

The New Northwest.

FREE SPEECH, FREE PRESS, FREE PEOPLE.

VOLUME X.—NO. 6.

PORTLAND, OREGON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1880.

PER YEAR—\$3 00.

A FINAL VICTORY.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RECONSIDERS THE VOTE ON THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE RESOLUTION AND PASSES IT BY A LEGAL MAJORITY.

A GRAND RATIFICATION RECEPTION TO BE ACCORDED THE MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES OF THE LEGISLATURE IN SALEM TO-NIGHT BY THE WOMEN OF OREGON.

The NEW NORTHWEST is happy to announce that the suspense into which thousands of its readers were thrown last week by the uncertainty of the final result of the pending action of the House of Representatives on the Woman Suffrage Resolution was only temporary; and, as everything that is publicly said in reference to the woman movement is eagerly sought for by the reading world, we append a synopsis of the entire proceedings, well knowing that our readers are expecting it.

The time set for special consideration of Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 having arrived, Hon. Lee Laughlin, Representative from Yamhill, moved that the House concur. Two or three gentlemen accepted the motion.

Mr. Lawrence, of Baker, moved that Mrs. Duniway be invited to address the House, time unlimited; unanimously carried.

Mrs. Duniway responded briefly, saying she was deeply thankful to the honorable gentlemen for their high compliment in extending the invitation, which was more than she had asked for or expected. But, realizing, as she did, that this resolution had been already discussed in the hearing of the Representatives; feeling, as she did, that she was among friends, who only wished to do right; and knowing, as did all present, that this was not the time or place to present an argument upon a question that must necessarily go before the people for final decision, she preferred to rest the case with the wisdom and intelligence of representatives, feeling sure that they would not be afraid to trust the voice of the voters of Oregon upon it, which was all the women of the State were asking.

Mr. Laughlin made a masterly speech in favor of the resolution. His argument upon the right of the people, at all times, to alter, amend or abolish the Constitution, was calm, deliberate and logical. He spoke with deep earnestness, and had evidently investigated the subject thoroughly. The address made a profound impression upon the large assembly that had gathered to hear the discussion, and was received by a majority of the Representatives with evident favor.

Mr. Barrett, of Washington, stated his willingness that the question should be submitted to a vote of the people, but said he was not in favor of Woman Suffrage—was afraid it would not tend to elevate society to let women vote. He admitted the corrupting influences of politics, but was evidently unable to see the fact that this very admission naturally suggested the remedy which women were seeking to administer.

Mr. Minto, of Marion, said the question should be submitted to the people, both men and women—was afraid that men alone would not vote for Woman Suffrage. The women of New Jersey had voted until 1846. New Jersey was a little State, but she had taught the Nation that the votes of women would not destroy a republican form of government nor abolish the family and social relations. There are existing laws and customs in so-called civilized society, growing out of the idea of man's ownership in woman, that nothing but the recognition of woman's individuality through the ballot can correct. The aboriginal father who sells his daughter in marriage for a pair of blankets or a pony is only different in degree from the cultured Englishman who sells his daughter in like manner for a title, or the proud American who barter away his tenderly reared and carefully educated girl for a marriage settlement. The idea that man is the head of the family is a mistake. It is a relic of barbarism. The religion of Jesus does away with the head of the family nonsense. It is a shame and a disgrace to the American Government that it welcomes to the ballot-box the entire masculine riff-raff of native and foreign birth, no matter how brutal or ignorant, and compels the wives and mothers of intelligent men to bow in submission to the laws of their making.

Mr. Yates, of Multnomah, said that he had been a member of the Wyoming Legislature that enfranchised that Territory's women; that he had watched the result of that action with the deepest interest, and was proud to testify to its beneficence; that he had seen order grow up out of confusion in Wyoming through the votes of women, aided by the votes of the better classes of men. The tribute this gentleman paid to his mother was grandly eloquent and touchingly beautiful.

