

the Professor's pudding-stone, fossils and all, in the following manner:

I would ask by what right Prof. Bartlett, Prof. Haven, or Pastor Helmer votes in the churches to which they belong? Certainly not because they are professors, or pastors. They have but one simple basis for their right, and that is the basis of membership in the church where they vote. The pastor cannot vote unless he is a member of the church. No other relation whatever can give him this right. If it be called in question, no one would urge in their behalf the fact that they were of a certain age, that they were of the male sex, that they were this, that or the other, but would turn to the church record, and if they appeared there as unquestioned members, their right to vote would be established beyond controversy. If membership does this for them, I ask why it does less or more for any others, male or female, old or young, black or white? Civil law is urged against us, but civil law is in exact accord with the principles here stated. Women, minors, unnaturalized foreigners, etc., are not members of the body politic, and, therefore, are not allowed to vote. So soon as any of them become members their right is unquestioned. Prof. Bartlett claims it as the universal practice in Congregational churches in New England to deny the sisterhood the ballot. If so, so much the worse for New England! But I belonged to a church in Connecticut twelve years, and to another in Massachusetts three years, and never heard of such a thing, and did not suppose it existed in any. If it exists in others, it is time it ceased to be so. A few years since, one of the churches of this state had but a single male member, but a noble sisterhood. Prof. Bartlett says such a church "might as well die." Instead, however, the work of those sisters was blessed of God, and now that is a strong, self-sustaining church, and doing much to sustain others. Ought those sisters to have been denied the rights of membership, and that one man allowed to lord it over God's heritage? Let us not receive or attempt to receive any with a pretence of admitting them to our membership and then deny them the rights pertaining to membership. N. H. B.

NO TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION.

A FRIEND who has just woken up to the wrongs of woman, writes us of this new movement to get rid of taxation:

MY DEAR MRS. STANTON: Since writing you last, I have made several discoveries—one is, that a lady in Troy has gotten up a petition, and already presented it to the Legislature, to have the taxes removed from all ladies who have less than \$5,000. This bill they say will pass. She has got Mr. Griswold and other prominent men on it. This will be as much as our Legislature will do this year. Then another kink is, that this Constitution must pass muster, or they must wait twenty years before they can make another; if this does not pass, then the old one must remain. This is what I have learned by talking over my petition. I find talking on the subject is doing a great deal of good, and perhaps to get the subject before the people, is at present better than a petition to the Legislature, for they hear every man of them, every movement made by a woman. Your paper is a power, and I must get you more subscribers.

You are mistaken about the Constitutional Convention. The Legislature can call one any time they choose, and all the more easily if this one is defeated. We have had enough of these Republican half measures.

We are glad to see this movement of women property-holders for release from taxation. Our Constitutional Convention, in refusing women their right of representation, left them the logical right to rebel against taxation. Suppose the fifty widows of Rochester, whom our friend knows, with the one hundred of the "Brick Church," would this very spring refuse to pay their taxes, leaving the officers of the law to seize and sell their furniture at auction, what a practical demonstration they would make of their faith in the good old doctrine of "THE REVOLUTION"—Taxation without representation is tyranny. Agitation! agitation!

QUERY.—Is not *suavity* the soul of wit, and

CHILDREN IN MASSACHUSETTS FACTORIES.

