

played his cards to drive the audience away without giving Baker a chance to address them. But although it was nearly midnight when Baker began speaking, he held the audience for forty minutes, scoring the Republicans for their subservency to the trusts, and in denunciation of Rockefeller and Standard Oil methods of finance, although McCarren was on the platform with a number of his cronies. The audience greeted Baker's exhortation of Wall street methods of fleecing the public, with rapturous applause, while McCarren and his friends winced and covertly sneered. A few nights subsequent to this, at a district meeting where Baker was billed as the chief speaker, an ex-Congressman was introduced first and held the platform for an hour. Baker was billed to speak at two other meetings that same evening and requested the chairman to notify the speaker that he had these other engagements. It has always been the custom in Brooklyn for speakers to give way temporarily to candidates who have other appointments to fill. After repeating the request Baker left without addressing the meeting. However, he took pains to let both his friends and enemies know that the leaders had deliberately planned to squelch him.

Although not in favor with the Anti-Bryan Democrats who have control of the Brooklyn machine, Baker is popular with the rank and file Democrats who do the voting. They give evidence that they admire his fighting qualities wherever he addresses them. Even at a conservative business men's noonday meeting in New York, at 597 Broadway, one day last week, at which I was present, Baker was the only speaker that evoked enthusiasm, although his talk was along the most radical lines. He received quite an ovation from the audience at the conclusion, the reporters joining in the applause.

A few evenings ago I was passing through Baker's district on a trolley car. Just before I got off a couple of gentlemen, who by their dress and demeanor gave evidence of being successful business or professional men, took seats near me. One of them expressed himself very strongly in favor of Baker's course in Congress and said that he believed the people would return him, the other gentleman quietly assenting. Some of his friends are predicting that he will lead the ticket, notwithstanding the secret knifing that he will receive at the hands of McCarren's friends. Baker, himself, feels sanguine of victory if he had friends to make an aggressive and thorough campaign. To do this effectively he must not only conduct the cart-tail campaign, but the forty thousand voters in his district should receive his record both in and out of Congress. This alone will cost a thousand dollars. The circulation of his article in the September Arena, entitled "The Reign of Graft and Its Remedy," would be an effective campaign document.

Both the national committee and the Congressional committee have refused him aid. He will receive no aid from the local committee. Unless his radical friends throughout the country lend a helping hand he has a difficult task ahead of him. His reelection would be a victory for radical democracy everywhere.

D. S. LUTHER

BUFFALO.

Buffalo, N. Y., Oct. 18.—In my last letter (p. 278) I told of the "public opinion" ordinance which had been adopted by the Common Council of this city, referring to the fact that a resolution had been introduced in the Board of Aldermen providing that a question be submitted to the voters to advise whether school houses shall be opened for public meetings under proper regulations, and saying that the resolution had been referred to the school committee, and that the Common Council had adjourned over the month of August. Since then some progress has been made.

The Board of Aldermen met on the 5th of September. Mr. Stockton, of the Referendum League, was unable to persuade the committee on schools to meet and take action on the resolution prior to the meeting of the Board. He did, however, persuade the Board of Aldermen to discharge the committee and adopt the resolution. Approved by the Board of Councilmen on the 7th and signed by the Mayor on the 8th the ordinance came in force just within the required time for placing it on the ballot.

The next problem was to get the question upon the ballot. The City Clerk on the 3d of October, under the direction of the Corporation Counsel, sent a certified copy of the referendum ordinance and the resolution to the Commissioner of Elections, who is a county officer, with a request that he place the question on the ballot and inform him (the city clerk) whether or not he would do so. The Corporation Counsel and Mr. Stockton were preparing to make application to the Supreme Court for a peremptory writ of mandamus to compel the Commissioner of Elections to place the question on the ballot in case his answer was unfavorable. This proved unnecessary, however, for a reply was received from that officer saying the question would go upon the ballot.