Dr. Plummer, of Multnomah, made a logical,

practical and in every way favorable speech in advocacy of the resolution.

Mr. Galloway, of Yamhill, thought there was no doubt of the constitutionality of the resolution. He hoped the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Barrett) would get married and learn as much on this woman question and profit by it as much in the next six years as he had in the past six. He had voted against this resolution in '74; but six years' experience with an able and excellent wife had cured him of the fear that had beset him in the past, when he had absurdly imagined that the ballot in woman's hand would work a revolution in natural laws. A few years ago it was thought that women were incapable of mastering the higher branches of education. The doors of colleges were locked against them, and the professions were considered beyond their intelligence or power to grasp. Nobody adheres to any such fallacy now. And, if women are capable of mounting the highest pinnacles of thought and searching through the profoundest of the professions with an intuition all their own, it is folly for men to attempt to limit their opportunities or set bounds to their inalienable rights.

Mr. Wadsworth, of Benton, said the House was the happiest convention he had ever seen. There seemed to be no hen-pecked husbands present.

Mr. Zumwalt, of Lane, was afraid of giving away one-half of our [men's] rights. He thought man was the head of the family, and was evidently afraid that the will of Omnipotence would be thwarted by the votes of women if they were allowed to use the ballot. It must have been a relief to God to discover so able a defender in the Oregon House of Representatives.

Mr. Smith, of Jackson, was afraid that seven men and five women might be caught on a jury, and predicted awful consequences.

Mr. Yates rebuked the Representative from Jackson in high-toned, moral and befitting language.

Mr. Taylor, of Clatsop, made an able argument in favor of the resolution. His chances for matrimony are even better here than at Astoria, where he is a prime favorite among the best young ladies in the city by the sea.

Mr. Blevans, of Union, was afraid women would soon discover their power over men if they had the ballot. He was evidently determined not to be "intimidated" by "brains."

Mr. Thompson, of Lane, rung the changes on the J. D. Lee argument. Like the Senator from Polk, he was afraid women would be legislated out of motherhood if permitted to vote. The arduous labors of legislation were too heavy for them. Was in favor of giving them *privileges*, but was evidently unable to comprehend the principle of inalienable rights, as applied to the mothers of the race. Thought the laws of Nature would be violated; thought too much of women, etc., etc. Expatiated on the "filthy pool," but failed to see that such a pool ought to be cleansed. Seemed not to realize that the cleansing work of the moral and physical world has always been the work of women, and did not see that he was cutting off the head of his own argument by admitting that man, in a hundred years of one-sided effort in keeping bachelors' hall, had made a bad mess of the National housekeeping.

Mr. Lawrence, of Baker, announced his support of the resolution from principle. He said God's best gift to man was woman. Let her be given the power to act as his companion in politics, and their united efforts will cleanse the "filthy pool." Woman will go to the polls with her husband, but she will not descend to the primary struggles of pot-houses and ward meetings, for her influence will purify these pestilential elements, and in time we shall have no more of them.

Mr. Chamberlain, of Linn, said he would vote for the resolution now, but against when it came before the people.

Mr. Shelton, of Linn, was determined in opposition, now and all the time; was afraid to vote for it, on account of his wife, who was opposed to Woman Suffrage, and had all the rights she wanted. His blue ribbon club was opposed to it, also. His struggle against destiny was short but frantic.

Somebody moved to table the resolution; lost. The previous question was ordered.

Mr. Lawrence moved a call of the House. The doors were closed and absentees sent for. Smith, of Jackson, moved to adjourn; lost. Galloway moved that further call of the House be dispensed with; carried.

The vote stood 28 for and 25 against; necessary to a choice, 31.

Then came the tug of war. A motion to reconsider the vote was the next thought of the Woman Suffragists; but, as those who voted against were the only members who could move to reconsider, the resolution encountered a dead-lock, and the opponents of the measure were jubilant.

Thursday was spent without further action. Mr. Shelton, of the negative, promised to move

the question, but a little intimidation from Bourbon quarters frightened him, and he went squarely back on his word.

