

the luxury of crime. Their trial will last a long time and they will be put to much inconvenience, but their lives will probably not be seriously jeopardized. Some communities are more easily and deeply shocked than others by certain crimes. It would not be safe for a very rich man to commit a crime far from the neighborhood of a large strong jail and a determined sheriff. For the community's indignation once aroused would only, under such circumstances, be appeased by his swaying or charred body. The community sense ignores personal considerations of gain in order to protect itself from the lawless. The community is made up of individuals, but in detestation of an atrocious, unnatural crime it is like one absolutely uninfluenced by gain. The community on rare provocation is a giant, aroused and revengeful. If the fugitive be rich the social sense is still more indignant and his shrift is short.

Not so very long ago it was an unwritten law, but none the less effective, that a father might slay his daughter's seducer and escape with his life, or that a husband might kill his wife's paramour and still go unpunished. Recent trials have shown that the sentimentality that excuses murder and lets the murderer go free no longer affects juries. Men have so stiffened themselves in regard to the sacredness of life that even a woman is not allowed to shoot her betrayer. That old superstition that a woman is better than a man is losing its hold upon juries. And if upon juries, then upon men. In Kansas a jury has recently demonstrated its ability to recognize a brutal murderess and to recommend punishment, severe, if not adequately severe. In New Jersey a wife's belated tale of an assault incited her fatuous husband to commit a murderous assault upon a probably innocent man. The husband was arrested but was secure in the belief that no jury would punish a man for resenting an attack upon the holiness of his home. The upright judge who tried the case, refused to admit any testimony as to why the husband assaulted the minister and the long-suffering, sorely tried sense of justice which has had to yield for so many centuries to this anomalous sentiment in regard to an assault upon a woman justifying murder, was, at last vindicated. These two trials are no small satisfaction to men and women who have impotently contemplated this long injustice, this letting a murderess go free, and hanging a no more brutal murderer. Good men are tender to women. They idealize them and a designing woman plays upon the chord of female helplessness until, what with her tears and the hysterics of relatives, the jury is no more than twelve sympathetic and deeply moved men. In such an emotional condition it is not difficult for a clever and magnetic lawyer to convince them that the prisoner at the bar is a wronged woman whom it is a mistake to punish for murder though the flesh she made clay has been rotting for a year.

Men have long threatened woman that if she insisted upon her rights they would deny her the courtesies they are used to grant her. Rights are more satisfactory, more continually applicable to all ages and to all degrees of beauty and plainness than courtesies. A woman in the enjoyment of all human rights is quite able to dispense with courtesies. The latter cannot be reckoned upon. Some men are courteous to their acquaintances, and discourteous to their families; some are courteous to wives, sisters, cousins, aunts and

all their lady friends and brutal to all unknown, plain women. There are so many of this latter type, that it is really more comfortable and safer for woman not to depend upon courtesies but to enjoy the certitude of her rights which can compel a certain legal civility not at all a bad substitute for a seat in a crowded car and a very artificial deference in public. This modern tendency to try a murderess as if she were a man is perhaps a manifestation of the treatment which men have threatened to apply to the new-woman. If so it is a wholesome result of the struggle for individualism. The perversion of justice on account of sex is silly. It has lasted long enough. It makes law contemptible by interrupting its universal application, and it encourages crime by excepting some people from the consequences of crime. This latest and unexpected result of the entry of woman into business, the struggle for the same wages and the demand for professional recognition, is altogether desirable. If woman is to receive the same reward for her activities and attainments she should be punished for her crimes with the same severity applied to her brother criminals. The consistent new woman is satisfied to keep step with her brother along all his paths. In many ways she is handicapped, but she is willing to take her place, without favors, either for herself or any other working member of her sex. Courage and certainty of her election to labor baffles criticism and unmanly, unchivalrous ridicule, and the new woman is far on her course. She has gained the right and just increased her likelihood of being hung, if she murders, like a man. I like to call attention to these progressive stages in the march of woman to complete emancipation.

A Colored Woman's Federation.

In Buffalo last week three hundred and fifty delegates to the National Association of Colored Women of the United States met and discussed means by which colored women may assist in the more rapid development of their race. It was the second biennial meeting of the federation and was an example to white women in the orderly transaction of business. Over one hundred organizations of colored women claiming a membership of over 10,000 persons were represented, chiefly located in the south. The association was established five years ago to aid in the advancement of colored women's interests. The president of the association said in her address to the delegates: "The denser the ignorance and the greater the degradation of the masses of a people, the harder should the more favored portions strive to illumine the minds and improve the morals of those whom it is in their power to uplift. The work of inspiration and illumination in the south has been directed almost entirely upon the negro man. Even white men are somewhat difficult to civilize from the outside. Take the manners and morals of a mining camp composed entirely of white men for example. The insistent effort of a good and refined woman upon a man is the quickest civilizing energy yet applied. When the colored women of the south learn the latest system of child culture, when they make daily use of the tooth brush and the bathtub and of the few other essential tools of civilization, the regeneration of the southern negro man is in sight. For the law of selection will leave the dirty man mateless. A neat, clean woman, white or black, will not love a dirty man when she has the choice of a clean one." The association did

not consider this point. It will probably be ignored in all future meetings. Nevertheless such is the source of enlightenment for the southern negro.

