

Little Father, or pater. It thus affords no root from which to extract the term "paternalism."

The trouble with our demagogue friend who misuses the term "paternalism" is that he has not grasped the fundamental significance of the American Revolution. He does not realize the fact that the colonists of 1776 turned things around, politically; that they, grown weary of "paternalism," undertook to supplant it by means of doing, through a government by the people, the things that the king—the pater—had arrogated to himself the right to do, for the people.

The American who calls government operation, in America, "paternalistic" thereby demonstrates his failure to comprehend the spirit of the Republic, that the act of a pater is paternal, while the act of democracy is democratic.

The demagogue may retort that un-"democratic" things are often done in democracies; to which it may be answered that the acts of monarchs are sometimes "democratic." In both cases it would be a mere playing with words.

In America, he only is a paternalist who declares that the government—the organized public—is not capable of doing a distinctive public service as well as an individual citizen could do it. To surrender a public service to private ownership and control is the nearest possible approach in a democracy to paternalism. It is as much as to say that the people are incapable of managing their own business; therefore, some great and good individual—some Little Father (pater) must do it for them.

If the people of the United States should decide that popular government is a failure, and should substitute a monarchy, they would thereby declare for paternalism—for a "father" to rule over and protect them. If they should decide that public operation of the post office is a failure, and should sell it out to, or give it into the hands of private individuals, as a privately owned and operated concern, the act would be as nearly paternalistic as any act could be, in a republic.

The misuse of the term "paternalism" by American demagogues

is significant of their sentiment toward democracy. They look upon government as a thing apart from and superior to the people. Their hearts have worshiped imperialism so devoutly and for so long a time that their intellects have forgotten (if they ever have known) that, in America, the government is of, for, and by, the people.

The real paternalist, in America, is he who denies the capacity of the people to manage public service through the machinery of government. He regards the people as children, members of a great family, needing a "father" to organize and operate their public business. And he would gladly be that "father," himself; for "there's millions in it!"

What is paternalism?

It is the ownership and operation of public utilities by any other than the public; as, in an autocracy, by the monarch, or, in a republic, by a private individual or corporation.

EDWARD HOWELL PUTNAM.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

AUSTRALASIA.

Corowa, N. S. W., Australia, Nov. 10.—In my last letter (p. 487), I told you that two local government bills were before the New South Wales State parliament. The municipalities extension bill, relating to present municipalities has been postponed until next session. The shires bill has passed the Assembly, and is now before the Council, or upper house.

I said in the same letter that the maximum tax which could be levied was two pence half penny in the pound on the unimproved value of the land. This referred to the abandoned municipalities bill only. Under the shires bill the maximum tax is one penny half penny in the pound on the unimproved value; but if that does not bring in a sufficient revenue, a further tax of one half penny in the pound on the improved value may be levied. The total area of the present municipalities is only a little over 2,800 square miles. The shires bill is designed to bring about 191,000 square miles more under local government.

For many years the growth of the labor parties has been steady, but there are now signs of a reaction. The labor leaders have been more cautious lately in their utterances.

At the Interstate Labor conference

(page 344) in April, the "objective" was altered, and all direct mention of State socialism omitted.

In both Queensland and West Australia, where the State parties are strongest, there has been friction between Labor ministers and the parliamentary Labor caucus, the ministers being accused of not pushing on fast enough with labor legislation.

In Queensland the Labor party is the predominant partner in a coalition ministry, but some of the Labor ministers state that in future they will stand as independents. At a recent by-election in Queensland, in a mining town which was considered a safe Labor seat, the Labor candidate was easily defeated by an "independent."

In West Australia for more than a year, the Labor party led by Mr. Daglish was in power, though not in the majority, the numbers being Ministry (Labor), 22; Opposition, 24; Independent, 4. In September the Daglish government was defeated, but a ministry formed by the Opposition leader came to grief soon after meeting the House. A general election was held in October, when the Labor party lost a number of seats, the result being Ministry, 34; Labor, 13; Independent, 1, with two returns still to come in.

Mr. Daglish, the ex-premier, severed his connection with the Labor party and was elected as an Independent. In his address to his constituents he said that the systems of cabinet and caucus would not work together. He found the caucus trying to control the cabinet. Ministers answerable to the country for the administration had either to throw over the caucus or become merely the creatures of other members having no such responsibility. One or two Queensland Labor ministers have spoken in very similar terms.

In both States one of the points of difference between ministers and the caucus has been the question of crown land sales. The caucus demands their cessation and substitution of leasing, but ministers say they find this would retard settlement. Why this should result does not appear. I know that in New South Wales when land let on perpetual lease is made available it is readily taken up, being often many times over applied for. This system, of course, enables men with but little capital to take up land for themselves.

At the Interstate Labor conference (p. 344) one plank (4th) adopted was that a referendum of Commonwealth electors should be taken on the tariff question, in order that the parliamentary Labor caucus might vote solidly for high or low duties, in accordance with the result of the referendum. This proposal came from the protectionist delegates at the conference, but

was strongly opposed by the free trade members in caucus.

