

in another connection Altgeld said, "Compromisers, traders and neutral men never correct abuses, never found or save free institutions, never fight for human rights. They always become the instruments of the enemy. Wherever they are in control the party is unworthy the respect of mankind. Only men of courage and conviction can save this land. Only the men who stand erect ever get recognition."

In concluding this letter, Mr. Robins, as a Democrat I assure you of my purpose to vote for you for United States senator, confident that you will continue to act upon your matured Democratic convictions and give unqualified support to the constructive Democratic policies of President Wilson. As secretary of the Altgeld Memorial Association I now invite you to serve as the orator at the Memorial exercises May 30, 1915, at the grave of Altgeld, and as one of the members of the Altgeld Monument Commission I shall endeavor to have the Commission invite you to be one of the orators at the unveiling of the Altgeld monument at Lincoln Park on Labor Day, 1915.

Again thanking you for your leadership in this great fight, I remain, Sincerely,

JOSEPH S. MARTIN.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

STUDIES IN CALIFORNIA DIRECT LEGISLATION.

San Diego, Cal., October 17.

An official pamphlet of 112 pages, issued by the Secretary of State of California, is now being mailed to every elector in California, giving him or her the exact wording of each bill or proposed amendment to the State Constitution to be voted on at the election, Nov. 3.

Of the 48 proposed measures 27 were referred to the voters by the legislature, 5 are laws which were passed by the legislature and signed by the governor, but whose operation was suspended by reason of referendum petitions, and 17 of the measures were placed on the ballot by initiative petitions, each of which contained at least 31,000 signatures. Eighteen of the measures are bills and 30 are proposed constitutional amendments.

One of the proposed constitutional amendments (No. 43 on the ballot) exempts from taxation all educational institutions of collegiate grade not conducted for profit. In the argument favoring this proposition it is stated that "every state in the Union, except California, exempts college property from taxation. California should not be the only state to discourage the investment of private capital in higher education." There is no opposing argument.

Proposition No. 8 is an amendment to exempt from county and city but not from state taxation for 20 years "all vessels of more than 50 tons burden registered at any port in this state and engaged in the transportation of freight and passengers." This is proposed in order, it is claimed, to encourage our shipping interests.

Proposition No. 10 is an initiative amendment to abolish the Poll Tax. In his argument in favor of this amendment Paul Scharrenberg, Secretary of the

State Federation of Labor, says: "The poll tax has been handed down from the period when the people were classed as chattels. . . . Originally a tax upon property, the poll tax is now a tax upon persons, upon life itself. . . . The poll tax is a survival of despotism and a denial of democracy. . . . An unjust and oppressive tax cannot be justified on the ground that the proceeds are devoted to a useful purpose. It is not necessary to tax the poor in order to maintain the schools and pay the teachers a decent salary."

The argument for the retention of the poll tax says, among other things: "Every citizen, whether rich or poor, should pay some tax, and should thus be made conscious in a direct way of his responsibility for the support of the institutions under which he lives." This argument also states that "the state poll tax yields for the state school fund about \$850,000 per annum, which is about one-seventh of the total amount which the state provides for the support of common schools."

Proposition No. 34 entitled "Taxation of Public Property" presents unique points of considerable interest. The cities of San Francisco and Los Angeles in order to get adequate water supplies had to go to outside counties, and buy land where water was found. San Francisco purchased over \$1,000,000 worth of property in Tuolumne county, and Los Angeles bought in Owens river valley over 75,000 acres of land. These lands, before their purchase by the two cities, had paid taxes to the various counties in which they were located. The 75,000 acres purchased by Los Angeles constituted over one-fourth of the located agricultural land of the county. Since the purchase, San Francisco has absolutely refused to pay a dollar in taxes to Tuolumne county, and Los Angeles has paid taxes on her purchase under protest. The proposition requires the cities to pay the land tax, but not to pay any tax on the improvements.

Proposition No. 7 entitled "Local Taxation Exemption," is the amendment locally known as "Home Rule in Taxation" which was rejected two years ago by the voters of this state. Our legislature has again referred it to the people.

The two arguments for this amendment are signed, one by George Gelder, and one by Geo. B. Finnegan, and the one argument against the amendment is signed by W. F. Chandler. All three are assemblymen. The first argument dwells largely upon home rule features, and states among other things: "The amendment is merely an enabling act, and does not, of itself, adopt any system of taxation, nor does it make any change in the present systems now in use."

The second writer, Mr. Finnegan, says: "The general property tax for state purposes was so unsatisfactory that California abandoned it four years ago by separating state and local taxation. The general property tax for local purposes is unsatisfactory in California as well as in other states that have separated state and local taxation. The personal property tax is unsatisfactory wherever it is in force. . . . It is condemned by every thoughtful student of taxation."

