

Included in this new law are provisions for the regulation of telegraph, telephone and cable companies as well as railroads and express companies. The Interstate Commerce Commission is given power to regulate both freight and passenger rates by reducing them when it finds them to be unreasonable; and in cases of new rates imposed by the companies, the Commission may suspend their operation pending a hearing on their reasonableness, but only for 120 days. On the question of "long and short haul," it is made unlawful to charge less for a longer distance than for a shorter one within the longer, for freight of like kind or for passengers, without authorization by the Commission. Federal courts (except when three judges sit, one of them being a judge of the United States Supreme Court) are forbidden to issue injunctions against enforcement of State statutes (vol. x, p. 857; xi, pp. 567, 851; xii, p. 420; xiii, p. 160) as unconstitutional. The President is authorized to appoint a commission to investigate stock issues, but the new law does not attempt otherwise to regulate or supervise those issues.

+

In addition to its regulatory provisions this law creates a new Federal court—a commerce court—to have the jurisdiction of Circuit Courts over certain cases. It is in effect a special court for the review of the decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, over which it is given full judicial jurisdiction. This court is to consist of five Circuit Court judges. At first, five appointments to the Circuit bench are to be made by the President for the purpose of assignment to the commerce court for one, two, three, four and five years, respectively. Its decisions are subject to appeal to the Supreme Court.

+ +

Two New States.

By unanimous vote on the 16th the Senate passed the House bill for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico (p. 60) into the Union as States; but with amendments which on the 18th the House accepted. On the 20th President Taft signed the bill.

+ +

A Great Prize Fight.

For several months newspaper readers have had an abundance of news about an approaching prize fight between James J. Jeffries, an historic heavyweight champion, and Jack Johnson, a Negro aspirant for the heavyweight championship. The date fixed for the fight is July 4, and San Francisco was the place assigned for it. It had attracted wide attention, and was to have been attended by large numbers of wealthy and respectable men of sporting temperament who find

joy without "sentimentality" in the sensations of struggle, whether the struggle brings defeat or victory. But on the 15th, when the advance sales of seats amounted to \$130,000, Governor Gillette of California directed the Attorney-General to take legal steps to prevent the fight. San Francisco had been selected because under the laws of California, although prize fighting is prohibited, boxing is allowed, and this prize fight was nominally a boxing match. Mayor McCarthy, of San Francisco, resented the Governor's action, and for a time all California was in a rage of partisanship over the affair. When, however, the Attorney-General announced that he would call out the militia to stop the fight, if the police did not stop it, its promoters entered into arrangements to have it come off at Reno, Nevada, where no fine distinctions are made between boxing matches and prize fighting, and both are allowed—the latter on a license fee of \$1,000.

+ +

British Politics.

Since the burial of King Edward (p. 490), politics in Great Britain have begun to shape up again. On the 16th cable dispatches from London reported that the Liberal prime minister, Mr. Asquith, and the Tory leader, Mr. Balfour, had had several private meetings during the week, and that an agreement between them had been reached with reference to holding a conference on the question of the veto power of the House of Lords. On the same subject, T. P. O'Connor, M. P., in his cable letter of the 18th to the Chicago Tribune, said:

The proposed conference of the party leaders on the veto question has produced an extraordinary effect in British politics. It overshadows everything and paralyzes and numbs everything. Nobody would believe that the House of Commons is the same place as a few weeks ago. Then party passion ran higher than for a quarter of a century. . . . Now a new spirit reigns and not a word of rancor or even spirit is heard. . . . The Ministry is passing its bills at a breakneck pace, always avoiding any but the non-controversial proposals, and the House of Commons keeps reasonable hours for the first time in half a century. . . . As the conference approaches the conjectures, rumors, and attitude of mind change with every hour. . . . Asquith is said to share the hopes of Lloyd-George, who last week was the solitary optimist in the Ministerial circles, that the conference may end in a settlement. . . . There is some foundation for these sanguine hopes. The Tories now realize that the present House of Lords will no longer be tolerated by the electors of England and they are prepared to meet the coming storm half way by agreeing to even a drastic reform. Curiously, however, as the hopes of a peaceful compromise increase, the suspicion of the rank and file of both parties increases. The radicals were hostile at first, then they became sullenly reconciled, but to-day they have relapsed and again are openly distrustful.

