

shadows grew long at the setting of the sun. Never in a hurry, he seemed to incarnate in himself the calm spirit of the garden, where each lived for all and all for each.

One day the old Gardener was absent from the scene of his labors. He never came there any more. Many days went by. At first the flowers that had known him so long did not miss him very much, but after a long time when he did not come, they became restless and tired. The earth in which they grew seemed to become hard and cruel. And it seemed that something of the meaning of their lives had gone.

One day an Evil Spirit, passing by, breathed upon that garden, and said:

"You are losing your opportunities. Each of you is missing his success. Why do you languish here in idleness. The Gardener is dead. It was he that restrained you. Now you may live. You might be the tallest of all in the garden. Don't let others put you in the shade. Life is the survival of the fittest. Every one see how tall you can grow. There is always plenty of room at the top."

Then a miracle happened within those low walls. All grew up as in a night. A new spirit of enterprise had taken possession of every living thing. This was progress. How different from the sleepy old days with the Gardener. Even the grass understood, and grew long and tangled and tough. All the plants sent up their stocks as tall and strong as they could. They sought to spread their leaves over one another's heads. Their branches grappled in a life and death struggle for light.

Sunshine that had once flooded all the place was now at a premium. They crowded so close together that the little spring flowers grew faint and pale and soon withered and died. Even the stronger summer flowers forgot to bloom.

Then the weeds, which were not encumbered with flowers, knew that their day had come. They crowded to the wall all who did not adopt their methods.

And now the struggle became more sordid still. The weeds began a battle among themselves. They had a less delicate sense of honor than the former sentimental occupants of the garden; they resorted to cunning and underground devices to gain advantage. The battle went on to the death. With deeds of darkness they undermined one another's strength, and made one another hideous. Their ugly, deformed stems scraped and sawed one another when the wind blew. The birds and butterflies and bees became frightened and came no more. Instead, spiders made their webs and awaited their prey among the broken ragged stalks.

Only the top leaves were now green, and before the summer was half done they drank up all the

moisture from the ground, and they all died together.

The Spirit had promised the survival of the fittest, but it was only the survival of the rankest. "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear!"

✦ ✦ ✦

## PEOPLE'S POWER.

Portions of a Speech Delivered by John Z. White at Passaic, N. J., on the Eve of the Adoption by Passaic of the Commission Form of Government. From the Passaic Daily News of July 24, 1911.

In presenting this matter, I wish to warn you that I make no effort to reach your belief. I would recommend you very carefully not to believe me, or anybody else who talks to you. My effort is not to arouse your faith but to reach your understanding. When you shall observe the nature of Commission government, and if it shall fail to convince you, then you may very properly advise me to add to my remarks the words the merchant did at the close of his advertisement. He said, "Don't go elsewhere and be cheated; come here." If you find that the idea of Commission government does not agree with your judgment, reject it, but do not reject it unless you understand it.

Everywhere over the United States it has been the practice to find out which particular party endorsed any particular idea, and then depend upon which particular party may have furnished its endorsement, to determine where you would place the weight or emphasis of your vote. If you happened to be a Democrat, and the Democratic party said the thing was good, lo and behold, it was holy in your sight. If you happened to be a Republican, and the Republican party said anything was good, lo and behold, that thing became holy in your sight. Now, why should we not have a judgment of our own, individual, regardless of what our neighbors or our party associates may determine? This has gone on so far that a great many citizens have lost their judgment politically. We are getting into the habit of condemning everything and are arriving at the same state of affairs as our good friend the darky when he was ill. Friends said: "Sam, you ought to have a physician, and if you will tell us what kind of a doctor you want, we will get it—allopath, homeopath or osteopath." "Well," he said, "it doesn't make any difference. All *paths* lead to the grave." . . .

Not merely to be perfectly frank, but so you won't think I am trying to conceal anything from you, I wish to advise you that I am a Democrat. And the reason I am a Democrat is that my father was one. And that's about the only good reason for being a Democrat. Now, if any of you gentlemen happen to be Republicans, and seriously contemplate your own consciousness—

which would be very unusual—you will discover your reason for being a Republican is identical with mine for being a Democrat. There is no difference between the Republican and Democrat today. You cannot tell them apart in broad daylight. . . . Have an opinion of your own. Act upon your opinion; do not just agree with me or anybody else.

