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TO SUBSCRIBERS.
The original subscribers who paid for the paper when Mr. Sullivan started it in 1894 have been sent every issue since, and with this number will have received more than they are entitled to. They are invited to renew their subscriptions, not only for themselves but for their friends. Running a reform paper even so small and modest as The Record has some compensations, but not among them is financial profit. If it wasn't for kind friends near at home, the publisher would not only have the work to do, but also foot most of the bills. Can't you subscribe for some one else as well as yourself? Ten subscriptions for $2.

No one receiving The Record who hasn't paid for it, will be damned.

SPECIAL EDITION.
The regular number would not come out till March, but money has accumulated that ought to be published, and this is an extra. The regular numbers will be brought out on time, and when subs. come in, one and possibly more extras will appear during this year.

ANOTHER YEAR.
The Record enters now on its third volume. It will be run through 1896. Whether 1897 will see the beginning of another volume is a question depending upon circumstances, and its subscription lists.

The publisher cannot afford to pay the bills, and if he could, thinks it useless to do so for any length of time. If the subscribers, after a decent trial, won't pay the bare cost of printing and postage, then either the people are not ready for such a paper, or else the editor or the publisher don't know his business. In either case, the paper had better stop. So much for those who haven't subscribed. Now's your chance. In 1897 you may not have any chance. Ten for $2.

The editor is a very busy business man. He's willing to give his time to this work as long as it seems necessary. It has been necessary in the past. The Record has filled a valuable place. Facts and laws have been gathered here which else would have been swept into oblivion. And the facts have been the strongest argument. The Record has not only been a true, safe-keeper of facts, but also, when read carefully, an overwhelming argument for Direct Legislation.

In the first progress of the movement such a gatherer and preserver was greatly needed. Mr. Sullivan showed foresight in starting this paper. But as the movement progresses and no other reform movement has grown with the sturdy- ness and rapidity of the Direct Legislation movement, and as other journals take it up and record its advance and argue for it, there is not that need that makes The Record like The Record.

The Record has been valuable as a spreader. One article in a recent issue was followed through its reprints and it was printed in papers with a circulation close onto if not over a million. The Record has a large exchange list, and will put any paper applying onto that list, whether it returns the supplement or not. But the time may come when the work and talents of the editor can be applied to better advantage elsewhere. It has at times already seemed so to him. When he is sure of that, promises will be fulfilled and the paper will stop. Subscribe now; a year hence the chance may be gone. Ten for $2.

POLICY.
While The Record, from the nature of its aim, must be political, it has not been and will not be partisan. It recognizes that while there is more Direct Legislation sentiment in the Populist party than in all other parties, yet there are ardent Republicans, like Messrs. McEwan and Irwin, and Democrats, like Messrs. Cotter and Sulzer, who are interested in the political sentiment, and also that there are many young men who are sick of party and who see that Direct Legislation will kill the bitter partisan spirit which is a curse to our country. So The Record will strive to sympathetically record the facts of any D. L. movement, whether inside of any party or outside of all.

The editor believes, and this belief is shared by the closest students of the movement, that Direct Legislation will come in the smaller places first; gradually spreading till finally it seizes on to some State, and from this will spread to other States, until finally it reaches the nation. That is, that it will come from below upward. This would be the natural order of a democratic movement. Yet in the United States our township, county, ward and city life has been stifled, and the patriotic sentiment has flowed into State and National channels. We think more of the State and Nation than we do of the locality. It is possible that this divergence of social sentiment may overbalance the natural growth of Direct Legislation and cause it to de- velop first in State life before it comes in local
life. This view is strengthened by the fact that most of our local life, if not created by, is subordinate to State management. Despite these facts, it seems to the editor that it will develop first in localities, and that that is the wisest way for it to develop.

So the most attention will be given to local Direct Legislation. This will not be an easy task during the coming year, when a national campaign will give a national trend to all political ideas. Hence, this issue has an article on the New England town meeting, the very interesting account of what was done in Buckley, Wash., and other local matters.

Yet agitation for State and national Direct Legislation and for the insertion of planks in platforms is very valuable educationally, and due space will be given. But in all matters, facts and laws will have precedence over arguments. Other papers are giving the arguments. If the Record can furnish the material its aim will be accomplished.

EDUCATIONAL.

Elwood Pomeroy is editing a column every week in The Coming Nation, with a circulation of between 20,000 and 70,000, and also in The Appeal to Reason, with a rapidly growing issue. L. E. Swope, of Morehead, Ky., is putting a column weekly in The Sentinel of that State. Mrs. Myra Peppers, of Ottumwa, Iowa, furnishes a column or so to The Farmer's Tribune, General Weaver's paper. Dr. Persifor M. Cooke, of Denver, furnishes a column to each Sunday edition of The Rocky Mountain News. Many other papers have frequent articles.

The Industrial Herald, of Oregon City, Ore., had a fine number devoted to Direct Legislation on Nov. 8th last, and The Tacoma Sun followed suit on Dec. 13th and The Coming Nation on Jan. 4th. The articles in the last were gathered with great care, and they will be reprinted in book form, price 10 cents. And so many articles came in that they have overflowed into succeeding numbers. Between one and two hundred of his issue were sold. They are sold at $1.00 per hundred Address Tennessee City, Tenn. They have also published a pamphlet, entitled "The Social Democracy," by J. W. Arrowsmith, price 5 cents. This is a fine bit of work.

F. J. Eddy has rewritten, enlarged and much improved his pamphlet on "The Referendum Principle" already noticed. It may be obtained from The Record, price 10 cents, or $1.00 a dozen. J. W. Sullivan's book, "Direct Legislation," may also be obtained from The Record, price 25 cents.

An edition of Sullivan's book is almost exhausted, and arrangements have been made by which The Record and The Coming Nation get out another edition on cheaper paper with cheaper binding. Mr. Sullivan has given not only the copyright but also the use of the plates, and this edition will be sold for 10 cents each, and will be ready some time during the spring.

There are only a few of the Volume I. of The Record left. While they last they will be sold for 50 cents. Vol. II. of The Record has now been bound. It embaces five numbers, and will be sold for 25 cents.

THE PROBLEM OF THE CITIES.

By Elwood Pomeroy.

Reprinted from The American Federationist By Request.

"There are said to be republican villages in America where everybody is civil, honest and substantially comfortable. But these villages have several unfair advantages—there are no lawyers in them, no town councils, no parliaments. Such republican villages on a large scale would be worth fighting for."—John Ruskin.

That our city governments are failures is a fact that is becoming more and more widely recognized. Many of them are so corrupt that the services they render their citizens poor in comparison with the services given by the city officials in semi-barbarous countries, like Turkey and Russia. That the chief of police in San Francisco formerly kept a gambling house, and that the police of Chicago licensed brothels unofficially, bear their own testimony; would seem to indicate that the lowest depths had been reached. But there was a still lower one proved before the Lexow committee, in New York, where it was shown that the police were in league with a professional abortionist.

Is this rottenness due to democracy? This is the first question to answer.

Statistics prove that our population is moving rapidly into the cities. The country is being deserted to build up the cities. More and more people are gathering in the cities. The life of our nation is bound up with the life of the cities. They are becoming more and more powerful, not only as population centers, but also centers for the diffusion of thought and opinion, intellectual, social, economical and political. As our cities go, so goes the nation. If our municipal governments cannot be made pure and efficient, then good-by to the republic.

The second question is: How can our municipal governments be purified and strengthened? These questions are of vital interest. I propose to state some facts by way of answer.

The town of Brookline, Mass, has a population of 15,000. Within a radius of ten miles of its town hall is a population of nearly a million, increasing at the rate of 2,000 a month. The town is entirely surrounded by the cities of Boston and Newton. It is a part of the county of Suffolk, although it forms a separate city from the counties of Suffolk and Middlesex. It is within the metropolitan district of Boston, but is not a part of the city of Boston. It is a town within a city. The social and economical conditions are identical with other parts of the city of Boston. If the results of the government of Brookline are different from the results of the government of Boston, surely it can only be due to a difference in the methods of government and to the principles at the bottom of these methods.

Boston is not as badly governed as some cities, nor as well governed as others. It has its corruption, its bozes, its rings and its unsolved problems. Almost annually does it apply to the State legislature for the solution of some of these problems, and the legislature almost as often puts an inch plaster on a scraping sore. The other times it either does nothing,
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ing or turns out one set of officeholders to put in another. The city is abused by its West End street railway, and its gas companies charge a tax on part of the city and a higher in another part, getting all the traffic it will bear. It is a fair example of our municipal bad government. It has a mayor, aldermen, etc., as do other large cities.

Brookline is a New England town, with the National bank in the heart of it. Each man who can take part, can ask any question of the five selectmen (who are the town's chief officers, elected annually) and of the other officers; he, with nine others, can secure the insertion of any proposition in the warrant for calling the town meeting, where it will be discussed and voted on. The people appropriate every dollar that is spent. It is the most democratic system of government that can possibly be devised.

It may be said that the business is limited, that the money passing through their hands doesn't amount to much, and that if it did the system would break down.

A warrant for the yearly town meeting lies before me; it contains eighteen propositions calling for action. Accompanying it is a pamphlet of seventeen pages, being the "Report of the Selectmen of Brookline on the Articles in the Warrant;" and a book of 453 pages, with 144 additional pages of assessors' reports, and eighteen more pages of index, which is the "One Hundred and Eighty-ninth Annual Report of the Town Officers of Brookline." The budget is $407,105.

I find on page 845 of this report that the receipts last year were $1,795,217 and the payments $1,795,580. This is nearly three times the receipts and expenditures of the State of New Hampshire and about the same as the State fund of New Jersey. The interest of Brookline amounts to $18,148,264, with sinking fund and cash against it of $407,105. In the warrants are proposals to give the treasurer power to borrow, for certain specified purposes, $154,500, and, with the approval of the selectmen, to spend $500,000 in anticipation of tax payments. During the past year he did borrow $604,600, and in most of these cases he was directed not to pay over 4 per cent. interest on loans, and really paid 3 1/2 per cent. to 3 9-16 per cent. The credit of a purely democratic government is thus shown to be of the very best. The United States paid a higher rate of interest on its last bond issue. The appropriations asked for in the warrant foot up to $928,252. This is nearly $3,000 a day for running expenses. Other facts could easily be cited to prove the burden of money involved is not small, but these are sufficient.

How is it done? During the decade from 1784 to 1795, the town meetings averaged seven a year. Although the business has increased two hundred times during the century, there were during the decade from 1884 to 1895 an average of eight town meetings a year, and adjournments and general elections are omitted, there were four a year.

The meetings begin at 7 p.m. and are usually over between 10 and 11 p.m. The town has a population of 4,193. Nearly all of these are voters. At the election in 1894, 1,983 votes were cast for governor and about the same for the other officers. The town hall will seat between 1,000 and 1,900, and occasionally is filled, but usually there is between 200 and 300. Policemen are at the door with a check-list, and only voters and reporters are allowed in. The galleries are open to the non-voting public. Thus, by the law of natural selection, the public-spirited voters attend and the lazy and indifferent stay at home, while there is enough of the cantankerous element to prevent stagnation.

There is little tendency to oratory and many questions are asked. The previously circulated reports are very full and accurate, but occasionally a question will bring out an unseen point and an appropriation will be withheld. There is no soul loz-rolling. The difference between different sections are adjusted man to man, face to face. There is a fair reciprocity. No one section feels safe to act the part of the dog in the manger.

-There is a distinct tendency to economy. This makes the selectmen careful in recommending appropriations. The first question asked is: "Will it pay?" If yes, the appropriations are liberal. Thus the owners of land along Beacon street wished to widen it from fifty to 160 feet, with a parkway in the center. There was an amicable co-operation between them and the town, and it was done in 1898 and 1897, at an expense of $615,000, of which the town paid $465,000, Boston controls Beacon street before it enters and after it leaves Brookline, and was compelled to follow the town's lead. A pure democracy leads to improvements a county or state governed by a centralized, delegated body. In six years the property immediately on each side of this parkway had increased in value so much that the town was collecting an additional annual revenue of $5,000, and a demand return on an investment of $490,000. So it is all through the town work. A cursory glance at the many reports shows at once that the people are not niggardly in voting appropriations where they are convinced that it will do good.

-Of course, there are differences of opinion. But they are usually settled by discussion before a vote is had. On looking over the records of the seven town meetings of last year I find several propositions passed over to the next meeting for more consideration, a few indefinitely postponed, but most of them passed unanimously without the taking of the yeas and nays, and where the yeas and nays have been taken only one vote is recorded in the negative. A full and free discussion of things which directly concern them develops harmony of opinion and action.

Only a few more advantages of this democratic government can be touched on here. More than a tenth of the appropriations are for the schools. These have increased from $39,100 in 1884, to $97,715 in 1895. The schools are, from this report, very well managed. Besides the academic and grammar schools, they include a high school, manual training school, a chemical laboratory, art and music instruction, physical training and evening schools, free to all, of course.

The report on the water works is almost a model. Brookline claims to have far better water than Boston. The board of health report shows that sickness and the death rate are decreasing. The librarian's report shows a cir-

Calculating of 3.3 books per inhabitant this year, against 4.53 last year. So one might go through these various reports, which gauge the progress of a democracy in good government. Only two other items will be given: Five hundred dollars are appropriated for a public bath house for the boys. The assessor's report gives the names and residence of each taxpayer, with the poll tax, the total personal estate and its value, a description of the real estate and its value, and the total tax. A democracy wishes to know its resources and to have them publicly known.

The average rate of taxation from 1874 to 1885 was $11.95; for the last ten years the average rate has been $10.90, a large decrease, and it was a decade of the boldest improvement. The rate is so much less than the surrounding city of Boston that it attracts many people of the very best class, and in Boston, Brookline is called the tax-dodgers' paradise. A pure democracy lowers the taxation and keeps the rates low. It is a great improvement over a delegated government in this respect.

What is the scandal in the municipal government? None. Some few were charged in the Boston papers a few years ago, investigated and disproved. The same officers are re-elected again and again without much change and irrespective of their party affiliations.

How do the inhabitants regard it? They have been urged repeatedly to join Boston, have fought against it in the legislature and the courts, have voted on it and always voted it down by large majorities. I conclude from the facts up well in a recent number of the New England Magazine: "If it is painful to be impressed with the failure of Americans to govern their large cities well, it is with relief that we turn to the example of about six square miles of area in the very heart of a great metropolis in the United States, which area represents a larger proportion of homes for all classes, of superior schools and public library, better roads, better water and sewers, and more efficient and honorable management than is found in any city in New England, with the exception of Boston, and with the highest accumulation of taxable property exceeding that of any other municipality in the world of the same population."

Equally favorable facts could be garnered from the history of hundreds of New England towns, but Brookline was taken because it was inside of a city and had all the problems of a large city save those of bad government. Boston gave up the town meeting in 1822, when it had the population of 40,000, yearly expenditures of $240,000, and a debt of $106,000. In the face of these facts, you may say that delegated government is a failure, but you can not say that democratic government has failed.

Mr. Chandler has spoken of the adaptability and elasticity of the town meeting, and has said that it can be applied to almost any very large town, though it is in its primitive state to a very large population.

What is the principle at the bottom of the town meeting? It is that the officers are the servants and not the rulers of the people, who have the direct and constant control of their servants. How can this principle be applied to large cities? The trades unions, with the American Federation at their head, have already blurred the way by their use and advocacy of Direct Legislation through the Initiative and the Referendum.

If the Referendum was in force, no ordinance, contract or other measure, after passing the council would go into effect under a reasonable time, which, in my opinion, should not be less than thirty nor more than sixty days for a city measure. During this time, a negligible minority of the people should petition for its repeal, all the people, it would be voted on by the people after a fit time for discussion, and a majority against would prevent its passage. The percentage petitioning should be of such a size as to shut out merely crank petitions and to show that there was a need of investigating the matter, but it would be better to run the risk of an occasional unnecessary reference to the people than to make the percentage so large that it would be almost impossible to get a petition signed. In my opinion, 5 per cent, is about right.

This will stop boulding and the lobby, as the aldermen cannot be sure of delivering the goods. It will draw a better class of people into the common council, because they will then be above suspicion. They cannot sell a franchise or a privilege unless the people are satisfied with the conditions.

The Referendum is negative, preventive. The positive, constructive part of Direct Legislation is the initiative. If the Initiative was in force a suitable number of the voters could petition for any matter, and this petition would go before the council, taking precedence of other matters. They would have to vote on it. If they did not pass it in a reasonable time, which, in my opinion, should not be less than thirty nor more than sixty days, it would go to a poll of the people. I think the same percentage should govern initiating petitions as referenda, that is to say, 5 per cent. But these are matters of detail to be settled by local conditions.

The Referendum alone would be of incalculable value, but is incomplete without the Initiative. As constructive is vastly superior to preventive work, the Initiative is vastly more important than the Referendum.

No legislation can be more direct than that of the New England town meeting. The Initiative and Referendum, by allowing the people to group and re-group, approving or rejecting any individual measure, applies the Direct Legislation of the New England town meeting in a perfectly feasible manner, to large populations. It is not often used, not often needed, but it is necessary, and the fact that it could be used at any time would prevent the introduction of bad measures. The officials would be true servants of the people and not rulers.

The principle back of it is not new. The Declaration of Independence says all governments should be by the consent of the governed. Direct Legislation is a method of applying the very bed-rock principle of our government, the rule of the majority.

The plutocracy, which is rapidly gaining control, knows full well that the small, high and mighty principles, and then not carry them into effect. It is strong in opposing methods because they are not practical, or unconstitutional, or for any other reason than that it is the principle they oppose. It behooves
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all true patriots and lovers of their kind to go beyond the principle, to make sure of the methods in season and out, till they get them. In conclusion, our city governments are rotten. The life of the republic depends on our municipal governments. Democracy is not a failure. Responsibility is a failure. Democracy can be applied to cities, States and the nation by the Initiative and the Referendum, known together as Direct Legislation. Push the method.

HOW IT'S DONE IN SWITZERLAND.

Through the kindness of Carl Burkli, of Zurich, Switzerland, we have received ten or fifteen pamphlets illustrating how the Referendum is used there in municipal matters. Several of these have been translated by Mrs. Moses Cooley. In New York City, and extracts are given from them showing how the people are informed as to vote on intricate questions. These pamphlets are issued by the City Council, corresponding to our Boards of Aldermen or Boards of Public Works.

COMMUNAL VOTE OF JUNE 9TH, 1895.

To the Voters of the City of Zurich:

In pursuance of a resolution of the Great Municipal Council of April 18, 1895, the following proposals are laid before the voters:

I. A proposal to build schoolhouses in the Second, Third and Fifth Districts.

II. A proposal to lay out a shooting place at Albisgutli. We invite you to consider this motion, and to vote on Sunday, June 9th, 1895, for its acceptance or rejection by yes or no, on the ballots to be sent to you.

Zurich, May 8th, 1895.

In the Name of the Municipal Council.
The President, H. Pestalozzi.
The Secretary, Wyss.

This is the first page of a sixteen-page pamphlet which, as you see by the dates, was sent out on April 18, 1895, and that ballots were sent to each voter. The resolution was passed on April 18th, so that it took about three weeks to prepare this information, and then a month after one was sent to each voter, the ballot was taken.

For the construction of these schoolhouses, a credit of 4,500,000 francs, or about 339,000, was necessary, divided between the years 1895-1898. This pamphlet states first the necessity for these schoolhouses. One of them was held in a parsonage which had been given without charge by the church wardens, but which was now to be torn down, and classes had been held in various buildings because the schools were crowded. Plans for a grammar school had been prepared by the School Board of the former Villages, now incorporated in the city, and these would be used. The Fifth District school, primary, kindergarten and manual training, had been housed in an engine house and a private house, etc., etc.

Next the plans were explained and the reasons given why there was more urgent need in one district than in the others. This is followed by the costs of the sites and the buildings properly itemized and the amounts to be expended each year. Thus each voter could vote with judgment on the first proposal.

The second proposal covered pages 7 to 16. The first information was: "Article 228 of the military organization of the Confederacy by which the communities are obliged to have the necessary grounds in proper condition."

A statement of the different grounds in the city was given, and how one part of the city, which had grown rapidly, did not have enough for the different societies to use, to say nothing of the militia. It says: "The demands upon the commons are constantly increasing, more than two-thirds of the city shooting clubs are assigned to them for practice, while the numbers of the common shooting clubs and their periods for practice have more than doubled in the last ten years. The maximum capacity of the commons has been reached; relief must be had." The dangers of the crowded condition are spoken of. And then the four necessities of a shooting place are spoken of and how the co-operation of some clubs can be had, and the advantages of this site at Albisgutli and its requirements, and the cost and the details of the plan. The site embraces 235,827 meters, and the cost will be 300,000 francs, or about $50,000. The annual expenses will be about 10,000 and the receipts about 14,000, leaving 4,000 francs annual profit to the city. The canton would contribute 50,000 francs, leaving 250,000 for the city, and the interest charge would be only 2,000 francs, so the city would make 2,000 francs a year on it. The pamphlet ends by stating that it is not only a good investment but also a duty, and that the deliberating authorities recommend it.

This brief summary of a pamphlet, nearly double the size of THE RECORD, does not convey but dimly an idea of the conscientiousness, clearness and care with which these projects are explained to the voter. The authorities feel that they are responsible to the voters, and that feeling is shown all through these careful explanations. Also they are responsible not mainly to the wealthy classes and big taxpayers but to the whole people, and this feeling is marked in the provisions and rules which are to govern the shooting places. Also local feelings are observed, as shown by the reference to the local boards regarding the schools.

Mr. Burkli has sent on ten or fifteen of these pamphlets, all showing the same care for the people in their servants. The title-page of an eight-page voter's information will be given to close:

COMMUNAL VOTE OF JUNE 17TH, 1894.

To the Voters of the City of Zurich:

In pursuance of a resolution of the Great Municipal Council of January 27th, 1894, we submit to you the following motion for your vote:

A credit of 4,000,000 francs be voted to the Municipal Council for the continuation of the Weinberg street.

We invite you to consider this motion, and to vote on Sunday, June 17th, 1894, for its acceptance or rejection by yes or no on the ballots to be sent to you.

Zurich, May 12th, 1894.

In the Name of the Municipal Council.
The President, H. Pestalozzi.
Substitute for the Municipal Secretary,
TH. USTERI.

On January 27th the motion was passed, and it took to May 12th to get this pamphlet ready and the vote was held on June 17th. This pamphlet goes into the details of the construc-
tion, with the salaries, expenses and everything connected with it, so that it is easily understood and so that it would be almost impossible for a job to lurk in it. Would it not be well to adopt this in our municipal affairs?

ANOTHER D. L. SOCIETY.

By B. F. Fries, of Pottstown, Pa.

The secret reform order entitled the "Peers of Kosmos Compact or Industrial Mutualist," with which I have been officially identified for more than a quarter of a century, does most decidedly favor Direct Legislation and everything pertaining thereto, firmly believing that it is an absolute requirement for any people who even pretend to maintain the right or opportunity of self-government.

There are eighteen specific declarations constituting the "Cardinal Principles" of the Order of P. K. C. The tenth reads as follows: "That a government of, for and by the people shall be adequate and is therefore necessary to adopt the Initiative-Referendum or Direct Legislation, together with an independent nominating process and a fair and secret ballot system. Also, to institute a plan that allows the adherents of any public policy a proportionate representation; directly to restrict the power and prerogatives exercised by our judges and their removal on petition of the citizens; the consolidation of the law-making branches of the Government, and frequent but brief sessions of the same; the substitution of a Council of Administration for our present executive heads of government; that the military of all kinds be reduced to a minimum and their despotc rules abolished, and particularly a justly impartial, non-partisan Civil Service system made thorough and universal in its operations."

