

who presided as chairman, a policeman escorted her from the hall. Gaynor's speech was a plea for 'personal liberty,' and for a liberal construction particularly of the Sabbath observance laws. He attacked General Theodore A. Bingham, former police commissioner, who is now campaigning against Gaynor, as a 'strut-about, a head-butler from the White House, brought here over the heads of 5,000 better men than he, who introduced here a militarism which would never be tolerated in Russia.' 'Law and order,' he continued, 'must prevail in this city, but first of all we must have law and order among those who rule. The individual rights must be observed. There must be no snap arrests.' Bannard's speeches in Brooklyn were confined principally to municipal issues. He avoided personal attacks, as he has done all along, but was a severe critic of Tammany in general.

IT IS PREDICTED that, as a result of the contest now on between the two big political parties in England, a national election will soon be held. Charles P. Stewart, writing from London to the Lincoln (Neb.) Star says: "The fight will be one of the fiercest, as well as one of the most important, on the strength of the issues involved, that Great Britain has known in generations. One point the electors will be asked to settle is whether England is to continue under a government virtually by the aristocracy, as in the past, or is to pass into the hands of an element which, if not actually socialistic, is at least so near to it that the 'upper classes' can't see any difference. The survival of the system of hereditary legislation will also be at stake. A decision will likewise have to be reached between the advocates of protection and those of free trade. The liberals are the supporters of what the conservatives call socialism—old-age pensions, governmental provision of work for the unemployed, state insurance against sickness and involuntary idleness, state ownership of public utilities, the gradual obliteration of large fortunes through the imposition of a heavy graduated income tax and enormous death duties, and taxation of land to an extent sufficient to prevent holdings in excess of what the owners can make useful to the community at large. The same party favors a reorganization of the house of lords on a basis which will make it, mainly at least, elective. Free trade is also a liberal doctrine. The conservatives, as representing the country's vested interests, naturally oppose all the so-called socialistic legislation to which the liberals are committed. They think the ends the liberals seek in the direction of the amelioration of the present deplorable condition of the poor, can be accomplished by the establishment of a heavy protective tariff. They admit the necessity of some sort of a reorganization of the house of lords but on far less drastic lines than the liberals propose. There are other and minor differences of opinion between the two parties, but the issues of socialism—so-called—protection and the maintenance of the principle of hereditary legislation are the most important. They are the issues, too, which are most likely either to interest or actually to effect the rest of the world."

THE FIGHT was precipitated when the house of lords rejected what is called "the budget" which is the measure providing for the finance and taxation systems for the coming year. On this point Mr. Stewart says: "The liberals say the house of lords has no right to veto a 'budget.' The conservatives say it has. Apparently the conservatives are right, for it is a practical certainty the house of lords will do it. The question is a constitutional one, but constitutional questions are not as easily settled in England as in the United States, because the English constitution is not a written document but merely a mass of precedent and sometimes precedents clash. They clash in the present case. In one way the lords have the advantage. There is no question that the 'budget' must pass both houses before it becomes law. If the lords refuse to pass it, whether or not the constitution permits them to refuse, then that 'budget' is not law. The commons' only choice is to get up a new one, which will meet the approval of the upper house, or to abolish the house of lords. The only point upon which everyone is agreed is that the lords have no right to initiate financial legislation. The peers can hardly be expected to welcome the loss of their own fortunes, but there is one thing that

must not be forgotten—the members of the house of lords are not altogether fools merely because they have the prejudices of their class. They know they can not successfully oppose the people's will, and many things they have done in the past prove that they have pretty accurate notions as to what the masses want. So it is by no means a foregone conclusion that hereditary legislation will be done away with even though the upper house does defy the commons in the present instance. In a national election the conservatives may win, after all."

DAVID LLOYD-GEORGE, chancellor of the exchequer for England, was given a popular reception at New Castle. "We're going to send that bill up to the house of lords and get all of the taxes or none," he said. He did not know what would be the final action to be taken by "poor Lord Lansdowne, with his creaking old ship and mutinous crew," but if the lords tore up the constitution by it, following with the money bill, they would force a revolution. "The lords may decree a revolution, but the people will direct it if it is begun, and issues will be raised that are now little dreamed of, the answers to which will be charged with peril for the order of things which the peers represent," said the chancellor.

FEDERAL JUDGE T. C. Munger, sitting at Lincoln, Neb., delivered with the consent of Circuit Judge VanDeventer, the opinion declaring invalid Nebraska's guaranteed deposits law. The court holds that this law infringes the United States constitutional clause providing for the taking of property only with due process of law. The court holds that because the act requires men to incorporate before they engage in the banking business it is void, the theory being that individuals may not be barred from business. Two days after this decision Governor Shallenberger gave to the press a statement in which he sternly criticized the court's opinion, saying that there was nothing left but to await the action of the United States supreme court in hope of a reversal of this sweeping verdict. The governor added that the decision showed that the people must pay more attention to the character and quality of their judges. He says it is the place of congress to act, adding: "The remedy lies with congress to go to the very root of this whole question. The only federal court specifically created by the constitution is the supreme court of the United States. All inferior federal tribunals are the result of legislative enactments. Their jurisdiction can be limited and determined by congress. The procedure in cases which deal with state matters entirely, such as this law was designed to do, should be confined to the state court of last resort, and from thence the appeal, if there is any, should be directly to the supreme court of the United States."

