

ly, a member, seconded by one or more others, may move to adopt it nevertheless. The Initiative again. If the committee reports favorably, a vote of the legislature is taken, which is a Referendum. But what is the legislature? It is to the people what the committee is to itself. If then the people are to govern themselves, and not be governed by a committee, the proposed law must go from the representative body to the body it represents. In that larger body, if the legislature (now a committee of all the people) has acted adversely on the measure, a member of the larger body, one of the people, seconded by as many others as it is fair to require, may move the people to adopt the measure notwithstanding the adverse action of their committee, the legislature. Here you have the Initiative raised from legislative power to people's power. But if the legislature (a committee of the people) has acted favorably, a member of the larger body, one of the people, seconded by as many others as it may be fair to require, may move the whole people to veto the action of their committee, the legislature. Then you have the Referendum raised from legislative power to people's power.

In other words, the Initiative and the Referendum are to the political body as a whole, what motions and rules and appeals from the chair are to their representative bodies.

To understand the referendum in this way, and to know its history in the United States, is to know why it is popular with American democrats, while its House of Lords' namesake is unpopular with British democrats.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THOSE QUEER CANADIANS.

Portland, Ore.

I use the term "queer Canadians" advisedly. I mean that they are "at variance with what is usual or normal" in the United States, "differing in some odd way from what is ordinary"—on this side the line; but not strange, suspicious or questionable. And I am speaking of the Canadians from Winnipeg west to Victoria, for our party—Joseph Fels, Daniel Kiefer and I—went from Minneapolis to Winnipeg and then followed the line of the Canadian Pacific to Vancouver and Victoria.

At Winnipeg we were joined by Robert Lloyd Scott, of Winnipeg, who accompanied us to Portland. I mention Scott because he is worth mentioning; young, but a big part of the democratic movement in Canada.

+

Yes, those western Canadians are "queer." Most of them, as far as I could see, are demo-

crats; and while they know we have the worst government on this continent north of Mexico, they are too courteous to tell us so unless we insist on "annexation" of Canada to the United States. Then they tell us plainly, but still courteously, why they forbid the bans.

They, subjects of a king, have more democracy in government than we have, and they are getting ready to have more than they have. So are we, for that matter; but they are not tied up and hampered with Constitutional handicaps against democracy as we are. They are not shouting for a "republican form of government;" they see that we have the form without the substance, and what they want is the substance, remembering what the Pope said about forms of government; they know that "a painted ship upon a painted ocean" is not a merchant marine.

"Nominally we are ruled by a king, but actually we are not," say those Canadians; "nominally you Americans rule yourselves, but actually you are ruled by your servants; and as your Congress, your President and your Federal courts are seldom in harmony, it is discordant rule." Queer, aren't they?

They say, also: "You have a Congress to make laws, and a President to enforce the laws made by your lawmakers; but your Federal courts nullify the laws made by your representatives and prevent your Executive from enforcing the laws. So you are ruled by nine men, not by yourselves, and the nine men are not responsible to the ninety million in any way. So we would rather be excused from annexation." Am I wrong in saying that they are "queer"?

+

Once more, "God save the King" is always the last course of any public luncheon or dinner in Canada. As well try to prevent an American political crook from barking about the flag when he's trying to work a crooked deal as try to adjourn a Canadian public luncheon or dinner without "God save the King." But, really, they don't care any more about the King than Joe Cannon does about the farmers when he tearfully pleads for "Protection for American farmers." The difference is that Cannon knows he isn't telling the truth, while the Canadians don't try to deceive anyone with their after-dinner song. But the Canadians don't make one-tenth the fuss over their King, what he says, what he has for breakfast and how he looks when he's trying to think, as we make over our President in the same circumstances.

+

Perhaps I haven't proved that the Canadians are "queer." Well, then, when a member of the Canadian parliament is defeated for re-election he takes no further part in making laws; in most of the Provincial parliaments there is no Senate; the term of Provincial legislators is five years, unless the "government" is defeated on a bill or resolution, in which case there is a new election—the theory and generally the fact being that a defeated government doesn't represent the people and has no business remaining in power. The "government"—that is, the party in power—may be returned to power by

the voters, but it must take its chances at the ballot box.

+

Now I submit the clinching proof that the Canadians are queer. Their cabinet system is totally unlike our absurd, irresponsible cabinet lack of system at Washington and unlike our State government system.

