

for women on the terms on which it is conferred upon men, would place highly restrictive property qualifications upon woman suffrage in Great Britain. Under those qualifications, most workingmen's wives could not vote though their husbands did, nor could any unmarried working woman unless she individually occupied lodgings worth \$50 a year unfurnished. This was our inference from the laws regulating male suffrage in Great Britain. We based it upon the statement of British suffrage statutes made by President Lowell in his work on English government. But the Woman's Journal disputes either President Lowell's statement or our inference—one or the other, we are not certain which. Of course, if the statement falls, the inference falls with it. But does the Woman's Journal really think that either statement or inference is disposed of by merely saying that its fallacy "has been shown over and over again by Keir Hardie, Philip Snowden and other well informed English suffragists"?

+

As we hold Mr. Hardie and Mr. Snowden in high esteem, both as citizens of the world and as public men, we should readily accept any statement of fact they might make of their own knowledge, and should rank high any opinion or inference of theirs from the facts they stated. But the Woman's Journal quotes no statement of theirs, no opinion of theirs, and does not even vouch (except in the vaguest way, and apparently not on personal knowledge) for their having authoritatively or deliberately said anything at all on the point. We submit that its vague and unverified reference to some possible expressions by Mr. Hardie and Mr. Snowden (and others unnamed) is inadequate. In our editorial, we cited for our basic facts the elaborate treatise by President Lowell, "The Government of England," specifying pages for reference; and we have not now the slightest reason for doubting President Lowell's accuracy. From those facts we drew our inference, and we see no reason yet for altering it. Our inference may, indeed, have been erroneous, but the Woman's Journal does not show wherein nor how. If that paper, which we regard with undiminished respect, or any other paper or person, will cite authorities proving President Lowell wrong in his summary of the British suffrage statutes, or point out definitely by reference to his summary or any other authoritative document a fatal error in our inference, we will gladly make a complete retraction of that phase of our suffragette criticism. But unless President Lowell is wrong in his statement of the

British statutes, or we in what seems to us to be a very obvious inference from his statement, Mr. Hardie, Mr. Snowden and the other Englishmen are mistaken if they have said anything to warrant what the Woman's Journal attributes to them.

+

With reference to a point raised by the Woman's Journal regarding the same phase of the subject, let us suggest that if it investigates with an open mind it will probably learn that the proportion of workingwomen in England who individually (not in couples but individually) occupy lodgings worth \$50 a year unfurnished, is by no means so large as in its comment upon our editorial it ventures to imply. Even in this country, how large a proportion of unmarried workingwomen occupy lodgings for which they individually pay \$50 a year unfurnished? And, then, what of workingmen's wives? Are they, or are they not, a negligible factor in the movement for equal suffrage?

+ \*

#### Old New England's New Message.

In a recent speech in his home city, James J. Storrow, one of Boston's leading men, and deservedly so, gave out his conception of New England's message to the country. "Liberty" was the word with which the Fathers were deeply concerned, he said, and they showed that they were not only ready to preach the gospel of liberty, but to die for it. Those days are past, Mr. Storrow proceeded, but the present New England generation must remember that the Declaration of Independence does not stop with the word "liberty"; it goes on to say that every human being has the inalienable right not only to life and liberty, but also to the pursuit of happiness. It is on this basis that Mr. Storrow's conception of New England's message of the present rests. Listen to him:

Behind every human activity there must be a moral idea if the activity is to be of real consequence. What are we New Englanders thinking about to-day? We have passed on from the word liberty, having attended to that little matter, to the word "happiness." We have been studying conditions of human life. We know more about it than our fathers did. We know that the ordinary boy or girl born into the world is fitted to enjoy a healthy, happy life, and yet we see in a great city hundreds and thousands of boys and girls, through no fault of their own, but due to their unfortunate environment, condemned to the prison cell of unhealthy and unhappy lives. I believe that the moral idea New England is formulating to-day, and that lies perhaps unexpressed in the minds and hearts of us New Englanders, is that we are going to do our utmost to solve successfully the problem of so organ-

izing our political conditions, our social conditions and our industries, that a child born into the world is not to be robbed by circumstances for which it is in no way responsible, of the health, morals and the ability to earn a decent living which will give that boy or girl the happiness coming next after the word liberty in the Declaration of Independence.