In connection with the foregoing there are three leading demands set forth in the "Prefatory" styled the A. B and C Demands, and the C declares: "To make self government and other genuine reforms possible we must establish the Initiative-Referendum mode of law-making." Surely that is plain enough.

To all these declarations every member is pledged not only in belief as to its justice, but also to teach and establish wherever possible.

Furthermore, in the "Qualifications for Membership" there is an "Official Note," stating that: "The Peers of Kosmos most decidedly holds that the will of the people shall be the law of this land, and consequently the unmistakable will of the members of this school of reform shall rule the same." Therefore, it may naturally be inferred that the rules and customs of this order require that any matter issued by a higher body or officer may be subject to a vote of the membership concerned, provided a reasonable number make a demand to that effect.

True, our declarations were not so explicit at the start as they were at its reorganization in 1889, when the "Abstract of the Cardinal Principles" was put forth. But the real essence of the Swiss Referendum was adopted at the first formation of the P. K. C., being patterned after certain forms of meetings of the ancient Swiss, and also after the purpose of our own New England town meetings, where once the spirit of liberty did dwell.

At the first meeting of the Grand Constella-
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indebtedness, or change its charter, and do similar things, those matters are REFERRED to the citizens who vote upon the same. Now, if the City or Town Council, which is the local Legislature, should make it an absolute rule to submit all important ordinances to a popular vote, then the "Referendum" would be established so far as relates to the governmental laws of the house.

Again, whenever a private party or company desires to obtain special privileges from the public, they secure a number of signatures, chiefly of the self-styled "property-holders" or "better class" to a petition, to our "Borough (step-) Fathers," and forthwith their requests are granted. Now, then, let this process of proposing ordinances or laws by certain citizens be made impartial (not confined to a class), and also imperative on the part of the Councils, who shall duly REFER such propositions to the people for "Adoption." or "Rejection." Thus the "Initiative" for home affairs would also be established.

If we had in operation such Direct Legislation, just for local affairs, then the people themselves could decide about giving away their last remaining common heritage, the public roads and bridges, for the benefit of private profit-makers. And also could curb the reckless extravagance of no-tollers' School Boards, despotic Boards of Health, and vastly improve all our local conditions.

The foregoing indicates the main purposes of the "New System People."

HOW DIRECT LEGISLATION WAS GOT IN BUCKLEY, WASH.

By E. L. Robinson.

We have to give credit to the Tacoma Sun, the Appeal to Reason and the Coming Nation for the groundwork work in organizing the Initiative and the Referendum prior to the call for a nominating convention for November 27th, 1895, by the Populist Committee Chairman.

On the morning of the day the convention was to meet rumors were afloat that no other convention would be called, and that adverse parties would prevent the Populist meeting and control the nominations. Upon hearing these rumors I hastily drew the resolutions passed by the convention, and printed below, and sought the Committee Chairman and we two spent the day calling on men of all political faith requesting them to be at the meeting and help make the resolutions a platform by which to pledge the nominees.

The favor with which the idea was received was very gratifying, and all the opposition which developed at the meeting sprang from political heeler who were aware enough to see the real point of the issue.

It was a Populist nominating convention, and, while the Populists had control of it, the following resolutions were passed:

"SHALL THE PEOPLE RULE?"

"PLATFORM OF THE CITIZENS' TICKET:"

"WHEREAS, Many city ordinances are of such importance as to tax the wisdom of the whole people; the people must meet and decide what not be borne by the City Council alone, but should be shared by all the people; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the nominees of this caucus for City Councilmen be pledged to the following propositions:

"1st. Whenever five per cent. of the registered voters of the City of Buckley shall petition the City Council to refer an ordinance drawn by said petitioners to the people for their approval, and shall accompany said petition with a deposit of a sum of money not less than $20 being deposited with the City Clerk to defray expenses of a special election, then said nominees pledge themselves (if elected) to vote for a call for a special election for the purpose of receiving instructions from the people on the passage of said ordinance; and if, at said special election, so called, a majority of the voters voting thereon shall approve of the enactment of said ordinance, then the nominees of this caucus pledge their vote (if elected) to the enactment of said ordinance. And if a majority of the votes cast at said election shall be against enacting said ordinance said nominees will vote against its enactment.

"2d. Upon all ordinances of general importance to the public not initiated as heretofore specified, the nominees of this caucus pledge their vote to delay said ordinances becoming operative for thirty days after the petitioners pass the same, but if within said thirty days five per cent. of the registered voters of the City of Buckley petition the City Council to refer said ordinance to the people for instructions, then the ordinance being deposited with a deposit with the City Clerk of not less than $20 to defray the expenses of a special election, the nominees of this caucus (if elected) pledge their vote to said special election; and if a majority of the votes cast at said special election being against said ordinance, said nominees pledge their vote to repeal said ordinance." As soon as they were passed an invitation was extended to all voters present to participate in making nominations. This resulted in placing three Republicans on the ticket for Councilmen and a Populist for Treasurer.

When the Chairman called on the nominees to sign the endorsement of the resolutions, a motion to reconsider the motion was ably championed by the political heeler referred to, but all parties were represented in argument in defense of the resolutions, and the motion to reconsider was lost. In deference to the nominees who were Republican, a motion to call it the "Citizens' Ticket" and "Citizens' Platform" was adopted.

The disaffected parties called another caucus, at which we also attended and the resolutions were promptly laid on the table indefinitely. This drew the issue distinctly on the Initiative and Referendum among all the voters who were opposed on the action of the convention in not convening in time to the short time to work in and the lack of information on the subject in the hands of men of the old parties, a great many fought on the old party lines, and we were successful in electing two.

A canvas of the new Council shows three out of the five members—two having held over—to be in favor of the principle. This new Council took office January 1st, 1896. After the organization a test will be made of the Initiative.

The clause imposing the cost of the special elections upon the petitioners was considered by many unjust, but it was put in to cut off a fight on the question of expense.

Buckley's population in 1890 (U. S. Census) was 850, and, counting ebb and tide since, I think it safe to say we have 1,000 now. In political complexion, the Republicans and Populists stand about equal, with say 35 per cent each, the Democrats 50 per cent being Democrats and Populists.

Our municipal government comes under the head of cities of the fourth class in the State Code, and is vested by law, a Council of five members, a Clerk, Treasurer, Marshal and Police Justice.

Our State Constitution and laws provide for many questions being brought to the people for settlement, and I do not think any serious legal objection can be raised to our carrying out our little local plan so long as we confine ourselves to purely local questions.

We hope, with you, that it may prove a spur to
others to set some practical tests of this most practical of reforms, so that we may become a truly self-governing people.

POLITICAL

The National Executive Committee of the Prohibition Party has refused to consider the overtures looking toward a union of reform forces on the Prohibition ticket, the first plank of which demanded Direct Legislation. It said it lacked jurisdiction. If Mr. Dickie and some others have their way, Direct Legislation will not appear in the next Prohibition Party platform.

Suggestions for the next People's Party platform are almost as thick as the leaves in Val Lombrosa, and almost all of them contain Direct Legislation, and many say that alone, and others say finance and Direct Legislation. The Silver Knight, the organ of the Silver Party, says silver and Direct Legislation. It is already in more than three-quarters of the Populist State platforms, representing more than three-fourths of the Populist vote. It is sure to go into their national platform, and the only question is whether it will be made the only or dominant plank or take a less prominent position.

There is a movement on foot to call a conference of D. L. advocates to meet at St. Louis, on July 21st, which is where the next national Populist convention will be held, and the day before. If the object is to secure the strongest statement in the platform possible and to organize nationally.

It is a significant fact that the two men who did their prettiest a year ago to switch the People's Party over onto the sole issue of silver should now be advocating Direct Legislation. General Weaver's paper, The Farmer's Tribune, has editorially come out in favor of Ignatius Donnelly's proposition of making D. L. the dominant issue. Mr. Taubeneck, at the meeting of the Illinois State Committee, proposed resolutions for the insertion of Direct Legislation in the next national platform. They were passed.

The Democratic and Republican parties, except in some few localities, keep a non-committal attitude. Some of these members are doing fine work.

NEW YORK.

The exact question voted on in N. Y. State last November was: 'Shall Chapter 78 of the laws of 1895, which provides for issuing bonds to the amount of not to exceed $9,000,000 for the improvement of the Erie Canal, Champlain Canal and the Oswego Canal be approved?' In the whole State there were 599,770, or 54 per cent., in favor; 322,884, or 29 per cent., against; and 173,968, or 17 per cent., scoring, defective and blank. At the same election there were 1,189,021 votes cast for the different candidates for the head of the ticket. This is 80,734, or about 8 per cent., more than were cast on the measure: 23,104 of these votes were defective, blank or scattering. This is 9 per cent. of the total number against 17 per cent. on the measure.

A BRITISH USE.

Messrs. Gompers and McGuire, the delegates from the American Federation of Labor to the British Trades Union Congress at Cardiff, Wales, in September, 1895, in their report to the body seuding them at its last convention, especially praised the proceeding of the British body, which, though not so called, is practically the Initiative and Referendum. They said:

"In the congress very little if any new matter is brought up for discussion and action; other than such propositions which have been duly forwarded to the executive office at least six weeks before the meeting of the congress. These propositions were sent to all the organizations affiliated, which, if they desire, may forward amendments within four weeks of the congress. These propositions and amendments are sent to the delegates to be voted two weeks before the meeting. We are aware that our Federation has adopted a similar measure, but we are of the opinion that until it is more generally accepted that new matter or measures which have not been regularly proposed and submitted before our conventions, may be more likely to have resolutions adopted for which there is insufficient time for consideration, as well as consultation with the rank and file of our membership."

AN APPEAL.

Hon. Thomas McEwan, Jr., member of Congress from New Jersey, when in the New Jersey Legislature, introduced the Direct Legislation amendment and fought for it. He has worked for it since. He deserves honor for this work. He is continuing that work and you can help him and it.

At the request of the Direct Legislation League of New Jersey he will introduce in the House of Representatives the following resolution:

Resolved, That a special committee, to consist of five members of this House, be appointed and instructed to consider the subject of Direct Legislation or otherwise to inquire into the feasibility of applying the principle of Direct Legislation, through the Initiative and the Referendum to the legislation of the Federal Government, and to report to this House, at this session, by bill or otherwise, the results of said inquiry.

"And that for the purpose hereof the committee be authorized to sit in the city of Washington, or any other city of the United States, and employ such clerical aid as may be necessary."

The New Jersey League has passed resolutions petitioning Congress for such an inquiry. The American Federation of Labor, at its just closed session, passed a favoring resolution. It will greatly assist Mr. McEwan in this work if every reader of this will get resolutions petitioning Congress for such an inquiry passed by trades unions, labor organizations, boards of trade, and any other societies possible, and send them to Mr. McEwan, at Washington, D. C. (Congressional Postoffice). See that the resolutions going to Mr. McEwan are properly attested by the signatures of the proper officers—usually president and secretary—and by the seal of the organization, if it has one. It would be a great convenience if it were a duplicate copy, not necessarily signed, were sent to Eltweed Pomeroj, Newark, N. J., the secretary of the New Jersey League, which has started this matter.

Remember that this is only a resolution for an inquiry and organizations which have taken no stand, or which are even opposed to Direct Legislation, can consistently ask for an inquiry as well as organizations that favor it. Reform, labor and trade papers please print this notice.
A Non-Partisan Advocate of Pure Democracy.
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POLITICAL.

The movement to have Congress appoint a committee of inquiry on the application of the Initiative and Referendum to National Government has received a very strong and widespread backing from business, trade and labor organizations, political clubs, etc., etc., all over the country, but it has struck a snag in the House of Representatives where the Committee on Rules have practically decided to smother it. This may not be possible.

But over the country the D. L. movement is growing in a very sturdy manner. The Grander Age, a paper published at Co-opolis, Miss., has published the following call:

CALL.

Believing that the time has fully arrived when all patriotic citizens of the United States should unite at the ballot box in favor of a People's Government, we, the undersigned, sign this call for a convention, to be held at Chicago, Ill., on the 3d, 4th and 5th days of June, 1886, to nominate a National ticket on a platform containing as planks: 1. Initiative—which means the right of the people to propose a law. 2. Referendum—which means the right of the people to, by vote, accept, reject or repeal laws. 3. Imperative Mandate—which means the right of the people, by vote, to, at any time discharge any officer who may seem to them unfaithful or incompetent, and elect a successor to his place. Believing that through these principles all reforms can finally be accomplished, we agree to support the above platform and the candidates nominated upon it if they be honest, earnest representatives of the people.

And this call is said to have a good deal of backing.

The movement for a National D. L. Conference at St. Louis, opening July 21st next, is also much talked of, and will likely come to a head soon.

There is also to be a conference of reformers at Pittsburg, Pa., on March 12th, and Direct Legislation will be one of the things discussed.

In the few State Legislatures in session this winter the subject is coming up in various forms. See the article on Ohio. What has been attempted and accomplished will be stated more in detail in the next Record.

In France twenty-eight members of the Chamber of Deputies have issued a manifesto and drafted a resolution in favor of the Referendum and Direct Legislation by the people.

NEBRASKA.

By Walter Breen.

For the past two years the Initiative and Referendum have been widely discussed in Populist circles, and they adopted at their last State Convention a plank favoring same by a good majority. I believe fully 70 per cent. to 80 per cent. of the Populists are alive to the subject, and perhaps about 5 per cent. to 10 per cent. of old party men. The idea is progressing faster than I thought it would.

We have started a club here and printed and are circulating a number of this petition:

"If you cannot think to ask your friends to sign this, paste it on the wall where they may see it themselves.

"We, the undersigned, favor the adoption of the Initiative and Referendum. Whenever 5 per cent. of the voters of any legislative jurisdiction shall petition their respective legislative bodies for a reference of a law, its submission to the people for their vote upon its adoption should be mandatory."

(N.B.—You are invited to copy this and solicit signatures. Send copy of results to Executive Committee, Initiative and Referendum Club, 1011 New York Life Building, Omaha, Neb.)"

THE HASKELL BILL IN OHIO.

By Thomas A. Maddern.

During January and February a great stir was made in Columbus and the Ohio Legislature over the Haskell bill, which aimed to place the Republicans and the temperance people tried to get passed. It applied Direct Legislation to the saloon question. Each county could vote for itself whether it would have saloons or not. A little paper called Anti-Saloon was widely circulated, which had many good things in it. One article, headed "Give the Voters a Chance," said: "One of our Representatives, when importuned by a Liquor League agent, said: "It's a poor party that can't trust the people." This is the way to talk. We must make every Representative feel that he is a poor Representative of the people who can't trust his constituency to say what they want. Those who do not do so will find that the people will not trust them when they want office again."

The same paper says, also: "The brewers
of Ohio are awake to the crisis and are raising a large corruption fund to buy up the Legislature. We have it on good authority that the Brewers' Association agreed to raise $500,000, if that amount would suffice to defeat the Haskell bill. It is believed that this will be in addition to the amount raised by the saloon keepers, which is estimated at $25 each, and will mean over $300,000. Upwards of $700,000 to be placed in one end of the balance and the Haskell bill in the other with honesty, justice and the sacred interests of home, church and good government. Which way will the beam tip? The enemy are bold, defiant, persistent in effort and unscrupulous in method.

The beam tipped toward the $700,000 and the Haskell bill was defeated. As a compliment to the active work done for it, it was given a large minority, but it was defeated. If the $700,000 had to be distributed among all the voters in the State, it would not have been enough to carry it, but it was concentrated against a small body of men given uncontrolled power, and it succeeded.

As long as we concentrate temptation in this manner corruption will be successful. The Republican Party had a large majority in both houses of the Ohio Legislature, and Governor Bushnell is a Republican, and more than a majority of the Republican members were elected after a direct pledge had been given to vote for this measure.

CITY REFERENDUM IN MASSACHUSETTS.

North Adams, Mass., though it has some 16,000 inhabitants, has only within the last year passed from a New England town with the town meeting into a city government with a charter, which contains, among other things, the following:

"Section 16. Any appropriation made by the City Council for the erection of a City Hall, or for land or the location of a building, shall be subject to ratification by the legal voters of the city voting in their respective precincts at an annual municipal election.

"Section 18. No vote of the City Council granting or bestowing an exclusive franchise of any kind to any person or corporation shall be valid unless the same shall be approved by a vote of the qualified voters of the city voting at large in their respective precincts at the annual municipal election.

Section 85. So much of this act as authorizes the submission of the question of its acceptance to the legal voters of said town shall take effect upon its passage, but it shall not take further effect unless accepted by the legal voters of said town, as herein provided."

AMONG THE CATHOLICS.

At a joint meeting of the fifteen trustees of the three branches of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Lockport, N. Y., held Sunday, January 12th, resolutions were adopted unanimously for publication in the official organs of the society advocating that hereafter the C. M. B. A. be governed by the Initiative and the Referendum, and that the Grand Councils and Supreme Council, as now existing, be done away with. The following is part of the resolution:

"We call attention to the methods now followed by the German Typographical Union and the Cigarmakers' International Union of America in governing and conducting these bodies, viz., the Initiative and the Referendum, by means of associations governed by the members in their respective branches. We verily believe that, after an experience of almost twenty years in the conduct of the C. M. B. A., we might well take immediate steps to educate our members in the direction suggested, as it would save hundreds of dollars. We suggest that all the branches in the several States and Provinces take such action in the premises as they may deem fit, even to calling special sessions of the respective Grand Councils if necessary.

This society numbers 40,000, has a sinking fund well up to half a million dollars, has branches in every State of the Union and in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec."

D. L. NOTES FROM CORRESPONDENTS.

From Dr. P. M. Cooke, of Denver, Colo.:

We may get the Constitutional amendment submitted at the next election. We are getting faster out here than most of the Eastern States, but soon there will be a grand rush to get in line on Direct Legislation.

From Otto G. Thum, of Pueblo, Colo.:

On January 18th we organized the Direct Legislation Club of Pueblo. L. W. Rogers, editor of The Industrial Advocate (late in jail with Debe), is our President; Otto G. Thum, V. P.; D. C. Coates, Secretary. It is our intention to organize other clubs in various parts of Colorado and then form a State league. Mr. Rogers travels most of the time, and will make it a point to organize leagues wherever he goes.

Hon. Mr. McMurray, Mayor of Denver, recently vetoed an ordinance granting a franchise over certain streets to an existing tramway company, and gave as his reasons: "No franchise should be granted to a company running for a period longer than the parent stem. No valuable franchise should be granted without giving the right to the life of said franchise. No franchise should be given without first having been submitted to a vote of the people at an election, the expenses of which should be borne by the beneficiary." Mayor McMurray is a Republican, but a way-up reformer.

From W. H. McMaster, editor of The Weekly News, Kent, Iowa.:

I am running an independent paper, but I find room for a little educational matter, and will be pleased to help spread the word, as personally, I am for Direct Legislation.

From Frank Leary, editor of The Silverton Industry, Silverton, Colo.:

It would astonish you to see the progress that Direct Legislation is making in this State. It has been interested in reform issues for many years, but have never seen such rapid progress as the Direct Legislation issue is making.

It is said of Russia, that it is a tyranny of one tempered by assassination. Our government is a tyranny of many tempered by frequent elections of the despots.
GOVERNOR GRIGGS AND DIRECT LEGISLATION.

BY WM. A. COTTER, PRESIDENT D. L. LEAGUE,
NEW JERSEY.

Extract from oration by Hon. John W. Griggs, July 4th, 1895, in Newark, N. J., as reported by the Newark Daily Advertiser:

"I have absolute faith in the judgment of the people when intelligently and deliberately formed. No laws passed without the power of the legislation, or by the language of the Governor's inaugural address, in which he says:

"I consider it most important that you should at once restrict the volume of legislation. The mass of statute law has now become so immense as to be almost beyond the power of the legal mind to acquire it or the judicial mind to interpret it. It was intended by the amendments to the Constitution adopted in 1875 to decrease the quantity of statute law by the abolishment of special legislation upon several subjects, notably the government of counties and municipal corporations. Such decrease was for several years effected. But gradually, aided by experience and a sharpened ingenuity, the draughtsmen of statutes came to know how to draw up laws which, while possessing the form of generality required by the Constitution, had all the substance of special application to the desired locality without becoming fastened to any unwilling municipality. It was the unexpected object of the constitutional amendments referred to, to provide a uniform system of laws for all the counties, cities, townships and other political subdivisions of the State; a system not mere written laws, but laws compulsorily applied to all, so that all cities, all counties, all townships of the same class should be governed by the same uniform systems. Unfortunately our courts have held that this constitutional requirement is satisfied in a statute when by its terms it is applicable to all the members of a class, although, as a matter of fact, it may be practically applied to only one of that class. In other words, the courts hold that it is only necessary that all members of a class may take the benefit of a statute, but that the law need not be compulsory on all."

"So it has become easy, by means of different forms of local options, such as popular elections for or against the adoption of any act, to pass laws in form of the most perfect universality which in effect are special charters for a single city. On account of this unfortunate interpretation of the constitutional intent, the so-called general laws relative to cities have become multitudinous. They fill over 350 pages in the new volume of General Statutes, and the laws under the title of Municipal Corporations will fill as many more.

"But a more striking instance of manifold legislation exists in the laws relating to boroughs. These forms of local government did not exist until recently. They were all created under so-called general laws. The spirit and letter of the Constitution required that they should be governed by a uniform system. Yet we find three different general acts now in force regulating the creation and government of boroughs. At each session of the Legislature numerous amendments to each of the three systems are passed, until this one title in the General Statutes covers 11 pages of the law book. And it is these acts that no legal adviser or judicial interpreter can safely say what the law is on many subjects relating to boroughs. Besides boroughs, we have separate systems respectively for borough commissions, for towns, for villages, for seaside resorts and for townships, each possessing indiscriminately similar powers and differing only in name and arrangement.

"For some years past the annual volume of the laws has been growing in thickness. As an example, the most recent, that of 1895, contains 106 different acts relating to cities, forty-three relating to boroughs, thirty-three relating to townships, and so relating to various subjects that it cannot be that any such number was necessary."

"Take some other subjects. There are nine separate amendments to the school law, seven different acts on the subject of sidewalks, eight relating to the State House, five relating to swamps and marshes. Similar variety and multiplicity will be found in any of the annual statutes for the past six or seven years.

"When we consider that the power of legislation is the greatest that can be exercised by any human agency, that every law changes the rights and modifies the duties of a greater or less number of citizens, it is proper to inquire whether proposed laws are sufficiently considered before they are adopted. The same tendency to multitudinous and slipshod legislation prevails in other States of the Union, and has attracted the attention of many thoughtful persons."

"Besides the uncertainty and confusion that ensue from the existence of so many separate statutes, there is another and more serious tendency to create popular disrespect for the sanctity of the law. What can be so readily made and so easily altered can be fairly considered as of small importance.

"The General Statutes of the State now in press will comprise three large volumes of over 1,000 pages each, and in bulk will be about twice as large as the General Statutes of the United States. Unless we confess that our legislative system is a failure, we must find a method of remediying this excess. It is not yet too late to pass a system of laws of comprehensive form for the government of municipalities, which should be compulsory upon all, so that the uniformity of local government contemplated by the Constitution may be attained."

"This increase of laws, affecting almost every interest in life, cannot continue without involving many important subjects in serious confusion and difficulty. Many of the acts relating to one or another kind of municipal bodies affect the levying and collection of taxes and the issue of bonds, matters in which not only the public but many private persons are financially interested."
The Direct Legislation Record. March, 1896.

"Reform is necessary in the matter of legislation as well as in other things."
Under Direct Legislation, as asked for by the N.J. League, there would be no need of courts putting "unfortunate and strained" constructions on laws, as each locality would legislate for itself only. There would be needed but a few general laws each year or two, and all the expenses and complication the Governor so justly complains of would be done away with.

