

to do with the initiative and the referendum—one for State purposes and the other for local purposes. Whoever believes in one must believe in the other. They may, therefore, be discussed together as a single proposition.

The initiative and the referendum, modes of direct legislation, would make no change in present methods of law-making, so long as the law-making bodies remained true to their obligations. Those bodies would continue to draft, consider and enact laws, ordinances, etc., precisely as they do now. No reference to popular vote would be made if they performed their duties—pigeon-holing no good measures, and enacting no bad ones.

But if the legislative body were to enact a bad law, five per cent. of the voters affected could interfere and demand that the bad law be submitted to popular vote. If they did so, the bad law would not be operative until the people had voted on it; and if a majority voted against it, it would not be operative at all.

Or, if the legislative body were to pigeon-hole a good law, then eight per cent. of the voting population could demand that it be taken out of the pigeon-hole and submitted to popular vote. If a majority voted against it, it would remain in the pigeon-hole; but if a majority voted for it it would be a law whether the lobby liked it or not.

The initiative and referendum would abolish the lobby and abolish the boss.

One of the strong points about this reform is that it would often be effective without being used.

So long as there is no such means of keeping legislatures and local governing bodies honest, they pigeon-hole good bills and pass bad ones with impunity. It usually depends upon what the lobby wants or some boss demands. But if eight per cent. of the voters could pull good bills out of the legislative pigeon-holes and submit them to the people, and five per cent. could stop the operation of bad bills until the people had voted directly on them, legislators would hesitate about pigeon-holing good bills, and be very

timid about passing bad ones. Though an initiative and referendum law has been in operation in South Dakota for several years, it has never yet been appealed to. This fact is urged against the utility of the law, but is in fact a strong argument in its favor. For though the law has never been publicly appealed to, it has more than once been held over the heads of legislators like a Damocletian sword and with excellent effect. At least one most vicious bill which the bosses of the Democratic party in the South Dakota legislature demanded, was defeated because the minority threatened to appeal its passage from the legislature to the people. When that threat was made, the majority yielded and the bill was killed.

If the initiative and the referendum were in operation in Illinois, no bad law could be passed by the legislature if a majority of the people opposed it, and no good one could be pigeon-holed if a majority of the people favored it; no monopoly franchise could be granted by any city if a majority of the people of that city objected, and no municipal reform could be strangled if a majority of the municipal voters really wanted it.

Whoever wishes to see this wholesome regulation of legislation in force in Illinois, will take the pains to vote "Yes" to the first two propositions quoted above. Though a majority vote in the affirmative will not in itself enact the law, though it will be only advisory, it is not likely that the legislature next winter will be indifferent to advice of that kind if expressed with the emphasis of a heavy majority.

For legislators are politicians, and politicians know that if they would succeed in politics it is more important to obey the people than a boss. If they are usually more obedient to bosses, it is because they always know what the boss wants them to do and are not always certain about the wishes of the people.

Let the voters of Illinois make their wants clearly and emphatically known by voting in the affirmative on these questions, and the legislators may be depended upon to do the rest—boss or no boss, lobby or no lobby.

## NEWS

The most exciting political event for months, one which may well prove to be of the utmost moment in its influence upon national politics, is the declination of Speaker David B. Henderson as the Republican candidate for re-election to Congress from the Third district of Iowa. Mr. Henderson's action is especially important because of his position as speaker of the lower house of Congress, of the critical circumstances under which he declines re-nomination, and of the significant reason he gives for declining.

His decision was announced to the President, at Oyster Bay, by Chairman Babcock of the Republican Congressional committee, on the 16th. The President had just closed a political conference with Senators Allison of Iowa, Aldrich of Rhode Island, Hanna of Ohio, Spooner of Wisconsin, and Lodge of Massachusetts, together with Postmaster General Payne, and had agreed with them upon a policy for the campaign. According to the special report of the Chicago Tribune of the 17th, the leading Republican paper of the middle West, this agreement embraced five propositions: (1) The President's policy regarding trusts was to be approved and he was to emphasize it in his further speaking; (2) the lawsuits instituted by him against the beef trust and the railroad merger were to be made the basis of an appeal to the people to patiently await the decisions of the courts, which would show whether further legislation or a constitutional amendment is necessary to check the power of trusts; (3) the President was to stand on the record he has made by those lawsuits, and refrain from proposing tariff revision as an anti-trust policy; (4) Cuban reciprocity was to be approved; and, (5), as to the tariff the position was to be taken that the party is committed by the platform of 1896 to the principles of protection but not to particular schedules, and that tariff rates are to be regarded as details to be settled by Congress from time to time. As the Tribune's report sums up the decision of the conference with reference to the tariff and trusts, it was—

agreed by all that there will be no adherence to the theory that the tariff can be or should be reduced merely because certain articles were produced

by trusts or monopolies. The effort will be made at all times to keep the tariff and the trusts as separate questions to be dealt with on their merits. There will be no abatement of loyalty to the general principle of protection, but there will be an admission that certain articles are now receiving more protection than is desirable. The plea will be made and insisted upon that any revision or readjustment of the tariff should be made by the friends of protection and not by free traders, and the country will be appealed to not to jeopardize existing prosperity by turning the tariff over to its enemies.