Religion and State.

The Roman Catholics of England are demanding that when King Edward VII takes the oath on his coronation day it shall be so revised as to omit denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which it now contains, and which every king of England has taken since the Test act in the reign of Charles I. The protestants of England were at first not disposed to resist the demand. A select committee of the house of lords was appointed to consider if a revision of the denunciation of the doctrine contained in the oath were practicable. The committee has reported and it is recommended that the report be referred back to the committee again. In that event the correspondents are of the opinion that no revision of the oath will be made this year, and if not before the coronation of King Edward VII, then the agitation is not likely to be renewed until the accession and coronation of the next king of England.

The protestants of England and Ireland are not concerned about the doctrine of transubstantiation. Not that at all. Whether the king of England believes in that or any modern miracle is not the question. The protestants are afraid of the civil relations which a catholic king might establish between England and Rome or between England and the Pope. Protestants are civilly, not religiously, jealous of Rome. The doctrine of transubstantiation is insisted upon by the Pope. Therefore when King Edward asserts that he does not believe in it, it is essentially a declaration of independence of Rome.

Since the publication in the newspapers of the litigation between Bishop Bonacum and a priest who is seeking in the law courts to retain a parish which desires him to continue his ministrations, in spite of the Bishop's excommunication, Nebraska protestants comprehend better the feeling which makes it impossible in England to substitute any less emphatic clause rejecting catholicism in the coronation oath of the kings of England. In the trial it developed that the Bishop sent a priest from Lincoln to inform a witness that if he testified on the side of the excommunicated priest he would shut the gates of heaven against him. The Bishop sincerely believes that he is justified in threatening an earth-dweller with everlasting punishment. He is convinced that while dwelling on earth he has jurisdiction in heaven. No one from above has ever claimed lack of jurisdiction in his trials, but the defendants have fled to the Nebraska courts. And the judges profess entire ignorance of the Bishop's district. It is this persistent claim of supercedence of the church over the law that creates protestant jealousy. The latter are afraid of civil aggression on the part of the Pope, and divided loyalty is treason. To shut the doors of heaven, so far away, upon a mortal whose tired feet have not yet paused at the brink of the river which divides noise from silence, is an act the possibility of which it is impossible for a protestant to comprehend.

In the light of this stupendous claim it is easier to comprehend the no-popey riots of England and the increased excitement of the protestant majority in England and Ireland caused by the demand of the Catholics for the excision from the oath of

the declaration of independence. Twenty-seven protestant associations in England, Scotland and Ireland called "The Council of the Imperial Protestant Federation" have issued a petition to the house of lords asking that no change whatever be made in the oath without the explicit assent thereto of the British people expressed by means of a general election.

Colonel Sandys, M. P. who presented the memorial, admits that, if the King's declaration were intended as an insult to Roman Catholic subjects of the British Crown, it could not be justified. Colonel Sandys, however, insists that it is not intended as an insult, but as a necessary safeguard of England's civil and religious liberties. The Imperial Protestant Federation holds that, if Englishmen are to retain their civil and religious liberties uninjured, "it is absolutely essential to have a Protestant king, who must be one, not in name only, but in reality, and, therefore, it is provided by the Bill of Rights that he shall do some public protesting against Rome as a specimen and an evidence of his Protestantism." This public protesting against Rome is done in the King's declaration, as it stands at present.

It is pointed out in this petition that the Tablet, the Roman Catholic newspaper owned by Cardinal Vaughan, lately described the rejection of the dogma of transubstantiation contained in the royal declaration as, so to speak, "the flag of protestantism nailed over the threshold of the throne, and on the very apex of the British Constitution." Accepting the correctness of the description, the Imperial Protestant Federation says, "Let us keep the good old protestant flag waving!" And it goes on to demand that "No papal gag shall be placed in the mouth of the King of England."

A Humour Test.

A man with a reputation for humour strong enough (the reputation) perhaps to last a decade, recently contributed a story to one of the magazines. It was a successful story judging from the number of exchange editors who clipped it from the magazine and reprinted it in their papers. It is now pronounced a test for a sense of humour. The individual who cannot see the point is adjudged lacking in this sense, a quality most essential to sanity and sound judgment. The sentence which the funny man thought of, the point to the story, is contained in this sentence: "Nothing looks worse on a rainy day than a walking skirt." A specialist in detecting the presence of a sense of humour says that the point of this is so deftly concealed that no one possessing an undeveloped sense of humour is able to see it, and that very few women can appreciate it. It is gratifying to be offered an infallible proof by which we may discover whether we belong to the large, comfortable average or to the uncomfortable, cranky oddities who can do one or two things surpassingly well by ignoring home ties and routine work of all kinds. Any kind reader of these pages who sees the fun in the rainy day joke is invited to write this department. I shall be very glad to publish a key to this joke. To be sure it can then no longer be used as a test in assaying a sense of humour, but the genius who invented this one might be driven by the necessities of the case to invent another. As soon as the interpretations are received they will be printed and it is sincerely hoped that among them will be some which are the work of woman's unassisted intellect.