of exhibiting his inconsistency, this brave defender of paupers' rights in a "free" country says he does not think "the good people of Washington Territory will allow so hurtful a measure as Woman Suffrage to be put in their constitution." The reason he gives for its "hurtfulness" being the hackneyed one that "the Creator never designed woman should occupy the same sphere with men." Now, although this rapid nonsense has been over and over again dispensed before the breath of logic, we will stoop to argue yet a little longer with the self-appointed arbiters of woman's sphere, who believe the Creator cannot manage the creatures of the purer sex unless the manacles of men's political power be upon them. If God never designed men and women for the same sphere, why did he put husbands, wives, brothers, and sisters in the same family? Did he not create men "male and female," giving to them, and not in her, dominion over all the earth?

The writer further informs us that women must be put down with idiots and insane persons because they are "differently organized from men." This startling announcement sounds strangely familiar, but it proves nothing, except the necessity that this different element should not be put down, but compose one-half of the body politic, in order to complete a perfect whole, as in the home, and in society.

The pauper has a different sphere from the farmer, but our writer thinks it would be unfair to disfranchise him for simply being "out of luck." Yet he sees no injustice in disfranchising woman for being, in his eyes, "out of luck" also. Poverty is no political crime, but, according to his logic, sex is a very heinous one, if it happens to belong to the feminine order. "A woman's life," he tells us, "should be devoted to home duties and the care of children, and not to the affairs of government."

The thousands of mothers of men who have devoted their lives to the rearing of large families to rise up and bless them in their present strike for liberty need not be reminded that rearing men is woman's work. But how are women to be "keepers at home" unless they have homes to keep? How many women does this same writer supply with homes, so they may have no need of other employment than keeping them?

He also takes a decided stand against taxing the churches, saying, "taxing them, if not like killing the goose that lays the golden egg, is at least like starving them very much." Now, we should like to hear from him about taxing women, whom he denies the right to vote. Would he be as consistent with them as he is liberal with the pauper who has no taxes to pay? He says that "woman has done a noble work for the whole race in her God-appointed sphere." We presume no sensible person will deny this, nor that it redounds to her glory that she has done so, but we submit the declaration that her man-appointed sphere has not been a success, nor never will be, so long as there is a "political rabble" to make laws for her to obey, which she is taxed without representation to sustain. Woman does not believe in "political rabbles," and one of her very first acts as a voter will be to disperse them by the very charm of her presence at the polls, as she now does at the church, the post office, the lecture-room, and in the home. Man's opinion to the contrary notwithstanding, we must reiterate the oft-repeated declaration that the Creator made no mistake when he saw and said that "it was not good for man to be alone." And if the new constitution of Washington shall be in harmony with God's law, we may depend upon it the women will be enfranchised in preference to the paupers whom they are taxed to support.

Godley's Lady's Book for March is on our table. It is a magnificent number, fully up to the many score that have preceded it, and superior in some respects to all of them. The mantle of L. A. Godley and Sarah Josepha Hale has fallen gracefully upon the shoulders of the present publishers. For them to sustain the high reputation of the world-renowned Lady's Books is itself a glory worth striving for.

Dr. J. W. Watts is out in a card in the Statesman, signed "Yamhill," as a candidate for governor. We heard of his spending a whole dollar for a newspaper subscription the other day in Portland, and this explains it. Candidates are apt to be liberal.

A terrific tornado, attended by loss of life, swept through Casey county, Kentucky, Saturday, March 24, doing frightful damage to that neighborhood.

AN HOUR WITH CORRESPONDENTS.

A. B. Phelps, the bachelor farmer, philosopher, and poet, from whose effusions we published some brief extracts a short time since, again favors us, this time with two poems, from one of which we abridge the following:

"About five years ago you may remember my bringing to your notice the death, by scalding, of a little child of Mrs. Grabel, living near Portland. On Monday, the 11th ult., the bereaved mother laid another little girl—victim of typhoid fever—in a grave beside her. I would not think of burdening the NEW NORTHWEST with mourning lines, but as I had brought the other little girl to your notice, I thought I would attempt it with this one. The last sad rites were unavoidably performed in a pouring rain, though the sun came out gloriously at the conclusion of the ceremonies, fit type of the life to come.

