

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-