

violates the basic principles of all Governments, which derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Dr. Shaw's refusal to pay her income tax recalls the fact that she comes of a tax-resisting family. Her grandmother, an English widow, was a Non-conformist, and was opposed on principle to paying tithes for the Church of England. Regularly, whenever the tax was demanded, she refused to pay, and let her household goods be sold at auction in the street, while from her doorway she told the tax collector what she thought of him.

THE EUGENICS OF SUFFRAGE

By Florence Woolston, Editor of The Woman Voter.

In olden times witches were blamed for everything that went amiss; nowadays it is the suffragists. Within the last few months we have been accused of promoting bad government, abetting white slavery, sex appealing by wearing Monsieur Poiret's designs in clothes, fostering decadent drama, art, literature; contributing to the decline of piano playing, and a long line of attending calamities. Since these are comparatively new denunciations, we had almost forgotten the classic impeachment of the falling birth rate, lately revived in a cartoon in Judge.

It would be easy enough to prove that children continue to be born in suffrage countries or that a decreased birth rate is causing great concern in France, where women are not yet enfranchised. We could, upon demand, produce photographs of women voters in the United States, proud mothers of from four to eighteen children, or issue a convincing census of suffrage babies.

But why should suffragists be required to pass a eugenics test for citizenship? We are not asking for a limited franchise for mothers and fathers, with the high offices to go to those who have the largest families. We wish individual and not family representation in government. If maternity were prerequisite to the ballot,

we should bar out such women as Miss Addams, Miss Lathrop, Miss Kellor and the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw, who have spent their lives trying to make the world a comfortable place for children.

After all, the question is not what might happen to children if women were enfranchised, but what have women actually done for children with the ballot? The problem of the birth rate is social and economic, its solution a matter of speculation; the love of women for children and their desire to protect them can be demonstrated by facts.

In Colorado, where women have voted since 1893, a State department has been created for the protection of children. It is supported by the State, with offices in the capitol. Six hundred agents, with power of police or sheriff, are constantly guarding the welfare of the young.

The magnificent legislation of last year in California shows what women voters mean to do with their political power. The successful passage of laws for equal guardianship, the protection of illegitimate children, minimum wages and protection of women workers, child labor laws, raising the age of consent, establishing training schools for delinquent girls, developing kindergartens and playgrounds and providing for pure milk and pure food is due in large measure to the efforts of women. Other equal-suffrage States present similar illustration of the mother spirit in politics.

CUPID, THE STORK AND THE BALLOT

By Mary Ware Dennett, Corresponding Secretary National American Woman Suffrage Association.

What is the connection between them? There isn't any, the opponents of woman suffrage to the contrary notwithstanding. Why bring up the question of marriage and parenthood in connection with a woman's voting when it is never brought up in connection with a man's voting? Marriage and parent-