What is Commission government? What is the proposal?

It is the proposal that we from now on conduct and administer our public affairs in exactly the way we always do conduct and administer our private affairs. That's all. To apply to public affairs exactly the same method that we every day apply in the administration of our private affairs. . . .

Now, how do we administer our private affairs? Why, if I have more work than I can do, and I want some one to assist me, I employ some one willing to work. In other words, I engage an agent. That agent I want to do what I want done, not what he wants to do, not what he thinks ought to be done. I employ this agent to accomplish a result that I desire. I want him to represent me, not some one else, not himself, but me. I want a representative. I am not able to do everything that I desire to have done. I must have help. How do I secure a representative in private life? Why, when I employ this individual to assist me, I reserve certain powers. If this agent does not do what I want done I can go and do that particular act myself. If the agent insists upon doing something I do not want done I have the power to stop him from doing that particular thing. If the agent becomes generally unsatisfactory I reserve the power to dismiss him and get some one else. That is the way your employer makes his employees represent him. And without these reserved powers you cannot get representation in any relation of life.

Those three powers are known as the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall when introduced into public affairs.

The Initiative is the method whereby we compel the doing of a thing we want done, even if our agent does not desire it or fails in any way to perform it.

The Referendum is the method whereby we prevent an agent from doing what he wants to do in violation of our desires.

The Recall is the method whereby we dismiss an unsatisfactory employe.

These three powers are reserved to the people, who are the principals, and they place our government affairs in exactly the same position relatively to the people as that of an agent to his principal in the affairs of private life.

I see some ladies here. Suppose one of our ladies has an assistant at home, a cook, for in-

stance, and that your cook doesn't do what you want—won't make an angel cake; you can go into the kitchen and make the angel cake yourself, can't you? That is Initiative. It is the reserved power whereby the principal, the employer, can get done what he wants done, even though the agent fails. It is the same way in our city government. We elect a Commission. Suppose they do not do what we want done. Then it is proposed that the people do for themselves what their officials do not do.

Now, the method, involving a larger number of people than are generally engaged in private enterprises, is a trifle more elaborate, but it is exactly the same thing. Suppose we have a government of three, or five, or six men, employed to run the city, but with this reservation on the part of the people, that if the people want anything done that these commissioners do not do, then the people may proceed to do that thing themselves, without reference to their government. The process is this: We draft a law expressing our idea, our notion, determining what we want. If we are wise we will go and see our legal friends to get it in proper form. Having drawn it in the shape in which we believe it ought to be passed, we go to our neighbors who are voters, and ask them to sign this proposal. That is, we make a motion, and every man who signs it seconds the motion. It is usually provided that 5 per cent., or sometimes 8 per cent., or 10 per cent., of the voters must sign this proposed law before their signatures become authoritative. But with the necessary percentage of signatures we go to the city clerk and file the document with him. We say, Here is a proposal that certain things be done in a certain way. This proposal is signed by 5 per cent., or 8 per cent., or 10 per cent., or whatever other percentage you may agree upon, of voters of this city. Therefore, we demand that either our city government put this into operation at once, without changing a solitary word, or that they submit it to the people to be voted upon at the next election. And if the majority of the votes cast upon that measure are in the affirmative, then the measure is adopted, irrespective of whether the officials desire it or not.

Now, would you think of hiring me to run your business on any other basis? Would you think of hiring a man and putting him in any business to run it, on any other basis? You hire a man to do something. Suppose he does not do it? Suppose he partly does it. Suppose some one part of the enterprise is left unattended to? Don't I reserve the power to go and attend to that particular proposition myself? Why, certainly I do. Every employer in the United States always reserves the same control, and by virtue of reserving that power the agent, the employe, knows that he must make good or lose his job. Put your public officials in exactly the same position that every private employe holds,

one of reserved power on the part of his employer, whereby he must make good.

