

misery now brooding all around him, which has produced these "Letters on the Laws of Work." And there surely is no wisdom or statesmanship in the government of this country—the *Tribune's* own statement as to its present poverty and destitution being witness—that entitles it to pass so hasty and severe a judgment on Mr. Ruakin. Probably no one knows better than the *Tribune* that every real benefactor of the race has been accounted by those he would bless as a dreamer, a madman, or a devil.

The United States claim to be the freest and best governed people in the world. In material resources no country can compare with them. It has long been their boast that they could feed and clothe easily the present population of the globe. And now it is seen that they cannot even maintain decently their own household. No one man or woman in the nation, no one family, is so rich proportionably as is the nation as a whole. What would be thought of the Astors or Vanderbilts if, with all their wealth, there were actual starvation in their kitchens among the lowest menials, not to speak of the children of the family? And the illustration might be extended still farther. Those who claim to know all about it, say the earth is more than sixty centuries old. How old will it have to be, with all its laws and religion, before it can retire from business—on not a competence merely, as most men desire, but on an independent fortune, every son and daughter provided for and every reasonable want and wish abundantly supplied—its sordid lust and love of gain forever quenched?

Those last words from the *Tribune* cover a frightful secret, did the world but know it. The old slaveholders kept the mean whites around them, permitting them to live on them much like dogs or beasts of prey, only for their votes once a year. In every post and place where men are employed by the government—men (not women, be it known) are retained, amounting in all to many thousands, and often on high salaries, only for their votes, as the planters permitted, tolerated the poor whites; and the honest, toiling men and women must drudge and starve to pay them. What is this but taking the children's bread and casting it to the dogs?

P. P.

THE CROWN OF EARLY WOMANHOOD.

BY REV. DR. CHAPIN.

LAST Sunday evening Rev. E. H. CHAPIN delivered an earnest and eloquent discourse on "The Crown of Early Womanhood." In speaking of the true development of woman, he uttered an appeal for her rights, substantially as follows:

The condition of obligation and, the condition of rights are inseparable. Woman is bound to develop her nature to the utmost possible capacity; but, in order to do this, she must have room and opportunity. Here is the true force of all the arguments in our day, on behalf of woman. Her rights imply her obligations; her obligations compel her to demand her rights. But, in fact, her claim is not for woman's rights, but for human rights. As a human being, she has a right to develop herself to the utmost possible capacity. She claims the human right to be and do the best she is capable of being and doing. No artificial restraint should be put upon the exercise of that right. There is such a thing as man's sphere, and such a thing as woman's sphere; but we are to de-

termine these respective spheres, not by preconceived notions, but by practical experiments. Man has no business to declare what is or what is not the sphere of woman. True, the qualities of her nature are different from the qualities of man. But let results, and not preconceptions, determine of what she is capable. A peach tree can never become a pear tree. The peach tree has its rights, the inherent rights of its nature, and of God's design, to develop all the fulness of its life. But it would be a very absurd thing to enact a law that no peach tree should become a pear tree, and afterwards, fearing that it would, to deny it a certain amount of light, and air and moisture. Yet that is intrinsically no more absurd than some present customs. Woman has simply the right that man has, to be and do the best she is capable of being and doing. The fullest freedom of man's right would never result in his becoming anything else than a man. Woman, if allowed the same freedom, would become nothing else than a woman. There is a divine right to rule in society; not by the authority of kingship, but by the authority of nature. There are men who are made to be rulers. There are men who are made to be prophets and poets. So woman, possessing the rights of womanhood, will act out her nature, and develop the true woman. As to the matter of suffrage, so far as I know the argument, it is all on the side of woman (and the sharpest edge of sarcasm too). But the subject must be decided by practical demonstration. It is said women are not fit to vote. I think they are justified in claiming that they are as fit as the mass of men. Again, it would be unwomanly to vote. It is no more unwomanly to vote than it is unmanly. Further it is said that women do not wish to vote. The majority of them, at the present day, do not; but they have the right, and if they desire should be permitted to exercise it. If woman were allowed full scope to follow out her nature, she would develop a truer womanhood. The essential differences of her mind and moral qualities would become clearly defined. The way, after all, to settle great social questions is not by restrictions, but by freedom. Whatever we may think in regard to woman suffrage, woman requires more freedom than she has, now; for, though there has been great improvement, she is very much limited and oppressed. It is said that woman can't do man's work. Well, if she can't, she won't do it. But where she takes the same kind of work that man does, and does it better than he, her wages are much less. Some of our best teachers are women, and their remuneration is far below man's. Prejudice and injustice prevail in regard to woman's work. She suffers indignities and tyrannies in her labor. She has a right to be and do what she can. Old restrictions upon her honorable employment should be abolished.

