

selves, of their candidate or of their policies.

Next.

4. Corporations chartered by the State must be subject to just regulation by the State in the interest of the people; taxation for public purposes only; no government partnership with protected monopolies.

But what would be "just regulation"? What are the non-public purposes for which taxation is objected to? What is meant by government partnership with protected monopolies? Anybody may have his own opinion about it, but how can he tell from this vague general declaration that Judge Parker's opinion is the same as his?

Next.

5. Opposition to trusts and combinations that oppress the people and stifle healthy industrial competition.

That plank reads as if it had been written by one of Hearst's editors and revised by one of Rockefeller's lawyers. But what does it mean? Opposition to an evil without method of opposition, amounts to nothing even when sincere. When insincere it is bunco.

Next.

6. A check upon extravagance in public expenditures, that the burden of the people's taxes may be lightened.

What is meant by extravagance? Who has been extravagant and how? Is it, for instance, the Republican party? The platform does not say so. Does it consist, for instance, of collusive transactions with railroad monopolies, of river and harbor appropriations, or of army and navy and pension expenditures? The platform does not say so.

Next.

7. Reasonable revision of the tariff; needless duties upon imported raw materials weigh heavily upon the manufacturer, are a menace to the American wage earner, and by increasing the cost of production shut out our products from the foreign markets.

What is "reasonable" revision of the tariff? What are "needless" duties? Why confine the abolition of needless duties to raw materials? Is it the McKinley and Dingley idea of reasonable revision and of what is needless in the way of duties? Or is it Henry George's? If it is Judge

Parker's, pray what may be his idea of a "needless" duty and a "reasonable" revision?

Next.

8. The maintenance of State rights and home rule; no centralization.

State rights! Home rule! About what? Everyone favors State rights and home rule, except in so far as they are inconsistent with his own idea of the sphere of national rights and the scope of central authority. Where do these office-hungry platform builders draw the line?

Next.

9. Honesty in the public service, vigilance in the prevention of fraud; firmness in the punishment of guilt when detected.

Why not continue with "love of the neighbor, obedience to God and abhorrence of the devil and all his works"? When platform-makers are generalizing with a view to avoiding friction, they ought to take advantage of the opportunity to make their creed as comprehensive as is consistent with the greatest harmony.

Next.

10. The impartial maintenance of the rights of labor and of capital; no unequal discrimination; no abuse of the powers of law for favoritism or oppression.

That word "unequal" appears to have the lonesome merit of really meaning something. It must mean something, or it wouldn't have been used to qualify "discrimination." We are unable, however, to guess what it does mean unless it implies that Judge Parker stands for "equal discrimination," which is all the more commendable for being difficult. But with that flash of meaning the platform is enveloped again in the darkness of undisputed and indisputable generalities. Who is there that does not favor "impartial maintenance of the rights of labor and of capital"? Who that does favor "abuse of the powers of law for favoritism or oppression"? On that plank all the hostile industrial forces might indeed gather in perfect harmony, but only to begin quarrelling at the first inquiry as to what are the rights of labor and of capital and what is abuse of law in labor matters.

All things in general to all men

and nothing in particular to anybody, those declarations are what Bryan intimates, an alluring "ad." for a confidence game. Under the circumstances of the great issues that confront the American people, it is an insult to the most ordinary intelligence of citizenship to offer them as a political platform. The man who, under those circumstances, could stand upon such a platform without uneasiness and loss of self-respect, must be as little in moral dignity as the men who could be fooled into supporting him with their votes must be lacking in common sense.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

AUSTRALIA.

Melbourne, Victoria, March 3.—We have passed through the throes of our Commonwealth election and are now just approaching the State elections. Our leader in Victoria, Mr. Max Hirsch, was defeated, as you know, for the Federal House of Representatives, though he did remarkably well against a fairly strong local opponent and sitting member, and we think would have been returned but for the fact of it's being harvest time—and this a very heavy one. That prevented the farmers from voting, as they would have done at any other time of the year. It was, of course, foreseen by our Protectionist ministry and arranged accordingly. Mr. Hirsch depended to a great extent upon this vote, and it failed him for the reason stated.

Many single-taxers here (myself among the number) were sorry that he should deem it necessary in the interest of the Free Trade party to throw up his State representative and seek the suffrages for the Federal House, especially so as the State House is the body which will have to bring in land values taxation if it is to come.

I say "if it is to come," for we have many times thought it must, but still it has not. For the first time it is now placed in the programme of one of the parties—the Opposition. When it passed the House under Sir George Turner's premiership it was not a Government proposition until forced on in the House, and of course our upper (or landlord's) House threw it out. It is now undoubtedly ripe for the position it holds in the platform of the Opposition, as there is scarcely any one except the large landed proprietary who does not advocate or agree that it should be given a trial. But of course the aforesaid landlords' House stands in the way, and we yet lack a majority willing to fight for right against might.

Qualifications for the lower House have been lowered, and this renders the

NEWS

Week ending Thursday, April 21.

probability of passing measures demanded by the people much greater than before. There is also a clause in the new constitution providing that if certain legislation is twice demanded by the people as shown by the return of a majority of men pledged to a programme, then in the event of the Upper House still refusing, there shall be a joint sitting and on failure to agree a double dissolution and appeal to the country.