The Federal Labor members recently held a very long debate over the matter, but no scheme could be devised by which a satisfactory referendum could be taken. The idea has, therefore, been abandoned, and Labor members will, as before, vote according to their own individual convictions when the tariff issue is again raised in the House.

Mr. Deakin, the prime minister, has stated that at the next general election his principal plank will be increased protection.

The New Zealand parliament has come to an end without deciding whether perpetual crown lessees shall be allowed to acquire the freehold of their land.

This will probably be one of the chief questions at the forthcoming general election.
ERNEST BRAY.

BUFFALO.

Buffalo, N. Y., Dec. 11.—In addition to the recent work of the Referendum League, which I described in former correspondence (p. 541), it may be useful to note the League's previous work of the year.

It obtained by persistent effort the adoption of an ordinance authorizing the use of the schoolhouses for public meetings, in accordance with the vote in 1904, but not upon as good terms as desired. Ten dollars must be deposited, seven of which is returned if no damage is done, and the meetings must not be for religious, social or partisan purposes.

The League unsuccessfully opposed in the Council the making of the contract between the city and the gas company, on the ground that it would make a municipal electric light plant, on which the people were to vote, impossible for three years. It secured a bid from a responsible bidder to supply gas at 65 cents per 1,000 feet. The city is now paying \$1 net. After the contract was signed, Mr. Stockton brought a taxpayer's action to set it aside. He was beaten in the trial court and in the Appellate Division, and has made an application to be allowed to go to the Court of Appeals.

Last Winter we prepared a bill providing for a commission to build a municipal electric lighting plant, and to submit the question whether it should be built to the voters, making provision for the issuing of bonds. This bill was introduced in both branches of the legislature, and was buried in committee. Our two annual bills, the public opinion bill and the bill requiring franchises to be approved by the people, met a like fate. An effort was made to have the Com-

mon Council indorse the municipal lighting bill, but without success.

Last Winter the Iroquois Electric company asked the city for a franchise to lay conduits and string wires in the streets for the purpose of bringing more Niagara Falls power here. The League opposed the granting of the franchise on the ground that the city was going to vote on the question of a municipal distributing plant for electricity and any more franchises would interfere with that programme. The franchise has not been granted yet, and the result of the League's action will be that the city will impose terms in the way of price to be charged for electricity, etc.

A grant was made to certain companies about ten years ago to lay conduits in the streets for electric wires upon the condition that half the space therein should be reserved for the city's use for ten years, and if within that time the city began to use the conduits such use should continue without charge. The ten years' limitation expires January 15, 1906, and no use has yet been made of these very valuable rights. The League has been urging the Common Council to string cables in these conduits for the purpose of lighting the public buildings and supplying power to the water pumping station, and the city has gone so far as to advertise for bids for cables and transformers and to issue bonds for \$20,000 to pay for the same. This has been done in face of the open hostility of the Commissioner of Public Works and the covert hostility of the Board of Aldermen.

The League is now opposing the attempt on the part of the Street Railway company to seize the most important thoroughfares remaining unoccupied by tracks, which would destroy the possibility of a municipal street railway. The League secured the adoption of a resolution by the Civic Conference, a body composed of representatives of various civic societies, favoring the establishment of municipal docks.

Most of this work has devolved upon the president, Mr. Lewis Stockton, who has devoted nearly all his time to it. Mr. Frank C. Perkins, the League's electrical expert, has also given a great deal of his time to fighting for the city's rights in all the matters relating to electricity. Others, of course, have worked hard and faithfully. It is safe to say that the advances of democracy here center around the efforts of the Referendum League, which has especial strength because it is not tied up with any selfish interests and is winning the regard of citizens generally for its vigorous fight for the general public good.

ALBERT H. JACKSON.

NEWS NARRATIVE

How to use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives: Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue so until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Thursday, Dec. 14.

British politics.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman has succeeded in forming a Liberal ministry (p. 580) of exceptional strength. It was approved by the King on the 9th and authoritatively announced on the 11th. The names of those constituting the cabinet were cabled as follows:

First lord of the treasury—Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, prime minister.
Chancellor of the exchequer—Herbert Henry Asquith.
Secretary of state for home affairs—Herbert John Gladstone.
Secretary of state for foreign affairs—Sir Edward Grey.
Secretary of state for the colonies—Earl of Elgin.
Secretary of state for war—Richard Burdon Haldane.
Secretary of state for India—John Morley.
First lord of the admiralty—Baron Tweedmouth.
President of board of trade—David Lloyd-George.
President of local government board—John Burns.
Secretary of state for Scotland—John Sinclair.
President of board of agriculture and fisheries—Earl Carrington.
Postmaster general—Sydney Charles Burton.
Chief secretary for Ireland—James Bryce.
Lord president of council—Earl of Crewe.
Lord of the privy seal—Marquis of Ripon.
Lord high chancellor—Sir Robert Threskild Reid.
President of board of education—Augustine Birrell.
Chancellor of Duchy of Lancaster—Sir Henry Hartley Fowler.

Following are the ministers not in the cabinet:

Lord lieutenant of Ireland—Earl of Aberdeen.
Lord chancellor of Ireland—Right Honorable Samuel Walker.
First commissioner of works and public buildings—Louis Vernon Harcourt.