In the negative argument by Mr. Chandler it is stated: "Individuals or corporations locating factory or mercantile sites would locate in the counties

where taxes were the lightest, thus inducing local officers to exempt such property from taxation in order to secure such sites, to the detriment and expense of other classes of property. . . . A person could own vast numbers of live stock . . . and not pay a cent of local taxes on that kind of property. . . . It will assist the professional tax dodger."

Much activity in favor of this amendment is being shown in many parts of the State.

There are 12 of the propositions which are strictly local in their provisions, and not of interest to the general reader, except, perhaps, proposition No. 30. This is an amendment to allow irrigation districts to buy and own stock in foreign corporations when necessary for the success of their irrigation canals. It affects only the extreme southeastern part of the State. The affirmative argument reads: "The canal system by which water is furnished to this community, owing to the configuration of the country, has its heading on the Colorado river in California, runs thence for 40 miles through Mexico, and then back into the United States, furnishing water for irrigation for 500,000 acres in Imperial county. Neither an irrigation district nor an American corporation can own a canal in that part of Mexico."

Proposition No. 14 entitled "Voting by Absent Electors," is an initiative bill prepared largely by commercial travelers. It provides for "the issuing of a certificate of identification and ballot to voters who will be absent from home precincts on election day."

The measure, it is claimed, is to be of special benefit "to commercial travelers, locomotive engineers, trainmen and railway postal clerks" (over 30,000 of them in the State), "whose judgment is quite as valuable to the welfare of the commonwealth as that of any other class of citizens who might be named."

Proposition No. 13, an initiative amendment, entitled "Qualification of Voters at Bond Elections," brings up again the old, old question of whether it is property or the person that votes. It gravely insists that no one should vote on the question of bond issues unless a property owner. The argument in favor of the measure mentions nine reasons why it should pass, the last one being "allowing the man who pays the debt to contract the debt."

The argument against the proposition is by James H. Barry, editor of the San Francisco Star. Among other things, Mr. Barry says: "This amendment proposes a step backwards. The world is not moving towards disfranchisement, but towards enfranchisement of those now disfranchised. . . . Many of the so-called 'large tax payers' are merely tax collectors. The merchant gets the tax receipt for taxes paid on his goods, but the tax is added to the price of the goods, and the consumer pays it. . . . The man who lives in a rented room, eats at a restaurant, and has no other property than a change of clothing, pays taxes when he pays for his room and food and clothing."

Proposition No. 23, entitled "Elections by Plurality, Preferential Vote and Primary," is designed to allow, when desired, "a preferential system of electing officers when such are chosen as non-partisans, and of nominating party candidates when

officers are chosen as partisans." The "preferential" system is stated to be in effect the "Berkeley" plan of "majority choice with but one election instead of two, thus saving the cost, time, and energy of a second election. It is already in successful operation in Grand Junction, Colorado Springs, Denver, Duluth, Spokane, Portland, Ore., and Cleveland."

Proposition No. 32 is to abolish a clause in the state constitution which forbids the governor, during his term of office, to be elected United States Senator. Since the legislatures no longer elect the U. S. Senators the restriction is not necessary to protect the State solons from the possible undue influence of the governors.

Proposition No. 41 entitled "Miscarriage of Justice," is designed to prevent verdicts in civil cases from being set aside on a mere technicality. Too often "our appellate courts do not try the case; but only try the record," and so there is frequently a miscarriage of justice.

Proposition No. 45 entitled "One Day of Rest in Seven," is an initiative bill specifying which lines of business may and which may not be operated upon Sunday or upon any other day of the week which may be religiously observed. In the affirmative argument for this bill it is said: "It is neither a religious measure nor a 'blue law.'" There is opposition to the bill, evidently from a Seventh Day Adventist, as he contends that the measure establishes Sunday as a day of rest, and enforces it upon the people, "while those who would observe another day are merely permitted to do so, under prescribed conditions, limitations, and restrictions." The State Barbers' Association was the main promoters of this bill, and they circulated their petitions in many of the churches of the state.

Proposition No. 44 entitled "Minimum Wage," is an amendment to allow the legislature to establish a minimum wage for women and minors.

Proposition No. 3, entitled "Eight Hour Law," is an initiative bill introduced by the socialists, and its affirmative argument is signed by Thos. W. Williams, state secretary of that party. The bill prohibits work for more than "eight hours in one day, or more than 48 hours in one week, except in case of extraordinary emergency caused by fire, flood, or danger to life or property."

Excepting the Temperance measures, none of the 48 propositions to be voted on in November has awakened so much opposition and caused so much discussion, as has this eight hour bill. Farmers' associations seem to be most opposed, and with several other organizations are loud and persistent in their denunciations. The State now has an eight hour law for women, and the skilled laborers have made an eight hour regulation for themselves. In view of these facts Mr. Williams in his argument for the bill says: "The eight hour day will not paralyze industry. . . . California's industries are still growing."

