

women most prominent in opposing equal suffrage are holders of public office. Thus the president of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (Mrs. J. Elliot Cabot) was for years a member of the school board in her own town and also overseer of the poor. Yet that association, in its published documents, objects to equal suffrage, on the ground that "suffrage involves the holding of office, and office-holding is incompatible with the duties of most women." Suffrage does not involve office-holding by the majority of women, but only by a few; and there are always some women of character and ability who could give the necessary time. Women, as a class, have more leisure than men.

In the enfranchised states there has been no rush of women into office, and the offices that women do hold are mainly educational and charitable. In Wyoming women have had full suffrage for 32 years, yet no woman has ever been elected to the legislature. Neither Colorado, Utah nor Idaho has ever had more than three women in its legislature at one time. During the first ten years after municipal suffrage was granted to the women of Kansas, in the 300 cities of that state, about 1,600 men were elected mayors, and only 16 women. It is as yet only the smaller cities that have chosen women to serve in that capacity, and the amount of time required is far less than that needed to be a public school-teacher, the matron of a hospital, or for any one of a thousand positions that women already hold without criticism. Mrs. Antoinette Haskell, who was twice elected mayor of Gaylord, Kan., and declined a third term, says that the mayor's duties took her on an average about one hour a day.—Progress.

#### THE PHILIPPINE LANDS.

It is the avowed purpose of the administration to purchase the lands now owned or occupied by the religious orders in the Philippine islands. Negotiations have been proceeding to this end at Rome and at Manila. The communities must be willing to sell, or, it must be presumed, the administration would not undertake to effect the purchase.

A pending bill enacts that the government of the United States shall become owner of these lands, which are chiefly agricultural, but partially urban. Some of the details of the bill

may be altered. President Roosevelt is accredited with the belief that the best way to proceed in this delicate business is for the government of the United States to issue bonds running from five to 35 years to whoever will buy at cost, this country thus escaping loss on the transaction.

History has taught its land lessons in vain if this shall seem the wisest method of meeting the land problem in the islands. While the debate upon the ultimate fate of the archipelago must continue not only at Washington, but throughout the country, it must be obvious to all reflecting Americans that our duty in the islands, a duty forced upon us and not desired, cannot be discharged in a year or two. We can neither abandon those 10,000,000 people to anarchy nor permit a monarchy to intrude upon their desolation for conquest. The first part of our duty to them is to be discharged in a right adjustment of their land problem.

A right adjustment of that problem does not consist in transferring their soil from one set of owners to another set without respect for the natural rights of the people. To them by natural law their soil belongs. The government of the United States should so conduct its purchase of the lands now for sale as to restore their benefits in perpetuity to the people themselves. That is to say, the government of the United States should honestly and lawfully acquire the fee to the lands offered for sale, and continue to hold the fee until it is transferred honestly and lawfully to the government of the Philippine islands in whatever form that government shall be constitutionally organized hereafter. It is at least possible that after trying us for a time the people will prefer to remain permanently as citizens of the United States under our flag. Should this be their choice the American people will not cast them off.

Land tenure has had a long and diverse history. Originally the land of every civilized country belonged to the people. Its ownership by individuals was unthought.

Use of land, not proprietorship, was individual. While population did not press for subsistence use of land for tillage or pasture was free. Private inclosure did not originate until the baronial power asserted itself in Europe.

The best epitome of the results of forcible private inclosure of land can be seen in England. During the early

part of the reign of Queen Victoria England produced three-fourths of its food and imported only one-fourth. The system of land tenure inaugurated by forcible private inclosure of common lands has reduced England to the necessity of importing more than three-fourths of her food, while millions of her rich acres have lapsed into waste because the laws exact of the soil two returns, a living for the working tenant and revenue for the idle owner. . . . .

If the lands we are to buy in the Philippines be not safeguarded against these dangers we shall transplant an ancient curse to our new trust estate. The tillers of the soil should live by their labor and the surplus revenue which the land produces beyond that should accrue to the entire people and ought not to be private wealth. If the Philippine lands shall be let down to speculators providing for the time real or fraudulent occupiers all the evils of the middleman of India, chronic impoverishment of the soil, known in Ireland as subletting, will be established in the archipelago and will become a perennial plague, robbing simultaneously both the tenants and the government.

If the government of the United States buys lands in those islands it should retain the fee. Use of the lands should be leased to actual occupiers within reasonable areas. There should be no middlemen and no subletting. Revaluation at prescribed periods upon a basis of practical arbitration should be the bond between the fee holder and the occupiers.—Editorial in Chicago Chronicle of Feb. 4.

#### MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

##### CLEVELAND TRACTION PROBLEMS FROM A CHICAGO POINT OF VIEW.

Cleveland has a street railway problem that presents many points of similarity to the traction question with which Chicago is wrestling. The grants in Cleveland begin to run out in 1904 and 1905, and expire at varying dates thereafter until 1912 and 1914. The chief difference between the situation in Chicago and that in Cleveland seems to be that the companies in Cleveland do not assume that the near expiration of their grants is any warrant for allowing their service to deteriorate. Plant and equipment in Cleveland are maintained in first-class condition and the management is progressive and awake to the needs of the public.

The legislature of Ohio in 1896 passed a law making 50 years instead of 25