The problem now is to get the people to vote on the proposition. This question was adopted for the purpose of starting the referendum movement without the corporate opposition which would be met if a question more vital were submitted. The disadvantage lies in the fact that, owing to the character of the question and the shortness of the time before election, the vote may be light. This would give the opposition newspapers a string to harp on about the referendum always being a failure. The Referendum League is doing all in its

power to arouse interest in the question. The two morning papers are favorable and give us a good deal of space, and several high school teachers are trying to get their pupils to work at the polls. The Superintendent of Education is in favor of the adoption of the plan.

The League is also questioning candidates for the State legislature as to their stand on the referendum generally, and has prepared literature to send out in opposition to State Senator George A. Davis, who "held up" the referendum bills in the Cities Committee of the Senate last winter and who is now seeking reelection. The normal Republican majority in his district is 2,200, which the League hopes to reduce.

ALBERT H. JACKSON.

AUSTRALASIA (p. 407).

Corowa, N. S. W., Sept. 15.—An important question in connection with land tenures is coming up for settlement in New Zealand. About 1,735,000 acres are held by nearly 9,000 tenants on lease; 1,565,000 acres being at a rent of four per cent. of the capital value, without revaluation, for 999 years, and the balance subject to periodical revaluation. There is a movement to allow these tenants to purchase the freehold. This is strongly opposed by a party which also desires to prevent any more crown land being sold. Mr. Seddon, the premier, who is an opportunist, has parried the matter so far, and has now shelved it by appointing a royal commission to inquire into the whole question of land tenure.

In New South Wales we have a perpetual leasing system, also, the land being let at a rent of one and one-fourth per cent. of the capital value for the first five years, and afterwards at two and one-half per cent., subject to revaluations. There is a similar proposal here, that the tenants should be allowed to buy the freehold, but the number of leaseholders is not yet large. The chief argument used in favor of the proposal is that tenants cannot borrow money on the security of their land. To read the Conservative papers, anyone would think a farmer could not be happy unless his land were mortgaged.

In this state the Reform party has organized a ministry, with Joseph Caruthers as premier and James Ashton, a true democrat, as minister of lands.

The Labor party has made a further gain in Queensland. There were three parties in the State parliament until the Labor party and another formed a coalition ministry. But the House was then almost equally divided, so that neither side could command a majority. An election was held in August, when the parties were returned as follows:

Ministerialist (coalition).....	19
Labor (coalition).....	34
Opposition.....	14
Independent.....	2

In the previous parliament the Labor

party consisted of 24 members. This party is strongly in favor of State socialism.

In West Australia the State premier (Labor) has promised to introduce a bill for taxation of land values.

The South Australian State treasurer proposes to increase the land value tax from one halfpenny to three farthings in the pound. [From about one cent to one and one half cents of tax, to each five dollars of value; or, from about two to three mills tax per dollar of value—an increase from two-tenths of one per cent. to three-tenths of one per cent. —Ed.]

The accounts in *The Public* of Chief Justice Marshall, (Vol. III, p. 677) and the way the American Constitution was "Hamiltonized" have led me to watch the proceedings of our Federal High Court. So far the decisions have been few and comparatively unimportant, though some may become valuable as precedents. They seem to be all in the right direction, upholding the rights of the States. Too much power was given the Federal government by the constitution act, so it is very undesirable that more should be added judicially. Fortunately the Chief Justice, Sir Samuel Griffith, besides being a very able lawyer, is a democrat.

The High Court may have to decide a very important point regarding arbitration legislation. Any ordinary person reading the constitution act would think a federal arbitration act could only become operative if an industrial dispute extended beyond the limits of a State. But there seems to be some doubt of this, and the Labor party has assumed that the federal act will over-ride all State acts. If the federal arbitration bill ever becomes law, the High Court will eventually have to decide as to its scope.