. . . The protectionist Tories are equally suspicious, thinking Balfour may attempt to throw over tariff reform. . . . Redmond's arrival will change the entire situation, he being always the rallying point of the radicals when the action of the Ministry is suspected of not being sufficiently firm. . . . The chief hope of the conference is the evident recognition by the Tories that there is no present chance of their winning the next election and the impossibility of any longer defending the House of Lords. Every politician who enters the conference takes his political life in his hands, and it is quite possible that any compromise may end the careers of some of them.

* * *

Woman Suffrage in Great Britain.

There was an immense parade of woman suffragists (pp. 195, 210, 211) in London on the 18th, in which 10,000 women marched from the Thames embankment to Albert Hall. The procession was two miles long, and the paraders came from all parts of the United Kingdom. The delegation from Ireland included granddaughters of Daniel O'Connell. Canada was represented by a distinct delegation. There were also representatives from the continent. The occupations were distinguished by representations of women scientists, physicians, hospital nurses, actresses, stenographers and factory girls; and 500 women marched in prison garb. Mrs. Drummond, the grand marshal, with her aides (the Honorable Mrs. Haverfield and Vera Holmes), rode horseback astride at the head of the procession. At Albert Hall, Mrs. Pankhurst's appeal for funds brought \$5,000 from Mrs. Lytton, a noted scientist, and Pethick Lawrence gave \$5,000 more. About \$14,000 was given. Lord Lytton was among the speakers. The cable dispatches report the demonstration as one of the most impressive in favor of a public movement ever attained in London.

*

This parade and mass meeting were in support of a women's suffrage bill recently introduced in the House of Commons as a compromise measure between the "limited bill" suffragists and the adult suffragists (p. 195). The measure had been drafted by the "Conciliation Committee for Woman Suffrage"—"a body," says the London Daily News of May 28, "with a clear policy and a definite legislative proposal to submit." The News goes on in the same editorial article to say that the Conciliation Committee—

includes some of the most prominent champions of either of the two views held as to the method by which the question should be dealt with by statute. Friends of the adult suffrage solution and friends of the "limited bill" have come together upon the common ground that the woman's vote is now within the range of practical politics—the present House of Commons, like every House since 1870, showing a majority in favor of that ideal—and that,

in spite of this, a settlement may be indefinitely delayed unless a compromise can be arrived at among suffragists. Those who favor the simple admission of women to the existing franchises on the same terms as men have come to see that there is force in the common Liberal criticism that such a measure would greatly add to the "property vote" and to the facilities for plural voting. Adult suffragists, on the other hand, are ready to allow that that plan promises no early settlement, opposed as it is by most Unionists. The Conciliation Committee, then, propose a working compromise. They have drafted a bill which enfranchises every woman possessed of household qualifications, or of a ten-pound occupation qualification, within the meaning of the representation of the people act of 1884; and enacts that marriage shall not disqualify. This, as the committee point out, practically applies the existing English local government register for women to Parliamentary elections the country over. That franchise has worked well for many years in local affairs. It excludes the ownership and lodger votes. Its basis is thoroughly democratic; the Independent Labor Party has avowed itself that 82 per cent of the women on the municipal register belong to the working class. On the other hand, the measure is experimental in character. Most of the new voters would be women who earn their own living, who pay rates and taxes. Few married women would be qualified. As an "installment" the bill, we think, ought to receive the support of those who favor, as we have done, the adult suffrage solution; and we do not see that any sincere supporter of the other solution need object to the measure.

* * *

The Land Question in Denmark.

Although the recent elections (p. 438) for the lower house of the Danish congress (Rigsdag) turned immediately upon military questions, the land question was involved, as we are advised by Mr. C. M. Koedt (formerly Danish consul at Chicago) who obtains his information from the Danish press, radical and otherwise, and from personal correspondence. The new House consists, he explains, of 57 Liberals, 13 Conservatives, 20 Radicals and 24 Socialists. On the military question the Radicals and the Socialists are united in opposition, the Liberals and the Conservatives being pro-military. On the land question—land value taxation—the Conservatives are opposed, the Radicals and the Socialists are for it, and the Liberal platform at these elections contained a distinct promise in its favor. This promise was accentuated by the former prime minister, and leader of the Liberal party in these elections, in a letter to Sophus Berthelsen, editor of "Ret" (Justice), the Henry George organ. No party in the new Rigsdag has a clear majority, but inasmuch as the Liberals have 57 out of the 114 members, Mr. Koedt infers that the Liberals will form the ministry, the Danish parliamentary system being like the British, and that a policy of land value taxation will be undertaken, unless new elections are