MAYOR PINGREE ON LEGISLATORS AND DIRECT MUNICIPAL LEGISLATION.

EXTRACTS FROM SEVENTH ANNUAL MESSAGE AS MAYOR OF DETROIT, MICH.
BRIEVE-GIVING AND BRIEVE-TAKING.
Several times since I have been Mayor of this city, public officials have been caught with bribe money in their hands supplied them by persons engaged in business and social circles.
Under laws that are too technical to enforce and a public, at least the so called "respectable element," too prone to suspect every man who denounces an attempt to buy his vote, is it any wonder that, with corruption visible in so many places, so few convictions have been obtained? As our city increases in wealth and population it will become more and more a fertile field for the briber to work his trade.

Persons seeking franchises are constantly trying, often by means of ill-gotten money, to buy priceless privileges and establish vested rights in the very heart of the city. * * *

My experience has taught me that it is the bribe-giver who is the most responsible for the corruption. The briber is generally rich, the person who receives a bribe usually poor; their conditions are different, and the bribe giver, who is the most dangerous, should be held responsible.

COMMON COUNCIL COMMITTEES.
The attention of your honorable body is called to unnecessary delay of local legislation, made possible by the inaction of your committees, with the present Mayor being in favor of the delays. It has occurred that measures of some importance have been pocketed by chairmen and not heard of for months, or not at all. It may be promotive of the prompt dispatch of business to formulate a rule requiring the Clerk to report from time to time the actual progress made by committees upon the various matters referred to them.

LOCAL LEGISLATION.

Detroit, because her Mayor happened to be under the ban of the influences which dominated the last Legislature, now feels the burden of a mass of local laws which oppress rather than protect our citizens. Sometimes I feel as if I should apologize to my fellow-citizens for some of their bad laws, for they are made to suffer for laws that were aimed in the main at me.

Not only does Detroit suffer on account of the vicious local laws, but the whole State is affected by this special form of legislation. These laws were rushed through the Legislature and approved by the Governor without allowing those to be governed by the laws even a chance to express an opinion.

While these laws were all approved, even the Governor has said in substance that, were they brought to him again, he would try to stop their passage by vetoing them.

Since the adjournment of the Legislature, the laws affecting the municipality of Detroit have been compiled and form a good-sized volume, although the citizens of Detroit are as yet ignorant as to the contents of a vast majority of these laws.

God grant that we may never be cursed with another lot of so-called Representatives like those who bartered the people's rights away under the guise of representing this city. But, to guard against such a possibility, I wish to call your attention to the very first act passed by the last Legislature of New York, entitled "An act to provide for public notice and opportunity for a public hearing before the Mayor and legislative body of certain cities concerning all special laws relating to such city." This act provides that before any act shall become a law it shall first be submitted to the Mayor and Common Council, and then printed, and a date set for complete hearing. Funds are provided to cover the expenses of such a hearing, and, so far as local legislation is concerned, the city, through its Mayor and Common Council, may accept or reject such laws, thus giving the city a practical veto upon all laws of purely local concern.

DIRECT LEGISLATION.

There is a growing feeling on the part of the public, due to apprehension that the encroachments of private interests upon legislative bodies may influence those bodies to surrender public rights to even a more serious degree in the future than has marked the past, that the adoption of a system of Direct Legislation may prove to be a remedy for these admittedly great and growing evils.

While I am not prepared to go to the limit of Advocate the adoption of this subject, I do desire that until such a time as the growth of public opinion attains to the inevitable conclusion that all business into which a public franchise enters for its successful operation shall be wholly under the control of the government issuing such franchise, or the business operated exclusively within the city, the House of Representatives of the Legislature should pass an act that the issue of all such franchises should be decided by a vote of the people as soon as the Constitution of the State is amended to permit.

BOOKS.

Within a short time The Record, in connection with The Coming Nation, will have ready a second edition of J. W. Sullivan's book on Direct Legislation, which is the standard on that subject. It will be issued at 10 cents each, and as a special extra number of The Coming Nation, but it will not be sent to subscribers unless they remit the 10 cents. Parties sending in 50 cents for two subscriptions July 1st will receive a premium. This book used to cost 25 cents, and the present price of 10 cents is exceedingly low for a book of 130 pages. It would be much less than cost (Mr. Sullivan did not give it out) for those who gave the copyright and use of the plates. Can you do a better thing than to purchase ten and circulate or sell?"


THE SWISS STAND AGAINST CENTRALIZATION.

There were two Referendary votes in Switzerland last fall. The following translations from Swiss papers will throw full light on these. They were furnished by Philip Jamin, of Geneva, and translated by Miss Mann, of New York.

The first four quotations refer to the vote on November 8d, on the question whether the control of the militia should be taken out from the Cantonal Governments and given to the Federal Government. It was a proposition passed by the Federal Government and its full sanction, and the Referendum was called on it. The first quotation was from a paper issued two or three months before the voting was taken; the other three quotations are from papers issued shortly after the voting:

From the Journal de Geneva.

There are differences of opinion about the organization, instruction and administration of the army, and also whether the nomination of officers, distribution of engagements, expenses of service, etc., shall continue to belong to the officers of the cantons or shall be transferred to the national officials in the arrondissement. Our studies are to leave it as it is. Our army is for the defense of the nation, and the result of the Referendum voting will increase or diminish its force of resistance.

From La Liberte, of Fribourg, Switzerland.

There is no lack of courage, endurance or docility in our army. The effect is rather up. It is too much officialism and ceremony.

The true feeling of democracy vanishes in proportion as the idea of centralization makes its way. The people do not wish centralization. It is necessary to use artifice to lure them to hide the reality of things from them, as the sellers of quack medicine do, in order to get them to centralize their administration.

From La Suisse Liberale, of Neuchatel.

It was not the army which was touched by Sunday's vote. Let us not infer that the Swiss people are disaffected with their militia; on the contrary, they will make any sacrifice necessary, and they would consider the proposed change a grave error. If the people had considered the proposed revision necessary, they would have voted for it; for they know that the army is the surest guarantee of the security of the country and of its neutrality.

From L'Avenir, of Geneva.

The Swiss people have spoken. Last Sunday, by 75,000 majority, they refused the military centralization.

The bond money has been spoken. A. R. Twitchell, of Minneapolis, "Bond and Industrial Slavery," price 25 cents, in its chapter on remedies, places Direct Legislation as the first thing to get in a very forcible manner.
of jingoes and people inflamed with pomposity and love of war.

This sentiment is peculiar to the Swiss army, as an army for defense, and, from that point of view, it is amply instructed and efficient as far as the troops and officers are concerned.

On September 28th the Swiss voted on the question whether the manufacture of matches should be a Government monopoly or not. The following quotation is from a paper issued shortly after the National Legislature had passed the law for this purpose and before the Referendum had been demanded on it.

From Les Conseils Des Etats.

Another monopoly? A monopoly of matches is demanded on two grounds, hygienic and economic. It is claimed that the present manufacture is insufficient and that the manufacturers have difficulty in living and supporting foreign competition. It is proved that the manufacture may be carried on without disease, and the Swedish process will contribute to that end. The private conduct of the industry may be regulated when it is no longer menace by expropriation by the Confederation. Capital will flow into it then. There is a demand nowaday for the Confederation to make itself a manufacturer in order to save industries which are unprofitable. But this is not its role, unless we wish to create a complete collectivist State.

The protection of the workmen’s health would be much more efficaciously secured by a law forbidding the use of injurious processes (yellow phosphorus) than by a new monopoly. Science can easily be applied to make the manufacture harmless. It is done elsewhere, and this we can do.

The discussion has been going on for two years in the two Councils. At last they have voted. Three propositions were up: First, monopoly second, monopoly, and third, prohibition of yellow phosphorus. By twenty-two votes against eighteen the monopoly gained. And oh! the beautiful Referendum in view!

From letter from Philip Jamin, of Geneva, written after the voting on this match question, translated by Miss Levin:

The explanation of the vote on the match question is clear. It is necessary to say, first, that matches are actually made without phosphorus and without damage to the health of the workers. A factory making matches without phosphorus existed at Fleury, but it could not sustain itself against the factories using phosphorus. All that is required to insure the manufacture of matches without phosphorus is that the Federal Government should prohibit the sale of phosphorus matches as well as their use. Certain injurious things are wisely prohibited in commerce, and cannot be obtained without the signature of a physician.

But that is not the thing wanted by the politicians at Berne; they want a new source of revenue that cannot be controlled by the cantons. The rulers encounter great difficulties when they try to impose taxes with a view to obtaining new monopolies which will turn in millions. The people have accepted the monopoly of alcohol, presented like this match question, as a humanitarian matter. It hoped to triumph on like grounds on this question. The negative vote settled it. The Referendum has given most satisfactory results.

On this occasion a great number of Socialists, nearly half in certain cantons, voted against this measure; although it is well known that the Socialistic idea is to extend the province of the Government as far as and as fast as possible to manufactures, to railroads, sickness and old age, insurance, etc., etc. The Socialists who voted against this measure knew that during the two or three years that the law was enforced they could count but three or four cases of necrose (the disease produced by handling phosphorus), and that these had been contracted before the application of the law; but when the question of a Government monopoly of match making came up, an increase of the malady was proved, and at the same time it was shown that the factory inspectors had culpably failed to enforce the law. The lesson learned by this false show is that necrose is only a pretext. Nothing is more false than the pretense was the worst in the labourers’ welfare.

A persistent application of the law on manufacturers, or a single article added, like that which prohibits the sale of dynamite, would have sufficed. The prohibition of the use of phosphorus would check the malady at its source.

Among the partisans of the law one finds: First, The makers of matches, delighted at the prospect of selling for ready money those factories which are not prospering.

Second, Those voters who thought that to give the business into the hands of the Government was the only way to protect the health of the workers.

Third, Those who hoped to find through the creation of this monopoly places as inspectors, directors, sub-inspectors, etc., etc.

Fourth, An important number of voters, Socialists, who regard every bit of centralization in the hands of the Government as a step toward Socialism.

Fifth, The rulers and the troops who obey them blindly.

The opposition counts in its ranks:

First, The men who know that matches can be made without phosphorus and that a steady application of the law would prevent the return of necrose, but that for their own purposes the rulers have recently failed to enforce the law.

Second, The voters who oppose on principle any extension of the Federal powers.

Third, Different independent factions of the Socialists who regard the development of officialism as a farce.

In a word, the true inwardsness of this vote is an effort on the part of the Government to increase the resources of the treasury, and the balt was the security of the worker’s health. It failed.

CLUBBING RATES.

The subscription price of the RECORD is 92 cents. It will be sold with the following papers at the second price. The first is the price of the paper named.

The American Federationist, 50 cts. both 65 cts.

The Coming Nation, 50 " 65 "

Appeal to Reason, 50 " 65 "

The Altrurian, 50 " 65 "

The Other Side, 40 " 65 "

The Representative, $1.00 $1.15

The Dollar, 1.00 85 "

Our Populist, 1.00 75 "
URGENT LAWS.

A QUESTION AND AN ANSWER.

FROM A LETTER FROM HENRY D. LLOYD, OF CHICAGO.

I see that the Swiss Federal Assembly has the right to exempt its own enactments from the Referendum by declaring them urgent (Art. 1 and 2). A word might, perhaps, be well in the next RECORD telling how this power has been used.

From a letter from Philip Jamin, of Geneva, Switzerland:

"There is a clause about the urgency in the Federal, cantonal and municipal Referendum laws. See what happened in 1888 in the Grand Council of Geneva. Speaking for the expense, for which there was little justification, a deputy energetically reprieved his colleagues of the majority 'on the miserable habit which gains more and more to decree urgency and to exempt from the Referendum those expenses which are really not urgent. This is contrary to the spirit of the constitutional law. A reason of State importance or a public necessity is the only justification for taking one of these items from the public approval or disapproval. It would be a pity to continue to make exceptions at the pleasure of the Council save of those cases which had been arranged for by law.' But, alas! these words went down the wind; every time the majority of the Council decides to use a sum of money and fears the appearance of the Referendum they decree urgency.

"You can see the same in the Cantonal Councils and in the Federal Parliament at Bern. In March, 1894, the Chambers voted six millions for the building of a new Federal palace and decreed urgency, knowing beyond doubt that the Referendum would be demanded. The New Gazette, of Zurich, and all the liberal and radical journals, begged the Council not to vote so much money at that time.

"Submitted to the people, this project for a six million palace would have been defeated by an extravagant majority amounting to a unanimous NO. The delegates of the associations of workingmen of the Canton of Argovie protested against the suppression of the Referendum on this matter.

"This urgency figures generally as the final clause in the Referendum laws, and it is an excellent instrument for the passage of such projects as the people would oppose if consulted. Urgency is not needed; it is defended only by those who exploit it. The pretexts urged in justification of this clause, so deadly to the action of the Referendum, have no foundation.

"To those who believe that urgency measures are necessary at times, one can answer that such cases can be determined in advance; for example, the appearance of a dangerous epidemic, the defense of the country. Experience proves that in cases like these there is no need for an urgency clause. In 1871, when news was received that 85,000 men of the Army of the East were preparing to cross the Swiss frontier, all the Federal militia required to protect the neutrality within a few hours and without the necessity of any urgency clause, as no legislative action was required for the military preparations. The absence of urgency will enforce greater preparedness for accidents and defense; hence, accidents will not happen as often and defense will rarely be necessary."

ANOTHER TESTIMONY.

FROM CHARLES BURKLY, OF ZURICH, SWITZERLAND:

"The power of declaring cantonal and Federal laws urgent has never been abused. The urgency occurs very seldom, so seldom that I do not presently remember a single case. Such urgent laws, when unpopular, would quickly find a formidable opposition in the initiative, a very good corrective, that would immediately spring up. The urgency requires, in most cantons a two-thirds majority."

NOTE.—In this country the advocates for Direct Legislation have not taken the advanced stand of Mr. Jamin and his fellow Swiss, but most of the laws and constitutional amendments proposed have the provision that a very large majority, either two-thirds or three-quarters of a law-making body, may declare a law which is for "the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety; urgent and not subject to the Referendum. The creation of laws do not have this restriction, but the law-making body can declare any law for any reason they may see fit, urgent. Hence the growth of this feeling against urgency.

OPTIONAL OR OBLIGATORY REFERENDUM.

BY PHILIP JAMIN, OF GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.

The Referendum should not be optional; that is exercised on the demand of a certain number of voters. When it is optional it sometimes becomes a power in the hands of the politicians and facilitates bargaining; the politicians menace the adversaries with it even when they have been most active in the work of the Legislative Assembly.

More than once the obligatory Referendum would have swept as clean as a whistle projects for increasing the taxes when the present Referendum had proved useless because it was optional. Why? Because voters opposed to the new law were unable to bear the cost of a Referendum. Then often there was little time for it, and then there is the people's indifference, and the politicians always count on that. Often instead of uniting the Referendum and Initiative votings, as they easily could, they multiply votings in order to tire the voters, and so, little care for large expenses arises from these frequent popular consultations.

In May, 1892, the effort to get a Referendum on the extradition laws failed solely from a lack of funds; only 21,600 signatures were obtained. Certain poor cantons, where communication is difficult, could not even gather the names.

Another characteristic of the optional Referendum is the informer. The signatures are handed to the official bureaus for verification, and the opinions of the people become known. Numerous voters, fearing the possible consequences of giving their signatures against certain projects, abstain from signing.

S-leure, Bern, Zurich, Schwitz and the semi-canton of Bale, Campagne, have the obligatory
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Referendum. In the canton of Schaffhouse, where a constitutional law of January, 1895, has just been introduced, it is obligatory.

Among other examples, look at France, where the Referendum has appeared at several points. In January, 1895, the Municipal Council of Paris wished to make use of the Referendum on the much-discussed question of the Metropolitan Railway. The Ministry set this decision aside.

In December, 1893, The Berner Tagblatt announced that M. Brunner would propose to the National Council a motion demanding the obligatory Referendum in all cases of finance. When one refers to the succession of voting in which the majority were nays, such as that of December, 1891, it is readily understood that politicians dread popular control. In the canton of Argovie, in November, 1892, the Grand Council passed a law on naturalization, and the the press which, in this canton, is almost entirely in the hands of the political leaders, gave the law an excellent reception, but the voters judged otherwise by 12,643 against and 9,350 in favor.

DIRECT LEGISLATION.

WITHOUT ANY CONSTITUTION CHANGING— WILL NOT DO TO WAIT FOR THAT.

BY W. S. UREN.

Legislative Agent in Oregon of the K. of L., Federated Trades, Farmers' Alliance and Grange.

The Initiative and Referendum is a system by which a majority of the voters can make and repeal law without the consent or approval of the law-making body, and by which no law can be made by that body without the approval of a majority of the people it is to govern.

The great need of the American people today is the direct power to make and repeal laws. We must have immediate results. It will not do to wait until we can change the State and national constitutions. It is possible to do it all this year through party machinery—a party platform and the voluntary pledges of party candidates.

Let the platform declare that, until it is possible to amend our State and national constitutions, the candidates shall at all times vote, first, to refer all important laws to a direct vote of the people; second, that the candidates shall at all times vote to refer every question or proposed law demanded by a certain number of petitioners to a direct vote of the people it is to govern. This is the voluntary Initiative and Referendum.

A great work can be done on this line in Congress this winter if reformers will unite in demanding from their Representatives and Senators the immediate passage of a law providing that at the election for Presidential electors in 1896 there shall be submitted to the citizens of the United States qualified to vote for such Presidential electors at said election, certain questions, for instance:

1. Shall Congress make a law allowing free and unlimited coinage of silver on equal term with gold at the ratio of sixteen to one, as it was before 1878? Yes. No.

2. Shall Congress make a law providing for the building and operation of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States Government? Yes. No.


4. Shall Congress repeal the Wilson tariff law and reenact the McKinley tariff law? Yes. No.

5. Shall Congress make a law providing for the purchase and operation by the Government of the telegraph and telephone lines of the country? Yes. No.

6. Shall Congress make a law providing for the purchase or building, and for the operation at cost by the United States Government, of the railroads of the United States? Yes. No.

7. Shall Congress make a law to raise part of the revenue for the United States Government by levying a tax on the value of land exclusive of improvements? Yes. No.

Shall Congress submit to the Legislatures of the different States amendments to the Constitution of the United States for the following purposes:


9. An amendment providing for the election of the President and Vice President by direct vote of the citizens of the United States? Yes. No.

10. An amendment providing for the election of United States Senators in every State by direct vote of the people? Yes. No.

Passing over the details of such a law, it should also require the President to invite the friends and foes of each measure to submit short statements of reasons and facts for and against the same, to be published in pamphlet form therewith, and a copy delivered through the post office, so far as possible, to every voter in the United States.

A section should also be added, requiring the President, whenever in future a written demand is made upon him signed by 100,000 legal voters of the United States, either for the repeal or enactment of any law by Congress, to submit the same to the people under the provisions of this act, the submission of the question to be made at the first Congressional election not occurring within nine months after the demand is made upon the President.

Suppose the People's Party adopt a platform pledging its candidates to the voluntary Initiative and Referendum. Not one Populist will refuse to vote the ticket, while a host of voters who are not Populists will certainly vote with us. We ought to cast at least 5,000,000 votes and elect 150 Congressmen. Besides our own, many Republican and Democratic candidates will probably make the same pledge, even though their platforms may be silent on the subject. Some of these will keep their promise. We could probably count on 140 members. The united demand of that number of Representatives for the Referendum clause on every important law would surely cause some questions to be so referred to the people, besides defeating much vicious legislation.
A Non-Partisan Advocate of Pure Democracy.
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REVIEW OF THE FIELD.

Hon. Thomas J. McEwan, Jr., of New Jersey, submitted the following resolution:

RESOLVED. That a special committee, to consist of five members of this House, be appointed and hereby instructed, through a subcommittee or otherwise, to inquire into the feasibility of applying the principle of Direct Legislation through the Initiative and Referendum to the legislation of the Federal Government, and to report to this House, at this session, by bill or otherwise, the results of said inquiry; and that for the purpose hereof the committee be authorized to sit in the city of Washington, or any other city of the United States, and employ such clerical aid as may be necessary.

This was referred to the Committee on Rules and they have refused to report it and although Mr. McEwan is a Republican, Speaker Reed refused to recognize him or any one else to speak on this subject.

THE PROHIBITION PARTY.

The Seventh National Convention of the Prohibition Party was held in Pittsburgh on May 27th and 28th. A majority and minority report of the Platform Committee were made. The first contained five planks on the liquor question and a sixth on woman's suffrage. The minority report contained sixteen additional planks, the sixth of which reads:

"Believing that the free expression of the popular will is essential in a representative government, we favor the adoption of the Initiative and Referendum."

The convention was almost unanimously in favor of this, but before it could be considered, the money question came up, and the silver men being defeated, a dominant issue man proposed as a substitute for the whole platform a prohibition plank only and it was carried. Thus, all other reforms, including direct legislation, are unnoticed in the regular Prohibition Party platform.

At once there was a bolt from the convention and the new National Party was organized, which put in its platform the following:

"The Initiative and Referendum and Proportional Representation should be adopted."

This new party has had large accessions of strength from the old, and the split probably spoils all hopes for an increase of vote or influence by the Prohibition party, and the new party may coalesce with other reform elements.

That Direct Legislation has become a cardinal principle with the Prohibitionist is shown by its incorporation in almost all their State platforms. The following sample is taken from the platform adopted by the California Prohibition party this spring:

"We demand Direct Legislation, the Initiative and Referendum in national, State and local matters."

Two or three days before the Prohibitionist Convention, a small group of earnest men and women, most of whom had been connected with the Prohibitionist party in the past, met in convention in Pittsburgh and launched the National Reform party. The first plank in the platform reads:

"Direct Legislation, through the Initiative and Referendum, should be the first principle incorporated in a national platform, in order to restore the ancient rights of government of the people, by the people, for the people."

Its platform is so similar to that of the People's Party that it is doubtful if it ever amounts to much.

THE PEOPLE'S PARTY.

Direct Legislation is sure to go into the next national platform of the People's Party. It was recommended by resolution of the Omaha Convention of 1892. Since then it has been put into the State P. P. platform in every State having an organization save in five or six of the Southern States. It has been recommended for insertion in the national platform by most of the State conventions. Four sample resolutions will be given:

CALIFORNIA.

"The People's Party of the State of California reaffirm the principle of the Omaha platform and demand Direct Legislation by the Initiative and Referendum and Proportional Representation."
"Resolved, That the delegates to the St. Louis Convention be instructed to do all in their power to secure a union of all reform forces on a common ticket on a platform embodying the fundamental principles of the Omaha platform, and in addition recommend the adoption of the Initiative and Referendum."

"We demand the Initiative and Referendum, so that all laws can be referred back to the people for their approval before they become statutory enactments."

"We favor changing our national constitution so as to provide some form of Direct Legislation, and the early submission of important national questions to the people."

This issue is sure to be a prominent one in their campaign, and many hope it will be the dominant one. The City Central Committee of St. Louis, the Convention City, have voiced this in an address, from which we quote.

"First—We hold that the greatest issue before the American people is the restoration of true democracy by the adoption of Direct Legislation.

"Second—That this issue affords the only practical basis of union, since it recognizes the parity of all reformers, giving none preference or precedence, and refers each reform issue to vote of the whole people irrespective of the comparative importance or progress of each.

"Third—As the People’s Party is the largest of reform parties, it is fitting that the union of all reformers should be within its ranks, and we demand that the National Convention make Direct Legislation the first plank in its platform and the chief issue in its campaign, and invite all reformers to its support upon that basis, and we will work unceasingly to secure this action."

