

merely an amendment under which the changes wanted by the Chicago corporation interests can be secured without the possibility of any realization of those they don't want. Voters who favor a constitutional convention, so that all desirable constitutional changes may be made, will best promote their object in that respect by voting against the proposed charter amendment.

Among the sterling democratic Democrats who are candidates for useful offices of which they would be useful incumbents, is Frank Stephens, of Philadelphia. He is the Democratic candidate for State senator in the seventh senatorial district, his candidacy being under the management of Harold Sudell, 5030 Hazel avenue, Philadelphia. Mr. Stephens is making his campaign, which appears from Philadelphia papers to be a lively one, in the interest of honest taxation—not in the old and hackneyed sense, but in a very real sense. Impressed with the value of the New York system of distinguishing site value from improvement value, in the assessing of each parcel of real estate, and then publishing the tax list in detail, a system but recently adopted in New York (p. 451), Mr. Stephens is urging the adoption of this system in Philadelphia. It is a bad system for tax dodgers but a good one for tax payers. In making his campaign Mr. Stephens is supported by such papers as the Record, the Ledger and the North American, a fact which in itself is an encouraging sign of a developing public sentiment in the right direction on fiscal matters in the good old city of Philadelphia.

Entirely apart from all questions of equal suffrage, the intelligent women of this country are protesting against being classed by act of Congress, in express terms, with illiterates and felons. This classification is made in the bill, now pending in the Senate, for the admission into the Union as a State, of Oklahoma and the

Indian Territory. That bill forbids the proposed State ever to restrict the suffrage "on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude, or on account of any other conditions or qualifications, save and except on account of illiteracy, minority, sex, conviction of felony, mental condition or residence." A committee of protest has been organized by eminent women, who invite immediate correspondence on the subject with Mrs. Harriet Taylor Upton, of Warren, Ohio. They demand that the word "sex" be struck out of the bill, not only as an open and flagrant insult, but also as making possible such an interpretation of this enabling act as not merely to excuse disfranchisement of women by the State but even to prohibit its enfranchising them.

Owing to the light registration of women in Chicago the usual inane comment upon woman suffrage is going the newspaper rounds—the comment, namely, that this proves indifference to voting rights on the part of the great mass of women. If masculine reasoning powers were to be graded by this test, masculine reputation for intelligence would fare ill. It might better adopt the traditional feminine syllogism—"because." For the Chicago registration of women is utterly without significance. Women are allowed to vote only for trustees of the State University, officers in whom there is no political interest, and for whom but few men would vote if they were not already at the polls to vote for something in which they are interested. Added to this is the fact that every woman who registers and votes is doing something out of the common, and doing it in the face of numerous discouragements—such as offensive polling places, impertinent election officers, and jostling and impudent crowds of men. Furthermore, no attempt is made to "bring out" the woman vote, and only by strict attention to election notices can any woman know that she has the right to vote; for not at all elections does this privilege recur, and

newspapers make no display of the information when the time approaches. Of the women who are now registered voters in Chicago, it would be safe to say that they are a large proportion of those who knew in time that they had a right to vote; of the remainder of those who knew, it would be safe to add that a large proportion were prevented either by a reasonable timidity or by difficulties of time, place and circumstances. No inference can be drawn from a small registration of women under those conditions. Let the politicians nominate for University trustees some persons conspicuously obnoxious to women, and inferences might be drawn from a light registration. But in that case there would be no room for inferences. Women voters would outnumber the men. Voting is not wholly free from the influence of human nature, whether voters are men or women.

The Boston Herald has gone all the way to the Luchu islands to prove that communal land tenure is not productive of good results. In those islands it appears from the Herald to have been customary to re-allot land holdings at intervals of from five to thirty years, and in consequence land was not well improved. But now all this is changed. Individual ownership having been established, the Herald reports great industrial improvement. The sugar crop alone has increased more than 30 per cent. in volume, and other gains equally satisfactory have been made. But satisfactory to whom? Who enjoys the increase? That question is always overlooked by your touter for industrial progress.

Really, it was quite unnecessary to cite the Luchu islands to prove that communal land tenure, with frequent changes of occupiers, does not promote industry. History testifies to it and common sense suggests it. But it is only swapping evils to change from communal tenures to land monopoly. What is needed is security of tenure. This is not afforded by