expense of having to endure bad weather for elections.

✣ ✣

"Representative" Government.

Are the people of Ohio still in doubt about the Initiative and Referendum? Are they still willing to give weight to the objections of lobbyists who live by influencing legislators, and to the Interests that lobbyists serve? Hasn't the grand jury at Columbus made them realize that representative government without the Initiative and Referendum does not represent the people?

✣ ✣

For People's Power.

It is agreeably significant that at a citizens' meeting at Cincinnati last week, called to consider the legislative bribery, all the speakers emphasized the necessity for the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. These speakers included John Fry, editor of the Iron Molders' Journal, Jerome B. Howard, manager of the Phonographic Institute, Herbert S. Bigelow and J. Chandler Harper. Mr. Howard countered briskly on the warnings of obsolescent politicians that People's Power would subject us to "gusts of popular passion." The real danger to democracy, he argued, is not from popular passion but from popular lassitude; and, reminding the people of Cincinnati of judges going to a boss, hats in hand, for instructions, he said that in such cases "gusts of popular passion" would have their value.

✣ ✣

One of the Tricks.

An exposure of another of the slick Big Business tricks is made in a recent Collier's by Jerome G. Beatty. The trick was attempted in New Hampshire, and its exposure is almost a liberal education in Big Business politics. "When the tax bill passed," writes Mr. Beatty, "Governor Bass's secretary rushed to him with the news. The bill was one of the most important progressive measures, but he didn't turn flip-flops of joy as the secretary expected. He asked to see the amendments. They were brought to him. 'There's a joker in here somewhere,' he said. 'The Senate wouldn't have passed it so readily if there wasn't.' Governor Bass called in his friends, and they stayed up most of the night looking for the laugh. They found it. In the original bill, section 11 read that every utility company should be taxed on 'the actual value of its property *and estate.*' An unimportant amendment had been added to section 11, and in adding it 'and estate' had been dropped. To the ordinary observer that looked to be a most laudable attempt to eliminate unnecessary legal verbiage. But Louis E. Wyman, an attorney, dug into the Supreme Court decisions and found that the court had once decided that *franchises* were not property, but that they were part of the estate. When the trick was exposed there was a panic in the State House."

✣ ✣

Defeat of Direct Legislation in Illinois.

Only nine votes were lacking in the lower House of the Illinois Legislature to submit the direct legislation amendment to the people of this State for their approval or rejection. If this particular nine had voted right, however, very likely another nine would have "played the goat" in their place. Coaxed on or whipped on by Big Business, the standpat Republicans and the reactionary Democrats were determined to defeat submission of the measure to the people, notwithstanding the platform pledges of both parties, and notwithstanding the popular vote of 447,908 in its favor last fall to only 128,398 against it.

✣

It is evident that those House members who voted against submission, or were silent or absent, and gave as their reason that a *majority* of the people had not voted for the amendment last fall, were guilty of bad faith. The proposition before the House was not adoption of the Initiative and Referendum; it was only whether the question of its adoption should be submitted to the people. Must a majority of all the voters ask for such submissions before "representatives", bound to it by party pledges, are politically obliged to vote for submission—for bare submission? No honest man who believes in Lincoln's doctrine of government by the people can say so.

✣

How many voters, then, must ask for submission of an amendment before a party pledge for the amendment becomes binding upon their "representatives"? In this instance the popular vote asking for submission, 447,908, was not only three times the vote against submission, but it was 71 per cent. of the vote of two years before, which gave the electoral vote of Illinois to Taft for President. Isn't 71 per cent. of a deciding vote for President enough to oblige a representative, if he is a representative, to submit a proposed amendment to the people? The excuse of those "representatives" is a transparent subterfuge, and every one of them should be marked for defeat at the next election—not only those who had the treacherous courage to

Digitized by Google

vote against submission, but also those whose cowardice prompted them to pass their vote or stay away.

✤

The action of the "representatives" of both parties who defeated submission of the Initiative and Referendum amendment to the people of Illinois, is in itself a powerful argument against absoluteness of representative power. Here was a formal demand for submission of a proposed Constitutional amendment—a demand by 447,908 voters of the State—nearly 40 per cent. of the total vote of all parties for President two years before, and over 70 per cent. of the vote that then gave Illinois to Taft,—and yet the people's "representatives" decide that the vote was too light to warrant their submitting the proposed amendment! If that is within rifle shot of *representation,* pray how far off is *mis*representation?

✤

There need be no discouragement, however, on the part of Illinois advocates of the Initiative and Referendum. The idea itself is daily gaining strength, and the *mis*representatives at Springfield have furnished it a new and powerful argument. Public opinion may be so far advanced during the next two years, that an amendment more potent than the defeated one can be adopted. It might extend to amending the Constitution itself. The present legislature has demonstrated the necessity of holding constitutional as well as legislative power continually within popular control. Nothing less can be effective against the dominion which Big Business obtains, by hook or by crook, over "representatives" with power to misrepresent.

✤ ✤

Judges and the Recall.

Governor Osborn of Michigan furnishes further argument in support of the Recall for judges. The Michigan legislature recently passed a bill repealing a requirement that the Supreme Court judges of that State reside at the capital, and Governor Osborn vetoed the bill because the judges had previously agreed, in consideration of an increase in their salaries, that they would reside there. In his veto message he said: "This bill has been lobbied for actively by members of the Supreme Court, actuated by selfish purposes. While this may be their privilege, it indicates the finite character of our courts, and proves to my mind that any Recall law that might be enacted should apply to the judiciary with equal force as to other officers of the government."

Democratic Leadership.

The name of Andrew M. Lawrence, whose totem pole is William Randolph Hearst and his political partner the present Mayor of Chicago, seems to be up for Illinois member of the Democratic national committee. This is the edict, at any rate, that came from the banquet in Mr. Lawrence's special honor last week at Chicago; and if his opponent is to be Roger C. Sullivan, the present incumbent, "Hobson's choice" was in comparison a marvel of variety. That several of Mr. Bryan's friends were conspicuous at the banquet, while Mr. Bryan himself though conspicuously in the city was not at the banquet at all, has naturally surcharged the political ether with interrogation points. There is also an esoteric significance about that banquet which transcends in political importance the possibility of a contest for committeeman between the new firm of Lawrence and Harrison and the senior member of the former firm of Sullivan and Lawrence. We allude to the Presidential plans of Mr. Hearst. With due allowance for the possibility of his seizure of the Democratic nomination for himself should a favorable snatching opportunity occur, Mr. Hearst is apparently engineering the Harmon candidacy; and this makes a pretty game, well worth watching from every corner of the country.

✤ ✤

Innocence is Innocence.

The labor union officials who have been whisked from their homes across the continent by private detectives in the pay of a private corporation, for trial in a distant place, and in such manner as to prevent their appealing to the courts of their own State for lawful protection, are entitled to the presumption of innocence. And Innocence is Innocence, even if "Murder is Murder." But Mr. Roosevelt does not seem to think so. It was he, by the way, who threw the weight of Presidential influence into the scale to create public opinion against those Colorado labor leaders who were similarly kidnaped by private detectives employed by private corporations, and who upon trial were afterwards acquitted. In the same spirit as before, Mr. Roosevelt now denounces labor unions for coming to the defense of McNamara. In a signed editorial in The Outlook under the sinister title of "Murder is Murder," reproduced broadcast over the country as part of the campaign for creating public opinion against the presumption of innocence in McNamara's case, Mr. Roosevelt anticipates the trial with his own verdict of guilty; for this is the spirit and effect of his one-sided editorial. The

Digitized by Google