Among the many proposed platforms, that by William P. St. John, President of the Mercantile National Bank of New York, has attracted much attention. As revised finally, it consists of really two planks, as the third is a denunciation of Cleveland’s administration and methods. The first is devoted to money, and the second reads:

"Second. We demand provision for Direct Legislation by means of the Optional Initiative and Referendum."

A test of this principle seems warranted by the practice of Switzerland. If found practicable, its application will result in a closer relation between the people and legislation. Should the general lines of railroad become a possession of the government? Would seem to be such a change in public policy as might wisely be referred to the people.

"Without any class behind it, without any powerful organization to back it, without the sinews of war—money—so necessary in ordinary campaigns, without any man of supreme genius to champion and lead it, this issue has forged ahead with astounding rapidity and strength. It is now on the verge of passing from the stage of education and agitation into that of achievement and practice.

Direct Legislation has broken out in another and, by some, an unexpected spot. Last fall, Rev. W. F. Cooley, pastor of a Congregational church in Chatham, addressed the Northern New Jersey Conference of Congregational churches on Direct Legislation. As a result a committee on Applied Christianity was appointed, which reported on March 17, as follows:

REPORT ON DIRECT LEGISLATION.
NORTHERN NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE OF CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES, COMMITTEE ON APPLIED CHRISTIANITY.

We report it as our profound conviction that the responsibility of the churches for the morality of their public servants ought to be vigorously pressed, in the interest of pure and righteous government, and that ministers ought to inform themselves and develop the public conscience thereupon.

We further report that, in our opinion, the rise of the professional politician, who has come to stay, and is a menace to the reality as distinct from the form of government, renders it necessary to take precautions against him. Such needed precautions seem to us to be fully supplied by the so-called Initiative and Referendum provisions, commonly known as Direct Legislation.

We think, furthermore, that the churches, if interested in the improvement of political morality, must be interested in these proposed measures, as directly conducive thereto, as well as to the security of that truly popular government without which religion itself cannot be truly popular.

Finally, after mature deliberation, we are unable to discover that there are any more serious objections to this reform than the familiar one that “we have never done so before.”

This report was received but not adopted, the conference not feeling well enough posted on the matter to commit itself. The committee is continued and is doing good educational work. Dr. J. L. Scudder, pastor of Jersey City Tabernacle, has preached repeatedly on it.

The March issue recorded a similar movement among the Roman Catholics. The very fact that such a thing comes before these bodies is significant and encouraging.

The Prohibitionists, by a vote of 87 to 52, put a strong D. L. plank in their State platform at their last State convention. The Populists instructed their national delegates to work for a D. L. plank in their national platform.

PROGRESS IN NEW JERSEY.

BY WM. A. COTTER.

The effect of the work done by the Direct Legislation League of New Jersey is observable in the number of laws in which the Referendum was placed by the last Legislature.

Chapter 19. The legal voters may determine at their next annual meeting to increase the number of school trustees to five.
where there are between eight hundred and fifteen hundred children in any school district now entitled to have three trustees.

Chapter 21, relating to second-class cities providing for the purchase of lands and erection of high school buildings, provides that the act shall be inoperative until adopted by legal voters at the charter election.

Chapter 39, which provides for board walk in cities near the Atlantic ocean, provides that the act shall not go into effect until accepted by the people.

Chapter 45, relating to public roads and parks, provides for a vote of the people to raise money and that the money may be taken every year.

Chapter 62 authorizes a vote to be taken on the construction of foot and bicycle paths and to determine where the money should be spent.

Chapter 80 recognizes this new departure, referring matters to a vote of the people, and construes the intent and meaning of words, "legal voters" to be those who are entitled to vote and who do vote at the time and in the manner prescribed in and by said statute upon the question or proposition submitted, and that no voting shall not be counted.

Chapter 93 authorizes the legal voters of towns to direct the levy of a tax for the construction of hard roads.

Chapter 98 provides for a vote of the people upon any division of towns, townships and boroughs into wards.

Chapter 115, which provides for the building of a drawbridge across the Harlan river at Perth Amboy, provides that the act shall be inoperative in the county of Middlesex until assented to by a majority of the legal voters thereof at an election to be held for that purpose.

Chapter 150, relating to public instruction, provides for a vote of the people upon the issue of bonds to purchase lands.

These are found in the laws so far as they have been printed and distributed. There are, no doubt, others in laws that have been passed which have not been printed.

New York. Insensibly Direct Legislation is making progress in our legislation. The much abused Raines bill, passed this winter at Albany, has two forms of the Initiative and Referendum in it, though they are not called by that name. The Vote very clearly states these as follows:

"Local Option is provided by towns, a vote to be taken every two years (if ten per cent. of the electors petition for it) on four propositions, namely: Sale of liquor to be drunk on premises; sale of liquor not to be drunk on premises; sale by pharmacists on pharmacy or drugstore; sale by hotel keepers. A majority of the votes decides on each proposition. Local Option in cities and by wards has been eliminated from the act. No saloon can be established within 200 feet of a dwelling or dwellings without the written consent of two-thirds of the owners of the buildings so occupied; but this does not pertain to saloons already in operation."

Michigan. The D. L. League organized in Detroit last fall is doing admirably. They have drafted the following proposed amendment:

JOINT RESOLUTION proposing an amendment to Article 4 of the Constitution of the State of Michigan.

RESOLVED, That an amendment to Article 4 of the constitution of the State of Michigan be made by adding thereto sections 50, 51 and 52, by amending sections 1 and 20 of said Article 4 so that the same said sections 50, 51 and 52 shall and the same are hereby proposed to read as follows:

Section 79. The legislative power is vested in the Senate and House of Representatives, and in the qualified electors of the State of Michigan, as provided in Article 4 of this constitution.

Section 80. No law shall embrace more than one object, which shall be expressed in its title. No public act shall take effect, or be in force, until the expiration of ninety days from the end of the session at which the same is passed, unless otherwise directed by two-thirds vote of members elected: Provided, That any such act shall not take effect, or be in force, when five per cent. of the electors of the State, as ascertained in section 50 of this article, shall have petitioned the Secretary of State within the said ninety days, for the submission of the same to the electors for their approval or rejection at the next ensuing general election.

Section 50. When five per cent. of the electors of the State—to be determined by the number of votes cast for all the candidates for Governor at the last general election—shall present a bill, or an amendment to the State constitution, to the Secretary of State, he shall submit such bill or amendment to a vote of the electors thereof for approval or rejection at the next ensuing general election.

Section 51. The electors of every county, township or municipal corporation, upon petition to their respective county, township or city clerks shall have the same right to apply the Initiative and Referendum to all local legislation affecting such locality in same form and in the same manner as set forth in sections 20 and 50 of this article of the constitution.

Section 52. The Legislature shall provide such legislation as may be necessary to carry the provisions of Article 4 into effect.

On May 1 they published the first number of a neat four-page paper entitled Direct Legislation. This will be issued monthly. Ten thousand was printed of this, and will be of future numbers. The subscription price is ten cents a year, and they already have a list of nearly a thousand subscribers. It will be more of a present than the record, a record of facts, proposed laws and growth for the use of the worker for D. L. This new paper is meant mainly for circulation in Michigan, but sample copies can be obtained from G. R. Weikert, 481 Clinton avenue, Detroit; and while you are about it, you'd
better send a subscription, it is only ten cents.

The secretary of the League expects to get a D. L. plank into the Republican platform this fall—it is already in the Prohibitionist and Populist platforms in Michigan—and if Mayor Pingree can be nominated for Governor by the Republicans, there is a strong probability of the above amendment passing the next Legislature. If the Republicans do not nominate Mayor Pingree, some may fall on the Independent or the Populist ticket, and in that event Direct Legislation will be a live issue.

For several years the Populist and Prohibitionist parties in Nebraska have had strong D. L. planks in their State platforms. This spring the regular Democratic convention, which met at Lincoln on April 22, put the following plank in its platform:

“We are in favor of the Initiative and Referendum system as an aid to securing a government by the people, for the people, and by the people.”

This is the third State, Massachusetts and Oregon being the other two, in which the Democratic party has declared in favor of Direct Legislation. But in Nebraska there was a splitting Democratic convention, which met on April 22, and opposed its former comrades so strongly that it inserted the following plank in its platform:

“We believe in the government founded by the fathers of this republic and in the constitution, which for more than a century has been the admiration of the civilized world, and we repudiate the theories of Populists and so-called Democrats allied with Populists, who would destroy that constitution for the socialistic experiment of Initiative and Referendum.”

This is the first political plank in opposition to a D. L. plank that we know of. It is also the first time it has been called “socialistic” in a platform.

By W. S. Siewel Retsonal.

I have been an interested Virginia, reader of your columns, and am so thoroughly convinced that Direct Legislation is the one thing needed for us in national, State and municipal government that I have recently succeeded in getting the following ordinance adopted by my fellow-counclmen in the town of Blacksburg, Va., where I live:

“Believing that the government of the town should be controlled by its citizens, therefore, be it ordained, That any ordinance now in force, or that may be in future ordained, shall be submitted to the citizens for their ratification or rejection under the following conditions: The Mayor, when petitioned by fifty per cent of the registered voters of the town, or by a certain ordinance or ordinances, the same to be incorporated in the petition, be submitted to a vote of the citizens, shall order an election for same provided that not more than two ratification elections shall be held in one calendar year. Said order for election shall be posted thirty (30) days prior to the date of holding same and a copy of the ordinance or ordinances to be balloted upon posted therewith. At the election the ballot shall be: For Ordinance No. - . Against Ordinance No. - . The election must be held according to Virginia election laws. When the ballots have been canvassed, if it appears that a majority of the votes have been cast against the ordinance it shall be enforced: if less than a majority of the votes cast for it it shall be annulled. This shall be in force from its passage.”

Now I realize that the above is crude, and I expect criticism. I further realize that it is only one-half of Direct Legislation, but we will get the Initiative in time.

If the use of these facts will stimulate others to take practically to promulgating Direct Legislation, then use them; for I would throw my mite into the balance for reform. I am fully persuaded that there is a “Coming of the Revolution” which will be reared upon the ruins of our present one, and that government will be the best ever organized by man. I believe that the work will be accomplished peacefully and that the people are growing more and more dissatisfied with existing conditions. Those who are using every effort, legitimate or illegitimate, to continue the present form of government to the betterment of the few and the detriment of the many have seen “the hand upon the wall,” and it has written “Mene, Mene, Tekerel, Upharin.”

Note by the Editor—There is only one serious mistake in this ordinance. The percentage required for petitions should be five per cent, or ten per cent, instead of fifty per cent. The latter is too large. It might just as well be made over fifty per cent. and then have the petition enact or annul the ordinance. In a town that is not growing rapidly, it would probably be better to have a fixed number instead of a percentage to sign the petition, as then there’d be no misunderstanding. Thus, if Blacksburg has 1,000 voters, 100 might be the number required for an effective petition; if it has 5,000 voters, 250 might be the number. Then, why should there be only two ratification elections a year? It might also be well to state that it was the Mayor’s duty to announce the results. Otherwise this ordinance is very good. It is one of many encouraging indications of the growth of the movement and is very practical.

The Storthing or National Legislature passed a bill which provides that before a monopoly to sell liquor can be granted to any corporation by the council of a town or district, the question shall be submitted to a popular vote of the men and women in the community who pay the taxes, and the vote of the majority of the legal voters shall determine whether such corporation is wanted or not. If a majority of the legal voters cast their ballot against the liquor company, the right to sell liquor can not be granted, but this innocent-looking clause means that only the votes actually cast against the company are counted in opposition, while the vote of
every voter who remains away from the polls is counted in favor of the company.

The decision by the popular vote is binding for five years, and unless one-seventh of the voters demand a reconsideration of the question it continues in force another five years. If the voters decide against granting the right of sale to the liquor companies, all such right is denied, as the law expressly prohibits the granting of the license to any one else.

For the first time in the history of the country, women were allowed to vote on any question. It was an hour of solemn responsibility, and the women frequently dropped their ballots in the box with the words: "In Jesus' name."

The whole country was moved by the agitation, and the pent-up feeling found expression in the result of the voting was announced.

Only two of the whole number of towns where the question was presented voted for the renewal of the liquor company's franchise. These towns were lost because of a division in the ranks of the temperance people. About one-half of the cities and towns of Norway have rid themselves of the liquor traffic by this effort, and the other half is morally certain to follow next fall, at which time the licenses of the old companies expire in these towns, and the opportunity will be given the people to decide for or against a continuance of this traffic.

Credit is due The Voice for these facts.

The first large Referendum on Australia this continent was taken this winter in South Australia. There were three questions decided by the people on the same day as the general election for Parliament. The first was on the question of sustaining the present unsectarian education, and there were 36,806 in favor and 17,300 against. The second was the Protestant proposed alteration for Bible reading in the public schools, and there were 18,500 for and 34,300 against. The third was the Roman Catholic proposed alteration of a capitation grant to denominational schools, and there were 9,000 for and 17,300 against. The discussion and agitation were very active, and those disputed questions are now settled.

The South Australian Premier, who has a majority with labor members, is in favor of Referendum on all important questions. Hon. George Reid, the Premier in New South Wales, has declared his intention of passing Female Suffrage and Referendum before his term of office expires in 1898. In April the Women's National Convention of New Zealand, assembled at Christ Church, unanimously affirmed Direct Legislation.

In the Queensland Labor platform occurs the following plank:

"The submitting of measures for approval or rejection by the people."

NEW ZEALAND.

By Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Member Parliament.

The first Referendum bill was introduced by Mr. E. J. O'Conor in 1893, when it was beaten by a large majority without debate. Mr. O'Conor was rejected at the election of 1894, and the writer, who had just entered Parliament, introduced the bill. A lively debate ensued, in course of which the Ministers averred themselves as strongly against the bill. On a division for a second reading there were 24 noes and 19 ayes. The bill was thus killed by five votes. Counting pairs the figures were 32 noes and 27 ayes. Last year I again introduced the bill, when it was carried through the second reading by 40 to 26, counting pairs. Thus an actual majority of the whole house of 74 members voted for the bill. The Ministers practically maintained a neutral attitude, one voting for it and one pairing against it, and the rest abstaining from voting. The reason for this sudden change was that public feeling showed itself strongly during the last recess.

There is no doubt but that the bill is certain to pass before long. At any rate, I will bring it on next session, and if I can get it through the Lower House, which only accident can prevent, it is probable that the Council will reject it. But in any case it will be a burning question before the country. At the election, which takes place soon after the session, I feel assured a majority will come back for the bill, so that the future appears bright. The greatest trouble will be with the Council (Upper House), whose powers the bill proposes to curtail.

The principle is being applied in several acts proposed and passed. For instance, in a bill entitled "An Act to impose on lands traversed by railways constructed at the public expense a charge in aid of such construction," section 5, read:

"From and after the commencement of this act the construction of a railway shall not be authorized until and unless the proposal to construct the same has been affirmed at a poll of all the owners of private lands within the betterment area of the proposed railway."

And in "An Act to authorize rating on the unimproved value of land," sections 5 and 7, read:

5. (1) The following proportion of the ratepayers on the roll, that is to say,

(a) Twenty-five per centum of the ratepayers on the roll where the total number on the roll does not exceed 300.

(b) Twenty per centum where such total number does not exceed 300.

(c) Fifteen per centum where such total number exceeds 300.

5. (2) Thereupon the votes of the ratepayers shall be taken upon such proposal on a day to be fixed by the Chairman, being not less than twenty-one nor more than twenty-eight clear days after the delivery of such demand, and such day shall be forthwith notified in a newspaper published or circulated in the district. Provided,

(a) That such demand shall be deemed to be duly made on the Chairman, if the notice containing the same is delivered at the Town
Hall or other principal office of the local authority of the district; and,
(b) That if, within seven days after the delivery of such demand the Chairman fails to duly fix and notify the day on which the votes of the ratepayers are to be taken, then the votes shall be taken on the twenty-eighth day after the delivery of such demand, and the Clerk of the local authority shall notify the same in manner aforesaid, and the poll shall be taken in the same manner as is prescribed by "The Local Bodies' Loans Act, 1886," in the case of a proposal to raise a loan in the district.
7. The voting papers for the purposes of this act shall be printed in the following form:
"Proposal that property shall henceforth be rated upon the basis of the unimproved value thereof.
1. I vote for the above proposal.
2. I vote against the above proposal."
And no such proposal shall be deemed to be passed and affirmed by a majority of the valid votes recorded, and at least one-third of the ratepayers on the roll record their votes.

THE NEW ZEALAND REFERENDUM LAW.

A BILL ENTITLED "An Act to refer to the electors of the colony certain motions or bills for their decision.

Whereas, it is desirable to refer certain questions to the electors of the colony, so as to provide a system by which a direct answer, either in the affirmative or negative, may be obtained from the electors on such questions.

Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:
1. The short title of this act is "The Referendum Act, 1886."
2. Whenever both houses of the General Assembly shall have passed a resolution in favor of submitting any motion or bill to the vote of the electors, or whenever the House of Representatives shall have passed a resolution in favor of referring any motion or bill which has been twice passed by such house and twice rejected by the Legislative Council to a vote of the electors, then such reference shall be made in the manner hereinafter provided.
3. The Speaker of the Legislative Council or the Speaker of the House of Representatives or both the speakers shall, as the case may require, whenever a resolution has been passed as aforesaid, send a certificate thereof to the Colonial Secretary.
4. The Colonial Secretary shall, not earlier than two months and not later than six months after receipt of such certificate, publish the same in the New Zealand Gazette, and shall appoint a time for the taking of the vote on such resolution. Due notice of the time so appointed for the taking of such vote shall also be given by advertisement in such newspapers as the Colonial Secretary may deem necessary, and by notice posted on every school building and post office in the colony. Provided that any accidental omission to make such notification at any particular post office or post offices, school house or school houses, shall not invalidate any poll unless it can be shown that such omission has materially affected the result of such poll.
5. The vote shall be taken at every polling place in the colony whereat votes are taken for the election of members of the House of Representatives and before referees are appointed for such places, but not on the same day as is appointed for a general or licensing election.
6. In lieu of taking the vote in the foregoing manner prescribed, it may be taken at the post offices of the colony, and the postmasters shall fulfill the duties of returning officers. In such case the poll shall remain open one week, and the Governor may issue regulations providing for the taking thereof, and, mutatis mutandis, all the provisions providing for the taking of the local option poll shall apply thereto.
7. All the provisions of the electoral and corrupt practices acts shall, so far as practicable, be in force in regard to any poll taken under this act.
8. The result of the vote at each polling place shall be duly certified by the returning officer thereat, and such certificate and all polling papers, duly sealed up, shall be at once forwarded to the Clerk of Parliaments, and when he shall have received all the certificates he shall publish the result of the voting in the New Zealand Gazette. The voting papers shall be kept by the Clerk of Parliaments for one year.
9. If the vote be in favor of any bill or motion submitted, then such bill or motion shall become law on a date to be named by the Governor by proclamation. If the vote be in favor of any alteration of the law or proposal submitted otherwise than by bill, then it shall be the duty of the Colonial Secretary to at once prepare a bill to give effect to such alteration or proposal, and to introduce or cause to be introduced the same either in the Legislative Council or House of Representatives within ten days of the opening of the session of Parliament held next after such vote shall have been taken.
10. If any motion or bill be negatived at such vote, such motion or bill shall not again be submitted by Referendum to the electors for a period of three years after the taking of such vote.

NOTE.—A study of this bill shows that not only is there no provision for a popular initiative, but also the call for a reference to the people does not come from the people themselves by a petition, but it comes from one or both houses of the Legislature. It is more properly a bill to limit the power of the Upper House by a reference to the people. The Upper House, or Legislative Council, consists of forty-five members nominated for life by the Crown, which is the Ministry in power; the Lower House, or House of Representatives, are elected by the people for three years. The statement of the formation of the two houses is almost all that is needed to prove that they would not often be
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June, 1896.

The annual meeting of the N. J. League was held at the office of its President, Wm. A. Cotter, in Newark on the night of June 2d. A report was made by the President of the work done during the year. Another report was made by the Lecturer, Mr. Sullivan, of the progress of the movement, and a third report was made by the Corresponding Secretary, Mr. Pomero, of the receipts and expenditures and work done on the RECORD, the organ of the League. This report shows that there have been five issues of the RECORD since the report in July, 1895, and with this present June issue it would make six issues during the calendar year, two of which were extras, the January and April issues. The April issue was an unabridged copy of Sullivan's book, the others were eight-page papers. Two thousand were printed of each of these except the April number, of which 1,000 were printed, and the March issue, of which 3,000 were printed, and the demand had increased so that 5,000 would be printed in the future. The subscription list numbered 839, and the RECORD was sent to nearly 500 papers as an exchange, and was extensively copied. The money to foot the bills was received from sustaining subscribers, regular subscribers, donations, and a small amount from the sale of back numbers and books. The expenses were for printing and postage and some sundries, but nothing for editorial work. The report showed that the RECORD was in debt to Mr. Pomero $22.92. This report was referred to Messrs. Sullivan and Birdsall for audit, and, after they had examined and found it correct, it was accepted with thanks.

A committee of three was appointed to see if arrangements could not be made to continue the RECORD beyond the current year, as that is all that the publisher has agreed to do and all the sustaining subscribers have agreed to pay for. This committee consists of Messrs. Cotter, Sullivan and Pierson.

On the election of officers, the list at the head of this paper were elected for the ensuing year. On motion, the President was directed to appoint a committee of three, of which he should be the chairman, to introduce into both houses of Congress, as early as possible in the next session, a resolution for the appointment of a committee of three from each house to inquire into the application of Direct Legislation to national affairs, and to report to Congress by bill or otherwise.

On motion, the President was directed, with the assistance of the Corresponding Secretary, to draft a request for the insertion of a Direct Legislation plank into national platforms, and to send such a request to Hon. Thomas McEwan, Jr., for presentation to the Platform Committee of the Republican Convention; to Hon. William J. Bryan, of Nebraska, for presentation to the Platform Committee of the Democratic Convention; to Jos. H. Buchanan, for presentation to the Platform Committee of the Populist Convention, and to James H. Fleming, for presentation to the Platform Committee of the Silver Party's Convention.

The meeting then adjourned.

In pursuance of these instructions, the following letter has been sent to the four conventions:

OFFICE OF THE DIRECT LEGISLATION LEAGUE OF N. J.

NEWARK, N. J., June 9, 1896.

To the Members of the National Convention:

Gentlemen—At the annual meeting of the Direct Legislation League, held in Newark, N. J., on June 2 last, it was resolved by the said League that the national conventions about to be held by the Republican, Democratic, Populist and Silver parties be requested to place in the platform adopted a declaration in favor of giving to the people of the United States the right of self-government by Direct Legislation through the Initiative and Referendum, that they may thereby enact, accept and reject laws by a direct vote of those entitled to vote thereon.

In requesting you to do this, we state to you that the members of this League and the adherents to the cause throughout the United States are not confined to any one political party, nor believing in any one economic, political, financial or religious creed, but are ALL agreed upon this one object, as a means of protection against extravagance in public expenditures, and a curb to the enaction of any legislation against the interest of our common weal, as well as affording in time, when properly worked out, a means of finally disposing of vexed and vexing questions which recur at each election to disturb the business of the nation, and which thereby tends to destroy the stability of business and acts as a menace to the institutions of our beloved country.

We commend this question to you, and ask fair, frank and honest consideration for it.

WM. A. COTTER.

PRES. D. L. L.

ELTWEEF POMEROY,
SEC. D. L. L.

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN ACTUAL USE IN THE SOUTH.

BY MISS FRANCIS WILLARD, IN THE VOICE.