Proposition No. 18, entitled "Non-Sale of Game," is an act submitted by referendum, and is for the protection of game from the market hunter.

Proposition No. 20, entitled "Prize Fights," is an initiative act, designed, says the affirmative argument "to prevent commercialized prize fighting in

California, . . . without interfering with bona fide amateur boxing, or amateur boxing exhibitions."

Proposition No. 4, entitled "Abatement of Nuisances," is a law suspended by referendum. It is locally known as the "Redlight Abatement Act," and one of its purposes is to make "investments in exploitation of prostitution insecure," and thus diminish the social evil. It holds the landlord accountable for conduct of tenants.

Propositions Nos. 2 and 39 are initiative amendments put forth by the temperance people and have for their object state-wide prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Proposition No. 39 is to correct an omission of the date on which the provisions of proposition No. 2 go into effect, extending the time of one section three months and of another 14 months, thus giving liquor men and their employes a better opportunity to readjust themselves should the temperance law be passed.

Proposition No. 47, entitled "Prohibition Elections," is an initiative amendment put forth by the opponents of state-wide prohibition. It provides among other things that liquor elections shall not be held oftener than every eight years. The negative argument says: "This amendment is unfair and misleading. It seeks to disfranchise the people by making a vote on one issue settle an entirely different matter. There are voters who favor local prohibition, but who are opposed to state-wide prohibition. Under this amendment they could not choose between the two."

The fact that California has heavy investments in vineyards from which wine as well as raisin grapes are obtained is an important factor in the discussion, the "wets" claiming that prohibition will ruin this industry; while the "drys" are asserting that wine grapes are now raised almost at a loss, and that raisin grapes from which there is the most profit will not be disturbed by prohibition.

No one can deny that these referendums are great popular educators.

JAMES P. CADMAN.



AUSTRALIAN POLITICS.

Corowa, N. S. W., Australia, Sept. 25, 1914.

The federal election in May, 1913, gave the liberals a majority of one in the House of Representatives, and the labor party a majority of 29 in the Senate. As expected, the parliament proved to be unworkable, for bills passed by the House were rejected by the Senate.

The ministry then resolved to try to obtain a dissolution of both houses. A bill was passed twice by the House, and defeated twice in the Senate. This formed a "deadlock," as defined by the federal constitution, and the Governor-General granted a double dissolution.

This is the first time such a thing has happened. In the ordinary course, the whole of the House and half of the Senate retire every three years. Now both houses were wholly dissolved, and a fresh start had to be made.

The liberal ministry had appointed an Interstate Commission, which has been taking evidence on the tariff. The liberals proposed to adjust the tariff

and correct any anomalies, in accordance with the report to be made by the Commission; to adopt proportional representation for the Senate, and preferential voting for the House.

The labor party promised to amend the tariff by making it more effectively protectionist at once, without waiting for the report of the Interstate Commission; and to introduce the initiative and referendum.

The elections were held on September 5th, and resulted in a victory for the labor party, which has a majority of 10 in the House and 31 in the Senate.

The Cook government has resigned, and a new ministry has been formed by the leader of the labor party, Andrew Fisher.

ERNEST BRAY.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

JINGOISM AND PROTECTIONISM.

New York, Oct. 21, 1914.

On page 23 of "Collier's" for Oct. 24 is an article signed by E. C. Patterson, vice president and general manager of P. F. Collier & Son, entitled "Patriotism That Pays." In substance, it is an appeal to all Americans to buy none but American goods. It must cause regret to every genuine democrat to find so able a periodical, and one so usually progressive—except for its occasional catering to race prejudice—thus extending the fallacious principle which is embodied in the protective tariff. The thoughtless will undoubtedly applaud what they will interpret as the voicing of enlightened patriotism; but the judicious cannot fail to grieve.

Our European critics are wont to castigate us as a race of shopkeepers, incapable of being moved by any higher ideal than that of dollar-chasing; and so conspicuous an example of the lower nationalism, appearing in a magazine of the general character of "Collier's," will not escape their attention, nor fail to do its part in damaging our international reputation.

It is true, as Mr. Patterson points out, that a certain class of American snobs fawn at the feet of the older nations, and worship a foreign label, regardless of the quality of the goods for which it stands; but their fault is not properly rectified by the encouragement of a narrow chauvinism, which can see no good in anything outside our own boundaries. Between Europeomania and an egotistic provincialism there is a rational and more creditable middle course.

At a time like this, when the unchaining of war's horrors abroad should open the eyes of even the most unthinking to the evil and the perils of a narrow nationalism, the American periodical which seeks to decry any phase of the broad international spirit renders a distinct disservice to his country. American manufacturers do not need to be coddled. If they are able to demonstrate superiority, let them win favor through proof of merit, not through a shallow appeal to jingoism. Teach the public to demand quality, under whatever label it is produced; and let our manufacturers know that they must prove themselves worthy, if they desire patronage.