

MARYLAND SUFFRAGE NEWS

Published Weekly
By the Just Government League of Maryland.

Editors:
DR. AND MRS. DONALD R. HOOKER,
Cliffhurst, Mt. Washington, Md.

Contributing Editors:
MRS. JOHN G. WILSON,
DR. THIADREUS P. THOMAS,
MRS. B. J. BYRNE,
DR. O. EDWARD JANNEY,
DR. FLORENCE R. SARIN,
MISS MILDRED RANKIN.

Managing Editor:
Miss M. B. DIXON,
817 N. Charles Street.

Business Manager:
MRS. CHARLES JOSEPH OGLE,
Round Bay, Earleigh Heights, Md.

Subscription Rates:
DOMESTIC.
One Year.....\$1.00 Three Months on Trial..... .25
Six Months..... .50 Single Copy..... .05
CANADIAN. FOREIGN.
One Year.....\$1.50 One Year.....\$1.50



RECEIPT of payment must not be expected to show an address label under two weeks from date received. Instructions for RENEWAL, DISCONTINUANCE or CHANGE OF ADDRESS should be sent two weeks before the date they are to go into effect. Both old and new addresses must always be given.

Checks and drafts and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Maryland Suffrage News.

Advertising rates will be sent upon application to advertising manager.

BALTIMORE, DECEMBER 26, 1914.

THE NEW YEAR

GREETINGS to Nineteen Hundred and Fifteen! Greetings to all suffragists! Greetings to the political conventions that will assemble during the coming summer to decide whether or no the woman suffrage amendment shall be submitted to the voters!

The work that the suffragists do in 1915 will determine the action to be taken by the Legislature at the next session.

If public opinion can be aroused, if the voters can be convinced that it is their duty to make votes for women a practical political issue, if sufficient work can be done to achieve these ends before the political conventions meet this summer, the suffrage plank will, without doubt, find its place in every political platform. The chief thing is for the suffragists to work with the voters with the point in view of convincing them that they must use their franchise to force the hands of the politicians. The dominant political forces in Maryland will never yield to the demands of the women until they realize that behind this demand there is the compelling power of votes. If every suffragist in the state would make a New Year's resolution to get 10 men of her acquaintance to promise to vote against all candidates who refused to pledge themselves to support the suffrage bill, victory in 1916 would be assured. There are on hand at headquarters thousands of voters' pledge slips waiting for suffragists to take them out and get them signed. These pledge slips simply state that the signer agrees to vote against candidates for the legislature who repudiate the suffrage bill. It is not too much to ask the voters, upon whom the final responsibility for the government rests, to support their belief by the power of their ballots. Will you not resolve today to send for some of the pledge slips and to begin at once securing signatures to them? The date of the victory in Maryland depends not upon some of us, but upon all of us!

WOMEN CANNOT FIGHT; REALLY?

A WOMEN'S volunteer reserve force to help in home defense is being formed in England with a member of the nobility for its colonel. This event will increase the discordance of the old refrain: "Women cannot fight, therefore they should not vote." The utter fatuity of this effete idea has been well brought out by the European war. People have come vividly to realize that women as well as men render patriotic service in time of war. All through the long months that the war has endured women have performed not only their own duties, but the duties of men as well; they have taken the places of men in all branches of government service; they have tilled the fields and garnered the crops; they have gone to the front as nurses, and, above all, they have shared, in full measure with men, in the tragic burden of war. The final proof

that women should not be excluded from the right of franchise because they cannot fight may be found in the fact that they can fight when necessity demands it of them. The exponents of the "pedestal" ideal for women recoil in horror from the thought of women's taking up arms. They probably still believe that it belongs to the dignity and honor of men to protect women. Who, then, is making it necessary for women to take up arms? Are men or women shelling cities, directing raids and dropping bombs upon non-combatants? The kind of "protection" that the Germans gave the women of Louvain is typical of the kind of "protection" women may look for when they stand in the way either of the martial or commercial progress of men. If men had a universal desire to protect women, war would never be declared, and yet war is declared, despite men's chivalrous protestations. The fact of the matter is that, in the deeper sense, women constitute the protective portion of the race. They repudiate war because they do not wish to endanger the lives of their husbands and their sons. As they protect the child in his youth, so they would shelter him in after years from moral or physical danger. Romantic rhapsodies notwithstanding, the world will be a better place to live in when men realize that the protective instinct of women is of far more fundamental importance to the race than is their own.

THIRTY PIECES OF SILVER

NO matter what may be the individual's sentiments with regard to the question of national prohibition, there is something inexpressibly revolting in hearing the argument against the measure based upon the magnitude of the revenue which the liquor traffic yields. When the national prohibition amendment was recently voted on in Congress, it was said that the industry paid \$200,000,000 annually in domestic taxes and import duties into the national treasury, and in addition there were local license fees. The opponents of prohibition contended that the country could not afford to destroy an industry which yielded such rich returns, but surely such commercialization of the ideals of the nation should not be tolerated for an instant by those who have the welfare of the people at heart. National prohibition should be judged on its merits, not upon the basis of whether or no, in a purely financial sense, it pays. It matters little whether it be \$200,000,000 or 30 pieces of silver which contribute to the decision, national and personal morality must be free from the taint of gain.

CLUBWOMEN AND CHILD LABOR

Mrs. Harriet Bishop Waters, editor of the General Federation of Women's Clubs Magazine, appeals to all club women throughout the country to stir public interest in Child Labor Sunday, January 24, 1915. She writes:

"It is said that nearly half of all the children in the southern states, from 10 to 13 years of age, are at work instead of at school. All the states of the Union are reported as having violated the child labor law. There are still six states in the Union with no 14-year limit whatever, for children at work in factories, six states with no compulsory school attendance law, and 15 states whose 14-year limit for factories is practically nullified by exemptions."

Again the south is guilty of figuring on the child labor black list—Georgia, Texas, Florida, Alabama, South Carolina and Mississippi having no compulsory education law.

WHAT IS SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE

FROM the income-tax records it appears that of the 6977 income-tax payers in Maryland 5143 are married, 1228 are single men, and 606 are single women. There are 179 women who make separate returns from those of their husbands. One of the largest taxpayers in the State is an unmarried woman who has neither father nor brother to "represent" her in the government. From these data the conclusion is inevitable that a condition exists in Maryland today which in 1776 was considered to be sufficient ground for a revolution. Undoubtedly at the time of our Revolutionary War King George and his advisers thought the argument, "Taxation without representation is tyranny," wholly specious. The American colonists, however, saw the matter from a different angle. It is always easier for the victim of injustice to sense the wrong to which he is subject, than it is for the one who inflicts the wrong to interpret his own conduct. Presumably no man ever was a tyrant in his own eyes. The injustice of taxation without representation is as real today as it was when the destinies of nations were determined in accordance with this principle. And the King Georges of today are just as blind to the part that they are playing as the King of England was in the days of the Revolution.

HELP THE CAUSE.—Mention the Maryland Suffrage News When Patronizing Our Advertisers.