

legislature is not bound by the result. But as the mandatory Initiative and Referendum to be voted on next month in this State was submitted by the signatures of 137,000 (p. 873) voters—very many more than the requisite 10 per cent—and for the purpose of putting an end to “jackpot” legislation by enabling the people to control their legislative agents instead of being controlled by them, to secure representation in place of misrepresentation, and as candidates are being personally pledged, it is reasonable to expect that a large vote under the “public policy” law for the mandatory Initiative and Referendum will convince the new legislature that it had better do its part toward giving the people an opportunity to vote not merely in an advisory way but as a people having authority.

+

No matter what the advisory vote may be, the legislature can only submit or refuse to submit a Constitutional amendment such as is asked for. To do this there must be a majority in each House. After that, there must be a majority of all the votes cast at the election. With this obstruction to Constitutional amendments, the importance of first carrying what Herbert Quick calls a “gateway” amendment, is manifest. Let the advisory vote this fall be large enough for the Initiative and Referendum to make that reform “look good” to legislators, and other needed reforms will be easier. Whoever would help, may get all possible information and assistance by communicating with the Committee of Seven, Unity Building, 79 Dearborn street, Chicago; or Direct Legislation League, Odd Fellows’ Building, Springfield.

+ +

James O. Monroe.

Under the minority representation law of Illinois, the voters for legislative representatives in the 41st district, which coincides with Will and DuPage counties, may cast $1\frac{1}{2}$ votes for two Democrats, or $1\frac{1}{2}$ votes for two Republicans, or 3 votes for either of them. That is, if they vote for both their party candidates, the vote will be counted as $1\frac{1}{2}$ for each, whereas if they vote for only one, it will count as 3 votes for him. Each party has nominated only two candidates. They might have nominated three, for three are to be elected. This is a boss’s arrangement of course, the object being to elect two men who are “right”—“jackpot” right—of one party, and one such man of the other party. But the voters need not carry out this arrangement unless they wish to—not altogether at any rate. For James O. Mon-

roe is an independent candidate in this district; and every ballot with one cross opposite his name and no cross opposite anybody else’s, will count as 3 votes for Mr. Monroe. A man whom any democratic Democrat or democratic Republican may trust in the legislature, James O. Monroe is himself a democratic Democrat, and one that knows why; he is the same kind of democratic Democrat that Henry George was, and this should be guarantee enough.

+ +

The Pardon of John R. Walsh.

Ella Flagg Young, superintendent of Chicago schools (p. 651) has once more demonstrated her well balanced courage by pleading in person at Washington for the pardon of John R. Walsh (pp. 85, 412). It was both a courageous thing and a right thing to do. Not that John R. Walsh was a good citizen. He was not. But he was as good a citizen,—that is to say, he was the same kind of bad citizen,—as the men who tripped him up in the very kind of business game that all play at. The crime of which he was convicted was the violation of a technical requirement of a technical statute—precisely the kind of statutory irregularity that other bankers are guilty of, and for which Walsh would never have been prosecuted if he hadn’t crossed their path as a competitor in frenzied finance. If the national banking business were all exposed as ruthlessly as Walsh’s little corner in it was, there would be a financial earthquake from New York to San Francisco; and among its victims would be found some of the very financiers who sent Walsh to prison to get him out of their way. Mrs. Young is wrong in saying that there was some “dreadful misunderstanding.” There was no misunderstanding. The understanding was perfect,—and vicious, respectably vicious. But she is right in urging the pardon of this man, although it might rest as well upon the circumstances of his prosecution as upon the present condition of his health.

+ +

Criminal Responsibility.

Woodrow Wilson’s ideas about responsibility for crime of the men who manage corporations is certainly sound. He is reported to have said this in one of his campaign speeches for Governor of New Jersey:

Corporations do not do wrong. Individuals do wrong. Guilt is always personal. You will say that in many instances it is not fair to pick out for punishment the particular officer who ordered a thing done, because he really had no freedom in the matter; that he is himself under orders, exercises