Suppose your official or your employe does something you do not want done. Referring to our simile of the lady's cook in the kitchen, suppose the cook, instead of failing to do something, does something you don't want done, like putting salt instead of sugar in the angel cake. Don't you reserve the power to go into the kitchen and insist upon the substitution of sugar for salt? You prevent your employe from doing something you don't want done. You reserve that power, and by virtue of that reservation your employe becomes your representative. He represents you. Now that power reserved on the part of the people is known by the long word "Referendum." The people reserve the power to refer any particular thing the officials may do back to themselves. The method is a little more elaborate than in dealing with the cook in the kitchen. Suppose your city government passes an ordinance which will work out in a given way, and you don't like it. Ordinances do not go into operation for a period of some thirty or sixty days after enactment. During that time any citizen may propose that this particular ordinance or any part of it shall not become operative until it has been submitted to the people to be voted upon. Again he goes to his neighbors, who are voters, and asks them to sign this petition, for this proposed reference to the people. If he gets enough signatures, usually 5 per cent., he files it with the city clerk, during the period of thirty or sixty days, as may be determined, and if this paper is filed and so signed, then that law is held up and cannot be made operative or put into execution until the people themselves have had an opportunity to vote upon it, and if the majority agree with the signers the law is vetoed, destroyed, annulled.

Do you not see that under these two measures—first, your officials cannot prevent you from having any law you want, and, next, your officials cannot put upon you any law you do not want. It makes you the master. Now, do you know of any private enterprise that is conducted anywhere in the United States, upon any other basis? Are there any ladies in this city who will attempt to run a household with assistants upon any other basis than the reserved powers to make their assistants do what they want done and to prevent their assistants from doing anything they do not want done? Is there any woman who will attempt to run a household on any other basis than that? Is there any man who will attempt to conduct business on any other business basis than that? . . .

Yet, when we are trying to establish a method . . . of that kind, then we "destroy representative government."

Why, gentlemen, you cannot destroy that which does not exist. Destroy representative government! When did you ever have it? Does Lori-

mer represent the people of Illinois? Do you think the people of Illinois would have elected Cullom if they had had a chance? Does Senator Stephenson from Wisconsin represent the people of Wisconsin? Does Cox represent the people of Cincinnati? When have you had representative government? There is one way to secure representative government in this world, and only one, and that is to retain the power to compel our representatives. Is there any man that you know of in the good City of Passaic that will consent to run his private affairs in the way he does his public business? . . . Is there any gentleman you know of in Passaic who will give me an irrevocable power of attorney for two years to run his business? During two years he cannot interfere with me at all unless he can prove in a criminal court that I have violated the criminal law. At the end of two years he cannot take possession of his business himself. He must appoint me for another two years, or some one else in my stead. If he is tired of me, and I am pretty sure he would be, and he appointed some one else, what would that some one do? He would look over what I had done and improve on my methods. And at the end of two years the employer would want to get rid of this agent. If I happened to be a Democrat, he would get rid of Democrats and put in a Republican. He would not need much experience before he would get tired of that. That's what happened in San Francisco. Out there they tried a labor fellow named Schmidt, a poor, upright laboring man and they have got him behind the bars now, haven't they? It does not matter who you put in, it is the fact that he is not held to responsibility that brings him to rascality. Put in others and they will get everything that is loose, would they not? Finally an agent would come in and there is nothing to take, then what would he do? What would that man do? Why, he would pledge the future income of the concern; he would put it in debt. Is not that a fair description of practically every municipality in the United States? Is not that exactly what has happened? You have changed agents, you have had Republicans, Democrats, Citizens' Movements, Commissions of Honor, Labor people, and now they are having Socialists out in Milwaukee. The new broom is sweeping clean, but what will happen when that broom gets old?