It is well known that a larger area in the South is under Prohibition by means of Local Option than in the North, and this territory
is constantly increasing. If I remember correctly, the figures given me by our true friend and brother, Bishop Galloway, of Mississippi, they have eighty-nine counties, of which all but eleven are under Local Option and these are chiefly the river counties and the "Black Belt." In Arkansas, for fifteen years or more, women have what we call "the vote by signature," i.e., the authorities place on a woman on a petition for Local Option. She signs the autograph of a man, and if a majority sign these petitions, then the sale of intoxicants can not go on.

We have just come from Fort Smith, the big "border town of Arkansas, across the big river from the Indian Territory, and here I talked with Frank Parke, Esq., forty years or more a resident here, and a leading temperance man. He says that he does not believe there is a State in the Union more "salted down" to practical Prohibition than Arkansas. This is, as I understand it, the working of the law: If a county votes "dry," then the sale of liquor is forbidden, but even if it votes "wet," the people can get out a petition in any township, and if it is signed by a majority of the adults, that town is dry in spite of the county vote, and the same is true in all localities that are situated three miles from any school or church house; but this is done on the petition of the adult population, male and female. The legislature has repeatedly given (on petition) an area of from five to ten miles, taking an educational institution as a center, and that entire distance is legally free from the saloon. At the last election the entire State (by which I mean the aggregate of all the Local Option votes) went for Prohibition by 3,000 majority, so that we believe that as this educational process goes on among the people they will, within a very few years, reach the plane of knowledge and conviction that will carry a statutory law, and when this is done they can proceed in the same regular and systematic manner to constitutional Prohibition.

George C. Christian tells me that forty-three of the seventy-five counties in Arkansas are under Prohibition, and only 686 saloons have been licensed in the whole State since January 1. He says the respect for law is greater here than with us, and enforcement is the rule. What I have said of States in the South applies with some modification to all Texas, where I have just been, is voting for Prohibition in all the smaller towns; Georgia and Tennessee the same, and so on except South Carolina.

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE.

The following call was published on April 1, and has already been signed by over ten thousand persons, of many counties, of national reputation, and has been universally approved by papers of all shades of thought.

"We, the undersigned, unite to call a Direct Legislation National Conference, to be opened at St. Louis, Mo., on the morning of July 21, 1896.

The conference is called to secure:

FIRST. In all future platforms, municipal and local, as well as State and national, the strongest possible Direct Legislation declaration.

SECOND. The widest possible discussion of Direct Legislation.

THIRD. A UNION OF REFORM FORCES Local or National, for the same candidates but without necessarily giving up their separate organizations or distinctive issues and platforms, providing each organization thus unifying, places at the head of its platform, the following to be followed by its other demands:

We demand Direct Legislation through the Initiative and the Referendum in local, State and national government. We advocate the following, but are willing to submit these or any other questions advocated by a reasonable minority, to a vote of the people interested, and to abide by their decision until the people themselves reverse it.

Three things about this call have been particularly interesting. It is not a convention, and not a convention. Men of any party or of no party can attend it without disloyalty to their party. The only thing required is an advocacy of Direct Legislation.

Second. While it embraces the general objects, there is one practical, definite and timely plan for it to push—the last object.

Third. The place and date are the best possible for getting a large and enthusiastic attendance of able men.

The plans of the committee in charge are clarifying into a morning meeting for organization, acquaintance and the discussion of whether the time is ripe for a national organization and for other means of bringing D. L. to the fore; an afternoon meeting for the appointment of committees composed of delegates from each convention meeting in St. Louis, to work on the plans of how the call on the floor of their conventions, and an evening mass meeting to be addressed by ten or fifteen representative leaders of all shades of thought—labor, temperance political, economic—thus illustrating a practical union. After a report has been made by the committee in charge, recommending a course of action, the morning and afternoon sessions will be turned over to the body assembled for it to act as it sees fit. As the evening meeting is not to be deliberative in any sense of that word, the committee will retain charge of that. The evening meeting will probably be held in the Convention Hall, but if not, in one of the largest halls in the city.

This conference promises to be very important, both educationally and politically. All who believe in Direct Legislation are invited to it. The discussion of other subjects will not be permitted, and a harmonious conference may be hoped for. For information regarding accommodations in St. Louis, etc., address Sheridan Webster, 1500 Washington avenue, St. Louis. There is no fund to pay the necessary expenses of this conference, and contributions may be sent to Mr. Webster.

The meeting was called to order by Eltweed Pomeroy, of Newark, N. J., in the Entertainment Hall of the Exposition Building at St. Louis, at 9.45 a.m., July 21st, 1896. He read the call for the meeting which had been issued on April 1st, last, and which he said had been signed by about 10,000 persons.

Mr. Pomeroy then read from the Committee who had called the Conference, three declarations, a report and a series of resolutions which the Call Committee recommended and on motion, the declarations were adopted, the report received and the resolutions taken up one at a time for discussion and adoption or rejection. The declarations provided that all who had signed or were willing to sign the call, should have the privilege of speaking on the floor, that speeches should be limited to five minutes on any one resolution and an order of business.

Under this order of business the first resolution of the Call Committee came up. It was resolved, that this Conference at once proceed to the election of a temporary chairman and secretary and that it be by voice vote. This was carried and Eltweed Pomeroy, of Newark, N. J., was elected temporary chairman, and Jesse White, of Omaha, Neb., was elected temporary secretary.

A motion was made and carried that the chair appoint a committee of three on advertising the evening meeting and the chair appointed C. B. Hoffman of Kansas; Sheridan Weisner of Missouri, and A. F. Jansen of Wisconsin.

A motion was made and carried that the chair appoint a committee of five on resolutions, and the chair appointed J. W. Logan, of Neb.; Dr. F. M. Cooke, of Denver; Colo.; A. M. Todd, of Calamazoo, Mich.; W. F. Nichols, of Kentucky, and L. A. Ueland, of Edgely, N. Dakota.

A motion was made and carried that the chair appoint a committee of five on permanent organization and the chair appointed Hon. J. Warner Mills, of Denver, Colo.; Henry C. Dillon, of Los Angeles, Cal.; J. J. Streeter, of Hinsdale, N. H.; W. B. Bridgeford, of Franklin, Ky., and Mrs. Mary A. Jones, of Kansas City, Mo.

It was then moved and carried that the chair appoint a committee of five to select and nominate to the Conference, Committees composed of delegates or alternates to the Conventions soon to meet in St. Louis, and the duty of these committees is to urge the plan of union on their conventions and get the strongest possible D. L. Plank into the platform. The chair appointed A. S. Edwards, of Cave Mills, Tenn.; W. H. Harvey, of Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Hiram Vrooman, of Baltimore, Md.; E. J. Wibbles, of Ohio, and C. B. Hoffman of Kansas.

A motion was made and carried that the arrangements for the Mass Meeting in the evening be approved.

On motion, the Conference adjourned at 11.00 a.m. to 2 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSIONS.

The Committee to nominate Vice-Presidents for the Conference reported the following list and on motion they were elected.

Ala., Hon. M. W. Howell of Fort Payne.
Ark., W. S. Morgan of Hot Springs.
Cal., Henry O. Dillon of Los Angeles.
Colo., Hon. Thos. V. Cato of San Francisco.
N. Y., Hon. J. Warner Mills of Denver.
The Committee on Permanent Organization reported a constitution for a National D. L. League. Their report was taken up section by section and discussed and after a few slight amendments adopted. It is printed below. And the NATIONAL DIRECT LEGISLATION LEAGUE was then and there formed; and Eltweed Pomeroy of Newark, N. J., was elected President, Jesse White of Omaha, Neb., Recording Secretary, J. W. Arrowsmith of Orange, N. J., Corresponding Secretary, J. V. L. Pearson of St. Nicholas Ave., N. Y., Treasurer, and the following Executive Committee, Hon. J. Warner Mills of Denver, Colo., Henry C. Dillon of Los Angeles, Cal., Dr. Geo. F. Sherman of Detroit, Mich., R. M. Davis of Cincinnati, O., L. A. Ueland of Edgeley, N. D., Walter Breese of Omaha, Neb., Wm. A. Cross of Newark, N. J.

The committee on resolutions report was received and on motion, the adoption of the resolution they recommended was put off till the evening meeting.

On motion, the conference adjourned about 5:30 p.m.

EVENING MEETING.

In the midst of a large and very enthusiastic meeting in the evening, the secretary read the resolution and by a unanimous rising vote, it was carried. The resolutions are below. Judge Mills read the constitution adopted and between 50 and 75 persons then and there joined, each paying the membership fee of $1.00.

Resolutions Adopted by the National D. L. League at St. Louis.

Our Republic was justly founded on a "government of the people, by the people and for the people." Since it is the first duty of government to secure to all citizens alike, the blessings of Civil Liberty. Equal Justice before the law and Prosperity; and believing that these can only be secured when all citizens participate actively in the high responsibilities of citizenship; we advocate the restoration of the rights of the people to Direct Legislation as set forth in the Declaration of Independence and implied in the Constitution of our country.

Since reforms in our government must largely come by direct vote of the people and as political parties are among the most powerful agents for educating public opinion, we earnestly invite the co-operation of all political parties in this movement for preserving our free institutions, an ideal republic, a pure democracy, and urge them to insert in their platforms, state, national and local, the following:

"We demand the restoration of Direct Legislation to the people by vesting in the voters the power to propose laws, whether municipal, state of national and to enact or veto them."

OCTOSTUTION

OF NATIONAL DIRECT LEGISLATION LEAGUE, ADOPTED AT ST. LOUIS, JULY 31, 1882.

ART. I.--NAME.

The name of this organization shall be The National Direct Legislation League.
ART. II.—PURPOSE.

The purpose of this League shall be, to restore to the people direct legislation by vesting in the voters the power to propose laws, whether Municipal, State or National, and to enact or veto them.

ARTICLE III.—POWERS.

This League shall have power,—

1st: To establish affiliating Leagues in the several States and Territories, whose constitutions shall be in harmony with that of the National League, but they shall have power to add to their purposes the right of recalling an officer—sometimes called the imperative mandate and the right of proportional representation, and to attach such other conditions to the membership pledges as they may think best.

2nd: To elect an Executive Committee hereinafter provided for, which shall have power among other things, to make such prudential by-laws as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this League, which by-laws shall be provisional until enacted by a vote of the membership.

ART. IV.—DUTIES.

It shall be the duty of this League to carry on a systematic, educative propaganda upon the subject of direct legislation, or as it is sometimes called, the initiative and referendum.

ART. V.—MEMBERS.

Any person, without restriction as to age, sex, political or religious belief may become a member of this League on payment of the sum of $1.00, and subscribing the following pledge:

IN TESTIMONY of my belief in the principle of direct legislation I have heretofore subscribed my name and do hereby pledge myself to promote the purposes of this League.

ART. VI.—OFFICERS.

The officers of this League shall be:

A President, who shall preside at all meetings and discharge the duties generally appertaining to that office.

A Vice-president, for each State and Territory, who shall represent this League in their respective states and territories, and act as organizing officers therein. In case of a vacancy in the office of President, or other inability to act, the Senior Vice-president shall discharge the duties of that office. The said Vice-presidents shall be appointed by the Executive Committee, provided however, that each state and territory shall appoint its own Vice-president as soon as the League shall be organized in therein.

A Recording and Corresponding Secretary; the Recording Secretary shall keep accurate minutes of the proceedings of all meetings and perform such other duties as may be required of him. The Corresponding Secretary shall attend to the official correspondence of the League, and be ex-officio Secretary and a member of the Executive Committee.

A Treasurer, who shall have custody of the funds of the League and who shall pay out the same only on warrants signed by the President and Corresponding Secretary.

An Executive Committee, composed of seven members, of which President shall be one and ex-officio Chairman. It shall be the duty of the Executive Committee to provide funds for the expenses of this League, suitable places for its meetings, and generally to act with the President as an Advisory Board. Meetings of this Board may be called by the President at any time on notice mailed to each member ten days before the date of meeting. Four members of said Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

ART. VII.—ELECTIONS.

The officers of this League shall hold their respective offices for the period of one year, or until their successors are elected and qualified. Provided, however, that a new election of officers shall be held at each National Convention or Conference.

ART. VIII.—FUNDS.

There shall be no annual dues, nor assessments upon the membership.

The League shall depend for its support upon membership fees and voluntary contributions, until otherwise provided.

ART. IX.—AMENDMENTS.

This Constitution may be amended at any regular meeting of the League by a majority vote of the members present, and by a majority vote of the members of the League to be ascertained in such manner as the Executive Committee may decide.

The National Direct Legislation League.

Minutes of Meeting of Executive Committee, July 26, 1895, Held at 1403 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

Present:—Elwood Pomeroy, Pres. in the chair; H. C. Dillon, Sec'y; and the following members, J. W. Mills, E. M. Davis, L. A. Ueland, Orlando Kling, and Mary G. Jones.

The following was reported as a correct list of the members of the Executive Committee and their residences:

Elwood Pomeroy, Pres., Newark, N. J.; H. C. Dillon, Sec'y, Los Angeles, Cal.; J. W. Mills, Denver, Colo.; E. M. Davis, Cincinnati, Ohio; L. A. Ueland, Edgeley, N. Dakota; Dr. Geo. F. Sherman, Detroit, Mich.; Walter Breen, Omaha, Neb.; Wm. A. Cotter, Flemington, N. J.; Dr. Orlando Kling, 2007 Downing avenue, Denver, Colo., and Mrs. Mary G. Jones, of Kansas City, were present and took part in the deliberations.

The following named persons were duly elected Vice-presidents of the League, viz.:—H. P. Brunt, care "The Other Side," Atlanta, Ga.; L. A. Ueland, Edgeley, N. Dak.

The following suggestions were made as to the vice presidents in other states. The secretary was instructed to ascertain qualifications and report for Dr. Crow, care of "Labor Advocate," Birmingham, Ala.; Hopson, "Tuscaloosa Journal," Tuscaloosa, Fla.
BY-LAWS.

Moved by Mr. Ueland and seconded by Dr. Kling that the President and Corresponding Sec'y, be and they are hereby constituted a committee of two to formulate By-Laws for the Executive Committee, which by-laws when satisfactory to them shall be forwarded to each member of the executive committee for approval, amendment or rejection. Carried. Moved and seconded that a committee of two composed of the president and corresponding secretary be and they are hereby appointed to draft a constitution for Grand and Subordinate Leagues in the several states and territories, which when approved by a majority of the members of this committee shall be their recommendation. Carried.

SUBORDINATE LEAGUES.

Moved by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Streeter that we recommend as one of the cardinal principles to be incorporated into the constitution of Subordinate Leagues that a subordinate league may be composed of three or more persons, and that when of three only, it shall consist of a president, secretary and treasurer; that officers, shall be subject to recall by a two-thirds vote of the members, and that seven such subordinate leagues shall have power when represented by one or more members, to organize a State or Territorial League. Carried.

DUTIES OF ORGANIZERS.

Moved by Judge Mills and duly seconded that we recommend the committee on constitution for subordinate leagues to incorporate therein the following among "Duties of Officers":—

Vice Presidents and other officers and members of this League are especially admonished during the present campaign and at all other times to labor earnestly with candidates for legislative and local offices to engraft the initiative and referendum upon state laws, municipal charters and local ordinances, in order that we may begin to enjoy at once some of the principles of direct legislation, without waiting for constitutional amendments.

Funds.

Moved by Dr. Kling, duly seconded and carried, that we recommend to the committee on by-laws of the executive committee that funds for the expenses of the National League be raised in the following manner:—

1st. By providing that no charter be granted to any State League which is not accompanied by an application for seven or more new memberships in the National League. The amount thus received by the national organization shall be refunded to the State League in supplies, which shall be furnished by the National League at the following prices:—

Charters for State & Territory Leagues, $8.00
" " Subordinate .50
" " Direct Legislation Record," 25c. per year
Sullivan's Book, 10c. paper covers
Blank Forms and Blank Books, per set,
Motion seconded by Mills and carried.

OFFICIAL ORGAN.

Moved by Judge Mills, duly seconded and carried, that until otherwise ordered, "The Direct Legislation Record," published at Newark, N. J., is hereby designated as the official organ of the National League, to be furnished to the National League at two cents per single copy, 5 pages, and in the same proportion for additional pages.

EMBLEM.

Moved by Judge Mills and seconded by Dr. Kling that Mr. J. J. Streeter be requested to get up an emblem to designate the principles of our organization, and report to the executive committee with estimate of cost, etc. Carried.

On motion of Judge Mills the Executive Committee then adjourned.

Attest: ELMER POMEROY, H. C. DILLON, Sec., President.

The People's Party St. Louis Convention and Direct Legislation.

The second National Convention of the People's Party was called to order on July 22nd and it lasted till the 25th. It was divided into two factions and the Middle of the Road men had Direct Legislation on the badges and talked it very earnestly but the other side also advocated it.

When the platform committee was called together, on motion of Robt. Schilling of Milwaukee, five sub-committees were appointed, one of whom was for the framing of the Direct Legislation plank. This committee consisted of Congressman John C. Bell, of Colo., J. Weller Long of Mo., A. G. Burkhart of Ind., J. A. Parker of Ky., and J. G. Campion of Me. This sub-committee proposed the following plank: "We hold that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and in order that the consent of the governed may be clearly ascertained, we favor Direct Legislation under proper constitutional safeguards so that a given percentage of the citizens shall have the right to initiate, framing and proposing laws and of compelling the submission thereof and of all important laws whether proposed by national, state or local legislative bodies to a direct vote of the people for their approval or rejection as is now the practice in amending national or state constitutional amendments."

This was so long and cumbersome that the whole committee amended it to read as follows: "We favor a system of Direct Legislation the Initiative and Referendum under proper constitutional safeguards." This plank was adopted by the Convention and is in the National platform of the People's party. It was also, thanks mainly to Robt. Schilling, given a separate heading so that the platform is now divided into preamble, money, transportation, land, Direct Legislation and general propositions.

This plank in short, it is not as good as some wordings, in particular the one recommended by the D. L. Conference, but it would be satisfactory if the final clause, "under proper
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Constitutional safeguards was left off. Direct Legislation can be applied in many ways without changes in constitutions. And the clause indirectly implies that it cannot be applied until changes in the constitution are obtained. It is significant that this plank received more applause than any other in the platform and that it is the only really new part of the platform.

But the plank was not the only thing accomplished by the advocates of the more direct control by the people. A revolution far-reaching in its effects, was made in the manner of managing the affairs of the party. This is due to the Committee on Rules and Order of Business. In it, there were three sub-committees appointed, the last of which was on Rules for National Officers and it consisted of Messrs. Ettwein Pomeroy of N. J., Henry R. Legate of Mass., J. T. Garrett of N. C., M. D. Carroll of Mo., and John A. Sheffield of Ohio.

Some few changes were made in their report by the full committee and the Convention made two minor changes. As adopted it is as follows:

"RULES FOR NATIONAL OFFICERS.

1. National Committee.—The National Committee shall consist of three from each state and territory and the District of Columbia, to be elected by the delegates to this convention. And when elected, each member shall hold office till his successor is elected, which may be done by any regular state or territorial convention.

2. Officers.—The officers shall consist of a National Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer. The Chairman shall be selected by each National Committee to hold office till the National Committee selects his successor which they may do at any time. The Secretary and Treasurer shall be elected by each National Committee to hold office till the National Committee selects their successors which they may do at any time. These officers need not be members of the National Committee regularly elected from any state or territory.

The National Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer shall be members of the National Committee but without votes unless selected by some state or territory, save in the cases of a tie vote when the Chairman can cast the deciding ballot and neither of them shall vote by proxy, and no person shall vote more than one proxy in the National Committee.

3. Meetings.—At any meeting of the National Committee, not less than a third of the elected members shall constitute a quorum.

4. Executive Committee.—The Executive Committee shall consist of nine members, six of whom shall be chosen by the National Committee to hold office till the National Committee elect their successors which they can do at any regular meeting. The Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer shall be ex-officio members of this committee but without a vote save in the case of a tie when the chair shall cast the deciding vote.

According to these rules, the party in the state can readily change its members of the National Committee when it so wishes and the National Committee can change their Executive Committee whenever they so wish.

But this is not all. At the meeting of the National Committee on the evening of July 26th, Mr. Pomeroy of N. J. introduced a resolution which it has since been moved to change in one or two minor respects so that it will finally read as follows:

"Whenever a decision is wanted from the National Committee on any subject, the Chairman, or the Chairman on the request of any three members can frame a question and direct the Secretary to send it to each member with a request to vote yes or no on it and if within 18 days, a quorum vote and a majority of those voting, vote yes on the question, it shall be the action of the committee and so announced by the Secretary to each member of the committee and the signed votes shall be preserved by the Secretary and a record kept in the minute book; and if a majority does not favor the proposition or if a quorum does not vote within 18 days, it shall be lost and a record kept but not announced save to the members requesting action."

This means that Direct Legislation is put into actual operation in the government of the People's Party. All of the members of the Executive Committee are strongly in favor of Direct Legislation and it is expected that later on, there will be more developments on these lines, particularly in the formation of the next national platform.

Taking it all in all, this Convention which was more than any other convention of the year, a meeting of the common people, the bone and sinew of our country, has knitted Direct Legislation so firmly into the platform and formation of the People's Party, that that party must now go ahead on truly democratic lines.

The Republican St. Louis Convention and Direct Legislation.

Hon. T. McEwan, Jr., a Vice President of the D. L. League of N. J., who accepted its request to bring D. L. before the platform committee of the Republican National Convention at St. Louis, writes: "I was not on the platform committee. The member of the committee to whom I spoke said that the money question had taken up such a large part of the time of the committee and had been so hotly fought that it left no time to consider the D. L. matter. I know that the committee was pressed for time for the entire convention was being held back for its report.

I am as much in favor of D. L. as ever and believe it to be the best and in fact the only solution of our State and National difficulties."

The Democratic Chicago Convention and Direct Legislation.

Hon. Wm. J. Bryan accepted the request of N. J. League to bring D. L. before the platform committee of the Democratic National
Convention at Chicago. Mr. Cotter, the President of the N. J. League, attended the convention, but was not sanguine of its adoption by the convention but he expressed his firm belief in D. L. and promised to do his utmost for it, and well did he fulfill that promise; for he spoke for more than twenty minutes before the platform committee urging a D. L. plank. There was no opposition, and Mr. Cotter saw it adopted by the fear that they had put too much that was radical in the platform and that a D. L plank would only open another line of attack.

To show how Mr. Bryan stands, it is only necessary to quote a paragraph written by him in The Omaha World-Herald of April 29th last:

"The principle of the initiative and referendum is democratic. It will not be opposed by any democrat who endorses the declaration of Jefferson that the people are capable of self-government, nor will it be opposed by any republican who holds to Lincoln's idea that this should be a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

How a Moral Question Was Defeated at the Referendum.

BY ELTHWEDE POMEROY.

The licensing of brothels or "Houses of Tolerance" as they are officially called, has been in the city of Geneva, Switzerland, an inheritance from the Napoleonic occupation of that city in the early part of this century, but on Sunday, March 22nd, by a vote of 4,300 to 4,098 the people decided to continue it. On the face of it, this looks as if the people had voted for the continuation of an immoral system. But when the facts are known, it is seen that it was done through an abuse of Direct Legislation and not through its proper use.

Geneva has had the municipal Referendum for about two years, but the Initiative has been a recent adoption and this was the first voting on a question coming from the people. Some two or three years ago this question of stopping the legalization of vice, was made a question in city politics and the people spoke against it with no uncertain sound by the election of councillors who afterward did not obey the public will. The forces favoring a continuation of the system, are the landlords and some merchants who benefit by it and the lowest element in the city. As time went on, without any action by the Grand Council, the friends of the movement became impatient and finally it resulted in an Initiative petition backed by such societies as the Labor Bureau, Woman's Union, International Union of the Friends of Young Girls, Society for the Reform of the Legal Position of Women, &c., &c.