"Wreathed in the gloom of dire despair, With very faint and brain-lid face, A mother cries, in accents wild, 'O, death, give back my darling child. His tiny niche is on her brow! O, God of mercy, where art thou? On one who did this burden throw, For cross of Christ soothes deepest woe.'"

"Food mother, from thy deep distress Thou shalt arise, and live, to bless And recognize, as sweet carmes, This blow that seems so merciless; And thankfully, in accents mild, Will say to God, 'Thou hast my child.'"

"Unopposed by the stains of earth, As pure as death as at her birth, Escaping from a darker doom, Spared from the ill for us to come, Thy spirit child to heaven has flown, To vie with angels round the throne.

"Though limited her earthly span, It best accords with heavenly plan That she should die to give to thee, Through realms of God's immensity. And though, as child, she left your arms, You'll find her grown, with added charms, Wrought out in higher, wider spheres, To pay with smiles the old-time tears.

"And lo! beside you, ministering there, Her form transformed to angelic fair, The Man of Sorrows—he, the Christ, Of sinful man's apostle. There is a oneness in the skies Before which separation dies. And sweet the thought that time nor age Can mar our mutual heritage."

"To friendship's altar I have brought These lines as tribute, all unmeant, And feel that they are not unblest. In closing with the name of Christ."

Generally these tributes to the departed are of little value to any but the persons for whom they are intended, and it is usually considered in better taste to present them to the mourners, who are directly interested in the author's manuscript, than to publish; but the above is just now so applicable in hundreds of bereaved homes where this paper goes, and where the scourge of typhoid and diphtheria has been, that we have no doubt but that it will have many appreciative readers. The other poem will be considered next week.

The discussion awakened by the publication of "An Anonymous Opinion" a few weeks ago has created so much interest among the legal fraternity that the sensible lawyers are all destined to come over very soon to the fullest conception of the principles of individual liberty if the work goes on. By the way, we wish the lawyers were not too timid to allow us to publish their real names:

"Dear Madam: I have read with much interest the three consecutive communications in your valuable paper relative to the property rights of women, and I must say that the lady who had the last hearing has the best of the argument. I am almost afraid, in view of the lampooning you administered over the shrinking shoulders of your last legal critic, to venture an adverse opinion to anything you may choose to utter; but as you mercifully veil our names under the cloak of obscurity, thereby shielding us from the derision of those more fortunate and less brave, who have not dared to advise you, I will venture to say that, while I recognize the need of the freest and fullest individuality of woman in all things, I do not regard the ballot as worth anything at all approximate to the exertions you are making to secure it. I cannot see that the men of America, I mean the masses of them, are any better off with the ballot than they would be without it; and if they choose to withhold it from woman, what of it? She can sway them better without than with it. And, I think, if you will stand a while on the street corners, and watch the crowds go by, on a bright afternoon, you cannot help noting the fact that for every well-dressed man you may see at least five well-dressed women. Now, if the ballot would do so much to ameliorate the financial condition of woman, why has it not done more to better the financial condition of men? You will pardon me, but I think that by laying so much stress upon the ballot and its benefits, you only weaken your argument."

We do wonder if we're such a mortal terror to evil-doers as so many of them pretend? We looked in the mirror after reading the above effusion, and found, instead of the fierce-looking virago more than half expected to encounter, a remarkably mild-mannered and good-looking individual, who returned our inquiring gaze with a smile that was child-like and bland. But to the argument. Our friend, with the usual inconsistency of the advocates of man's rights, professes his belief in the principles we advocate, but denies us the only means of securing them. He is like the politician in our late "unpleasantness," who was "in favor of the Union, but opposed to the war." If, by some species of political ledgerman not necessary to indicate, he should find himself disfranchised, his belief in the power and benefit of the ballot would undergo an instantaneous revolution. The old fable of the farmer, the ox, and the lawyer is respectfully recalled for his consideration. He says women can sway men better without the ballot than with it. We sincerely demand the proof. The well-dressed women on the streets on a bright afternoon do not by any means portray the secret struggles of their lives. Servant girls, on a salary of

twelve dollars per month, can dress as well as the Collector of the Port. Dress isn't all one needs to make them independent, else the courtesan would be more best than the millionaire. If men with the ballot cannot do as well for themselves in the matter of appearances as women can without it, so much the worse for the men, and so much the more need of the ballot for women, that she may assist them. "If they choose to withhold the ballot, what of it?" Indeed, what right have they to withhold it? Who gave it into their hands, and by what usurpation of power do they claim for themselves the exclusive monopoly of a prerogative which they declare to be not worth the having?