If we had the Canadian—or British—cabinet system at Washington, with an elected President, Champ Clark would now be the American premier, for he is leader of the majority party in the House of Representatives, and he would choose the other cabinet officers; and the cabinet officers would have seats in the House, introduce "government" measures and be responsible for them.

No man could get into the cabinet except via the ballot box route. Think of Hitchcock, Dickinson, Ballinger—or any other man in Taft's cabinet—taking that route to high office!

+

One more proof of Canadian queerness.

At Winnipeg is published the Grain Growers' Guide, which is the organ of a great farmers' association. It is an agricultural paper that advocates the Initiative and Referendum, the Recall, free trade, and land value taxation, otherwise known as the Single Tax; and the Canadian farmers don't shy at it. Western Canadian farmers are no more afraid of free trade than they are of any other kind of freedom. Having no taxes to pay on improvements or personal property, they know the value of freedom from taxes on industry; seeing that any other kind of taxation except taxation of land values puts a premium upon speculation and fosters special privilege, they are not afraid of the single tax, which they know will benefit rather than injure the working farmer; and believing that the people should have the reins of their government in their own hands, they are for the Initiative, Referendum and Recall.

+

And the Canadian business men? That's a hard question.

The managing editor of a great daily paper once said to me: "Write that article so plainly that even the most ignorant business man can understand it;" and I replied: "You can't expect me to work miracles on a salary of \$40 a week."

Go to a "Canadian Club" luncheon in any western Canadian city and explain the Initiative, Referendum and Recall; most of the men will applaud. Talk of free trade, and about half will applaud. Talk of the single tax, and about one-fourth or possibly one-third will applaud; sometimes not more than one out of five. The "Canadian Club" is an institution, a habit in every Canadian city, and is composed of doctors, lawyers, merchants, bankers and monopolists—in fact, of all classes except the laboring class.

+

Though the Canadians are queer in the sense described, the queerest specimen I saw between New York and Portland was the American consul at

Victoria. He represented a northern Illinois county in the Civil war, and hasn't learned anything since; one of the men who "votes as he shot," but never hit anything when he shot. He told me that he was opposed to "the whole new-fangled system of government in Oregon," and that if he had been a member of the Oregon legislature when Chamberlain, a Democrat, received the popular vote for the Senate, he would have resigned rather than vote for him. All I could do was to murmur: "That would help some." He was sure the "fathers" who wrote the Constitution never intended that the people should make laws or elect Senators; from which I infer that he wears the same clothes that his grandfather wore and regulates his daily life by rules laid down by his great-grandfathers. After being talked to by him I wondered why Roosevelt went to Africa to get curious faunal specimens for the Smithsonian Institution.

W. G. EGGLESTON.

+ + +

## CANADIAN PROGRESS.

Montreal, Canada.

Westmount, a suburb of this metropolis of Canada, presents a striking object lesson of the economy to the residents of a municipality of municipal ownership and operation of public utilities.

A suburb of Montreal, with a population of about 15,000, and covering an area of three square miles, Westmount seems like a part of the larger city. The trolley lines of Montreal pass through and beyond Westmount without extra fares and with transfer privileges; and her streets extend through the suburb and beyond, without change of names. It is doubtful if one inhabitant in a hundred of either could tell where one city leaves off and the other begins.

+

Several electric lighting companies possessed franchises in Westmount which in a measure caused competition in rates. Finally these companies were merged into one company. Prior to the merger the price of electricity furnished to the citizens of Westmount was 15 cents a kilowatt, less 33½ per cent for cash. Shortly after the merger the discount for cash was reduced to 5 per cent, and on five year contracts a discount of only 15 per cent was allowed. This aroused considerable antagonism to the lighting company from the citizens of Westmount, but no movement was made towards relief until the garbage disposal question forced action.

The peculiar situation of Westmount made it imperative to consume its garbage within the city limits. A contract was entered into between the municipality and a firm of mechanical engineers, to design and supervise the construction of a combined Electric Lighting and Destructor plant. Ground was broken for the plant in September, 1905, current being furnished to a few customers in April, 1906. In the contract between the municipality and the constructing company it was stipulated that the latter should have the management of the company under the direction of the city authorities for the period of one year with a view to obtaining business, arranging an accounting and record system, appoint-