Hardly had this conclusion been reached and given in substance to the reporters, when the distinguished conferees were stunned by the news of Speaker Henderson's refusal to be the party candidate for Congress in his district, because, to quote Mr. Henderson's own language in his message to Chairman Babcock—

I cannot agree with many of my party who would prescribe free trade in whole or in part as a remedy for trusts.

Mr. Henderson's letter declining the nomination that had been tendered him several weeks ago by acclamation, puts his long delay in answering, and his final declination, upon the following ground:

Reported conditions in the public mind in my district upon public policies induced me to make this delay. Since my return to the district I have made a careful study as to the sentiment in the district and State and I believe there is no little sentiment, and a growing sentiment, among Republicans, that I do not truly represent their views on the tariff question. Believing this condition to exist and knowing that I do not agree with many of my people that trusts, to which I am and have been opposed, can be cured or the people benefited by free trade, in whole or in part, I must decline to accept the nomination so generously and enthusiastically made.

After thus formally declining, Mr. Henderson issued a formal address to the voters of his district. His policy as therein outlined is to regulate and control trusts by repressive legislation, securing power through a constitutional amendment if necessary, and not to disturb tariff schedules. While he asserts that he has never been and is not now opposed to "making needed changes" in the tariff, he adds:

I must say, and say emphatically, that I don't believe that a single schedule of the Dingley tariff law can

be so amended as to relieve the people from the oppression of trusts, or combinations of capital, however named, and that such action may involve the retarding of our expanding commerce and getting and holding of foreign markets.

The conclusion of his address, in so far as it relates to his declining, is in these words:

After a careful study of conditions and political views in Iowa and in my own district, I am satisfied that I am not in harmony with a great many of the Republican voters, who believe that free trade, in whole or in part, will remedy the trust evil. I believe that it will not, but that such a remedy is likely to involve the nation in dangerous results, and so believing I feel that I should not accept the nomination for Congress, which was so generously tendered me, and I have decided accordingly.

All efforts to induce Mr. Henderson to recede from his position had, up to the 18th, been unavailing. A letter, numerously signed by party leaders of national repute and influence, urgent private telegrams from similar sources, and a message from the President in which the latter writes: "I most earnestly ask that you reconsider your determination not to run," had been met by him with refusals to alter his published address. It is regarded as significant that neither Gov. Cummins nor any of his faction had joined in or encouraged these requests to Mr. Henderson to reconsider.

Five days prior to Speaker Henderson's delayed and unfavorable response to the Congressional nomination the Republicans had tendered him, ex-Gov. Horace Boies was nominated for Congress by the Democrats of the same district. The convention, which sat at Waterloo on the 11th, nominated Gov. Boies by unanimous vote. The burden of the convention speeches was a prediction that Boies would defeat Henderson and carry to Washington "the Iowa idea" of tariff reform—abolition of tariff on foreign commodities that compete with trust-made domestic commodities. The vote in this district in 1900, for President and Congress, was as follows:

	Vote.	Plurality.
McKinley (Rep.)	29,874	11,081
Bryan (Dem.)	18,793	
Henderson (Rep.)	30,181	11,325
Birdsall (Dem.)	18,856	

Though 75 years old, ex-Gov. Boies is still strong in body and mind. He

practiced law at Buffalo, New York, from 1849 to 1867, serving meanwhile a term in the New York legislature in 1858 as a Whig. With the collapse of the Whig party he became a Republican, and in 1867 removed to Waterloo, Ia., where he has ever since lived, practicing his profession. Leaving the Republican party because he opposed its prohibition policy in the State and its protective policy for the country at large, he affiliated with the Democrats, whose candidate for governor of Iowa he has been at three elections. In 1889 and 1891 he was elected, but was defeated in 1893. Gov. Boies stood second in the final balloting for President at the Democratic convention of 1896. He is a radical tariff reformer, and though he has withdrawn his support from the ratio of 16 to 1 is understood to be still a bimetalist. It is reported from Waterloo that it is his intention to make his Congressional campaign almost exclusively upon the tariff question and the trust question as affected by the tariff.

At the Democratic convention of Delaware, held at Dover on the 16th, Henry A. Houston was nominated for Congress, and the supremacy of Addicks, the "commercial adventurer and his creatures," was declared to be the question of overwhelming importance.

The Utah Republican convention met at Ogden on the 11th, and after recommending President Roosevelt as his own successor, nominated Joseph Howell for Congress. The Democrats, in convention at Provo on the 16th, nominated W. H. King for Congress and endorsed the Kansas City platform.

At Tacoma on the 11th the Republican convention of Washington (p. 360), nominated Cushman Jones and W. F. Humphrey for Congress; and on the 16th the Democratic convention of the same State, also in session at Tacoma, nominated G. F. Cotterill, S. E. Barron and O. R. Holcomb for Congress, and after reaffirming the Kansas City platform endorsed United States Senator Turner for reelection.

At the Republican convention of Alabama, held at Birmingham on the 16th, the report of the executive committee, which decided all contests against Negro delegates, thereby removing every Negro from the convention, was sustained. On the