

that the public conscience must be now aroused. I am therefore convinced that there will not be another subway steal.

FREDERICK C. LEUBUSCHER.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE SUPERSTITION ABOUT "JUDGES."

Brooklyn, N. Y.

In view of the "current" (i. e., steadily flowing) sanctimonious nonsense as to our "Judges," whom the Interests, and their attorneys (journalistic and professional, as well as legal) are now begging us to accept as the modern "American" Medicine-men or as oracles of new, "up-to-date" priestcraft or Theocracy, the publication of the following quotations in *The Public* may be a timely service:—

"If it be charged that the exercise of this power"—i. e., of refusing to enforce, in a "case" coming up for decision, any statute which they, the courts, deem "unconstitutional,"—"virtually constitutes our courts the masters of the Constitution, with capacity to nullify its provisions and thus to override the will of the people, the Answer may be found in the Fact that the Constitution nowhere imposes the duty upon either department of government of obeying the rulings of another, but leaves each free to act within the sphere of its own appropriate functions. Consequently, the decisions of even our Highest Courts are accepted as a finality ONLY in relation to the particular cases with which they happen to deal, and their judgments DO NOT impose compulsory limitations upon the action of any other department."—"Constitutional Legislation," by Prof. John Ordronaux, LL. D., Professor of Constitutional Law in Columbia University, N. Y. (pages 419 and 420 citing Bancroft's History of the Constitution, vol. 2, pp. 198-202; Inaugural of President Lincoln, as to Dred Scott case; Marbury vs. Madison, 2 Cranch, 137, etc., etc.).

"It is under the protection of the decision in the Dartmouth College case, that the most enormous and threatening powers in our country have been created; some of the great and wealthy corporations actually having greater influence in the country at large, and upon the legislation of the country, than the States to which they owe their corporate existence. Every privilege granted or right conferred—no matter by what means or on what pretense—being made inviolable by the constitution"—i. e., as "construed" by Marshall, under Webster's manipulation—"the government is frequently found stripped of its authority in very important particulars, by unwise, careless, or corrupt legislation; and a clause of the Federal Constitution whose purpose was to preclude the repudiation of debts and just contracts, protects and perpetuates the evil." (That is, it is made to do this, by our infallible, impeccable, "independent" courts).—"Constitutional Limitations," by Judge Cooley (one of our most distinguished jurists and legal writers).

The toadies and panders of Privilege and Plutocracy are pleading for the "independence" of the judiciary. Let us ask: "Independence" of WHAT? And WHY? Why must Taft as "Judge" be more "in-

dependent" than Taft as "President," or as "Senator," or as "Governor"? Why? Why? Why?

CHARLES FREDERICK ADAMS.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, August 15, 1911.

End of the Lords' Absolute Veto.

The power of the House of Lords of Great Britain to sit in absolute judgment upon legislation by the House of Commons is at an end. [See current volume, page 827.]

+

Following our last report, the next formal step was taken on the 8th and in the House of Commons. This body rejected the vital amendments proposed by the House of Lords. It did so by a vote of 321 to 215—a majority of 106. With minor concessions it then readopted the measure and returned it to the Lords, where it was formally received on the 9th.

+

The amendments conceded by the Commons are reported by cable as two, one of which relates to money bills and the other to the duration of Parliaments. The bearing of the former is upon that provision of the veto measure which forbids any veto whatever of money bills passed by the Commons; that of the latter is upon the provision that the Commons must pass other than money bills three times before the Lords' veto is ineffective, and this amendment also prevents an extension of the maximum period fixed for the life of a Parliament. A motion made by Lord Hugh Cecil (who led the disorder that prevented the Prime Minister from speaking in the Commons), that action on the measure be deferred for three months, was defeated by 348 to 209—a majority of 139.

