

unless the coal industry wishes to prolong it. A reasonable minimum wage for the miners, with safeguards to protect the owners against slackness and deficiency of output, will be settled by district boards. The minimum will be retroactive, the men being paid from the date of their return to work at the rate of their return to work at the rate subsequently fixed by the district boards. [See current volume, page 250.]



#### The Coal Strike in Germany.

In the Westphalian district 200,000 miners were reported on the 12th as on strike, and on the 13th 240,000, with indications of wider extension. Repressive police action had by that time brought on conflicts between policemen and strikers. Dispatches of the 19th reported that leaders of the miners unions decided at their meeting at Bochum on that day to end the strike. [See current volume, page 251.]



#### Probable Coal Strike in the United States.

Negotiations between miners and the owners of coal deposits in the United States for renewal of their contract, which expires March 31, have given rise to a situation which the president of the miners' union described on the 13th as looking "very blue" with indications pointing to a strike. Better terms, including 20 per cent increase of wages and a one-year's agreement instead of three years', were proposed by the miners, and this proposal the owners' union rejected on the 13th, with a counter proposal that the present agreement be renewed for three years. [See vol. viii, p. 853; vol. xii, p. 445; vol. xiii, pp. 83, 321; vol. xiv, p. 806.]



#### Free Sugar.

By a vote of 198 to 103, the lower House of Congress passed a bill on the 15th abolishing all taxes on the importation of sugar into the United States. It is calculated that if this bill becomes a law the price of sugar will be reduced a cent and a half a pound, and that the annual loss to the Federal revenues will be \$53,000,000. Party lines were crossed in the vote on the bill. Democrats voting against it were Estopel, Wickliffe, Dupre, Rondsell and Broussard of Louisiana, and Martin and Taylor of Colorado; while the Republicans voting for it (24 in all) included Lindberg of Minnesota, Murdock of Kansas, La Follette of Washington, Kent of California, and Norris of Nebraska. Four of these Republicans were Stand-patters, and 20 were Progressives. To make up the revenue loss on free sugar, a bill came before the House for imposing an excise tax (conformably to the Supreme Court decision in the corporation-tax cases) of 1 per cent on the incomes of

corporations, firms or individuals which reach or exceed \$5,000 a year. This bill was passed in the House on the 19th by 249 to 41. [See vol. xiv, p. 255.]



#### Direct Legislation in the Ohio Constitutional Convention.

Having decided on the 11th that instead of submitting to the people a new Constitution, the policy of the convention shall be—to submit all of the proposals which shall pass, to the electors in the form of separate amendments or in groups under a common title,—the Constitutional Convention of Ohio took up on the 12th the measure for the Initiative and Referendum. [See current volume, page 253.]



Mr. Crosser, chairman of the committee on Initiative and Referendum, reported the measure substantially as outlined in these columns last week, with the recommendation of the committee that it pass. On the 13th, the controversy having gone over to that day, Mr. Halfhill led the opposition with amendments increasing the number of signatures necessary for Initiative and Referendum petitions, and Mr. Lampson led it on another tack with a motion proposing the following amendment:

The powers defined herein as "the Initiative" and "the Referendum" shall never be used to amend or repeal any of the provisions of this paragraph, or to enact a law to adopt an amendment to the Constitution authorizing a levy of the single tax on land, or taxing land, or land values, or land sites, at a higher rate or by a different rule than is or may be applied to improvements thereon to personal property or to the bonds of corporations other than municipal. Such powers shall never be used to enact a law or laws redistricting the State for Representatives in Congress or redistricting the State for members of the General Assembly, or changing the boundaries of judicial districts.

No conclusion had been reached when the Convention closed its sessions for the week.