The bill was taken up by the Reid ministry where the Watson government had left it. The Labor party took no further interest in it, saying that with preference to unionists cut-out, it was useless. It has been passed by the House, and sent to the Senate, where there may be more trouble over it, as the Labor party is strong there. Mr. Watson, the leader of the opposition and Labor party, has given notice that he will move a no-confidence motion against the Reid ministry.

ERNEST BRAY.

## NEWS

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 20.

Although there has been no general dissipation of the apathy which envelopes the Presidential campaign (p. 439), public meetings in some places and under

some circumstances have been attended by large crowds and have apparently awakened some interest.

This is notably true of Bryan's campaigning in Indiana. As reported on the 18th by Raymond, the *Chicago Tribune's* correspondent, whose statements are usually trustworthy,—

Bryan is saving thousands of votes in Indiana, but he is not making any. He has been in the State since the middle of the week and has had extraordinary receptions everywhere. His crowds have been the only ones of any magnitude during this campaign. He is doing the work for which he was brought to Indiana, and doing it well. That is to say, Bryan has stopped the landslide against Parker among the old silver Democrats. He will, in all probability, hold the Democratic vote about to the normal figures, and has put an end to the intended slump to Watson.

Bryan's appeal to his followers is briefly indicated by the same correspondent, who says:

He has argued with the people with his usual cleverness that while he is still a silver man, while he disagrees radically with Parker's gold telegram, and while he does not like the influences which surround Parker in New York, still Parker stands for some things in the Democratic platform which Bryan stands for. Bryan is making the issue that he loves Parker not more, but Roosevelt less, and this issue is taking with the old Bryan free silver Democrats. He is keeping them in the party.

Referring to Roosevelt, Bryan is reported in a press dispatch of the 13th from Fort Wayne as declaring in his speech there that he is—

not willing to risk new questions if we have a warlike spirit in the White House. A man who loves war and has military enthusiasm, when brought to decide between peaceful and warlike means, may choose the more violent and involve us in a great war.

The burden of Bryan's speeches is opposition to militarism and imperialism. On the latter issue he was criticized by Senator Beveridge for his speeches against the Republican Philippine policy. Mr. Beveridge called him inconsistent because the Philippine islands were acquired through a treaty which Bryan himself had favored. It was the same accusa-

tion that has been frequently made against Bryan, of using his influence to secure the ratification of the peace treaty by the Senate. He noticed it on the 17th at several places in Indiana by saying:

If Senator Beveridge had been honest he would have told you that when I advocated the ratification of the treaty I also insisted that we should immediately promise independence to the Filipinos, and I insisted that the Bacon resolution should be passed. It was defeated by the vote of the Vice President. That resolution promised independence to the Philippines on the same terms that it was promised to the people of Cuba.

Judge Parker made an important anti-imperialist speech at Esopus on the 15th. It was in the form of an address of welcome to an anti-imperialist committee headed by Col. Codman. While reiterating in this speech the statement of his letter of acceptance, that the Filipinos ought to be assured of independence "as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it," Judge Parker severely criticized the statement of Secretary Taft that—

a promise to give ultimate independence will be construed by the more violent element, disposed to agitation, to be a promise to grant independence in the near future and during the present generation. The success of the experiment we are making in the Philippines depends on having the Filipinos understand that we are there for their benefit, but that we expect to stay there indefinitely in working out the good we propose to do them.

In the course of his speech Judge Parker, commenting upon this, said:

Here we have the issue clearly defined. The Republican party stands for the subjugation of defenseless foreign peoples. Democracy stands for freedom. We relieved Spain of this thorn in her flesh, the Philippines, to plunge into our own. We paid, and are paying, enormously for the privilege of performing this operation. Spain had been trying to conquer the islands since the early decades of the sixteenth century. She had never quite succeeded. That is not surprising. Every true American would despise a man who would not fight to the last gasp for the land of his fireside and the birthplace of his babes. . . . Our duty to the Filipinos demands a promise of independence. But if it did not our own inter-