But the landlords and their allies controlled the Grand Council. Mrs. Josephine E. Butler, a well-known American lady staying in Geneva, writes: "During the last five weeks our party were not allowed to meet, to instruct the people. Every meeting was broken up by the Lamps Rouge—so called because each House of Tolerance must have a red lamp burning in front—and finally every hall and room was closed against us by police order. Attempting to speak in the squares, or roads, our friends were stoned and assaulted and silenced by noise. Freedom of public meeting and freedom of speech no longer exist in Geneva." Philip Jamin of Geneva writes: "Gatherings of the people were rudely interrupted in spite of constitutions. Orators opposed to the ideas of the government were pursued through the streets."

The law is a recent one and likely crude and the Grand Council had the fixing of the details. So to confuse things they proposed a question of their own regarding these Houses of Tolerance to be voted on at the same time. I have seen one of the ballots. It reads, "Are you in favor of the question from the popular Initiative? Do you favor the proposition submitted by the Grand Council?" Nothing on the ballot told what either proposition was. According to the rulings made, those ballots marked ye or no to both questions are invalid and also those marked anything else than simple yes and no.

Is it any wonder that under these conditions the people did not know how to vote. Mrs. Butler writes: "Workingwomen told us that their husbands were good men but meant to abstain from voting altogether because they did not clearly understand the question. They understand what state prostitution is, but were not clear as to which question they were to answer yes and some thought it safer to be on the side of the government."

M. Jamin writes: "This vote goes to prove peremptorily that to ensure the free and moral action of Direct Legislation, it is necessary to attack and destroy the influence of the politicians in every field either direct or indirect." And yet on the very night of their defeat, with the blasphemous and indecent songs of the rabble ringing in their ears, between forty and fifty devoted men and women, protestant, catholic, and free-thinking, radical and conservative met and formed a committee to continue the fight till the won and they have the instrument to fight with.

The following is a condensed translation of a circular of the abolitionists which shows how the appeals are made:

Dear Fellow Citizens:—

The question of the suppression of the houses of licensed debauchery, now existing with the knowledge of the State, must be judged at the tribunal of conscience. One cannot deliberately do wrong, even if the acts apparently have the sanction of reason.

This institution has been lately suppressed in Berne, Neuchatel and Zurich, and all parties have worked together to this end. In Neuchatel, M. Jeanhenry, National Councilor, writes: "It is hard to admit that favoring immorality is a mission of the State." That which was admitted by the distinguished Radical was echoed by the conservatives, and there was not found a socialist who contradicted it.

Geneva is the Canton in Switzerland which still maintains the disgraceful institution. And it is defended behind the closed doors.
the Grand Council, a thing no one would dare to dream of. This, in itself, is sufficient condemnation.

If to create such an institution would be impossible, its maintenance should be equally unthinkable.

Our cause has made immense progress. We are approved by many of the first medical authorities in our country. Those men who still vaguely contend that it is a social necessity simply make known their own evil ways, for to approve licentious debauchery is thoroughly repugnant to an honest man. No one will wish to have that in his past.

But we are opposed by more or less willful ignorance and fixed interests. It is not only the abuse itself which is a source of profit to some, but those also stop at nothing to entice votes. The recent scenes of disorder have shown us what weapons are used by the champions of a cause already lost in public opinion: tumult, scandal and the violations of those public liberties secured by the law.

Promise yourselves that you will gain over at least one possible adherent: if each one of us does that much, the victory is ours.

We should neglect nothing that will render the outcome certain and glorious. Think of the honor of our families, of the future of our youths, of the good reputation of our dear Canton, and if you live in the country, come to the aid of those who live in the city, and we shall have a solid movement which will be impressive. Make one grand effort, and we shall never have to return to a disgusting question which has already been a great infliction.

LONG LIVE GENEVA!
LONG LIVE SWITZERLAND!
THE INITIATIVE GROUP.

SWISS NOTES.

REFERING TREATIES TO THE PEOPLE.
Translated from "La Tribune," Berne Correspondence.

A motion was introduced to so modify the Federal Constitution that foreign commercial treaties should be submitted to the people on a demand of 30,000 citizens or by eight cantons.

The people must be the last resort; the Legislature is constantly doing things of which the people do not approve; and those who are opposed to referring foreign treaties to the people, however radical they may profess to be, have really the old idea of aristocratic government in their minds.

THE FORMING OF LAWS,
Translated from "La Allgemeine Schweizer Zeitung," of Bale.

More than any other country, a democratic State like Switzerland should admit only good laws formulated by a legislature thoroughly understanding the matter, and having at heart the good of the people. And the editing of the text should leave nothing to be desired in the way of clearness and precision.

Considering that all forces are united, these laws will probably not be able to resist the referendum and this is the only way to teach the Councilors anything, and put a stop to the increase of "functionarism."

AN ELECTORAL REFERENDUM,
Translated from "Le Journal de Geneva."

The East Swiss, discussing the notion of the election of the Federal Council by the people, says it would be much more useful to give the electors the ability to recall the executive power, 50,000 or, if you like, 100,000 citizens should have the right to demand the revocation of the Federal Council as a whole, or of one or more of its members—the question to be submitted to the people who must decide in the last resort.

The idea is worth examining. If one found this wholesale slaughter too brutal, one could go through the group taking a man at a time. Each time the Council was re-elected by the Chamber a number of members could demand a referendum against this decision which would give to the people a check on the executive power and at the same time avoid the inconveniences of a direct election of the executive power by the people. For the rest, it would conform to our historical traditions. It would be a sort of electoral referendum.

The idea is new and has not yet found its definite form. It is well worth careful consideration by all parties.

A SWISS VOTING ON PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

[From The Outlook of June 6, 1896.]

Proportional representation has just been voted upon in the canton of Berne, in Switzerland; under circumstances that put that system in a new light. The fact that it is so widely employed in Switzerland has led many people to regard it as an outgrowth of radical democracy for which Switzerland stands. In the Berne election, however, according to the London Speaker, it was the Conservative parties which demanded the extension of the system to the election of cantonal legislature and the Radicals and Socialists who fought the proposition. In the cities the proposition carried, but the farmers of the Bernese Oberland voted almost solidly against it, and it was defeated by a majority of 8,000 in a vote of 60,000. The division among the voters was thus exactly opposite to that which most American advocates of proportional representation would have expected. The radical Democrats, it appears, held to the system of making each representative responsible to the people of his locality, while those who have opposed the democratic movement wished to substitute party representation for district representation. In our own country proportional representation has generally found its friends among Radicals and Socialists, but this is probably due to the failure of radical groups to secure any representation under the district system.
The Approaching Popular Votings in Switzerland.

BY PHILIP JAMIN.

Three referendum demands are to be submitted to the people: the first concerns the military discipline code, which has received 69,310 signatures; the second is on the railroad estimates (or accountability); which has 60,588 signatures; and the third deals with the cattle trade which has received 46,840 signatures.

Most of the initiative is a protest against the military penal code; this code is unworthy of the militia. It is full of the most severe punishments.

Under this code a military authority can follow a man even into his civil or private life for the purpose of punishing him "for all that he has failed to do in his military life." This one sentence of the law will inhere in the section.

The outcome of the second issue is doubtful as both sides are divided. The workers and employees of the railroads who hope to get better salaries with shorter hours, (to the number of 30,000) are for the project which makes the roads State owned.

The "Democrat" declares that the first objectors to the law are the Federal authorities themselves. One notes with what ease the authorities which prevent private industries from working their men more than 11 hours, passed 12-hour law for the postal employees; this law is violated—the day is 14, 15 and 17 hours. At the approach of the New Year it is 20 hours.

There are, in favor of the project, the discomfited stockholders of the lines in question and the State Socialists, so numerous in the German-speaking Cantons.

Against the project are the Federalists, numerous in the Romansch Cantons, in the those of the Grison and those of the small forests. Then those who have been disillusioned on the subject of the alcohol monopoly in which the rendering shows a deficiency of a quarter of a million, or that amount less than was expected.

The charges of the monopoly are enormous, 3 fr. a quintal. Under the monopoly the more the receipts decrease, the higher the charges.

It is also impossible to decide as to the third question because if the first and second items are rejected, this last will be upset with them on Oct. 6.

A fourth petition for the initiative dealing with the State bank, is in circulation and it is certain that the required number of signatures will be secured, but we do not yet know if it will be submitted to vote on the same day as those above mentioned.

This new project has excited great interest and partisans for and against, are deeply interested and are putting forth strong arguments to uphold their views.

The point is that private banks do not give sufficient attention to the needs of the "small and humble." Money pays: 3 per cent. and 8 per cent. and those, who borrow must pay 6 per cent. to 8 per cent. and there are other considerations, which discredit the private bank in the eyes of the impartial, those who are not interested in but one class of the population.

On the other hand if a State bank is put in the hands of the politicians it will mean great temptations.

The socialist workers will vote as a single man for the State bank; but socialists of other ranks of society will vote against it.

The project will be favored by all those who have any holding and, thanks to the energetic campaign undertaken, many will follow in their train under the banner of pure patriotism.

NOTES.

BY W. SIWEL RETSACNAL.

The last number of The Record Virginia gave an account of the adoption of the Referendum in my home, Blacksburg, Va., a town of about 2,000 inhabitants. Since then the following initiative ordinance has been passed:

"RESOLVED, that any ordinance drawn up or formulated and signed by 51 per cent. of the registered voters of the town and presented to the town council petitioning said body to adopt the same for the future government of the town, then the council shall adopt said ordinance at once and publish the same."

In drafting this I have tried to avoid the expense of an election by having 51 per cent. sign the formulated ordinance, that being a majority which should rule. The town is small as yet but growing, and the citizens can soon be canvassed.

Again I believe a man is more apt to rightly consider a question if approached personally. Discussing the matter with him you get him to study more thoroughly questions of government than by posting the desired ordinance.

A curious matter seemed about coming up under the Referendum ordinance. The new council are contemplating the banishment of hogs from the town which would greatly injure some of our citizens who can and do provide a good portion of their meat at home. Most of the citizens are against such an ordinance and will use the power they have by the referendum and initiative to annul the by-law proposed and to offer a substitute, requiring those who keep hogs to keep them in pens and have the pens cleaned etc., so that they are not offensive, and heavily fine all those who let the pens get into an offensive condition.

L. A. Murray, an enthusiastic Wisconsin and able D. L. advocate has organized at Kilbourn City, the D. L. Club of the People's Party of Kilbourn. It starts in with good membership and is doing very active work.

The D. L. League in this state has Michigan some fifteen or twenty local leagues. Their monthly paper which was started in May, has had a June issue but further publication was held over till fall. They send out 10,000 weekly issues.

C. D. Hillabald, of Canton, Kans., Kansas is one of the prime movers in a D. L. League there which has almost a model constitution and pledge card. It has no dues and their officers as a rule are unknown to the general public. Its pledge card is a model. He is a living active work.
The third of November last saw the end of one of our quadrennial referendums. At the beginning of our national life these were true elections—choosing of rulers. But each candidate who has run has marked an advance of the Referendum idea—the determining of principles by the people. Washington was chosen President because of his character, and not because of the party behind him and the principles he or they advocated. Both of the candidates for that office recently voted on, are of unblenched character. McKinley was not elected, nor was Bryan defeated, because of their personal characters, because the one was a fit and the other an unfit man to rule. The one was chosen and the other defeated because of the platforms on which each stood and the principles they advocated. As Bryan said in his telegram to McKinley: "We have submitted the issues to the American people and their will is law."

A LITTLE NOTED CAUSE.

Rarely in previous campaigns have the platforms and discussion developed such clear, definite and squarely opposed issues. A little noted cause of this progress of civil service reform, which has taken the spoils element, to a large extent, out of national politics. The President does not have a tithe of the power of appointment that he had a score of years ago, and most of the offices he does appoint to are more important and more in public view, so that his selection is limited to a comparatively small class in the community. This has nearly dried up one of the great springs of political activity—the hope of an office—and its place has had to be supplied by a higher incentive to political action, the advocacy of a principle. This change will become more and more marked and important in the future.

THE PEOPLE WILLED THE ISSUE.

Early in the year the Republican managers, relying on the disorganization produced in the Democratic party by a depression of business during a Democratic administration, used every effort to make the tariff the issue. The old-time Democratic leaders were afraid of the silver issue, and they would gladly have shelved or straddled it. But neither were successful. The free coinage of silver was the issue. The people would have it. The managers on both sides could not prevent it. It is a most abstruse, technical, and, seemingly, not a popular issue.

A CAMPAIGN OF EDUCATION.

The Baltimore News recently said editorially: "The last few months have proved a campaign of education. Not only have the people of the country informed themselves thoroughly, but they have also accustomed themselves to an interest in political matters on a scale almost unknown in this generation. In that this campaign has given the people a clearer view of their responsibilities and their powers, and has stirred up in them a deep and continued interest in political questions, it has produced an effect for good that is simply incalculable."

The Newark (N. J.) Evening News said: "The voters were suddenly called upon to decide by popular vote an economic question of government the consideration of which the lawmakers of the body had succeeded in staving off because of its perplexities and its danger. The issue forced an educational campaign of unprecedented character. Not in the history of politics in this country has such a battle been fought."

Mr. W. B. Shaw, in the Review of Reviews, said: "It has been the fashion in previous Presidential contests in this country to sneer at the phrase, 'campaign of education,' although it was said that in England, and some other countries, where popular suffrage prevailed, the words had a meaning which they never possessed here. However that may be, it is certain that from this time on the American people will fully understand what is meant by a campaign of education, for such a campaign we have had beyond question."

Speaking of local matters in their own States, and these States the ones most in dispute, where the conflict was the hottest
various college professors have given the following testimony: Prof. W. W. Folwell, of the University of Minnesota, says: "Every school district has been canvassed and every house supplied with the witty, albeit grotesquely, illustrated literature of the opposing meetings. Posters are used, and they aim to be arguments rather than caricatures. The campaign is earnest, and, for the most part, courteous. It is a campaign of discussion and education."

Dr. James A. Woodburn, of the State University of Indiana, says: "As usual, the old party spirit has been worked up, and party discipline has been applied; but, to serious people, all these elements have seemed more than ever out of place during the present referendum on great public question, and it may still be said that there has not been for years, certainly not since the war, such serious and earnest consideration of public questions on the part of the masses of the voters. More unselfish service than ever before has been devoted to politics. Two things may be emphasized in the outcome: 1. A remarkable extension of popular knowledge on the money question; 2. Old party ties have been greatly loosened."

Prof. Macy, of Iowa College, says: "The campaign in Iowa is characterized by earnest and sincere discussion of one issue, viz.: The free coinage of silver. There are no processions, few brass bands and little noise. Men and women sit for hours listening to a presentation of facts and statistics. Political meetings are numerous and large, yet they constitute the smallest part of the discussion. When that is over, in a friendly way, they engage in financial discussion."

Prof. Taylor, of the State University of Nebraska, says: "Harangue and appeal to selfish motive are not the order of the day, and whatever may be the party result of the election, a more valuable result for the future of the State of Nebraska is already gained in the rising level of intelligent discussion."

SUMMARY.

The Review of Review well sums it up when it says: "The spectacle of millions upon millions of citizens of a great nation debating the intricacies of the currency question certainly has its curious aspects. Nothing like it was ever seen in any other great country before. Whatever questions may at one time or another disturb the minds of the masses who hold the fates of the England, France, Germany or other European countries, the plain people have never for a moment believed it possible that they were competent to settle currency and banking questions on the plan of a popular referendum. These are matters involving scientific and expert knowledge. The intense discussion of 1896 in this country will not have resulted in making accomplished monetary scientists out of a majority of the population, nevertheless, the serious and honest effort of the voters to find out enough about these questions to act with reasonable intelligence and prudence, can only produce valuable results in the end. It is a part of our education as a democracy."

ON A COLOSSAL SCALE.

The quotations given prove the colossal scale of the education forced by this referendum. It penetrated the humblest hamlet, stirred the dullest intellect. Only a few facts can be given. The Republican National Committee issued over two hundred million documents, which is said to be half as many again as all ever issued by it since it began. These were printed in over ten languages and sent out in 5,000 freight, 20,000 express and 500,000 mail packages. Plate matter was supplied to thousands of country press. Posters and other matter were freely distributed. The Republican Congressional Committee sent out 2,500,000 copies of one speech, and that was but one of the many it sent out. The Democratic and Populist committees sent out tens of matter. Speakers circulated circulars everywhere. Spokesmen went through twenty-three States, making four hundred speeches, is only the magnificent climax of a tremendous amount of speechmaking, and on a subject which it would seem almost impossible to make interesting and popular.

THE COST OF IT.

The Oneonta Critic says: "To say nothing of the millions of dollars spent in campaigning, the cost of Presidential elections is enormous. Election expenses are not the same in any two States, nor in any two cities in the same State. This is due, first, to difference in population; and second, to the cost of rent and service, which is greater in larger cities. For instance, the election in New York State will cost about $1 per vote, in New Jersey 75 cents, in New York city $1.34 per vote cast, in Brooklyn $1.19, in Buffalo $1.21, and in Albany 89 cents; while in the majority of cities and towns it will cost less than 75 cents per vote. In Illinois the election will cost about 40 cents per vote, and in Chicago a little more than 50 cents. To obtain an exact average cost per vote throughout the country would require much difficult inquiry and calculation, but it will not be far from 45 cents, more or less."

"In round numbers there will be 13,000,000 votes cast at this election. At a cost of 45 cents each, the people will pay $5,850,000 for the privilege of voting, which sum is a very conservative estimate."

The exact amount spent by the various campaigns, the committees can never be known, but it runs into the millions, and when one considers the multitudinous local, county, State, congressional, national, etc., committees of all the different parties and the divers leagues, clubs and other organizations, the expenditures must be at least four or five times what the mere casting and
counting of the vote actually costs the Government. It is probable the cost of this colossal national referendum is not short of twenty-five millions.

CRUDE AND AWKWARD.

Yet it has been a very crude, awkward and imperfect referendum. It is worth all it cost, but by proper arrangement this expenditure might be a hundred-fold more educational. Already the most diverse and opposing lessons are being drawn from it. The American Federationist most clearly expresses this:

"At no time in the history of our country has a clearer object lesson been presented in favor of direct legislation by the Initiative and Referendum than during the present political campaign. There are innumerable advocates of the free coinage of silver, and, at the same time, protectionists, while there are also innumerable advocates of the free coinage of silver and free trade. The same holds true of the advocates of the gold standard. There is no opportunity for the citizens to declare for either the one or other principle direct without coming in conflict with their own convictions, their own conscience. For instance, there can be no question that if the income tax proposition were referred to the people that it would be adopted by an overwhelming vote. The same may be true of other propositions, yet since our people are required to vote for candidates representing a platform of principles, they are supposed to endorse or reject all the principles of the platform for which one or the other candidate stands. It is an incongruous tangle, and one which should lead to the adoption of direct legislation at an early day, thus giving the people an opportunity to vote direct upon each proposition separately. We shall then have a true consensus of the judgment of the people, insuring the greatest good to the greatest number."

Our present system is like the old undershot waterwheel, which utilizes 5 per cent of the power. Direct legislation would be the improved turbine, utilizing 95 per cent.

AN UNHEALTHY EXCITEMENT.

The excitement has been so intense that business has suffered. N. O. Nelson, a prominent St. Louis business man, says: "Business in the West has been reduced to about one-half its usual volume." The same is true in New York or less degree, all over the country. This interest is unhealthy, and it is because we crowd what should be extended over four years into four months. Between campaigns there is a period of reaction, lassitude and indifference. This is an unwholesome stimulation. The Vineland (N. J.) Independent tersely gives the reason: "The American people, under our Constitution, are disfranchised for four years. Nearly seventy millions of people are at the tender mercy of one man."

If the people could at any time veto any law that they did not want or secure the passage of a law they did want, this political interest, instead of being crowded into a few months, would be with us all the time in a wholesome and vivifying degree. It is the difference between a short deluge, followed by a long drought and repeated refreshing showers.

Reformers deplore these long periods of lassitude and indifference. Under present conditions they are wise and necessary. Between times interest cannot fructify into effective action till the lonely day of our enfranchisement comes around. It is forced to live on itself, and soon becomes sour or dies out, and then the capability of becoming interested is atrophied. Discontent, which cannot find a remedy, becomes pessimistic or violent. Either is bad, and both are the results, not of our quadrennial referendum, but of the crude and awkward manner in which they are done.

THE RESULTS.

Bryan's prompt acquiescence has already been given. Chairman Hanna said: "The result demonstrates that the American people are now, and they always have been, able to discriminate between right and wrong."

Senator Palmer, candidate of the Gold Democrats, said: "I adhere to my maxim that the American people can always be trusted, and that the rights of the people are safe with the people."

A few characteristic opinions from each side will be given. These are only a few from many.

REPUBLICAN OPINIONS.

The Boston Journal says: "The American people can be trusted. That is the first and most eloquent lesson of the great Republican victory. Whatever else this triumph may be, it is most conspicuously of all a confirmation of Abraham Lincoln's strong belief in the good sense of his plain, average fellow-countrymen."

The New York Mail and Express says: "To all the governments of the earth the word goes forth that the American people are true to themselves, faithful to the traditions of their fathers, and fit to stand with those who lead the majestic cause of civilization, morality and progress."

The Newark (N. J.) Daily Advertiser says: "The republic is safe. The people have justified the faith that has been reposed in them. They have responded to the test of their fitness to determine the most intricate questions of government, and their ability to protect their institutions against the most audacious, as well as most insidious, assaults, with a degree of unanimity that cannot fail to make the lesson instructive for all time. Whatever may have been the history of other republics, this Union of States, one and indivisible, need fear no foe from within."

Franklin Murphy, Chairman of the Republican State Committee of New Jersey, said: "I regard the victory—of which I have had at no time the slightest doubt—as due to the honesty and patriotism of the American people."

The Rochester (N. Y.) Post-Express said:
"The election of McKinley attests the capacity of us Americans for self-government. It admonishes us and teaches the powers beyond the sea that this republic is never to be despaired of."

The Philadelphia Inquirer said: "Now let us have peace; the people have spoken."

The Philadelphia North American said: "No cause of the nation has proven sound and true."

The Cleveland (O.) Leader said: "Popular government stands before the world stronger, higher, safer than ever before."

The Cincinnati (O.) Commercial-Tribune said: "We are all American citizens, alike bowing, whatever our personal beliefs, to that supreme law of the popular will."

The Topeka (Kans.) Capital said: "A greater demonstration of the people's capacity for self-government has never been made."

GOLD DEMOCRATIC.

The New York World, on July 11th and again after the election, said: "The World now believes in the abiding good sense and the active conscience of the American people."

The San Antonio (Texas) Daily Express said: "The interests of the whole people are safe in the hands of the majority."

The Washington (D. C.) Post said: "The vote which elected Mr. McKinley was the 'silent vote.' It was the vote of the thinkers, the quiet, patient, workers, the yeomanry, the bone and sinew of the land—the vote of sturdy men who wanted nothing of parties or politicians, who answered the promptings of their own consciences without external aid, who thought of their country first and of themselves afterward."

Postmaster-General William L. Wilson said: "We have just had a test of the capacity of universal suffrage to deal with a question so confessedly difficult that in other countries was committed to the trained experts and especially statesmen. That test has been made under conditions least favorable to a safe and correct judgment. That such a fight could move forward through all the stages of a Presidential campaign without a panic and without a cessation of ordinary business enterprise has been a marvel to other nations. That the result has been a triumph for national integrity is a cause for thanksgiving; that the result has been achieved by a partial and temporary dissolution of party ties and the hearty concert of forces, irreconcilably antagonistic on other policies, is a ground for quickening patriotism and lofty pride in American citizenship."