It is the nineteenth century, whatever facts in our progress may seem to be of the ninth or before. New England claims to be a source and centre of modern civilization, and Massachusetts its chief reservoir. But in that boasting state are too often found indications of barbarism and cruelty to chill the blood. At the disclosures of the last two years in some of its charitable and reformatory institutions, humanity almost stands aghast! An ancient river was said to sink in the sands in one country, and, flowing on in its hidden channel, appeared at length in another far distant country. Did the bloody stream of slavery sink in the Carolinas and Mississippi, to gush up with almost equal horrors in Massachusetts? The state has a law that prohibits the employment of children in factories under the age of ten years. Children so employed between the ages of ten and fifteen years must have had at least three months' schooling during the year next preceding their employment. Such children are not to be employed more than sixty hours in one week. How far the law is observed appears from the report recently made by the officer appointed to have charge of its enforcement. In Fall River he found one thousand children employed in factories, mostly of foreign parentage, in a generally low condition, ignorant in many cases of their own ages, earning very low wages, and deprived in great part or altogether of the school privileges which the law requires. To illustrate the spirit of some of the employers, the officer inquired of the agent of one of the principal factories, whether it was the custom to do anything for the physical, intellectual, or moral welfare of the work people. The answer would not have been out of place in the master of plantations, or the captain of a coolie ship: "We never do; as for myself, I regard my work people as I regard my machinery; so long as they can do my work for what I choose to pay them, I keep them, and get out of them all I can. What they do, or how they fare, outside of my walls, I do not know. They must look out for themselves, as I do for myself. When my machinery gets old and useless, I reject it and get new; and these people are a part of my machinery." Another agent in another part of the state replied to a similar question, "that he used his mill-hands as he used his horse; as long as his was in good condition and rendered good service, he treated him well; otherwise he got rid of him as soon as he could, and what became of him afterward was no affair of his." That man, the report says, had upwards of one hundred children in his employment, most of whom had never attended school. These are cases of exceptional hardship; but in the majority of establishments it is believed that, by the connivance of parents and employers, the law is violated, at least in some of its parts, to a most fearful extent. When women, mothers, have the ballot, how soon will many such outrages and cruelties be suppressed!

P. P.

A WRITER in the *Methodist* says: Austria and Rome form the subject of an essay in which we learn that since the passage of the civil marriage act the power of Rome will decrease, and the final separation of Church and State be hastened. "Woman's Influence in the Commonwealth" is discussed at length—a healthy

ENGLISH MOVEMENT FOR WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE.

"A NATIONAL Society for Woman's Suffrage" has just been organized at Manchester, England, the object of which is thus succinctly set forth: "to obtain for women the right of voting for members of Parliament on the same condition as it is or may be granted to men." The qualification to be approval of this purpose, and the payment of a small subscription. The methods proposed for the accomplishment of this object are thus set forth:

"Members of the Society, and others, are earnestly requested to aid the movement—1. By bringing the question under the notice of members of Parliament whenever they appear before their constituents. 2. Should notice of any motion, friendly or hostile, be given in the House of Commons, by writing letters asking the local members to support the principle of Women's Suffrage. 3. In case of an election, by calling on every candidate to declare whether he considers that women who fulfil the conditions required of men, ought to be excluded from the franchise. 4. If they are women possessing the legal qualification, by claiming to be put on the register of electors, either by the overseers or in the revising barrister's court. 5. By trying to procure insertion of facts and arguments bearing on the question, in the local press. 6. By communicating to the secretary any information likely to be useful to the Society, and the names of such persons as may be disposed to assist the cause. 7. Where there are three or four members in the same place, by uniting to form a local committee. 8. By endeavoring to increase the number of members."

It is declared in one of the society's circulars, that "exclusion of women from the parliamentary vote is exceptional and perhaps illegal in the case of freeholders; it is certainly wonderful in a country where the head of the executive government is a woman." It is believed that the recent Reform act "distinctly admits both sexes to the vote." It is deemed important to have women who are householders and otherwise possessed of the legal qualifications for the franchise, placed on the register, before the revising officer inspects it. If he rejects such names, the question will then be brought to judicial examination.

The Secretary of the society is Lydia E. Becker, 113 Carter Street, Greenheys, Manchester, England.

"FORWARD MARCH."

SUCH is the word of command given by the *Chicago Evening Post*, to head its comments on the lecture of Anna E. Dickinson, recently delivered in that city. Its comments are only samples of what we could crowd "THE REVOLUTION" with every week, from the press all over the west, especially the influential part of the press:

"The lecture of Anna Dickinson," said a friend to us last night, "was a very creditable affair for a woman." We thought it a very creditable affair for a man, and one which would have done honor, alike in manner and in matter, to the best of men. We wish there were more Anna Dickinsons to talk to the people in behalf of a cause which is daily gaining ground throughout the world, and which is destined, at no distant day, to be an accomplished fact. It is true that the advocates and supporters of the franchise for women are in the minority now. So, at one time, were the advocates of civil and religious liberty, of education for the masses, and of Equal Rights for all men. The best men and the greatest statesmen were once bitterly opposed to all these things; but Truth never gives up the struggle. Injustice, like that of taxing citizens to support laws which they have no voice in making, cannot survive the test of time and the inevitable march of events. It is time that people began to ponder upon this subject. The ballot for Women is nearer a realized fact than many of them think.