In the meantime, the friends of the resolution were untiring in their vigilance. The subject was also canvassed freely by the lobby, and many distinguished gentlemen took active part.

Mr. Wilbur, of Clackamas, consented to offer the motion. Mr. Smith, of Jackson, agreed to second. The critical moment came. Notices of bills, messages from the Senate, and motions to take up certain other measures, were sprung upon Mr. Speaker with great rapidity. Much confusion ensued.

Mr. Wilbur made several ineffectual attempts to get the floor, but finally succeeded.

The vote to reconsider stood 37 for and 16 against.

Mr. Ford, of Marion, tried hard to foist another measure upon the House, but was declared out of order.

The resolution was carried by the following vote:

Ayes—Barrett, Beebe, Biles, Brockway, Caldwell, Chamberlain, Collard, Craig, Dawson, Durham, Ford, Galloway, Geer, Laughlin, Lawrence, Meyer, Minto, Montgomery, Parker, Patterson of Polk, Patterson of Washington, Paul, Plummer, Sharp, Smith of Washington, Spencer, Stearns, Taylor, Wadsworth, Will, Wilson, Yates—32.

Noes—Barnard, Bird, Blevans, Harpole, Hodgkins, Kelly of Multnomah, Kelly of Umatilla, Morris, Newman, Pipes, Prosser, Rinehart, Savage, Schooling, Scott, Shelton, Smith of Jackson, Smith of Marion, Stanley, Thompson, Tuttle, Waggoner, Wallace, Wilbur, Mr. Speaker—25.

Even the opponents of the measure pleasantly accepted the result.

The ladies of Salem, who had been quietly awaiting the final action of the Legislature, began immediate preparation for a grand ratification reception, to be given in Reed's Opera House on this (Thursday) evening. Ladies and gentlemen from all parts of the State are invited to participate, and the prospects are favorable for a grand good time. The ladies have proclaimed general amnesty to all opponents, and every member of both Houses will be cordially welcomed, as well as the general public.

A DOUGLAS DEMOCRAT

GIVES CALIFORNIA'S LADY LAWYER HIS REASONS FOR DENYING THAT THE REPUBLICANS, AS A PARTY, SAVED THE UNION.

POMEROY, W. T., October 9, 1880.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW NORTHWEST: Permit me to submit to your intelligent readers this concluding rejoinder to Clara S. Foltz's reply of September 21st. I will present a few facts for her benefit and that of your readers.

The lady must know that just as soon as the President-elect takes the oath of office he ceases to be a partisan—is the President of the whole people, individually and collectively, and all his acts, both civil and military, are done for and in the name of the whole people; hence the absurdity and sophistry of the claim set up by the Republicans that they, as a party, saved the Union.

Mr. Lincoln's popular vote in 1860 was 1,866,352; opposing candidates', 2,810,501. Although Mr. Lincoln was duly elected, he lacked nearly 1,000,000 votes of having a popular majority. The whole number of volunteers enlisted during the war was 2,678,967. Now, does anyone suppose that the 1,866,352 voters for Mr. Lincoln turned out 2,678,967 volunteers, when probably not over two-thirds of his voters entered the army? Illinois in 1860 cast 172,161 votes for Mr. Lincoln, and sent 259,147 troops to the field, probably about three-fourths enlisted. In the State of Missouri Mr. Lincoln received a few votes over 17,000, and that State sent over 100,000 men to the Union army. What think you, kind reader, of the boast of the Republican party that it saved the Union? Where would the Union be to-day if the Democratic party had withheld its support?