Now let us look at the Commission itself for a little while. Suppose you wanted to go to Europe and leave your business in some one's hands. What would you do? Would you not appoint some one to look after your business and give them the necessary authority? If you did not give them the necessary authority, would you expect them to manage your business well? Certainly not. Put a man on an ocean liner to go across the ocean, and we give him authority to run that boat, and then if anything goes wrong

we do not call up the steward, we do not call up the purser, we do not call up the mate. We do not call up any officer except the captain. He is the man upon whom responsibility rests. That is the way you do everything in private life. You go to the man to whom you gave instructions, and in every place there is some man who has the duty and he is responsible. It is that fact that causes every individual all through the organization, no matter who, to realize that he has got to make good. Now in order to establish that condition, you must give the man power. We have been so afraid to give any one power here in the United States that we have invented a practice or system that is popularly known under the description of "checks and balances." Nobody knows exactly what this is, but it sounds good. . . .

With this system of checks and balances, as has been said, when all the checks are pledged and the balances adjusted, we discover the result is the people are checkmated. Instead of inviting our institutions to carry on this great, awkward, cumbersome machine that no one knows anything about, that you cannot get a line on, that you cannot endow with responsibility, we propose that in the commission we elect a few men, ordinarily five, giving each one of these men a department in the city government, and no orders can be issued in any one department except upon the responsibility of the official at the head of that department. If anything goes wrong with the streets, there are not twenty or thirty or forty councilmen to interview. There is just one man. No one else in the city has any power to fix the streets. If anything goes wrong everyone knows that that man is responsible. No one else can be talked to because no one else has any authority. That is exactly how you run a railroad. You make a general manager, who is responsible. He can employ a superintendent of rolling stock, a superintendent of traffic, he can employ a master mechanic, but he is responsible for what they do. In this way you can fix personal responsibility, and in no other way. That is the way we do everything in private life. That is the way we get personal responsibility. Why, you would not ask that lady to go into the kitchen and cook an angel cake unless you gave her sugar, would you? You would not expect her to produce angel cake without sugar. Give her power and then hold her to results.

That is the way we do everything. And if you place the same conditions around public officers you will have the same results in public life as you do in private affairs. . . .

We agree with Mr. Lincoln, that no man is good enough to rule another man. Self-government is the only sort of government that can endure. Every other sort of government must be kept down. Now, why? Simplest thing in the world. Nothing profound. The only fellow that cannot understand it is the statesman, the great

lawyer, the great educator. Everybody else understands self-government—if they want to. Your Governor Wilson is apologizing all over the country for what he has been teaching for years past at the university. Isn't that true? He is out today mixing with the common people, and he is therefore becoming educated. If he keeps on mixing with the common people long enough he will actually acquire an education. He says himself that all of these years in the university have been years of error. He says so—not I. We want to make people self-governing. Why? What is the reason? For this reason: You must have government. That is true, is it not? Every one except those gentlemen called philosophic anarchists will agree to that, and there is not enough of them to count. That being true, that government must rest ultimately in the hands of all of the people, or else in the hands of part of the people. If the government rests in the hands of part of the people, that part can swindle the whole to its own profit. It *can* do so. I don't say will. It can swindle the whole to its own profit, and the temptation to misuse the powers of government to personal profit are so strong that no group of men have ever been assembled in this world that have proven themselves able to resist that temptation. Individual men have resisted it. George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson—men of that type, we know to be able to resist all manner of temptation to go wrong in public office.

But you cannot point me to one group or to one legislative body in the history of this world that were long continuously in power that did not in greater or less degree prove traitors to those they were supposed to represent. If you know of such a body, will you name it to me? Where did it live and when did it rule? You cannot trust sovereign power in the hands of any *part* of the people. They will misuse that power. Not because they are bad men, but because the temptation is greater than human nature is fitted to resist. That is the explanation of the wrong. That is the explanation of our muck. That is the explanation of government. Not that men are bad, but that they are weak. You have no right to place this temptation on the shoulders or the consciences of your officials. You read the Bible, do you not? You know the Lord's Prayer? It says, "lead us not into temptation." Do you believe that, or when you say it are you joking? If you believe it, then will you explain to me how you satisfy your consciences with the responsibility and temptation you place upon each public officer in the United States? What right have you to place men in this position?

