

social action. A degenerate people; a "Reign of Terror"; a "French Revolution"—this tells the story of France on the same lines.

Must we have a "terror," or a "revolution," or shall we by civic sanitary engineering remove the cause? It is up to us. We may be sure that anything short of removing the cause will be ineffectual, and the cause can be removed. The rational civic will of a great people can build this nation in all its parts, to the fulness of its best ideals.

EDMUND NORTON.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

AUSTRALIA.

Corowa, New South Wales, June 3, 1909.

The Federal Parliament adjourned soon after the formation of the Fisher (Labor) ministry last November (vol. xi, p. 918). The principal planks of the Government program, as announced by Mr. Fisher in April, were: A graduated tax on land values, with \$25,000 exemption; referendum to amend the Constitution so as to empower the Federal Parliament to fix rates of wages ("new protection"); an Australian navy; provision of land defences by means of a modified form of conscription; control of the currency, and a Commonwealth note issue; nationalization of the iron industry; the severance of Commonwealth from State finances on an equitable basis after 1910, the Commonwealth to take over the State debts.

+

During the recess, repeated efforts were made to get the three parties in opposition to the Government to join together, and in the middle of May a fusion was effected, with Mr. Deakin as leader of the united party. When the House met at the end of the month, the Fisher ministry was defeated by 39 votes to 30. Four members who formerly supported Mr. Deakin, including Sir William Lyne, who was treasurer in his last ministry, refused to join in the fusion and voted with the Labor party.

Mr. Fisher asked for a dissolution of Parliament, but this was refused, and Mr. Deakin has formed a new ministry.

Following are the terms on which the fusion was made: (1) No interference with the present customs tariff; (2) a referendum to be taken to amend the Constitution to enable a State Wages Board or Arbitration Court to refer to the Interstate Commission for adjustment any unfair competitive rates or conditions in another State (this amendment not to be sought if all the States authorize the Commonwealth to legislate to this extent); (3) to develop the Australian navy and the military forces, with the advice and assistance of the British admiralty and war office; (4) until a complete scheme is prepared to adjust the financial relations of the Commonwealth and the States, an interim arrangement to be proposed for dealing with the Customs and Excise revenue of the Commonwealth (the Federal Constitution provides that, until the end of 1910, at least three-fourths of the revenue from customs and excise must be paid over to the States).

State elections were held in Tasmania at the end of April, when the Labor party increased from seven to twelve in a House of 30. An excellent method of proportional voting (a modification of the Hare system) was employed at this election, and appears to have given general satisfaction. For the lower house elections, the State was divided into five constituencies, each returning six members. Miss C. H. Spence, of Adelaide, and Mr. E. J. Nanson, professor of mathematics at the Melbourne University, are the chief advocates in Australia of proportional voting, and it is due largely to their efforts that it was adopted in Tasmania.

ERNEST BRAY.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

PROFESSOR FOSTER'S CASE.

Chicago, July 10.

I so seldom find anything in *The Public* editorials with which I am not in accord that I feel more free to express my disagreement with a part of your article entitled "Paganistic Queasiness" (p. 629). In this editorial you speak of the action of the Baptist ministers in expelling Professor Foster from their conference. You call the ministers "queasy" and "pagans," and you are puzzled to know why Professor Foster objects to his own expulsion "instead of wearing the honor with ill-concealed pride." We all have a right to our opinion, but in my judgment the ministers did right to expel Prof. Foster, and I do not see how they can be justly termed "queasy." I did not think then (and I am still of the same opinion) that I deserved to be called "queasy" or "sick at the stomach," when I enlisted in the Union army in the sixties. I stood up for a principle then, and the ministers, as I believe, were doing the same thing when they expelled Professor Foster. Professor Foster has a perfect right to believe and say what he pleases, but he should give his utterances at the right place, and under the proper conditions. One writer expresses my views when he says:—"Prof. Foster is at liberty to express himself within the bounds voluntarily placed upon himself by his social connections. Should he wish to free himself he should at once relieve himself of the restricting obligations by severing his connections. This is the only honorable way and any other way is an imposition. To prate about liberty and the abuse of such in the case of Prof. Foster is begging the question. Unbridled liberty is anarchy and destructive." As the *Inter Ocean* well said—"Is it honorable and honest for a man to enter an institution under pledge to support it, and then insist on staying in it while trying to destroy it? . . . It is a question that has nothing to do with theology, orthodox or heterodox."

JAMES P. CADMAN.

+

A man hurried into a quick lunch restaurant recently and called to the waiter: "Give me a ham sandwich."

"Yes, sir," said the waiter, reaching for the sandwich, "will you eat it or take it with you?"

"Both!" was the unexpected but obvious reply.—*Ladies' Home Journal*.