DRUNKENNESS IN HIGH PLACES.—The Leavenworth (Kansas) *Commercial*, a radically democratic journal, says an effort is being made to have Yates, of Illinois, resign his Senatorship, on account of habitual drunkenness. The effort should be successful, and another should be made with Senator Saulsbury. Too many of the public places are filled by men who are habitually drunkards. The thing has become so prevalent, so palpable, and so glaring, that we consider it the duty of the press to speak out plainly on the subject. In this respect we need look no further than our own State. We have men filling high judicial and legislative places

who are entirely unreliable, entirely unfit for business on account of their habitual intoxication. The community have been outraged long enough by disgusting boasts in high places, and we think the time for reformation, if it is ever going to begin, should commence at once.

THE WORKING WOMEN OF NEW YORK.

ARTICLE I.

Year in and year out, 'mid the scorching heat of summer, the driving storms of winter, the laboring poor pass to their work. With the "strong men," protected by "Trade Unions" and popular sympathy, we have little to do. Our mission is with that large, ill-treated, barely tolerated class, the working women of New York. It is not alone the limited fields of labor open to them of which women complain, but the stunted, grudging remuneration doled out for faithful services. It matters not that the pittance may be the only support of a wretched family, the laborer is a woman—God help her—and she must take whatever they give her. Until recently a woman was considered "out of her sphere," if she attempted any kind of work save with her needle. After the advent of the sewing machine, however, it was found that men could become operators, and the poor victims were for a time still left at the old work of basting and finishing.

Poor, toiling sisterhood! they sang the "Song of the Shirt" so long that their throats became parched, and the work hung limp and loose from their weary hands. When the war for the Union thinned the ranks, it was found that women could keep accounts, set type, write for the press, practice medicine, and do a thousand and one things requiring address, brains and energy.

Even here, however, is the great injustice practiced. Women are not admitted in equal numbers with men, and when admitted are paid inferior salaries. A saleswoman in one of our Broadway stores will receive eight or ten dollars per week; while a man, at the same counter, who does much less to influence trade, receives fifteen or twenty dollars. The latter salary is small enough, it is true. But if the man is entitled to it, why not the woman? Her services are quite as valuable to the firm; why then do they compel her to accept a smaller remuneration? If men have families to support, so have women. If the father is the head of the family, so in many cases is the mother. The good God in heaven knows how many women whose young families depend upon their feeble physical strength, toil up life's hill with bleeding feet. Woman cannot rise to repel the injustice, until her voice is heard in the councils of the land. In a few isolated cases, the women of a community have arisen and protested against the outrage, for it is no less; but they have been hooted at, derided, and finally have gone back to their work, cowed down, humiliated, and silent forever more as to the injustice and wrong.

A down-town merchant the other day found himself without a book-keeper, and, "for economy's sake," employed a lady to fill the position. He pays her five hundred a year; her predecessor received eighteen hundred. She performs the work as well. Why the difference in salary? An advertisement appeared in a city paper the other day, in which a lady copyist was wanted, at—Chambers st. A lady friend who wrote a fine business hand answered the application. Upon stating her terms, the partners, highly respectable merchants, looked at her in amazement, until finally one of them laughed outright, as