But again the space allotted to this department is full. Other letters will be answered next week. Send them on, friends.

RADICAL LECTURE.

Mrs. Lake, who has been lecturing frequently in this city during the winter, delivered her closing address in Good Templars' Hall last Wednesday evening to a fair audience, subject, "The Liberty of Man, Woman, and Child." She is the most radical of the radical in expressing herself upon the social issues of the day, and has a few outspoken followers in this city. While there is no doubt in the mind of any analytical thinker but that motherhood should rule in all that pertains to the sexual relations, since woman only must bear its burdens, and upon her, almost alone, must rest the foundation of human destiny, we cannot agree with her implied idea that man should not be bound by law to protect and provide for his offspring, and their mother, even if he has to be made to do it at the end of a chain gang. We recall, at this writing, more than one overworked mother of a little band of helpless ones, whose husband and father has chosen to obey the freedom of the "higher law," and left them to their fate, while he followed his "affinity," who was too unscrupulous to bear the fruit of her new alliance, and thereby cheated the "child" the speaker tells us of out of its "liberty" of life and physical growth on the earth plane.

We admire the talent and bravery of Mrs. Lake. She is an able, eloquent appearing woman, grandly eloquent at times, and even fool-hardy in her daring, but the "liberty" she strikes for would bring only suffering and anarchy to the mothers whom man's changing fancies and children for newer attractions. Let woman seek, first of all, political emancipation; then, in time, will come financial independence, and after this the control of her person. Then, and not till then, can we expect liberty for man, woman, and child upon a basis where each will be bound to respect and honor the individual rights of all. We agree with Mrs. Lake that men and women have the right to think right, and the right to think wrong. Evil is naught but undeveloped good, and the doctrine of total depravity is a delusion and a snare. But we also believe in the mission of the churches, and recognize in them, as in all else we meet, whether of good or evil, an outgrowth of humanity's needs, from which, in time, is to be evolved the emancipation of the race from the thralldom of political, social, and religious bigotry. As an eloquent and few can surpass Mrs. Lake. She can make a common-place poem strike you grandly, by bringing beauties to the light which before had been hidden. Let her go on. Let her shake up the dry bones of fossilized thought and waken the people to agitation. This, evidently, is her mission. Meanwhile, be it ours to patiently hew away at the foundation of all human liberty, that the creations of her soaring fancy may in time have a resting-place upon the rock of enduring ages.

THE USURPER.

A blatant foreigner, of excessive literary pretensions, who cannot speak one word of intelligible English, was introduced by a gentleman to a representative of the NEW NORTHWEST a few days since, and upon learning that the paper advocated woman's enfranchisement, he flew into a rage and spluttered his objections and anathemas against the rights of American women to a voice in the laws made by the aristocracy of sex in a most ridiculous and insulting manner. Without the remotest idea of what constitutes liberty and justice in America, he places the ruthless heel of his despotic ignorance upon the necks of the thousands of women who teach the science of government to the rising generation of American voters, and they can only protest against such usurpation of power in vain. To compel the enlightened women of this so-called Republic to bow the neck to the usurping power of the scum of European dynasties is only one of the many indignities to which the wives of American voters are constantly compelled to submit. The voter, white or colored, who does not scorn such dire usurpation of power and privilege, and do all in his might to overthrow it, deserves personal disfranchisement.

Woman's Words, published monthly in Philadelphia by Mrs. Juan Lewis, has come out as radically in its demand for the ballot for woman as the NEW NORTHWEST has ever been. The March number contains a portrait and sketch of the life work of Sarah Andrews Spencer, which every lady in the land should possess. Woman's Words is full to the brim of excellent reading matter. The February number closes an admirable serial entitled "True to Her," by Col. Lewis, which has met with such success as to induce the publication of another which will immediately follow. "Link by Link" promises equally well with the former story. Address, with \$1 00, Mrs. Juan Lewis, 625 Walnut street.

The discussion of the future state of the wicked is the burning question of the hour.

"YOURS TRULY" ON DRESS AND DRUGGERY, AND SO FORTH.