If you have government by all of the people, I mean where the ultimate power rests with all, where you have the Referendum, where you have the Initiative, the Recall, in the hands of the

people, where they can use their power if they want to, then the ultimate responsibility is with the people. Are they wiser than before? I don't think so. Are they more virtuous than before? I certainly do not believe so. If not wiser or more virtuous, then upon what ground have they better results? Just one. All of the people cannot profitably swindle themselves. That is the reason they won't do wrong. Because it is not profitable to do wrong. . . .

I do not pretend to say it is the only ground. There is a moral power, but there is the influence of profit, and any governmental arrangement that ignores the fact is founded on a false basis. And our government is ignoring it and always has. I am not interested in revolutions or interested in destroying government. I am interested in attempting to do something that folks have been trying to do for fifty years through the Federal government. We will rule by Commission government, coming back to the city at the other extreme of governmental arrangement, and begin to correct things at home.

\* \* \*

**THE NEWSMONGERS.**

Langdon Everard in London Labour Leader.

We are the nation's eyes and ears;  
We mould the nation's thought;  
We feed its follies and its fears,  
And bring its hopes to naught.

Our arms, like tentacles, are girt  
Around the throbbing earth;  
We handle burning truths, unhurt;  
Our pens to lies give birth.

We sow, and lo, the people reap  
The harvest of our tricks:  
Rechauffé of the garbage-heap  
And sport and politics.

We fan the fires of Ignorance  
And Hatred with our breath,  
Till Madness rides astride Romance  
And War stalks forth with Death.

With lies the people's path we've paved;  
They'll turn on us some day—  
On us, who, knowing we're enslaved,  
Are greater slaves than they.

We've sold our souls, to gain a crust  
From those whom we despise:  
Some day, thank God, we shall be dust,  
And dust our frauds and lies.

\* \* \*

Chatty Lodger (to Landlord): "You seem to have seen a good deal. What are you?"

Landlord: "Well, sir, I were a lion tamer, and I'd be there now if I 'adn't a-married. But you see, my wife were a knife-thrower in the same show, and she got to practicing her turn on me. Well, thinks I, life ain't too long to run no risks, so I took on a safe job and become a steeplejack."—Punch.

**BOOKS**

**"WHAT IS A LIVING WAGE?"**

The Standard of Living Among the Industrial People of America. By Frank Hatch Streightoff. Published by Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1911. Price, \$1 net.

Most Americans know, whether they admit it or not, that several million people in the United States are starving. This truth is bearable only when denied, or scientifically analyzed.

Yet there is room for just such an honest and able study of starvation as this essay by Mr. Streightoff which took first prize in the Hart, Schaffner and Marx economics competition for 1909. In the presence of this book fewer will deny the evil and more will seek its cause.

"According to the census of 1900," writes the author, "11 per cent of all workmen in the United States were unemployed for at least three months of the year," and the United States Commissioner of Labor reports that "85 per cent of this idleness was from causes entirely beyond the workman's control." Along with this irregularity of employment the yearly resources of "about 21 per cent of normal families are below \$500." "Beyond doubt the homes of several million laborers are far below a reasonable standard for comfort and for morality"—despite the fact that they pay nearly 20 per cent of their income for rent—and "about a third of the American industrial people do not consume enough proteids for the maintenance of efficiency."

The author adopts, slightly amended, Mr. Gompers' definition of a living wage as "a wage, which when expended in the most economical manner consistent with the intelligence of the average housewife, shall be sufficient to maintain the average-sized family [father, mother and three children] in a manner consistent with whatever the contemporary local civilization recognizes as indispensable to physical and mental health, or, as being required by the rational self-respect of human beings." With this definition in mind, Mr. Streightoff finds the extreme low limit of the living wage to be \$650, dividing the expenses as follows:

Food .....	\$297
Rent .....	100
Clothing .....	120
Fuel .....	40
Church and other organizations.....	20
Medical attendance .....	12
Amusement .....	20
Miscellaneous .....	40
Total .....	\$649

"At this wage there can be no saving and a