

who is considered in the laws relating to the franchise. The voter is treated as a person, not the head of a group. All the statutes on the subject so regard him. But the writer says:

"In answer to the editor's remarks that if family suffrage were recognized, justice would demand that the votes of each man should be proportioned to the numbers of his household, it is sufficient to say that the same line of reasoning would lead to the conclusion—if we admit that the suffrage is purely an individual affair—that a tall man should have more votes than a short one or the number of the individual's votes should be proportioned to his size! In the presence of such logic we stand uncovered."

Yes, uncovered entirely. Stripped of every vestige of an argument. The "logic," if it may be so dignified, is entirely his own. His "schoolboy" allusion naturally here suggests itself. It has not even the merit of wit. Admit that "the suffrage is purely an individual affair"—where the law places it, and the whole contention about "family suffrage" falls to the ground. It is the fanciful theory that the family is the political unit that provokes the argument as to votes according to numbers. In its absence the vagary about votes according to size is meaningless and absurd. Logic, forsooth! It "stands uncovered" as the very opposite of lucid ratiocination.

To the statement that the matured individual and not the family is the political unit in a popular government, the writer replies that "our statesmen have not found that out, for one-half of our matured individuals have not been recognized as political units." Wonderful logic, again! Almost enough to take off the hair and the hide this time, as well as the clothes of our "savage" scalp-waiver. Because statesmen have unjustly denied to one-half of the matured citizens of our country the right of suffrage, therefore the theory of our form of government is not that the matured individual is the political unit but that the family is! Women ought not to have the suffrage because our statesmen have not allowed them to have it! Women have not been given the suffrage, therefore they ought not to ask for it!

The next "argument" is that

"In Wyoming the people have had a territorial government up to a year ago and have had practically no politics."

This is as an offset to the fact that women vote there and have voted there for many years "without any serious results either to the family or society." But it is not true that in Wyoming there has been practically no politics. The two great parties have figured during the territorial condition of Wyoming as distinctly and vigorously as since she has become a State. The officers in cities, counties and the Territory were elected as Republicans or Democrats, and party spirit ran high there as in other places. We could produce abundance of evidence as to this and to the success and good results of woman suffrage there, if we had space today. Wyoming stands, not "uncovered," but clothed and in her right mind as a living witness for woman suffrage, and a potent answer to all the assertions and prognostications about voting tending to degrade woman as a wife, a mother, a lady, or in any other pure and admirable condition of life.

The admission of our opponent that there is weight in the argument that many women have "no husband or son to represent them in affairs of government" gives away the whole contention. It shows that the family is not the political unit. It shows that millions of citizens—not a few thousands as he says—single women, widows and others, have no voice in the affairs of government. They are taxed without representation. They are subject to tyranny. Give them the ballot and there is no sound reason left why all women citizens should not have it, as matured individual units in the sum of society and of the nation.

The noise, rowdyism or any other improper surroundings of the polls has nothing to do with the question of the equal right of a woman citizen with a man citizen to a vote for the officers who are to be "the government." Wyoming says that woman suffrage has aided in making voting orderly and respectable. Elections should be made orderly by law. If they are not it does not touch the question of justice, fairness and equality before the law involved in this matter.

The sneer about our admiration for the clean, white piece of paper, to which it is said we "so lovingly referred" is unworthy of the subject. The ballot is the emblem of political liberty. We are not ashamed of referring to it lovingly. Let those who will, sneer at it. We would give it to woman not to degrade her, not to deprive her of a single womanly attribute, not to make her less the angel of the household, but to lift her from the political phase of the idiot, the lunatic, the criminal and the outcast, and give her the right, as one of the people in a government of the people, to vote for those who are to govern her, to the selection of those who are to make the laws which she as an individual citizen is required to be submissive.

CARDINAL GIBBONS ON "PATRIOTISM AND POLITICS."

THE April number of the *North American Review* contains the usual quota of instructive articles furnished by that brilliant magazine from the pens of able publicists on current questions of great moment. Conspicuous among the contributions to this number is a paper by Cardinal Gibbons, the eminent Catholic prelate, on the absorbing theme of "Patriotism and Politics." The introductory portion of the article is mostly devoted to an explanation of patriotism and our system of government, and, of course, relates nothing specially new. Further on he indicates, as do many other thoughtful Americans, deep anxiety on account of dangers which appear to threaten the perpetuation of the Republic. To add force to his warnings he, as many other writers on this subject have done, depicts the situation of the Roman empire prior to its fall, and the causes that led to the catastrophe. He shows clearly that the conditions which led to the demolition of the Roman governmental fabric exist largely in this country, and he is apprehensive that a similar result will ensue to this nation unless adequate remedial means are applied. In order

to give a fair idea of Cardinal Gibbons' views, it will be appropriate to introduce some quotations from his article. After stating that "next to God, our country should hold the strongest place in our affections," he says:

"History is philosophy teaching by example. A brief review of the Roman Republic and the causes of its downfall will teach us a useful lesson. The Republic prospered so long as the citizens practised simplicity of life and the civil magistrates administered even-handed justice. Avarice and ambition proved its ruin. The avarice of the poor was gratified by the bribery of the rich; and the ambition of the rich was fed by the votes of the poor.

"In the latter days of the Republic bribery and corruption were shamefully practiced. Marius was elected to the consulship by the purchase of votes and by collusion with the most notorious demagogues. Pompey and Crassus secured the consulship by intimidation, though neither of them was legally qualified for that office. The philosophy of Epicurus, introduced during the last years of the Republic, hastened the moral and mental corruption of Rome. The loss of the political autonomy of Greece, which preceded that of Rome, may be traced to the same cause. To the early Romans the oath was sacred, and perjury a detestable crime."

After detailing incidents showing the methods by which Roman elections were carried—in some features they are similar to cases of political jobbery in this country—the eminent writer insists that we ought to take warning by the fate of the Roman empire. To exhibit the justice of his comparison, he says:

"In every possible way, by tickets insidiously printed, by 'colonizing,' 'treating,' and 'personation,' frauds are attempted, and too often successful, on the ballot. I am informed by a trustworthy gentleman that, in certain localities, the adherents of one party, while proof against bribes from their political opponents, will exact compensation before giving their votes even to their own party candidates. The evil would be great enough if it were restricted to examples of this kind, but it becomes much more serious when large bodies of men are debauched by the bribes or intimidated by the threats of wealthy corporations.

"But when the very fountains of legislation are polluted by lobbying and other corrupt means; when the hand of bribery is extended, and not always in vain, to our municipal, State, and national legislators; when our law-makers become the pliant tools of some selfish and greedy capitalists, instead of subserving the interests of the people,—then, indeed, all patriotic citizens have reason to be alarmed about the future of our country.

"The man who would poison the wells and springs of the land is justly regarded as a human monster, as an enemy of society, and no punishment could be too severe for him." Is he not as great a criminal who would poison and pollute the ballot box, the unfailing fountain and well-spring of our civil freedom and of our national life?"

Here is what he says concerning the treatment which ought to be meted out to those enemies of the commonwealth, who, by treachery and fraud, seek to undermine our popular system.

"Let the minister of justice arise, and, clothed with the panoply of authority, let him drive those men from the temple. Let the buyers and sellers of votes be declared infamous; for they are trading in our American birthright. Let them be