The other day, as Yours Truly was busily engaged in repainting the pots and pans for her numerous house plants, preparatory to spring house cleaning, Jim came home from the post office, bringing a package of newspapers, which came near going unred and unnoticed under the new rag carpet in the governor's room; for he it known, Mrs. D., Yours Truly has been chief cook and servant of everybody at Hill Center Grange during the past fortnight, or ever since A. C. Edmunds was out in this region organizing a greenback and anti-Chinese party.

"This is a white man's government, and I'll have no Chinaman around these premises, cheating white folks out of their honest dues," said the governor. And to appease his patriotic soul, the demand for Ah Gun's removal was met with a show of mock approval by his husband, Jim. But just how the dismissal of the heathen in question was to assist the impetuous white men who would rather lie in jail than do Ah Gun's work is a mystery to be solved by able politicians than Yours Truly.

As might have been expected, the entire labor hitherto performed by our Mongolian has fallen from his shoulders upon the not over able ones of the undersigned, who was finishing up a day's work of the roughest possible description by the job of painting above mentioned, when her eye fell upon one of the numerous "patent outsiders" in the newspapers that Jim had tumbled in a heap on the floor beside her.

Yours Truly, than whom a naturally more dainty and dressy girl of the period could not have been found a year ago, and who loves good clothes as well now as she ever did, was arrayed at the time alluded to in a wrapper very much the worse for both wear and dirt. Who ever saw a house painter in nice, clean, and inviting apparel? Did any one ever behold a chimney sweep, boot-black, laundryman, carpet cleaner, or hood-carrier in tidy array during the closing hours of a long day's work? But here's what that paper said, and surely Jim laid it beside Yours Truly, right side up, on purpose to draw her attention to it as if by accident. There's no sort of cunning or connivance at anything ever known among the men, however:

"It is too true that ladies are apt to fall into the habit of neglecting home attire," said that patent outside, while Yours Truly shrugged her shoulders and read on. "Consideration of their own pleasure, as well as for those around them, ought to prompt them to be always neatly dressed."

Yours Truly got mad! Of course angry would be the better word, or indignation the best, because most dignified, but mad is the only term that will express it. "Always neatly dressed," indeed! Why, Mrs. D., but—pshaw! What's the use of talking? Does any one suppose the wives and daughters of the political patriots who are dismissing the Chinamen "to keep the money in the country" for laboring (?) men are making badly-dressed drudges of themselves for fun?

"Jim, see here," said Yours Truly, pointing with her soiled finger to a sentence which ran like this, "I do not believe that there is one man in a thousand and so lacking in observation that the dress of his wife, whether tidy or opposite, escapes his notice." "Is that true, Jim?"

"Of course it is!"

"And then you ought to have seen that lofty look of wounded superiority, Mrs. D."

"And do you like me better in clean calico, with white neck-tie and linen collar, and nicely-arranged hair and white apron, than you do as I now am?"

"Certainly!"

"And then, Mrs. D., you should have seen that other lofty look."

"Then, Jim, see here! I care more for your love than for anything else in the wide, wide world." Jim looked the very picture of self-important pomposity now.

"I care for your love, not for your own sake, wholly, for I'm no angel, but because your love makes me happy, and I'm selfish enough to want to be both comfortable and happy. I am not comfortable in these shabby habiliments, because they are no more natural to me than they would be to a canary bird. But I cannot do a Chinaman's roughest work in tidy clothing any more than you could keep yourself neat when digging ditches—provided you dug them, which you haven't undertaken yet, though you had fifty Chinames at the beaver dam farm. But that was before you and the governor wanted Dick to run for office."

"Well?"

"I'm not a patriot, Jim Johnson!"

"There! Mrs. D., Yours Truly did not mean to enlighten your readers with Jim's surname, but you have it, so let it go."

"I'm not a patriot. I can't hold office, and I've no interest in a country that denies me a voice in making its laws; and I'm going to have my Chinaman back in the kitchen if Dick never gets his clutches on the public crib while life lasts! I want to be comfortable and happy. I want you to love me, because your love makes me contented. Your indifference drives me distracted. Of what avail is your love to me if you never express it? And in what plight am I to charm you if I must work from dawn till darkest night at everything dirty and disagreeable, while you ride over the farm with your boots blacked, and give orders with your gloves on? Try my work for a week, Jim Johnson! But I might as well tell you to fly to the moon, or maketalking. You wouldn't do the work in a week about this house that I have had to do this very day."