A NEW YORK farmer, who signs his name "Billy Madden," writes from Cairo, N. Y., a practical reply to J. J. Hill, the railroad magnate. Mr. Madden's article is printed in the New York World and is as follows: "I read yesterday's editorial in the World about farms. I bought a 125 acre farm in Cairo some three months ago. James J. Hill seems to be concerned about the future food supply for cities. My opinion is, well he may; but it is as much his fault and other express and railroad trust magnates. I have not heard of any of them offering special terms to deliver the farmers' products to the consumers in the cities. I sent a barrel of apples to my sister-in-law in Brooklyn, which cost me only 40 cents by boat and train—boat 110 miles—ten miles over Catskill Mountain railroad, the dearest in the world, which charges 10 cents a mile for passengers. The express company wanted \$1.25 to take it from New York to Brooklyn. The government should have a parcels post so a barrel of food of any kind could be sent 100 miles by putting a 25 cent stamp on it direct to consumer. I sent other barrels to a commission merchant. He will call at the boat for them and send me back what he thinks is O. K. I think it would be a good bet that the consumer pays at least four times as much as I got. The state governments will have to take the farms under their management and work them before many years, especially in the east, as my neighbor, who works 125 acres alone, tells me good farms twenty-five years ago are now grown up in bushes. The next man to me also has 118 acres. He works it alone. They can't afford to pay \$25 per month; \$10 would be about the limit. One hun-

dred acres should have three men. This land is rough, but could be made to raise good crops. There are a few farms well worked here by men who made their money during the boarding season the same as men of means everywhere."

IN HIS ADDRESS at Prescott, Ariz., President Taft called the Oklahoma constitution a "zoological garden of cranks." He was talking to the people of Arizona about their own constitution when he said: "You have got to formulate a constitution after the congress says you shall come in, and I want to say a word about that constitution. In saying so I give you an earnest knowledge of the seriousness with which I say that I believe you will be made a state. A constitution is for the purpose of laying down fundamental limitations upon your legislature and your executive. Now if you think that in that constitutional convention you ought to lay down all the limitations that are ordinarily included in the statute you are going to make a great mistake. The greatest constitution that ever was made is the constitution of the United States, and you can go through that in a very short time. You take the last constitution that was made—the constitution of Oklahoma—and it is a zoological garden of cranks. I don't mean to say that it has no good ideas in it; it has. But the idea of tying down a legislature, which is an experiment, so to speak, with the laws that are to be adapted to a new territory, with a long discourse imposing all sorts of limitations is a mistake which you ought to profit by. Your assumption of statehood throws upon you a responsibility that will not enable you thereafter to charge it all to the federal government. When you get into difficulty out here and have bad officials, or your legislature gets you into it in a county or city you can not say it is all at Washington, because Washington does not understand it. Then, the fault will be on your own head."

NOW THEY are beginning to talk of Roosevelt for 1912. A Washington letter to the Kansas City Post says: "During the memorable fight in congress over the railroad rate bill, a Washington newspaper began publishing long articles boosting Mr. Taft, then secretary of war, for President. The articles appeared to come ex cathedra, and the writer was well known as one of the president's intimates. Certain three senators, who had been watching these publications quizzically, being at heart much opposed to Taft, dined at the White House en famille with the chief executive. Mr. Roosevelt sat on the veranda after dinner, looked at the summer moon hanging in all the glories of June over the Washington monument, smoked big black cigars and talked to his senatorial guests. He was bent on impressing them, and on winning them around to his scheme of things in the senate, so he remarked, with an air of injured innocence: 'Do you know this fellow —, who has been writing these stories in the — about Secretary Taft?' 'We do,' they all replied, and kept on smoking. 'Well, aren't those articles the most remarkable things you ever saw?' 'They were,' calmly agreed the senators, 'And, the funny part about them,' said Mr. Roosevelt vehemently, 'is that he attempts to create the idea that I am inspiring them.' The senators smoked silently. 'Most absurd!' he cried. 'Of course I esteem Mr. Taft highly, but I have not the slightest idea of mixing in that fight or of pushing him or anyone else. It's not men I am interested in, but things more important.' The senators were apparently delighted to hear it. A few days passed. Two more Taft booms appeared in the columns of the Washington paper. The three senators—one of whom is said to have been Joseph Benson Foraker—sat in a row in the senate chamber and looked up at the press gallery. There sat the Taft boomer twirling a lead pencil. One of them called him—or beckoned to him—and down the writer came. 'Say, old man,' queried the senator, 'where do you get all this Taft stuff?' 'Get it?' answered the other, 'Why, I don't mind telling you on the spot I get it every day at the White House from the president's own lips!' The senator returned to the chamber, told his fellow-diners, and the air immediately was surcharged with profanity. This tale, told quietly at the time, is chiefly of interest now, because of the increasing gossip connecting Roosevelt with the presidential nomination in 1912. It shows to what great lengths his excellency went to boost Taft, and keep things moving for himself at the same time. It shows how long ago it was that the wires were being laid for the Taft boom."