#### Bryan Before the Ohio Constitutional Convention.

In speaking upon invitation before the Constitutional Convention of Ohio on the 12th, William J. Bryan advocated the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. On that point he said:

The Initiative and the Referendum do not overthrow representative government—they have not come to destroy, but to fulfill. The purpose of representative government is to represent, and that purpose fails when representatives misrepresent their constituents. Experience has shown that the defects of our government are not in the people themselves, but in those who, acting as representatives of the people, embezzle power and turn to their own advantage the authority given them for the advancement of the

public welfare. It has cost centuries to secure popular government—the blood of millions of the best and the bravest has been poured out to establish the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All this struggle, all this sacrifice, has been in vain if, when we secure a representative government, the people's representatives can betray them with impunity and mock their constituents while they draw salaries from the public treasury. The Initiative and Referendum do not decrease the importance of legislative bodies, nor do they withdraw authority from those who are elected to represent the people; on the contrary, when the people have the Initiative and Referendum with which to protect themselves they can safely confer a larger authority upon their representatives. The fact that the people can act through the Initiative and Referendum makes it less likely that they will need to employ the remedy. The attacks which formerly were made upon the Initiative and the Referendum have been directed more recently against what is known as the Recall. But it will be found upon examination that the Recall is an evolution rather than a revolution. The right to terminate an official term before its legal expiration has always been recognized. I know of no public official who is not subject to impeachment at the hands of some tribunal. If impeachment had been found entirely satisfactory the Recall would not now be under discussion, but impeachment has proved unsatisfactory. In discussing the Recall, I have assumed that it would apply without discrimination against all officials, including the judiciary. The argument that a judge should be exempt from the operation of the Recall even when it is applied to other officials, has no sound foundation. A judge is as much a public servant as any one else; if it is insisted that he enjoys public confidence to a greater extent than other public officials this very argument answers itself, because that superior confidence will protect the judge against injustice. In proportion as people have confidence in the bench they will be slow to remove a judge on insufficient grounds. The judge who would be swerved by fear of a Recall would not be fit for the place, anyhow. If there is any position in which we need rigid, uncompromising uprightness it is upon the bench, and the Recall, instead of menacing the independence of the judiciary, is more likely to improve the character of those who occupy judicial positions. With the Recall official terms may with safety be made longer. And speaking of the length of terms, the tendency is toward making an Executive ineligible to re-election. His duties are so responsible and his influence is so extended that he should be free to devote his best energies to public affairs, and no one can devote his best energies to the public if his vision is clouded by political aspiration or his judgment perverted by personal considerations.



#### Woman Suffrage in the United States.

At a joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage and the House Committee on the Judiciary, at Washington on the 13th, representatives of the National Suffrage Association and other organizations advocated a Constitutional

amendment extending the suffrage to women. Among the speakers were Anna Howard Shaw, Jane Addams, Mary E. McDowell, Leonora O'Reilly, Caroline A. Lowe, Ella S. Stewart and Elsie Cole Phillips. The opposition was represented by Ella C. Breihaut.



Taking advantage of the decision of Judge Owens to allow preferential Presidential primaries (not provided for by law) to be held in Cook County (the Chicago county) at the regular primaries in April upon payment of the extra expense by those interested, Mrs. Catharine Waugh McCulloch and other woman suffragists applied to him on the 13th for similar submission on like terms and at the same time, of the question, "Do you approve extending suffrage to women?" Judge Owens granted the request, and a campaign is now in progress. It has been learned, however, that the County Clerk, under legal advice, refuses to place the question on the official primary ballots. [See current volume, page 228.]



#### The Mexican Insurrection.

General Pascual Orozco has sent two envoys, Manuel Lujan and Juan Priete Quemper, attorneys of Chihuahua, to Washington to present to the President of the United States the merits of the insurrection Orozco is leading.



A joint Congressional resolution, passed by the United States Senate on the 13th, and by the House on the 14th, and immediately signed by President Taft, makes it unlawful to export arms or munitions of war to any American country where domestic violence exists. The President immediately afterward issued a proclamation declaring that since such domestic violence existed in Mexico all Federal law officers were enjoined to prevent violations of the resolution. Violation of the new law becomes a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for two years, or both. The joint resolution is so worded that government officials will make use of it in the future to prevent filibustering expeditions to any American country where a state of revolution exists. [See current volume, page 254.]



#### The Disorders in China.

The city of Canton in south China still suffers from the looting of bands of revolvers and brigands, with which the regular Republican troops are fighting; and the neighboring seaport city of Swatow is now in the same case. President Yuan Shi Kai is still unable to bring his own provinces of north China into order. It is said in the dispatches that