Every person of reasonable intelligence that has measured three-score years knows that the people of the North and the South were educated to hate each other; and it is equally certain that political demagogues and fanatics combined in the formation of that party which, as soon as it acquired sufficient strength, bade defiance to all law and the Constitution by the passage of personal liberty bills and open resistance to the laws of the United States. Call this party by any name you may, but "memory has not failed nor history all been burned" in relation to its legitimate fruit, the Kansas war, in which John Brown figured so conspicuously, his last adventure in the West being to cross into Missouri about Weston, capture ten negroes by killing one man, crossing back into Kansas, and conveying them in covered wagons up the Missouri River and crossing over

into Iowa. His next appearance was at Harper's Ferry, inciting the slaves to rise en masse and assert their own freedom. I forbear to mention the murder of women and children contemplated. That crusading party held that "the Constitution was a league with death and a covenant with hell," and claimed to be actuated and justified by a higher law than the Constitution, quieting their consciences with the revolutionary logic that slavery was an evil and the end justified the means—a doctrine that justifies a mob in knocking down a sheriff, forcing the door of the jail, taking thence the accused, and hanging them without judge or jury; a doctrine that utterly disqualifies its advocate to sit as a juror in any case.

The patriotic and constitutionally loyal men of the North, irrespective of party, seeing the exasperated condition of the South by the reckless crusade of fanaticism that bade defiance to all law, convened at Chicago and reconstructed the Republican party by inserting the fourth article, but for which Mr. Douglas would have been triumphantly elected. It reads:

That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

Every person that has a correct knowledge of the history of these parties must know that if the Republican party had maintained the doctrine of this plank from its first formation, there would have been no war—no "attempt to shoot this Nation to death." But—alas for our country!—the remedy came too late. The incendiary had already fired the temple of Liberty, and it yet remains to be seen whether it will ever be successfully extinguished; for, at Mr. Lincoln's death, to all appearances untimely, this plank dropped out of the Republican platform, and in its place was inserted, practically, the collection of the ballot by the bayonet and the political enslavement of the freedmen by the notoriously false teaching that they owed their freedom to the Republican party, and unless they sustained it they would be re-enslaved—their refusal to do so in many instances subjecting them to their unqualified execration.

Will the kind readers note the remarkable coincidence of the fourth article of the Lincoln and the second and fourth of the Democratic platforms? Will not the American people, on the second of November next, ignore all sectional prejudice and former party ties; and plant their feet upon these dual planks, broad enough and strong enough to hold up the Nation?—that the different members of the Union, one and inseparable under the Constitution, may henceforth have no other contention than that noble emulation of who can best work and who can best agree?

A. S. HUGHES.

We have just received a new book, entitled "Mars Revealed, or Seven Days in the Spirit World." Not having had the time to read it, and the publishers desiring it to be noticed, we copy a writer's opinion of it: "It fills a void which has long been felt in the hearts of all who think of and who have loved ones in the spirit land. It is a wonderful and fascinating book—wonderful in its conception, in its plan and in its execution; and it is fascinating in its interest, in its doctrines and in its descriptions. It is rich in imagery, perfect in morals, delicious, reasonable and satisfying in religion, and is a constant succession of most agreeable surprises. For its scope it is the most perfect collection of great and pure thoughts, and gems of expression, that I ever saw in prose, and its mild and incisive words cut in pieces and divide many favorite bigotries of the age, like a double and keen-edged Damascus blade." The book contains over 200 large (8 mc.) pages, and is published by A. L. Bancroft & Co., of San Francisco, in beautifully embossed cloth, at \$2.50 per copy; but a large discount will be allowed on all orders for 100 copies or more. Orders will be taken for the book by Mrs. Lucy L. Browne, 224 First street, corner Salmon, Portland, Or., who is agent for the book in Oregon and Washington.

Equality in disfranchisement relieves its utter misery to a lady correspondent of the *Wheeling (West Virginia) Leader*, who gives her reason for liking Washington, D. C., as follows: "Its citizens are disfranchised, and I felt while there that in one place, at least, in the world, was a woman as good as man, and her influence in the ballot-box was as great as that of the biggest man in town."

At Americus, Ga., a young man went to his wedding considerably under the influence of liquor, when the about-to-be bride refused to proceed farther, and announced the engagement canceled.