SILVER REPUBLICAN.

The Denver (Col.) Republican said: "If McKinley fails to solve the coinage problem in the near future, nothing can prevent the success of that movement in 1906, and so we feel justified in commending with utmost confidence that the battle is already virtually won."

The Denver (Col.) Times said: "Let the bimetallist take hope and be of good cheer, because never before have the people been so thoroughly aroused in any case, except the cause of slavery, as they have been in the campaign just closed."

The Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune said: "The verdict of history will be that in the campaign of 1896 the intelligence of the American people was not sufficient to meet and roll back the corrupt power and influence of money and that the people were beguiled into a course which gave to the money power the absolute control of this country, and that this was a great measure due to a bought or mortgaged press."

DEMOCRATIC.

William P. St. John, Treasurer of the National Democratic Committee, said: "The people have declared themselves unmistakably. I therefore cordially acquiesce. The next four years ought amply to test the single gold standard in the United States. I am confident that the party in power will be quick to abandon it upon sufficient proof that it is a failure. The agitation must have been sufficient to promise this. I shall try to expect, and certainly will welcome, the restoration of the prosperity which our boasted prosperity promised us with their victory. In my opinion the silverites in the Senate ought no longer to stand in the way of legislation by the majority."

The New York Journal said: "The people have chosen Major McKinley instead of Mr. Bryan to be President. Nobody has a right to object to the people's will, sovereign. It is the high privilege of the citizens of this republic to decide for themselves what is good for them, and when they happen to be wrong they always have the good sense to suffer the consequences with patience, knowing that at the ballot-box they can set things straight again."

The Journal regrets the decision of the people. Four years, however, constitute an insignificant space in the life of a nation. Let us hope that the confidence and prosperity will be forthcoming. The Journal has no inclination to quarrel with the jury of the people because of their verdict. If they had condemned the Democratic proposal to remonetize silver, it is because they have not been sure of its expediency and have been made doubtful of its morality. Further time is needed to convince them that it is both expedient and right."

The Philadelphia Item said: "For four years at least the financial standard of this country is fixed. Give the people a chance; remember that it will be four years before a financial change can be made. Let us, in the meantime, adapt ourselves to the situation and try to improve it."

The Chicago Evening Dispatch said: "Wait. It is only four years. The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly well. To dispute the will of the majority is revolution, and the Dispatch believes in the perpetuity of the nation, and concedes that what a majority of the people want all of the people can stand. Our faith is pinned to American citizenship. The voice of the people is the voice of God. If we insist on being in error, who is in error is in error, not in these times. We believe that it will yet awaken to the true interest of the nation, and that in a few years right will prevail."

The Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Leader said: "The will of the people is supreme. Let all cheerfully bow to it and hope that the best that could have been done has been accomplished."
The Indianapolis (Ind.) Sentinel said: "The result will come as a great disappointment to thousands, but the fundamental principle of our Government is acquiescence in the will of the majority, and, therefore, all good citizens will reconcile themselves to making the best of what they may possibly consider a bad matter."

The Kansas City (Mo.) Times said: "After this quiet triumph of the mind over the passions, we can look forward with confidence to the future of our common country."

The Salt Lake (Utah) Herald said: "The American people, as a people, cannot be purchased, though they may be deceived. Those who advocate free silver will accept the verdict of the American people as that of the sovereign power of this country."

The Wheeling (W. Va.) Register said: "But we have faith in the American people, in their common sense, and in their rugged honesty. Four years is not long, and Mr. Bryan is young."

The Houston (Tex.) Post said: "The voice of the nation has decided against the Democracy and in favor of the Republicanism, and nothing remains, of course, but to bow as gracefully as possible to the will of the majority."

INDEPENDENT.

The Springfield (Mass.) Republican said: "The people are to be trusted. Over and over again they prove it, and over and over the politicians and the wise men forget the lesson. The great and subtle question submitted are felt in all their gravity, the people do their quiet thinking about them, the orators grow hot, the editors abuse each other, the politicians are on the verge of madness, the crisis approaches, it is here, it has gone, and the people have decided is the best way."

FOREIGN.

The Toronto (Can.) Globe said: "The American Republic has passed through a serious crisis and has come out triumphant."

The Montreal (Can.) Gazette said: "The power of a democracy to govern itself wisely was vindicated in a remarkable way in the late election in the United States."

POPULIST AND LABOR.

The Chicago Sentinel said: "The lessons to be drawn are numerous, but all point to the one fact that a more thorough education on vital principles, with active work by the rank and file, relegateing professional tricksters and place hunters to the rear, is the only hope of the party, and a party that stands true to principles is the only hope of the country."

The Kalamazoo (Mich.) Mirror said: "The election which took place last Tuesday resulted in the decision of the American people to continue the present gold standard. Parties are defeated, but principles of right are bound to be adopted in the end. The rule of the majority with due regard for the rights of the minority, is vitally important to the working-man. How best the will of the majority can be obtained is a question which must be decided at an early date. Under our present system of government there is no way of securing a direct registration of the views of the people upon the questions which come up for action. Party prejudices of the voter and the grouping of issues in party platforms frequently result in the failure or inability of the voter to register his real views. There is but one method of carrying out the real wishes of the people, and that is Direct Legislation."

The Crewe (Va.) Chronicle said: "The election is over, and, as the result has been the expression of a majority of the voters of the country, the people are bound to abide by the result."

The Journal of Labor (Nashville, Tenn.) said: "The fight is not ended. It has only begun. The cause of liberty and freedom can never die. Although discouraged by temporary defeat, we must take up the fight and keep it up until victory is ours. If the majority of the people can stand four more years of the gold standard and McKinleyism, why can we put up with it. We'll resign ourselves to the inevitable."

The Longshoremans, of Detroit, said: "It was a great surprise to all—even the gold men—for every reliable indication pointed to a silver victory. When a majority of the people have decided in favor of a policy, that must be carried out."

The Knights of Labor Journal (Washington, D. C.) said: "For twenty-seven years we have sought to bring these matters squarely before the voters, and in this campaign for the first time we achieved our desire. The slight setback will not be cause for lasting regret; the battle is still on and will be fought out with constitutional weapons until equity is established under a government of, for, and by the people, rather than what is now in reality a government of, for and by a money oligarchy."

SUMMARY.

Before the election there were some ominous sayings on the Republican side, such as that of Mr. Lauterbach, Chairman of the New York City Republican Committee: 'We may not abide by the decision if Bryan is elected.' But after the election the Republican and Gold Democratic papers were loud in their appreciation of the wisdom of the people. Among the defeated, where naturally objections would arise, I have not seen a single voice suggesting opposition or even obstruction. They all recognize it as a decision on a principle and, for the time being, as a final decision. They deplore it, feel that its effects will be bad, urge more education, so that the decision may be reversed four years hence, but they accept it. So whichever side you are on, you must recognize one good result from this colossal referendum, crude, awkward and imperfect as it is, and that is a deepening and strengthening of the sentiment that the will of the people is the final decision on the great principles, even the most abstruse and technical, which shall govern us. Should the signs of the times point to such a weakening of this sentiment that in time it might be overthrown, then the republic might be despised. But the reverse is true. Such a weakening would be far worse than a wrong decision."

WORK TO DO.

Legislatures assemble in almost every State and Territory this winter. A Direct Legisla-
tion constitutional amendment or bill should be introduced and pushed in every one of them. What if it does not pass, and even suppose there isn't any chance of its passing, an easier and better means of propaganda cannot be found. You bring it at once to the attention of the public: not that small section only, but the large interested in reforms, which also to at the public who has never heard, is indiff rent or even hostile because they think it a crank notion. Adherents must be won from that public. They can be won by such a propaganda. Notices can be gotten in papers who would not even look at an able article on Direct Legislation. By introducing and pushing a bill in the Legislature or an ordi
nance in a town council you make it news, which they must publish. You prove it to be a clear, definite, practical plan, which they cannot sneer at as utopian. Therefore, though there may not be a chance of passing, introduce and push a measure in your Legislature this session.

And then it may pass. Such a measure is pretty near sure to pass in two or three States this winter. It is a probability in four or five others, and a possibility in all. HOW TO SET TO WORK.

If there is a league in your State, of course, associate yourself to it. Then draw up your measure. If you need help in this, send for 

vol. II and vol. III ('95 and '96) of THE RECORD. They will cost you twenty-five cents each, and each issue contains one or more laws or constitutional amendments. Some of these can easily be adapted to the conditions in your State. The present issue contains the New Jersey Amendment, which many think the best one yet drafted.

There are four lines of attack on a Legislature. The first, simplest, and, in some cases the easiest, is the presentation of a constitutional amendment such as the New Jersey and Oregon ones in this issue. In most cases I think this the best course.

The second is to introduce a bill giving it in a modified form, or giving it to cities, such as the Iowa Ballot Reform law, mentioned elsewhere, a copy of which can be obtained from James H. Shoemaker, of Dubuque, Iowa, or the Massachusetts law, giving Direct Legislation to cities. The issue of THE RECORD containing this law is nearly out of print, but a copy of the law can doubtless be obtained from Hon. R. W. Irwin, Northampton, Mass.

The third is to alter the charter of a city or cities by legislative act, so as to give them Direct Legislation. [See the proposals for Wabash town of Kearny in the March, 1895, RECORD.]

The fourth way is to attach the Referendum to bills for entirely other purposes. This has been done in a great many instances, and is often easily successful and a valuable propaganda.

Having decided what you intend to do, get a member of each house to introduce and push the measure. Use great care in this, as much depends on the man who works the legislative end, but do not stop there. Back him up by having a force of favorable Legislation so that they'll be felt. Get boards of trade, municipal and civic leagues C. E. societies, clubs of all sorts, farmers' alliances, granges, K. of L. local and district assemblies, trades unions, etc., etc., to pass resolutions and memorials favoring it. Don't be content with sending one copy of these resolutions to the man who introduces the measure; have the secretary of the organization send a copy to each member of the legislature. Introduce and Circulate petitions for it. Then it would be well to send each week some tract, book or pamphlet on D. L. to each member of the Legislature. A subscription to THE RECORD for each member would be a good thing. I will furnish Sullivan's book for $7 per hundred. Henry E. Allen, of Berwick, Ill., will furnish his book for ten cents or less. F. J. Eddy, Summerland, Cal., will furnish his book at ten cents or less. The Arena Publishing Company, of Boston, Mass., issues an admirable pamphlet by W. D. McCracken, "The People or the Politicians? or R. L. Taft can be obtained from Charles H. Kerr & Co., of Chicago, for ten cents or less. Arrowsmith's pamphlet can be had from the Coming Nation, of Ruskin, Tenn., for five cents or less.

Then you can probably get for the asking a reason for the circulation of the circulars, "The Ballot Reform Club Issue," from James H. Shoemaker, Dubuque, Iowa; other circulars from S. H. Connings, St. Joseph, Mich.; the D. L. League of Michigan, G. R. Welkert, Secretary, 481 Clinton street, Detroit, Mich.; the First Nationalist Club, of Boston, Dr. M. W. Moran, President, 45 Chambers street, Boston; the I. and R. League of S. D., L. M. Kaercher, President, Millbank, S. D.; W. S. U'Ren, Milwaukee, Oregon. I will be glad to receive notices and copies of other circulars. Then, if you can afford it, pay a good man to spend two months at your State capital in lobbying. W. S. U'Ren, of Oregon, was employed in that manner by a combination of the Grange, Farmers' Alliance, K. of L. and State Federation of Labor in his State, and did very valuable work. If possible, introduce your bill in the first week of your session. It will be sent to a committee, but pull it out with some sort of a report, and then get a public hearing before the Legislature, at which your best speakers appear. Such a hearing will be noticed in all the papers, especially if it is skillfully advertised beforehand. A little money spent then will produce better results than in any other form. Get more than one hearing if you can. It will likely be sent to a committee again with the intention of smothering it. Politicians will be unwilling to openly oppose it. Your policy is to force the question right into the face of its enemies and half-hearted supporters, and let them know that you will use such a record. If a more ambitious campaign is practicable, you can launch out into bureaus for speakers and many meetings, press work, addresses, organizers, etc. Then a correspondence opened with speakers in other States, offering and asking for aid, will often be mutually helpful. To foster this I give a few extracts from recent letters:

M. J. Turrell, of Garnett, Kan., writes: "Our Senator and Representative are genuine friends of the movement. They always get some pointers from you to help them draft
a constitutional amendment. We are farmers, and you can help us."

Charles Hillabold, of Canton, Kan., is Secretary of a league and is working on same lines.

K. O. Walders, of Hamilton, Wash., writes: "The reform party has carried the whole State. I am taking steps to get a bill in favor of Direct Legislation, and request your kind assistance. I will publish the bill you may draft and send it out with petitions and will attend upon the Legislature and urge its passage."

J. H. Calderhead, of South Butte, Mont., writes: "There is a probability that we may be able to submit to the people a Direct Legislation amendment, and I write to secure from you anything that may have been prepared, The sentiment is very strong in Montana, and I think we will carry it through."

Hugh C. Clawson, of Boise, Idaho, writes: "Enclosed find thirty cents for some back numbers of THE RECORD. The Idaho Legislature will convene about New Year, and if an effort were made we might get something done for Direct Legislation."

C. N. F. of Milwaukee, Wis., writes: "As a favor, will you oblige me with a bill for Direct Legislation. I am one of the fortunate ones elected to the Legislature, and I want to present such a bill, and will promise to do all in my power to get such a work started, for I believe it should be done."

Richard S. Monk, of Wilmington, Del., writes: "Can you give me information about Direct Legislation to present to our constitutional delegate, as we are going to form a new constitution in this State."

In New Jersey, Rev. Adolph Roeder, of Vineland, Secretary of the Vineland society, and a Vice-President of the N. J. League, will assist President William A. Otter, of Flemington. In Pennsylvania, W. Morris Deisher, of Reading, will do what he can. In Ohio, E. M. Davis, of Cincinnati, and Ernest Hicks, of Hamilton, where an active society has just been organized, will work. In Massachusetts, Henry R. Legate, of Boston. In Nebraska, where the outlook is very good, Walter Breen, John O. Yeiser and John W. Logan, of Omaha. In Colorado, J. Warner Mills and Dr. Orlando King, of Denver, and Otto Thum, of Pueblo, are the most likely ones. In Utah, James Thompson, of Salt Lake City. In California, T. V. Cator and J. C. Gore, of San Francisco, and in Oregon, W. S. U'Ren, of Milwaukee or Portland. This list is only suggestive, and nowhere near complete.

OUTLOOK.

From what I gather, it now seems to me that the D. L. constitutional amendments will be passed, if the campaign is properly managed, in the legislatures of Nebraska, Montana, and Washington. There is a probability of such passage in Kansas, Colorado, Utah, Oregon, South Dakota and Michigan, though in those States circumstances might be such as to defeat the best of management. There is a very hopeful outlook for the passage of the Ballot Reform bill in Iowa. The chances may not be even, but there is a hopeful outlook in California, Idaho, Oklahoma, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Delaware and Massachusetts. There's a possibility in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Kentucky.

HOW TO DO IT.

BY CHAS. D. HILLABOLD,
Secretary D. L. League of Canton, Kansas.

We intend to have a separate organization in each legislative district in the State, and each is to look after the candidates in its own district. In this way the organization can be carried on with but little expense, and it will do more effective work than to have one organization for the whole State attending to all the business.

All that is necessary to start is to get one man from each party in the district who is in favor of Direct Legislation, and who will act as an officer, get the membership pledges printed and go to work. After you have a respectable number you will call a meeting and elect other officers or re-elect the old ones. In this way the first officers will be men who have the cause at heart and who will push it.

Note.—The model constitution and pledge recommended by the Executive Committee of the National D. L. League is largely modeled on the constitution which Mr. Hillabold helped to draft. The main difference is between recommending and making obligatory that the officers of the League shall be from different political parties.

In districts where there are only two parties, you will not need a Vice-President, and if there are more than three parties, you can have two or more Vice-Presidents. The idea is to have all parties represented among the officers.

When we find a man who is willing to sign a card, we take his signed card and give him some blanks with instructions to get as many of his neighbors to sign as he can, and to each that signs he gives blanks and tells them to do the likewise. In this way, every member becomes an organizer.

This League originated here, and within three weeks after the first cards were printed we had 150 members in this county, and there are two other counties already organized. We expect to have the next Legislature submit the question to the people, but we may fail, as we did not organize long enough before the session; but we'll push the League just the same, and when the next Legislature is elected, two years hence, we'll be sure to win.

I think this the most practical plan yet devised to push this question to the front. This is a reform which must be got in the States before we can hope to get it in national matters, and I think this sort of a League will work well in other States.

The following letters was sent to each of the candidates for State Senator and Representative of this county.

Hon. Royal Matthews and L. D. Caseler, candidates for State Senator, 30th Dist., Kansas; and Hon.'s C. A. Hamlin and E. P. Wil-
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Williams, candidates for Representative of 65th Dist., Kansas.

Dear Sir: Will you pledge yourselves, if elected, to support and vote for, and if requested, to introduce a bill or joint resolution in the coming Legislature for the submission of the question of Direct Legislation as an amendment to the State Constitution to a direct vote of the people?

This league has a membership of 225 voters in this district at this date, and we believe the membership will double before November 3d.

Our membership is composed of voters of all parties, and on your answer will depend the question whether you will share in the votes of the members of this organization or not.

Your answer will be published, together with the answers of the other candidates for Representative and State Senator.

Very Res'p'ly Yours,

(Rep.) H. F. Volte, President.

(Dem.) R. A. Lindenberg, Vice Pres.

(Pop.) Chas. D. Hillobold, Secretary.

To this letter Mr. Mathews replied:

"There are many things advocated in Direct Legislation which, if I understand aright, meets my approval. I believe the people to be the source of power, and that every measure of public importance should come from the people and be submitted to the people. I am not sufficiently informed, however, to subscribe to your articles of faith without further investigation, which I will gladly take pleasure in doing."

As this did not answer the question, but only gave a general approval, another letter containing the following paragraph was sent.

"We do not ask you to subscribe to our articles of faith, nor as a citizen to vote for Direct Legislation when it is submitted to the people, but, as we ask that you vote as a State Senator so as to give the people an opportunity to say whether they want Direct Legislation or not."

No answer has been received to this.

Mr. Cassier replied:

"Will say that I heartily endorse Direct Legislation, and, should I be elected as your servant, shall labor to accomplish your demand to the full extent of my ability. Shall labor and vote to that end."

Mr. Williams replied:

"This subject is new to me, this book being the only one I have read on the subject, but it seems practical at least on questions of great importance."

A second letter was sent to him containing the same paragraph as to Mr. Mathews, and no answer was received.

Mr. Hamlin replied:

"In answer to your questions, I reply that I will, I have investigated Direct Legislation, and I believe it to be one of the essential reforms necessary to a true democratic government. It is one of the tenets of the party with which I am identified. I have in my speeches and through the press advocated this principle before I became a candidate for office, therefore you will not accuse me of making this pledge for the sake of securing your vote."

The whole of these letters and the answers or lack of answer was printed in a circular and distributed among the members of the League and the public. We have made two of them come out of the woods, and the other two now wish they had.

Extract from letter written after the election.

I have every reason to believe that the members of the League stood by their pledge, but the situation was such that it was not possible for them to make themselves strongly felt. Before the election the Democrats and Republicans looked on the League as some sort of a Populist scheme, and when the Populist candidates pledged themselves and the Republicans would not, they were sure of it. But fortunately there was a speech made here a day or two before election, to which the Republicans came out in droves. It was an excellent speech, and the speaker showed up in good shape the corruption of all parties, and concluded by saying the only remedy was Direct Legislation, and gave an explanation of it. Since then the Republicans and Democrats have become interested and want to know more. We are supplying them with Sullivan's book, and I haven't found one but what, after finishing this book, was convinced that D. L. was needed more than any other reform.

If conditions are favorable, we will try to bring D. L. into the spring elections for our city government.

---

EXTRACTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE.

From W. E. H. Lecky, of London, member of Parliament, author of "Democracy and Liberty," etc.:

"I do not think the question in England has yet come within the range of practical politics. As in the present Parliament the government commands an overwhelming majority in both houses, there is little disposition for organic change, but Professor Dicey, you know only know, has been advocating the Referendum as the ultimate correction of many evils. If parties again become closely balanced, it is probable that the advocates of some such measure will become more numerous."

From David Black, editor of the Iron Moulders' Journal:

"Among workmen, in some cases intelligently, in others without knowing why, the Initiative and Referendum are gaining in favor."

From the editor of the United Mine Workers' Journal:

"We consider your little paper a valuable acquisition to the ranks of reform literature and wish you an abundance of success."

From Hon. John C. Bell, Congressman from Colorado:

"The entire Populist party in Colorado, with a press embracing sixty or seventy newspapers, headed by the Rocky Mountain News at Denver, are unanimous in favor of Continued on page 44.
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THE BALLOT IMPROVEMENT CLUB.

Last March an organization was started in Dubuque, Iowa, with the above title. Its aims and methods can best be stated by extracts from the circular it issues. That it is advocating a system of Direct Legislation through a change in the ballot is very evident. Below is a sample ballot followed by extracts which have a very familiar sound:

SAMPLE BALLOT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Congressman.</td>
<td>For Congressman.</td>
<td>For Congressman.</td>
<td>For Congressman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NATIONAL MEASURES.**

Do you favor the free coinage of silver and gold at present legal ratio? ......................................................... (Yes) (No)

Do you favor the retirement of greenbacks and substitution of national bank notes? ................................. (Yes) (No)

Do you favor a protective tariff? .................................................................................................................. (Yes) (No)

Do you favor a tariff for revenue only? ........................................................................................................ (Yes) (No)

**STATE MEASURES.**

(Each State has its own questions, which would be printed here.)

**LOCAL MEASURES.**

(Each County and City has its local questions, which could be printed here.)

The above sample ballot illustrates how measures would appear on the ballot below the party ticket.

"While it is necessary that any ballot should enable the voter to designate the party and the candidate he may prefer, it is quite as important that candidates and parties should know the voter's will. The present ballot meets the first requirement, but not the last. Let it be amended by printing thereon the National, State or local issues in such form that the voter can answer yes or no to each proposition. When this is done, Councils, Legislatures and Congresses will know the popular will and legislate accordingly, or failing to do so, their responsibility will be clear, and their constituents will expect an explanation.

Civilization means progress in government as well as in other things. As a result of rapidly changing conditions new issues arise which the few are first to recognize. The ballot is the proper and only true medium for giving expression to and recording the growth of public sentiment on every question of public policy.

The right of petition is quite as essential to progressive government as the right to vote. The petition should therefore be made a part of the ballot system to enable voters to initiate the consideration and discussion of such legislation as they desire. A reasonable number of qualified voters should be allowed to initiate such petitions and have them printed and distributed at public expense, the same as is done with the ballot.

Petition boxes should be provided at the polling places in which the voters may deposit such petitions as they favor; and when a certain percentage of the voters deposit petitions for a measure, it should be submitted to vote at the next election.

ARGUMENT.

A GOOD BUSINESS REASON.

1st. The amended ballot will secure the speediest consideration and settlement of public questions in accordance with the popular will; and radical changes of policy or delays disastrous to business will become less frequent.

THE SIMPLEST METHOD FOR SECURING POPULAR GOVERNMENT.

2d. Its adoption will secure government of, by and for the people. The petition provides the simplest and most effective medium for initiating measures, and the Referendum would be superfluous if voters could dictate their will previous to legislation.

EDUCATES THE VOTERS.

3d. The opportunity given the voter to independently and fearlessly express his views on questions of public policy must stimulate thought. Exercising a faculty is necessary to promote its growth and development.

