

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-

est demands that we be relieved of the Filipinos just as soon as they are reasonably prepared for self-government. A colony-holding nation is ever subject to expensive wars with other nations and with its colonies. This necessitates strong garrisons and powerful navies and draws heavily upon the treasury. . . . It is alike certain that but two classes of our people can hope to be benefited by our holding the Philippines—the class which is always hunting for special government privileges and the class which seeks to make of office-holding a means of livelihood. . . . Aside from the duty we owe the Philippines in preparation for the enjoyment of the blessed privileges we possess, we should guard carefully against the danger to ourselves of an imperialistic policy. History teaches that from republicanism to imperialism the movement is gradual and unperceived of the people. Its ominous progress, when discovered, leaves open but two courses—submission or resort to violence. . . . That our people may never be compelled to choose between these fearful alternatives should be our prayer. But we should work as well as pray. And our work should be to guard the foundation on which our government rests. Its basis is that of declared ideas—ideas that are stronger than battle ships and armies, ideas which for more than a century have stimulated our development and which have given promise that our "world mission" shall be not to seize the territory of distant peoples and rule them with a scepter of iron, but to establish truth, honor, justice and peace among the nations. . . . We must choose whether within our borders the basis of government shall continue to be this idealism, or a materialism which is the sure precursor of dissolution; for no nation can endure upon a basis of materialism, however splendid. Prudence requires that that choice be made in time. The time is now.

After making a canvass of the State of New York, and finding that Roosevelt will probably have a plurality of 150,000 outside of the city, the New York Herald, which has been urgently supporting Parker, made the following double-leaded editorial announcement on the 18th:

In three weeks from to-day the people will have to decide who will be their choice, Mr. Roosevelt or Judge Parker. To speak frankly, there does not appear to be room for much uncertainty as to their probable decision. It seems almost a foregone conclusion that Mr. Roosevelt will be elected, not, perhaps, because the people have confidence in him and in his conception of

the Presidential functions, but because the country is prosperous and thus the necessity for a change is not very pressing.

There will be referendum voting in Illinois at the coming election as well as voting for candidates. In the State at large five questions are to be submitted, and in Cook County one more. The Cook County referendum is on refunding certain county bonds so as to make them payable in annual installments during 20 years. Of the others, three are under the "public policy" law, one relates to making the Torrens land title law mandatory, and the other authorizes a special charter for Chicago.

The "public policy" questions are (p. 377) as follows:

Question No. 1. Shall the State legislature amend the primary election law so as to provide for party primaries at which the voter will vote under the Australian ballot directly for the candidate whom he wishes nominated by his party, instead of voting for delegates to convention or caucus; the primaries, throughout the entire district affected by the offices for which nominations are to be made, to be held by all the parties conjointly at the same time and polling places. This law not to prevent the nomination of candidates by petition as now provided.

Question No. 2. Shall the State legislature pass a law enabling the voters of any county, city, village or township, by majority vote, to veto any undesirable action of their respective law-making bodies (except emergency measures) whenever five per cent. of the voters petition to have such action referred to popular vote. This law to apply only to such localities as may adopt the same.

Question No. 3. Shall the State legislature submit to the voters of the State of Illinois at the next following State election an amendment to the State Constitution, which will enable the voters of any county, city, village or township of the State of Illinois to adopt such system of assessing and levying taxes as the voters of any such county, city, village or township may determine.

The Chicago charter question (p. 435) is in the form of a proposed amendment to the constitution of the State, providing for the addition of the following section to Article IV. of that instrument:

Section 34. The General Assembly shall have power, subject to the conditions and limitations hereinafter contained, to pass any law (local, special or

general) providing a scheme or charter of local municipal government for the territory now or hereafter embraced within the limits of the city of Chicago. The law or laws so passed may provide for consolidating (in whole or in part) in the municipal government of the city of Chicago, the powers now vested in the city, board of education, township, park or other local governments and authorities having jurisdiction confined to or within said territory, or any part thereof, and for the assumption by the city of Chicago of the debts and liabilities (in whole or in part) of the governments or corporate authorities whose functions within its territory shall be vested in said city of Chicago, and may authorize said city, in the event of its becoming liable for the indebtedness of two or more of the existing municipal corporations lying wholly within said city of Chicago, to become indebted to an amount (including its existing indebtedness and the indebtedness of all municipal corporations lying wholly within the limits of said city, and said city's proportionate share of the indebtedness of said county and sanitary district, which share shall be determined in such manner as the General Assembly shall prescribe) in the aggregate not exceeding five per centum of the full value of the taxable property within its limits, as ascertained by the last assessment either for State or municipal purposes previous to the incurring of such indebtedness (but no new bonded indebtedness, other than for refunding purposes, shall be incurred until the proposition therefor shall be consented to by a majority of the legal voters of said city voting on the question at any election, general, municipal or special); and may provide for the assessment of property and the levy and collection of taxes within said city for corporate purposes in accordance with the principles of equity and uniformity prescribed by this Constitution; and may abolish all offices, the functions of which shall be otherwise provided for; and may provide for the annexation of territory, to or disconnection of territory from said city of Chicago by the consent of a majority of the legal voters (voting on the question at any election, general, municipal or special) of the said city and of a majority of the voters of such territory voting on the question at any election, general, municipal or special; and in case the General Assembly shall create municipal courts in the city of Chicago it may abolish the offices of justices of the peace, police magistrates and constables in and for the territory within said city, and may limit the jurisdiction of justices of the peace in the territory of said county of Cook outside of said city to that territory, and in such case the jurisdiction and practice of said municipal courts shall be such as the General Assembly shall prescribe; and the General Assembly may pass all laws which it may deem requisite to effectually provide a complete system of local municipal