Jim was astonished and confounded, the dear fellow. We'd been married a year, and he'd always been so good to

assist me when we had a Chinaman, and so thoughtful about everything till he became so excited over the working men's party that he fancied himself faultless.

"I mean what I say, Jim Johnson. And to prove to you that I'm in earnest, I will leave the supper you are waiting for to take care of itself so I can have the opportunity to appear at table neatly dressed."

Yours Truly was good as her word. In half an hour she sauntered into the dining-room, her hair frizzed and adorned with a tea rose, and her neat calico dress and dimity apron set off with delicate pink and blue ribbons. Jim, the darling, was red as a boiled lobster; but supper was ready, and he gave her a look of proud satisfaction as she dropped into her accustomed seat at the head of the table, which look vastly enhanced the happiness of YOURS TRULY.

P. S. We have the Chinaman back now. He cooks and churns and washes and scrubs and washes dishes, and Yours Truly is doing up any amount of spring sewing and light housework, in which she can keep herself always neatly dressed. The governor has quit the working men and returned to Democracy. Jim vows he'll vote the Republican ticket, and Dick don't know what to do. *Certe he won't work; but where's the "working man" that will?*

FOREIGN NEWS.

A special dated at Constantinople announces the arrival of ex-President Grant.

A special Vienna dispatch asserts that two divisions of Austrians will enter Bosnia in about ten days.

Layard, the British minister at Constantinople, gave a *soiree* at that place recently in honor of General Grant.

Yellow fever again prevails at Rio Janeiro. Deaths from the disease the first two weeks of February number forty-five.

The Governor of the Dardanelles has been ordered to allow no more men-of-war of any description to enter the Sea of Marmora.

It is stated that the Russians will begin to leave Roumelia immediately, some embarking at Pera, and others at San Stefano.

The work of removing obstructions from the Danube has commenced. It is expected the river will be open to navigation in a fortnight.

A Vienna dispatch says that the willingness of Russia to grant concessions to Austria arises from the fact that the princes of Roumania and Servia have resolved to accept Austria's protection, if it is obtainable.

The typhus is increasing rapidly among the Russians in Roumania. All the Roumanian railway carriages are infected. It is absolutely necessary for the army in Turkey to return by sea, and not through Roumania.

A Constantinople dispatch of March 3d says: "The treaty of peace has been signed. Grand Duke Nicholas announced the fact to the soldiers at the review at San Stefano to-day. Russia has abandoned her claim on the Egyptian and Bulgarian tributaries."

A Constantinople dispatch of March 5th says: "Foreign ambassadors have not yet received the text of the treaty. They are not certain whether it is definitive. It is understood, however, that the exchange of ratifications within a fortnight is obligatory."

St. Petersburg and Pera correspondents confirm the report that the treaty has been signed. At St. Petersburg the enthusiasm over the news was almost uncontrolled. There was an immense crowd before the palace shouting and singing, "God save the Czar." The Pera correspondent says that the treaty of peace was signed Saturday.

Intelligence comes from San Stefano that General Ignatieff and the special Turkish ambassador were to leave for St. Petersburg immediately after the signing of the preliminaries of peace. It is thought that a special ambassador will convey the Sultan's desire for the restoration of diplomatic relations, or be charged to conduct negotiations for drafting a definitive treaty, preliminaries only having so far been signed.

A Pera correspondent writes: "By giving up the hostile European provinces, at the same time receiving tribute from them, or saddling them with a portion of the national debt, and concentrating Mussulmans in the territory contiguous to Constantinople, and making the concentration required by territorial concessions in Asia Minor, the Turks will create a new Ottoman power ten times stronger than when it was spread over a vast, badly organized, and hostile territory."

The Austrian newspapers are dissatisfied with the peace conditions, as far as they are known. They express the opinion that the most difficult phase of the crisis is yet to be passed. They say nobody wishes to disturb the great result of the war, the liberation of the Christians, but while the demands calculated to lead to a conflict with England have been dropped by Russia, a similar consideration has not been shown for Austria. It is stated Count Andrassy will make a full exposition of his policy to the delegations, which will probably meet.

