

large decrease in the number of paid lobbyists at the next session of the Legislative Assembly in January, 1903." Subsequently one of the circuit courts of Oregon declared the amendment unconstitutional, one of the grounds for the adverse decision being that it was in conflict with Section 4, Article 4, of the Constitution of the United States, guaranteeing to every State a republican form of government.

In December, 1903, the Supreme Court of Oregon reversed the decision of the lower tribunal and confirmed the validity of the amendment. Mr. U'Ren, regarding this action, says:

No more important or far-reaching decision has ever been rendered by any court in our country, nor any that more ably represents and sustains the American ideals of government. The court said in part: "Now, the initiative and referendum amendment does not abolish or destroy the republican form of government. The representative character of the government still remains. The people have simply reserved to themselves a larger share of legislative power, but they have not overthrown the republican form of government, or substituted another in its place."

Mr. U'Ren, in speaking of the bill for direct primaries, said it "is proposed by initiative petition because it is a more direct and certain method of obtaining the law than to wait for the Legislative Assembly, in which the party bosses have heretofore defeated all attempts to secure such a law." He continues:

So far as I can learn, the initiative and referendum is more popular with all classes in Oregon than it was two years ago. Capitalists and business men regard it as ample insurance against any revolutionary laws, socialistic or otherwise, which might be enacted by any political party that may obtain power, as well as affording a complete protection against any hasty, ill-advised or corrupt action of the legislative assembly. On the other hand, it is now demonstrated that the initiative gives the people power to propose and adopt or reject any reform laws that party bosses do not want or that politicians would fear to make in the legislative assembly, as well as furnishing a safe and practical method for reformers and agitators to get a decision directly from the people on their demands in the concrete form of a proposed law. The initiative and referendum is in the Oregon constitution to stay.

JAMES P. CADMAN.

Chicago.

**Long-tailed Dog**—Don't you get tired of everlastingly wagging that little stump of yours?

**Stump-tailed Dog**—No; it feels just as if the tail was all there, and I get just as much fun out of the exercise as you do, with a good deal less work—Chicago Tribune.

**WHY JUDGE SEABURY WILL NOT VOTE FOR JUDGE PARKER.**

Without fully indorsing the conclusions of the writer of the following letter, we reproduce it in full as an important and significant incident of the presidential campaign. The writer is Samuel Seabury, one of the judges of the City Court of New York city, and a Democrat of force, standing and deserved influence.

I shall not vote for Parker and Davis. The action of the convention in approving the crime committed in Illinois, the facts being clearly presented and being undisputed, showed that the convention preferred the rule of the political corruptionist rather than recognize that political conventions should be honestly conducted and that the majority should rule.

Judge Parker's persistent silence before he was nominated and his tricky telegram as soon as he had safely secured the nomination showed him to be an apt pupil of the political methods of David B. Hill. The deception to which Judge Parker and his friends resorted to secure the nomination and the repudiation of the compromises entered into in relation to the platform will, I believe, before the campaign is over, be made perfectly apparent. When the facts are appreciated they can excite no other feeling than disgust and contempt.

The convention was controlled by a union of monopoly and pro-slavery elements. It was impossible that any really democratic action could have proceeded from such a combination. Both the Republican and Democratic parties as at present constituted are controlled by plutocratic influences. The great corporations which depend for success upon special privileges, the existence of which impoverishes the masses, will in this campaign contribute impartially to both of the great political parties. No matter which party loses, monopoly is confident that it will win.

In the contest between Roosevelt and Parker no political issues are involved. It is a mere personal contest for place and power. This is the lowest plane upon which a political campaign can be fought.

The fact that Grover Cleveland and others who deserted the party when it became Democratic in 1896 are now in control of the party is a sure guarantee that the party will be administered for the benefit of a corrupt plutocracy, as it was during Cleveland's last administration.

The indictment which Mr. Bryan brings against the element which now

controls the Democratic party is in all respects true, and the fact that it is true shows that the party is unworthy of support. It seems to me unreasonable to assert that the Democratic party stands at present for policies which are destructive of free government, and at the same time to support that party upon the theory that the best way to reform a party is to intrust the plutocratic element in the party with the control of the government.

The best way to reform the party is to see to it, when it sells out to the plutocracy, as it has in this campaign, that it should go down to the defeat which it deserves. The Republican party stands for the same plutocratic influences which are behind Judge Parker, and for imperialism and militarism. There is no reason to believe that Judge Parker is any more opposed to imperialism and militarism than is President Roosevelt, but even if he is opposed to imperialism, and should be elected, no change in the present imperialistic policy could be secured without a similar change in the Senate, which cannot be secured in this election.

From my standpoint a choice of two evils is presented, and I shall choose neither. If Parker is defeated the Democratic party will be forced to adopt progressive and liberal democratic principles, or go out of existence and give place to some party which will give expression to these principles.

The principles are more important than the party. Mr. Watson, nominated by the People's party, is a worthy representative of the principles which I conceive to be truly democratic, and the adoption of which I believe to be essential to the preservation of democratic institutions in this country.

He is the only representative of these democratic principles in this campaign. I shall, therefore, cast my vote for him. I am informed that a full Watson electoral ticket will be nominated, and I believe it will receive a large vote.

**FIGURES CAN'T LIE.**

There lies before us—the word lies is used advisedly—The Tariff Handbook, compiled by the American Protective Tariff League, the association of grafters who have taught the Republican party to stand pat; a document largely devoted to showing the terrible effects of Democratic free trade.