Is that indeed the message that New England is formulating? If it is, does New England realize the full import of those words—"a child born into the world is not to be robbed by circumstances for which it is in no way responsible," of "ability to earn a decent living"? Does Mr. Storrow himself realize their revolutionary content? Since it is as easy to be platitudinous in that way now as it was in the '50's with apotheoses to "liberty" at Fourth of July celebrations in Richmond, or Charleston or New Orleans, we hesitate at taking Mr. Storrow's inspiring words at face value. But if he does use them with profound meaning and conviction, if with all that they imply those words are truly New England's new message in the forming, then all hail, Mr. Storrow! and God bless old New England!

+ +

#### The First "Insurgent" Battle.

It must be confessed that the defeat of Barnes, the "insurgent" Republican candidate for Lorimer's vacant seat in Congress, is not at all encouraging to Republican "insurgency" in Chicago. Although he rolled up a large vote, over 8,000, it was barely more than 25 per cent of the total vote; and although he came in ahead of the Democratic candidate, the vote of the two together was only 154 more than the vote for the regular Republican candidate.

+

We must consider, of course, that Roger Sullivan, the Democratic leader, was probably working in couples with Lorimer to elect Lorimer's man, and that this purpose was aided if not actually accomplished by throwing Democratic machine influence and votes over to the Republican machine candidate. But that is a factor which the "insurgent" Republicans must reckon with every time and everywhere. If Roger Sullivan of the Democratic machine and William Lorimer of the Republican machine could combine to elect a machine Republican over an "insurgent" Republican at a by-election in Chicago in 1909, their affiliated Jim-Jims all over the country may very likely be able to do enough in 1910 to make another Jim-Jim Congress.

+

They will find the opportunity for this ready at

hand. Just as but few insurgent Republicans broke away from the Republican machine to help Bryan overthrow the machine of both parties, so but few democratic Democrats will respond to the call of Republicans who strike no higher political note than the insurgent Republicans are dwelling on. That a higher note is no easy feat for insurgent leaders is true enough. It is very likely impossible. They cannot yet lift the insurgent movement to as high a political plane as the democratic Democrats have reached. This, then, is the difficulty. The mass of insurgent Republicans will not join the democratic Democrats on the higher levels, and the mass of democratic Democrats will not join the insurgent Republicans on the lower ones. Hence a dead-lock, of which the Jim-Jims of the two machines take advantage, as Roger Sullivan and Senator Lorimer did in the recent by-election in Chicago.

+

To reformers who pin their faith to immediate political victories, rising exuberantly with these victories and sinking hopelessly under defeat, there is little encouragement in the present political outlook. But history testifies that "present outlooks" are usually opaque.

+ +

#### Subsidizing Forbidden Trade.

One rubs his eyes when he sees in a protection paper an editorial under the head "Opening the Way for Trade." For, of course, the way to open "the way for trade" is to abolish the restraints and restrictions upon trade, to remove the obstructions to trade. But we are told by the protection paper that the way for trade to be opened is by permitting ship owners to put their hands into the public pockets to get "ship subsidies"! Would it be more expensive to pay foreigners to come and take our goods?

+ +

#### An Interesting Debate.

The Society for the Preservation of National Prosperity caught the culprit, removed his clothing and bound him to a rail. Then the "stand-patters" and the "progressives" held a joint debate to decide whether the mixture of tar and feathers should contain 57 per cent of tar or 75 per cent. They finally compromised on 77½ per cent of tar. "Thank you, gentlemen," said the victim. "Your interesting discussion has given me much light—and happiness. At last I understand how a protective tariff is revised downwards. Hurrah for Prosperity!" But a certain large gen-