In the Federal House a great number of the members are single-taxers or strong advocates of land values taxation. Their policy is to endeavor to cause a shortage in the State revenues so as to compel a resort to direct taxation, and with this object they have prevented the Commonwealth from going into the loan market. Of course the fiscal issue has been the burning question since the foundation of the Commonwealth, and through the overwhelming Protectionist vote in Victoria that party has managed to secure a working majority in the House of Representatives—the House of initiative—though in the present parliament as a whole the Free Trade party have a majority.

But the parties are so close in the representation that nothing can be done. There is a triangular duel between the Ministry, the Opposition, and the Labor party—all fairly equal in strength. What the outcome is to be is just now of special interest. My own opinion is that if a coalition takes place between the Ministry and the Opposition (as the papers are advising), as against the Labor party, there will be defections from both sides which may give the Labor party a majority.

W. M. TRUEBRIDGE.

Sydney, N. S. W., Mar. 17.—Although Max Hirsch was defeated in Victoria for a seat in the Commonwealth parliament, we of New South Wales elected three single taxers: Edmund Lonsdale, for the New England Electorate; W. E. W. E. Johnson, for Lang, and W. H. Lee, for Cowper. In this State the free-traders simply swept the polls, returning 19 out of 26 for the Commonwealth House of Representatives, and 6 out of 6 for the Senate. The Commonwealth elections generally resulted in decidedly nailing down Chamberlain's coffin. The Opposition are against him because he is a protectionist, and the Labor party because he is an imperialist "Jingo." And these parties together form about a three-fourths majority.

J. R. FIRTH.

The real heroes do not always wear solemn faces, and do not generally deal in big words. A soldier going into battle (he was doubtless a Frenchman) found his knees trembling under him. "Shake away, old legs!" said he, "you would shake worse if you knew where I'm going to take you!"—Springfield (Mass.) Republican.

Since the sinking of the Russian flagship Petropavlovsk, with Admiral Makaroff and nearly all his officers and men on board (p. 24), there have been news dispatches in abundance regarding the Russo-Japanese war, but they have transmitted very little news. It appears to be certain that Verestchagin, the famous peace painter of war pictures, who was at the time a guest of the Russian admiral on board the ill-fated flagship, went down with the rest. But there is no certainty that the rumors of other disasters to the Russian fleet are true. From St. Petersburg it is reported with a strong show of probability that the Russian viceroy, Alexieff, who is said to have been chiefly responsible for plunging Russia into the war, has asked to be relieved. The reason given is that his bitterest enemy, Admiral Skrydloff, was appointed to succeed Makaroff in supreme command of the Russian fleet in the East.

Russia has become involved in further international difficulties by notifying neutral governments that newspaper correspondents who report movements of Russian warships and troops by wireless telegraphy will be shot as spies. The notice as received at Washington is reported from there as follows:

In a case where neutral steamers having on board correspondents who might communicate war news to the enemy by means of perfected apparatus not being yet foreseen by existing conventions, would be arrested near the coast of Kuantong or in the zone of operations of the Russian fleet, the correspondents will be looked on as spies and the steamers furnished with wireless telegraphy seized as prizes of war.

This is regarded as a direct menace to the corps of the London Times, whose chief makes the following declaration from Weihaiwei on the 18th by wireless telegram:

I possess a system of wireless telegraphy which, even if messages were not veiled by cipher, neither a Japanese nor Russian instrument could record. Messages go to the central cable office, thence to London, no one having access to them. I have never yet sailed in Russian

waters. All my messages are sent from the high seas and neutral waters. All fighting on shore which was witnessed could have been placed with neutral cables after five hours' steaming. Information has been conveyed to me that Russia threatens to treat correspondents using wireless telegraphy at sea as spies. As the London Times is the only journal which employs this means of communication, this is a direct threat upon the ship system directed by me. It behooves me, therefore, to inform the world at large of the course I am pursuing and call upon the several governments interested to protect their citizens who are in the employment of the Times. The definition of a spy in international law is one who disguises his true identity and insinuates himself within hostile territory for the purpose of communicating with the enemy. If I had insinuated myself in Russian waters and I had communicated with the Japanese I might come within this category, but I am guilty of neither.

News of American politics (p. 26) for the week relates chiefly to the Democratic convention of New York, which met at Albany on the 18th. The convention was securely under the control of David B. Hill. Only routine business was done at the day session, but in the evening a platform was adopted and the delegates to the national convention were placed under the unit rule and "instructed to present and support Alton B. Parker for the Presidential nomination. No opposition was made to the platform nor to the unit rule, but the instruction for Parker was opposed vigorously. A minority of the committee on resolutions offered an amendment recommending Judge Parker, but leaving the delegates "free to take such action at St. Louis as a majority thereof may consider most likely to insure the success of the candidates selected by the national convention." Speeches in support of this amendment were delivered by Senator Grady and Congressman Bourke Cockran. It was opposed in a speech by Senator McCarren, of Brooklyn, the chairman of the resolutions committee. When David B. Hill arose at the close of Mr. Cockran's speech the crowd supposed he intended to reply, but he merely moved that the vote be taken. This was promptly ordered, and the instruction for Parker came off victorious, the amendment being defeated by 301 to 149. There was no motion to