A couple were married in Portland last week who had to borrow clothes for the bridegroom for the occasion. The girl has plenty of clothes—while they last—but, now that she has engaged herself as a life-long servant to the groom, without wages, where the next are to come from is a conundrum.

A girl came to Walla Walla by stage from the East to be married to a Granger, but there were sixty dollars charges for freightage by her stage from Kelton, and the groom-to-be was long kept in waiting because he hadn't money enough to get her out of "soak."

EQUALITY OF CITIZENSHIP.

NUMBER TWO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW NORTHWEST:

Before proceeding further, I will just say that there are two kinds of free government, democratic and republican. A democratic is a free government, in which the people exercise the sovereign power in mass, each individual participating in all public affairs. A republican is a representative government wherein the people, by virtue of inherent right, possessing the supreme power, delegate a portion of that power to representatives of their own choosing. These representatives, as such, do not possess supreme power; the power they possess is delegated to them by the people, and to the people they must give account. They are, so to speak, servants of the people, executing their will; and cannot transcend their delegated powers without becoming usurpers, when the government would no longer be a free government, but a despotism. I have made this digression for the benefit of those who do not fully understand the machinery of the United States government, and will now return to our subject.

This government, as I have said, was formed by a free and independent people, with no more concessions of natural rights on the part of one individual than on that of another, and no more on the part of all combined than was necessary for the better security of those that were reserved. And, as it is necessary to adopt some plan by which the will of the sovereign people might be known and executed with the least possible trouble, and with the greatest security to their rights, it was decided to adopt a Federal Constitution, uniting the people of all the States into one nation for all national purposes, the same as a State Constitution unites the people of one State for municipal purposes; the one being a declaration of the sovereign will of all the people of the United States, and the other of that portion of the same people constituting one State. This Constitution being the written will of the sovereign people, in relation to the forms and powers of government, proceeding from them in their supreme capacity, can be changed, amended, or abolished only by them, while to their representatives it is a supreme and inviolable law, for this reason: Neither Congress nor any of the States, not even the Supreme Court of the United States, can go beyond the powers delegated to them by this Constitution. We have now shown you how and why this Constitution was made. You can easily see that it was not from the necessities nor for the benefit of a part of the people (the men), but from the necessities and for the benefit of all the people of the United States, both male and female.

We have also seen that in forming the government, and in the drawing up of the Constitution, great care was taken to secure to all the people the greatest amount of liberty compatible with a civil government. That you may know that we do not state the case too strongly, we will refer you to Walker's American Law, part 2d, lecture 5th, "On the relations of the States." He says: "The Federal government (the word federal signifies mutual agreement) is not a league of the State governments, but emanates from and expresses the sovereign will of all the people of the United States in their original and supreme capacity." So, also, Judge Story, of the Supreme Court, in rendering a decision before the court, says: "The Constitution of the United States was ordained and established, not by the States in their sovereign capacities, but emphatically as the preamble to the Constitution declares; by the people of the United States." We will refer you to but one more authority on this point, and that is the Constitution itself. It declares its origin in these words: "We, the people of the United States, do ordain and establish this Constitution." Thus you see that the government was established by the people, for the people. Now, as governments have nothing to do with persons except in the capacity of citizens, we will ask, 1st, Does the Constitution of the United States require that the citizen shall be of the masculine gender? 2d, What right has a citizen to a voice in the government? 3d, Why are the constitutional rights of each citizen equal? I think I have answered the last two questions fully. It only remains for me to show you that the term citizen embraces both sexes.

We will assume, and without fear of contradiction, that at the time of the formation of our government, the people of our country were, as now, composed of men and women, and that prior to the adoption of the Constitution were all alike possessed of the same natural rights. In examining the Constitution we can find no clause where woman yielded up any more of her natural rights than man did of his; neither can we find where it says that man shall be possessed of certain rights, from which woman is to be excluded. There is no distinction made between the sexes. Indeed, woman no more than man is spoken of in any other capacity than that of citizen, for the reason that I before stated, that a free government has only to do with its subjects as citizens. No sex is, therefore, recognized in the word citizen; it embraces both. If the word citizen signified only the masculine portion of our people, where would be the use of our State Constitutions restricting the right of suffrage to their male citizens. Neither would it be proper for the Constitution of the United States to read, "We, the people," but, "We, the men." If there were no female citizens, there would be no necessity for the phrase, "male citizen." The very phrase, "male citizen," conveys to our minds the idea that there are also female citizens. It is plain, then, that the term citizen includes both sexes.