+

Before the veto bill reached the House of Lords on the 8th, that body had adopted, by 282 to 68, a motion like the Balfour motion which had been defeated in the Commons by a majority of 119. But this did not stand in the way of final acceptance of the veto-abolition bill. On the 10th Lord Morley moved in behalf of the Ministry that the House of Lords recede from its amendments and pass the bill. In his speech he gave warning that every vote against his motion would be in effect a vote in favor of the prompt creation of a host of new lords. The King had consented, he

said, to the creation of any number of lords that might be necessary to prevent the defeat of the bill by any possible combination. This warning brought over to the support of the Ministry enough votes to give them a bare majority. Over 20 Tory lords voted for Morley's motion; and the two archbishops and nine bishops, abandoning the ecclesiastical policy of holding aloof from party questions, joined them. Many lords, unwilling to vote for the motion, yet stunned by the certain alternative of so large an accession of commoners to the peerage, abstained from voting. So the motion was adopted by 131 to 114, a majority of 17. Consequently the House of Lords hereafter will have no power to veto any bill which the Speaker of the House distinguishes as a money bill; and over any other bill its power of veto will be inoperative if the Commons, within two years after its introduction, passes it three times in successive sessions, the Lords having vetoed it after its first and its second passage by the Commons.

* *

Payment for Members of Parliament.

The first action of the British House of Commons to fall within the protection of the law restricting the Lords' veto, took place on the 10th, when that body adopted, by a vote of 256 to 159, a resolution proposed by Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, which provides for the payment of \$2,000 annually to members.

+

Members of the British Parliament have never yet been paid. Consequently only rich men could sit in the House of Commons unless subsidized. The old "chartists" demanded pay for members, and this is one of the very few remaining demands of those "dangerous" folk of nearly 100 years ago. It is probable, however, that the present action was directly caused by "the Osborne decision" against the Labor parties. That decision prohibited the payment by labor unions of money for the election and support of Labor party members of Parliament. By providing \$2,000 salaries for all members, the Commons gives its Labor members double their previous salary allowance from the unions.

* *

Labor Strike in England.

A third labor strike of enormous dimensions was reported on the 12th from England. It follows close upon a strike of dock laborers and transport unions in London which the strikers won last week, and the seamen's strike of a short time before which, although it centered in England, extended widely among the ocean-trading nations, and which also was won by the strikers. [See current volume, page 660.]

The present strike involves transportation, and appears to have broken out in several cities. At Glasgow street car men to the number of 3,000 were reported to be out on the 12th. At Liverpool, the strikers were dockmen and carriers, and large quantities of foodstuffs were reported to have been moved on the 12th by armed troops under the orders of magistrates, while the strikers looked on. At Manchester reports of the same day were to the effect that the traction men had gone out in sympathy with the Liverpool strikers. Riots in Liverpool and Glasgow were reported on the 13th, and on the 14th riots in Liverpool involving 100,000 men were reported. Meetings of the traction employes of Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Bristol, Sheffield and other large cities were held on the 13th, in consequence of which it was reported that a general strike of all railway men, transport workers and dockers is threatened, "unless existing disputes are settled promptly and satisfactorily." The dispatches indicate an enormous labor uprising, but are curiously silent as to the nature of the dispute. The magnitude of the reported conditions and dangers is wholly unaccounted for by any explanation of causes.

* *

Conference of Socialist Officials.

A national conference of Socialist officials elected by popular vote, met at Milwaukee on the 12th. The conference was welcomed by Mayor Seidel, and J. F. Weber, a member of the lower house of the Wisconsin legislature, presided. On the 14th there was a discussion of "New Scientific Budget-making, the Necessity and the Purpose," led by Carl P. Dietz, Comptroller of Milwaukee. Health Commissioner Kraft of Milwaukee led the discussion on "Public Health." Other subjects were Socialist newspapers, women in Socialist politics, and the problem of retaining Socialist control of municipalities once gained. Among the speakers were Congressman Berger, John Spargo, Morris Hillquit, and Robert Hunter.

* *

People's Power in Oregon.

In response to inquiries from the East regarding the practical working of the Initiative and Referendum in Oregon, the Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity has adopted the following resolutions:

Whereas, In a large number of States the struggle for the attainment of the Initiative and Referendum is now on, and from those States come letters of inquiry regarding the operation of these institutions in Oregon since their adoption in 1902, be it

Resolved, By the Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity, that the people of any community or commonwealth are assured that the people of Oregon have proved to their own satisfaction that it is the only possible way to have a representative