

So the last refuge of the objectors is the apathy of the women themselves. No strong reason remains after the debate is over, on the opposing side, but the fact that the majority of women do not want the suffrage.

This is, of course, no real and substantial cause for denying it to those who do want it, and who have a just claim upon it in a government of the people, in which it is admitted that taxation without representation is tyranny, and which is founded on the principle that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. But it obtains some plausibility from the undeniable fact that the masses of women either care nothing or very little about it, or that are opposed to it because they think it will impose duties upon them which they do not desire to assume.

But here is a movement among the ladies to demonstrate their wishes upon the subject. It meets the only strong objection urged against giving to women the elective franchise. And now that the women of Washington Territory propose to step forward and remove this objection, they are jeered at, and cautioned, and told that they are too eager and that they will disgust the men if they persist. Of such is the logic of the anti-woman-suffragists.

What are the ladies to do? If they do not agitate this question they are told they ought not to have the suffrage, because they show that they do not want it. If they do step forward and organize, and exhibit interest and diligence to obtain what they believe to be their right, they are denounced as unwomanly, and advised to be quiet and let the men decide the matter for them.

We believe the ladies of Washington Territory are in the right. Apart from the abstract question of woman suffrage, they should, by all means, endeavor to manifest their views on a question which relates to them directly and affects their status particularly. They ought to be permitted to vote on it. If they are denied that simple justice they ought to take such steps as will expose the injustice, and then test in the courts their right, under the laws of the Territory and the provisions of the State constitution, to have a voice in the disposition of a question that is to decide their political future, and either relegate them to political serfdom or

elevate them to a political plane with the sterner sex, and make them at least equal with the commonest, unlettered, colored corn-hoer or cotton puller in the South.

CONTRADICTORY POSITIONS.

In late dispatches Mr. Charles Francis Adams is credited with making an extraordinary statement, which does not hang on the same nail with railroad propositions and developments that have recently occurred in this region. He is represented as saying, in effect, that outside of newspaper talk he has never heard of a Union Pacific scheme to build through to California.

In opposition to this alleged assertion stands the prominent fact that the intention to build through to southern California was offered as the principal reason for the consolidation of the U. P. system that was lately consummated. The consolidated road consists of what were formerly eight distinct lines, one of them the Nevada Pacific, which had been surveyed and incorporated, and whose objective point is California. The amalgamated roads were given the title of the Oregon Short Line and Utah and Northern, of which Mr. Adams was elected president. A proposition to extend the Utah Central to the Nevada line was carried, that movement being necessary to connect it with the proposed Nevada Pacific.

Let us hope that the great railroad authority—Mr. Adams—was misunderstood, and consequently misrepresented by the press dispatcher. The subject of another line to California is one of vital importance to this region, and the people are sensitive about any indication of a disposition to throw cold water on such a scheme.

A ROMANIST ON THE RAMPAGE.

CARDINAL GIBBONS is a vigorous writer and a pronounced Romanist. The unveiling of the statue of Bruno has agitated the Catholic clergy and has called forth an allocution from the Pope, and now the Cardinal comes out with a letter directing attention to the Pope's utterances, and conveying his own sentiments as follows:

"A mingled feeling of righteous wrath and deep sympathy was bred in every Catholic heart when the news came that upon a public square in Rome impious men had dared to unveil the statue of an

apostate monk. Dragging the memory of a wild theorizer, a shameless writer, and defier of the divinity of Christ from the obscurity of a grave that had for three centuries closed upon its disgrace, these men, backed by mere brute force, have set upon a pedestal in the Holy City the statue of the infamous Bruno. Such a proceeding is a palpable and flagrant outrage, not alone upon the Catholics but upon the whole Christian world. Its animus is clear in its unchristian and defiant language employed in the unveiling of the statue of a man whose whole life breathed cowardice, pride and defiance of lawfully constituted authority. There is not the action of decent, honorable, but misguided men, calmly, and with due regard to the feelings of others, promulgating a new belief, or introducing a new cult. Their attempt is not so much to honor Bruno as to insult and vilify the vicar of Jesus Christ and His devoted children throughout Christendom. Indeed, their aim is higher still; they defy and insult not alone His vicar, but our Divine Lord Himself. From every land they have chosen as the committee to further the movement the champions of atheism, the would-be destroyers of the very foundations of Christianity. It is proper that the Christian world, and especially this portion, where the term 'religious freedom' is understood in a sober, Christian sense, should brand with their indignant scorn action such as this. We are not yet ready for processions in which the red and the black flags of revolutionists and anarchists are defiantly flaunted."

Bruno was the founder of a school of pantheists and flourished in the latter part of the 16th century. He was a Dominican monk but becoming skeptical on the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Transubstantiation, he was denounced as a heretic and had to flee for his life. He went to Geneva and thence to Paris, but in both places became involved in doctrinal disputes which brought him into bad odor so that he had to pass over to England. There he wrote many philosophical books which are now quite rare. He maintained that the "soul of the universe" not only pervaded all nature but that all substantial things were manifestations of Deity and thus God was "all in all." Returning to the continent he pursued a varied career, supporting Lutheran principles but refusing to join the Lutheran communion. In Venice he was arrested by the Inquisition, and after two years of persecution was at last burned at the stake. His martyrdom occurred February 17th, 1600.

The excitement among prominent Catholic ecclesiastics over the erection of a statue in his honor at Papal Rome, can be readily understood,