If these premises and conclusions which I have laid before you are correct, and no one can gainsay them, then the clause contained in the 2d section

of article 4th, of the Constitution of the United States, that "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States" applies to all citizens alike, both male and female. There can be no question, then, but that, from the very nature of our government, and from the original constitution, independent of the amendments, both men and women are alike included in the word citizen. Had there never been a Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution, woman, equally with man, would be entitled to a voice in the government. In other words, she would have a right to vote.

MARY OLNEY BROWN.

WORK FOR EVERYBODY.

Circulate petitions for a 16th Amendment, to enfranchise the women, not of one State alone, but of all the States and Territories. Woman's right to a voice in the government under which she lives is a natural right, and must be guaranteed to her by the Federal Constitution. Now is our time to knock at the doors of Congress and plant this right deep in the fundamental law of the land.

Petitions for a Sixteenth Amendment, for woman's enfranchisement, from 30,000 United States citizens, from twenty-two States, have been presented in open House and Senate by 31 Representatives and 29 Senators since January 19, 1877. The friends of Woman Suffrage in both houses, who intend to advocate the Amendment in the new Congress, desire its friends to sustain them by mammoth petitions from every quarter. Circulate this petition through the autumn and winter up to January 29, 1878. Obtain the names of all who have signed similar petitions to the present Congress, and as many more as possible. Head the petitions with such well-known names as you wish to have appear in the Congressional Record. Fill the blanks for State, town, and county, that members may refer to their own districts in presenting petitions. Have all the names signed plainly with ink on two copies of the petition, one for the House, and one for the Senate. Ask each signer to remit at least ten cents to the Treasurer of the National Woman Suffrage Association, Mrs. Ellen E. Sargent, No. 1,733 De Sales street, Washington, D. C., to defray expenses of classification for presentation to the 45th Congress. Every name received before December 1, 1877, will be classified with its appropriate State and county petitions, and presented by the appropriate Representative and Senator. Send with the petition name and post office address of each one who obtains signatures, so the officers may know the workers.

Cut this out, and paste it at the head of a sheet of paper and go to work. Put the names of men on the right, and women on the left of your petition, and trace every name carefully in ink:

PETITION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

To the Senate and House of Representatives, in Congress assembled:—The undersigned, citizens of the United States, residents of the State of _____, county of _____, town of _____, earnestly pray your honorable body to adopt measures for so amending the Constitution as to prohibit the several States from disfranchising United States citizens on account of sex.

RECENT EVENTS.

Secretary Sherman is disappointing his critics by actively preparing to put the silver act in full operation.

The funeral services of the late Senator Wade, at Jefferson, Ohio, were simple, short, and largely attended by friends of the deceased.

The Times' Washington special says that several Senators think they have satisfied the demands of their constituents, at least for this session, and that free coinage will not have a two-thirds vote.

Articles of impeachment having been presented by the House, the Senate March 5th organized as a court of impeachment for the trial of Judge Sherman Page of the tenth district for official misconduct.

The silver bill was sent to the Department of State March 1st by the Speaker of the House of Representatives with the endorsements of the clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate to the effect that the bill had passed, notwithstanding the veto.

The House, at 1:30 P. M. last Thursday, February 28th, passed the silver bill over the President's veto by a vote of one hundred and ninety-six against seventy-three. The bill was immediately sent to the Senate, and was passed by that body by a vote of forty-six to nineteen.

It may be stated that our government will extend a formal recognition to the government of Diaz at an early date. Diaz will make no pledge or stipulation, but extensive correspondence has developed an earnest desire on his part for friendly relations and for avoiding all cause of complaint.

A fever, supposed to be the typhoid, has broken out in the Institute for the deaf and dumb at Belleville, Ontario. Four pupils have died within a few days, and ten or fifteen others are prostrated. The Ontario government has ordered an inquiry into the cause of the epidemic, which is supposed to be impure water.

A Rawlins, Wyoming, dispatch of March 2d says: "A letter received here from reliable parties on Snake River says the Ute Indians are acting in a very defiant manner. They have already killed one hundred and twenty-five head of cattle, and threaten to go on the war path when grass comes. A letter from Bear River states that the people are greatly excited, and are preparing places of safety for the women and children."