

providing for plurality elections. It was adopted by a popular vote of eight to one.

Our reason for desiring to get rid of second elections was that the poorer party had a hard enough time raising funds to make any showing at the first election. When it came to a second trial for a few officials in a few localities, then the richer party had everything its own way.

Our experience of two hundred and fifty years was that good government loses rather than gains, and loses almost invariably and completely, by second elections. The single alternative vote would reach the result hoped for by reformers from a second election. It would enable members of third and fourth parties to express their first choice of candidates without at the same time helping to elect their last choice, as now is often the case.

LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN.

+ + +

THE HEART OF THE SUFFRAGE QUESTION.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

If the demand for woman suffrage were based upon the claim that granting it would purify politics, or cause any improvement in existing conditions, the point that its expediency is disproved or unproved might be relevant. I am well aware that some women suffragists do advance arguments of that kind. They are as illogical in doing so as others are in blaming woman suffrage for evils still existing in Colorado. If equal suffrage existed in Ohio, we should probably still have Cox rule in Cincinnati, and the usual Republican majority in the State. If it existed in New York Tammany would still control the city, and Hughes be in control at Albany. If woman suffrage were abolished in Colorado, Denver would still remain boss-ridden, and Guggenheim and Hughes would be in the Senate just the same.

My reasons for favoring woman suffrage are not based on any fear or expectation in regard to the use women will make of the ballot. I favor suffrage for women because I have no moral right to help to keep it from them. The question of what use they will make of the ballot has nothing at all to do with the question of whether they should be allowed to have it. If I have a right to keep women from voting, then I have a moral right also to keep men from voting, should I by any means happen to be able to do so. If I have no moral right to prevent men from voting, then I have no right to keep any woman who wants to vote from doing so.

Wherever suffrage is a "failure," whether it be man suffrage, woman suffrage, or both, the fault is not so much with the individual voters as it is with the common failure to understand the functions of government. Any government will be a failure that claims the right to regulate matters that do not concern it. As long as about nine-tenths of the laws on the statute books are attempts of government to meddle in individual affairs, the voters, no matter who or what they may be, will make more or less of a mess of the whole business. If government were restricted to its proper functions it would not matter much whether men of the Guggenheim stripe were in the Senate or not. Restriction of suffrage

is only one of innumerable meddlesome restrictions which most people unthinkingly concede to be a right of government to impose.

DANIEL KIEFER.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, April 20, 1909.

The Tariff in Congress.

Debate on the tariff bill (p. 372) began in the Senate on the 19th.

+

Meanwhile the Democrats had agreed in caucus to support a series of reductions of import duties on necessaries, and the incorporation into the bill of an income tax feature.

+

President Taft sent to congress on the 15th a message transmitting a recommendation from the Bureau of Insular Affairs for a proposed tariff revision for the Philippines. The measure so transmitted is described by the President as having been "drawn by a board of tariff experts, of which the insular collector of customs, Colonel George R. Colton, was the president," and the board as having "held a great many open meetings in Manila and conferred fully with representatives of all business interests in the Philippine islands." He adds that the bill "revises the present Philippine tariff, simplifies it and makes it conform as nearly as possible to the regulations of the customs laws of the United States, especially with respect to packing and packages;" and that "its purpose is to meet the new conditions that will arise under the section of the pending United States tariff bill, which provides, with certain limitations, for free trade between the United States and the islands." The President says that the bill "is drawn with a view to preserving to the islands as much customs revenue as possible and to protect in a reasonable measure, those industries which now exist in the islands." He recommends its enactment "at the present session of Congress as one incidental to and required by the passage of the Payne bill."

+ +

The Wheat Corner.

Soaring prices for wheat were noted last week (p. 375) when May wheat rose to \$1.28¼ a bush-