MEN CAN VOTE THEIR CONVICTIONS WITHOUT LEAVING THEIR PARTY.

4th. Party platforms and policies are often
dictated largely by selfish and mercenary influences brought to bear upon politicians.

Voters who object must either endorse them, join a new party or stay at home. The amended ballot would remedy this by rendering abortive any attempt to dictate policies that the voters might repudiate in whole or in part; and the primary principle of popular government—that the will of the people should guide legislators—could no longer be ignored.

VOTERS IN ALL PARTIES CAN VOTE TOGETHER AS FAR AS THEY AGREE.

5th. Many voters in all parties agree on some things, and voters of the same party disagree on some. The present ballot affords no opportunity for registering this dissent, the existence of which emphasizes the necessity for the proposed amendments if a correct consensus of public opinion is desirable.

NOBODY DISFRANCHISED BY BAD NOMINATIONS.

6th. The amended ballot will allow a large and respectable class, who are often practically disfranchised by inability to endorse the platforms or candidates presented, to exercise the more valuable privilege of voting for measures which they approve.

A PREMIUM UPON INTELLIGENCE.

7th. Individual responsibility will be increased as the latitude for independent expression is enlarged. The more ignorant, careless or indifferent the voter, the more likely he is to ignore the printed questions and remain content with making a few crosses to designate his choice of candidates. The amendment would therefore register the conscience and convictions of the more intelligent element rather than the whims or prejudices of the other class.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS MADE INDEPENDENT OF PARTY.

8th. The amended ballot would elevate public questions above mere party lines.

The tendency to demagoguism and partisanship in treating them would be checked and the dignity of the suffrage preserved in legislatures would be increased accordingly.

RESPECT FOR LAWMAKERS INCREASED.

9th. Councils, legislatures and congresses, being instructed, would be relieved of all responsibility for the consequences from legislation that embolden the proper will. The odium and suspicion that often wrongfully attach to acts of the legislator must cease when he can justify his vote with the simple plea, "I obeyed the instructions of my constituents." The political atmosphere will be purified, confidence in lawmakers increased and dignity added to political life, which would encourage the brightest and noblest minds to enter public service, and breed statesmen rather than politicians.

NEW PARTIES NOT NECESSARY.

10th. The necessity for organizing new parties to secure reforms would be obliterated, because the full sentiment for any measure could be given expression at each election, and its growth recorded more perfectly than would be possible on party lines. Some existing party would endorse a policy whenever its strength reached the dignity of a popular demand, and long before a new party could rally half the sentiment that might exist in its favor.

CORRUPTION DISCOURAGED AND THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE MADE PARAMOUNT.

11th. The influence of lobbies and corruption funds in securing class legislation would be greatly diminished if not destroyed. The individual legislator who ignored the expressed wish of a majority of his constituents could not expect to escape the suspicion of corruption or the charge of treason which his conduct might invite, nor hope to outlive the ignominy that would attach to his reputation thereafter. Party caucuses would therefore be impotent to bind him to vote for measures that constitute a bond of self-preservation being the first law of nature, fealty to the people rather than to party would become the rule.

OBSERVATIONS.

The only objections that have been made to the proposed amendment are these:

1st. That people who cannot read, or are not posted, would not be able to exercise the additional privileges the amendment would afford.

In a land of free schools and cheap books, what valid excuse can be offered for ignorance, and why should the privileges of intelligent people be curtailed because others may be too indifferent to enjoy them? Those who are content will have none of their present privileges curtailed by the proposed amendment.

2d. The additional time and expense involved in counting the votes and announcing results have been urged against it.

The candidates can be completed and announced within the usual time, and the amendment matter summarized and announced later. The moral benefits that must accrue outweigh any pecuniary considerations, and the increased economy in public expenditures will no doubt more than offset the extra outlay for election expenses.

3d. Faith in popular government has been undermined of late until there exists a sentiment that the people are not to be trusted.

Those who object to the proposed ballot on that ground forget that if the people are not to be trusted a monarchy or a dictatorship is the logical remedy. It would be obvious to any one that if the people are not wise enough to know what they want they are not wise enough to choose representatives to tell them what they shall have. Until a stream can rise higher than its source, the average wisdom of legislatures cannot be expected to exceed that of the people by whom and from whom they are selected. The amendment proposed will invest the ballot with a potency it has never possessed and thoroughly test the ability of the people to govern themselves. Should it fail in its purpose, it may then be in order for a Caesar or a Napoleon to offer his services.
Wherever such a measure can be adopted, it will provide a simple and automatic medium for giving expression to the popular will. Its adoption will mark a legislative epoch in the evolutionary struggle of the human race for intelligent self-government."

A bill embodying this was introduced in the last Iowa Legislature, and received 44 votes in favor to 40 against, but lacked 9 votes of the constitutional majority. An end of the session will make the Legislature convene on Jan. 19th, 1897, for the purpose of enacting a new code, and the club expects to have the improved ballot idea wrought into it.

They are also hopeful of its passage in Kansas and Nebraska. Congressman D. B. Henderson is among its endorsers.

There is one thing to be said in favor of this measure. It takes the line of the least resistance. The word "reform" is carefully steered clear of, and the word "improvement" substituted. This is more pleasant to the conservative ear.

For further information, write the Secretary, Jas. H. Shoemaker, Dubuque, Iowa.

THREE NATIONAL VOTINGS IN SWITZERLAND.

L. Archillette, in the Labor Leader.

On Sunday, October 4, the Swiss people were called upon to express their opinion, by way of referendum, on two large principles. First and most important was that of the nationalization of railways; second, development of the military sentiment. A third matter, relative to cattle trade regulations, was also submitted.

For a month before the date of the verdict Conservatives and a large portion of the Radical party had rived with each other in superhuman efforts for the rejection of the railway measure, which confers on the State a certain financial control of the companies, and is generally recognized to be a step toward public ownership. To the last moment these people were consistent of succes, and referred to the doubtful cantons with perfect equanimity. Their continuous cry had been: "The law is Socialist. It is the commencement of Socialism!" Their articles and their speeches had been full of this fright-compelling word—Socialism. In seeking to raise unthinking prejudices, they had, therefore, advanced the contest to its broadest import—had raised the whole issue of collectivism! That being so, the result was splendid:

For the measure 381,993
Against the measure 177,671

Majority over anti-Socialists ... 49,551

As to whether they would make a move in the direction of "Prussianization," the Swiss people were still more emphatic. They had proved that they could agree to an affirmative policy; it was the turn for the opposite course; and their shout of "No!" preceded d from 301,130 votes of the former and 76,736 votes of their opponents. Majority 224,395. It should be added, besides the principle of stricter discipline, that of centralization was involved—the confederation being granted larger powers in war matters by the proposed law, but the opposition was concerned mainly with the former aspect.

The third referendum resulted in 203,109 for, 172,854 against.

These three projects had been previously passed by the Federal Assembly, and the singular reversal of the military scheme brings out the necessity for democratic revision of the decisions arrived at by legislative bodies.

Our 75,000 Swiss comrades are in a minority as pronounced Socialists, but they have realized that they already possess enormous influence in the progress of the country. The Grütli, of Lausanne, presages from the railway triumph a similar victory for the State bank. The organ of the railway servants is particularly pleased. The Grütlianner remarks on the unanimity with which the Socialist party worked, and especially praises the activity of the members in Geneva, Vaud and Neuchâtel cantons. The time congratulates the party on similar grounds. The Social Democrat of Berne, exalts Socialists to proceed with the work of nationalization. It is satisfactory to be able to add that the last counsel has been adopted, and a hundred thousand signatures demanding a referendum on the nationalization of railroads are in course of collection.

BOOK REVIEW.
By Mrs. Ella B. Carter.

So much has already been written, and well written, on the subject of Direct Legislation that one wonders as he peruses a new book discussing this vital political question, what he can say. Who comes after the king? "In Hell and the Way Out" is the strong title of a little book of some sixty pages, by Henry E. Allen, of Berwick, Ill. The title has been chosen, not because the author believes in a literal hell, but because there is no word which more fully signifies and typifies "blank and black despair." The argument throughout the book is forcible and impassioned. Mr. Allen sternly questions: "Why is it that the United States and hell are synonymous terms to millions of our people?" In answering his own question, he clearly and succinctly enumerates the evils of our present social system, and classifies the destructive agencies that are sapping the foundations of popular government, as follows:

1. Selfishness engendered by present conditions.
2. The money power.
3. Inefficiency of our representative system.

The Swiss method of Direct Legislation is carefully reviewed and explained in its divisions of the Initiative and the Referendum; the advantages of direct rule by the people are pointed out; reforms are enumerated that might be compassed by the measure, and objections are fairly met by counter arguments. A strong indictment on a good many counts is made against our present system of class legislation, and a notable point is made in the declaration: "I say but one hope—THE RULE OF THE PEOPLE."

A few quotations, perhaps, will best show the aim of the brochure, though these are
rather difficult to make, where so much is true and stimulating to thought."

"If there is one law supreme in all, it must be the law of capitalism as applied to-day."

"We have tried the expedient of political parties—and with what success? Let present conditions be the answer."

What shall we say of a representative system, which has so many years utterly failed to check legislation favorable to class interest and gold monopoly?"

"Will any one claim that wealth is paying a fair and just proportion of the taxes, or has ever done so? The decision on the income tax law ought to serve as proof of the utter ineffectiveness of our present legislative methods in the interest of the people."

"If the means of earning a living are being curtailed and gradually narrowed down, it must be evident we shall soon have an enormous and permanent army of unemployed—in fact, we have it now."

"Shall we vote to continue the present system? Why delay, when millions of our people are already discouraged, disheartened, hungry and wretched? Haven't we been in hell long enough?"

The book closes with these words of impassioned appeal: "I plead for simple justice—for what is best in intelligent American manhood. Self Rule is an inalienable right—is only justice. It cannot—it must not longer be denied."

"If there is one thing in the book to which, as a woman, I must take exception, it is the fling at the Comstock postal law, which is wrongly compared to 'Russian censorship.' The laws referred to may have been in some instances unintelligently enforced, but they are commendable laws made in the interest of social purity, and were desired and striven for by some of the women whose names are mentioned in the book in a list of noted people who advocate Direct Legislation. The effort to stop the dissemination of vile and obscene literature through the United States mails was made in the interest of pure homes, and all must admit that in the integrity of the family and the home lies the true basis of the State, the only sure foundation of our civilization."

With the exception I have made, the book is 'inscribed to the farmers and trade unionists of America,' is published by the Direct Legislation Publishing Company (Chicago), and is sold at the popular price of ten cents.

EXTRACTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE.
Continued from page 40.

Direct Legislation. The **New** almost weekly uses a part of its editorial columns in behalf of this beneficent doctrine. It is now considered a cardinal principle of the party—in fact, the very tools with which reform must be reached."

From Rev. J. L. Scudder, pastor of the Tabernacle, Jersey City, N. J.:

"I am red-hot on Direct Legislation, greatest of all comprehensive reforms."

THE N. D. L.

Since the last RECORD Messrs. Pomeroy and Arrowsmith, who were appointed a sub-committee by the Executive Committee of the N. D. L. L., have drafted and reported to the Executive Committee the following recommended constitution for local and State D. L. Leagues and by-laws for the maternal League. These have been affirmatively voted on by Messrs. Arrowsmith, Breen, Cotter, Davis, Pomeroy, Sherman and Ueland. Messrs. Dillon and Mills have not replied. Hence this is the action of the N. D. L. L.

The matter explains itself. But readers will note that these constitutions are not obligatory, but only recommended. They are intended to aid the formation of leagues. They are short and simple. But local and State leagues can make any changes they see fit, or can draft entirely new articles, as long as they are not inconsistent with the national constitution. Now get to work and organize local leagues.

CONSTITUTION FOR LOCAL DIRECT LEGISLATION LEAGUES.

**Recommended by the Executive Committee of the National Direct Legislation League.**

**CONSTITUTION of the Direct Legislation League of...**

**Adopted at...**

I. **Name.** The name of this organization shall be The Direct Legislation League of... State of... No... (Note, This number will be furnished by the Recording Secretary of the N. D. L. L.)

II. **Object.** The adoption of Direct Legislation through the Initiative and Referendum.

III. **Membership.** Any person may become a member by paying twenty-five cents and by subscribing to the following pledge:

Pledge. I pledge myself to seek and vote for such candidates for lawmakers (national, State and local) as will work to extend Direct Legislation in lawmaking methods. No... Date...

IV. **Dues.** The dues shall be five cents a month and the admittance fee twenty-five cents. There shall be no assessments.

V. **Officers.** There shall be a President, Secretary and Treasurer to be elected annually, and, as far as possible, these officers shall belong to different political parties. Any office in this League may be declared vacant at any time by a two-thirds vote of the membership and a new election held.

VI. **Propaganda.** Among other propaganda of the League, the Secretary shall write to all candidates for lawmakers to be voted for by members of this League, asking each whether he will strive to extend Direct Legislation in lawmaking methods, and the Secretary shall publish the results. Officers and members shall labor with local legislative candidates and elected officers to engraft the Initiative and Referendum upon State laws, municipal charters and local ordinances.

A special duty of the League is to organize similar leagues in neighboring places.
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VII. Amendment. This Constitution can be amended at any time by a majority vote of the membership providing at least a week's notice has been given of a purpose to amend.

VIII. Declaration. The League shall not take action on any other issue than Direct Legislation.

BY-LAWS OF NATIONAL D. L. LEAGUE
Relative to the Formation of Local and State Leagues.

1. Number of Members for Local Leagues. Any three or more persons can form a local league and obtain a charter and number by writing to the Corresponding Secretary and remitting fifty cents for the charter. Where there is a State league, local leagues may obtain a charter on the same terms through it. The Executive Committee urges that at least one member of each local league join the National League, so as to be in touch with it, and to get its publications and circulars.

2. Number of Local Leagues in a State League. Seven or more local leagues, by banding together, can form a state or territorial league and obtain a charter from the Corresponding Secretary, with at least seven or more applications for membership in the N. D. L. L. The amount thus received will be refunded in supplies at the following prices:

| Charter for State or Territorial Leagues | $2.00 |
| Charter for Local Society | $1.00 |
| Direct Legislation Record | .25 per year |
| J. W. Sullivan's Book on Direct Legislation | .10 |

Notices of other publications will be issued later.

CONSTITUTION FOR STATE OR TERRITORIAL DIRECT LEGISLATION LEAGUES.

Recommended by the Executive Committee of the National Direct Legislation League.

CONSTITUTION.

of the Direct Legislation League of...

... Adopted at... on...

I. Name. The name of this organization shall be the Direct Legislation League of...

II. Object. The adoption of Direct Legislation through the Initiative and Referendum.

III. Membership. Any person may become a member by paying twenty-five cents and subscribing to the following pledge:

Pledge. I pledge myself to seek and vote for such candidates for lawmakers (national, State or local) as will strive to extend Direct Legislation in lawmaking methods.

No.... Date.......

Any local league may become affiliated with the State League by applying and by paying dues per month for each regular member, and they can send to meetings of the State League as many delegates as the local league sees fit who shall be entitled to as many votes as the league has paid memberships to the State Treasurer for the preceding three months.

IV. Dues. The dues shall be five cents a month, and the admittance fee twenty-five cents for those not already members of local leagues. There shall be no assessments.

V. Officers. There shall be a President, Vice-Presidents, Secretary, Treasurer and Lecturer, to be elected annually, and a National Vice-President or Organizer, to be elected the same as the other officers, but subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the National Direct Legislation League. The President, the National Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer and Lecturer shall constitute an Executive Committee, with full power when the League is not in session.

Any office in this League may be declared vacant at any time by a two-thirds vote of the membership and a new election held.

VI. Direct Legislation. The President, the National Vice-President, any local league, or any three members can, at any time, direct the Secretary to send out for a vote on any question to the membership of the State League, and within two weeks after the Secretary has received such request, he shall mail to each isolated member, and to each affiliated society, a copy of the question and if a decision is requested, asking them to vote within thirty days, and if within thirty days a majority vote on this question, and a majority of those voting, vote in favor of it, the State Executive Committee shall announce it as the action of the State League, and the Secretary shall record it in his minutes. If, within the thirty days a majority does not vote on the question, or if a majority of those voting, vote against it, then the Executive Committee shall announce it as lost and the Secretary shall record it in the minutes.

VII. Propaganda. The obtaining of State laws and constitutional amendments and the attaching of the Referendum to State laws shall be given special prominence in the State League's propaganda.

Officers and members shall labor with local legislative candidates and elected officers to engraft the Initiative and Referendum upon State laws, municipal charters and local ordinances.

A special duty of the officers of this League is to organize local leagues.

VIII. Amendments. This constitution can be amended at any regular State meeting or by the method provided in Article VI.

IX. Declaration. The League shall not take action on any other issue than Direct Legislation.

BY-LAWS OF N. D. L. L. for the Actions of its Executive Committee.

(Note. By-laws 1 and 2 regulating State and local leagues have already been given.

3. Regulating actions of the Executive Committee. Any member of the Executive Committee of the N. D. L. L. can send any question requiring the action of the Executive Committee to the Corresponding Secretary, who, within two weeks after receiving it, shall send it to each member of the Committee for their vote, and if within twenty days a majority of the Committee have voted on it by mail, and a majority of those voting have voted in favor of it, it shall become the action of the Committee.)
days a majority have not voted on it, or if a majority of those voting have voted against it, it shall not be the action of the Committee.

In either event, the result shall be announced by the Corresponding Secretary, attested by the President, and a record kept by the Recording Secretary.

Should the member requesting action desire to have an advisory vote before the final one is taken, the first sending out shall be announced as an advisory vote for suggestions, which shall be sent by the Corresponding Secretary to the original mover, who shall then re-draft the question and have it sent out for a final vote. Both advisory and final voting shall be under the same regulations as to time, etc., as where only one vote is had on a question.

4. Aid of State Vice-Presidents. When an advisory vote is taken, the question shall be sent to the State Vice-Presidents for their advice. The announcement of all final votes shall also be sent to the State Vice-Presidents for their information.

5. Publication. Unless action by the Executive Committee expressly says in it that it is to be secret, it shall be given to THE DIRECT LEGISLATION RECORD, and can be given to other papers for publication.

---

MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM.
THE LAW IN GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.
Translated by Miss Ella Levin, of New York.

Art. I. Laws or resolutions of the Grand Council are submitted to the approval of the people when the Referendum is demanded by 350 voters, or more, in the course of the thirty days following the publication of such laws or resolutions, within the limits herein specified.

Art. II. The Referendum cannot be used against the yearly expenses and receipts, taken in its entirety. Only the following special extensions of the law can be submitted to Referendum.

a. A new tax or the increase of the tax already imposed.

b. Or remission of taxes, or a loan under another form. The Grand Council indicates in the Budget the articles which are entitled to the thirty days delay.

Art. III. The Referendum cannot be exercised against laws or resolutions of exceptional urgency. The decision, as to urgency, is within the jurisdiction of the Grand Council.

Art. IV. In a case where the 350 signatures are obtained, the Council of State shall, within the maximum delay allowed, submit the law or resolution to the popular vote, and the refusal or acceptance of the law shall be decided by the majority of the votes. Votings on the law or resolutions submitted to the popular approval shall take place according to the mode prescribed by the constitution and the laws for constitutional votings.

Note by Philipp Jamin of Geneva:
A number of years after the introduction of this law the politicians tried to modify it, in order to make the Referendum illusive.

Referring to the project intended to hinder the free exercise of the Referendum, a prominent paper says: "The signatures, to be valid, must be given in a designated place for each commune. This place is the authority municipal, and attested by the Council of State. They cannot be taken at their homes, nor can the gendarmes in their official places."

"And the same men who pretend to have the greatest interest in the peace of the citizens in preventing signatures from being collected, do not feel restrained from making collections of signatures and inquiries at homes, and even at schools."

"How many persons are there who would dare refuse a signature to the collectors, for fear of revealing their condition? To keep their places at all price is the only care of the lower officials. Is it not plain?" etc., etc.

This article is called "A Quand les Gendarmes," and reflects the sentiments of the people who are opposed to the project of the politicians.

In July 1891, the Initiative was adopted in Geneva. Here is the law:

Art. I. The Initiative belongs to the voters and to the members of the Grand Council of State.

Art. II. Two thousand five hundred voters, or more, have the right to petition the Grand Council.

1st. To propose a law or resolution.

2d. To demand the elaboration of a law or resolution.

Art. III. The signatures of the voters should be given in the commune where they exercise the right to vote. The authenticity of the signatures is certified by the municipal authority under the control of the Council of State.

Art. IV. The Grand Council is obliged to enter into the matter and to come to a final decision on the object of the petition within six months after the reading of it, and in a public meeting. They can, first, adopt, amend or reject the project in the law or resolution directly presented; second, enact a law on the subject of the proposition.

In all these cases [every case] the decision of the Grand Council shall be submitted to the vote of the people within forty days; but whenever the proposition comes from the people in a complete and concise form, this project shall be submitted to the people with the decision of the Grand Council.

Art. V. The laws for other votings shall regulate all that concerns the execution of this present constitutional enactment.

THE OREGON AMENDMENTS.
The texts of the Oregon Direct Legislation Amendments printed below are interesting.
Both sections of the first gives the right of the Referendum, the second of the Initiative, the third relates to the filing of petitions, and it seems as if this might be consolidated with the preceding two sections.

On State matters, the numbers necessary to petition is 7¿, and in local matters 15¿. This is different from other amendments, but possibly wise.
The fourth section fixes six months as the time for filing petitions before a law goes into effect. Most of the other amendments fix six months, and the Michigan two months; but this is a wise variation. The lawmaker should legislate for the future, not the present. Then it says: "Except in cases of extraordinary emergency, which shall be stated in said act," This is a defect. Who is to decide what an "extraordinary emergency" is? The legislators or the courts? The "extraordinary emergency" ought to be defined. In most of the amendments it is "acts for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety," and it would be well these should pass by a two-thirds or three-quarters vote. Lawmaking is largely a matter of definitions, and the more clearly a thing can be defined the better it is; the less clearly, the more loopholes are there.

The fifth section provides that an election shall not be held oftener than once a year, and the sixth fixes the date of that election. This is unusual, as it is a detail which might well be left to legislative arrangement. It may be necessary some day to change it and vote every year. This is true of city and local matters, and their elections are bound by this section as worded.

The seventh section says that no one shall vote unless able to read and write. This is very unusual, and it seems unsafe to tangle up the Direct Legislation with an educational qualification for the franchise, which is an entirely separate and distinct question.

The amendment lacks any provision by which the Legislature could refer a bill to the people. This is necessary. It is not clear whether laws passed by the Legislature affecting only a part of the State, such as the dividing of one county into two or the annexing of a suburb to a city, would have to be referred to the voters of the whole State, or only to those affected. This ought to be made clearer. Most amendments have the provision that which been enacted by the people shall not be over voted on by the people. This is lacking.

The provisions for carrying the Initiative into effect are very poor. It does not state what is to be done with these initiating petitions. The Secretary of State may receive them, and not do anything more. He is not directed to do more. The amendment should state that these petitions go to the proper legislative body, if in session, and there take precedence of other measures, and if not passed by that body, that they go to a poll of the people.

This amendment is interesting, but defective in important parts.

The second amendment only pretends to give a legislative Referendum. It is good for that purpose, but was introduced to head off the full Direct Legislation. Both were introduced by the senator, and will come up again this winter.

THE OREGON D. L. AMENDMENTS.

Section 1. The right to approve, reject and repeal State laws, or proposed State laws and constitutional amendments, shall rest with a majority of the citizens of the State.

The right to approve or reject any act or proposed law or proposed laws and ordinances of any political subdivision of the State, such as county, city, town, district or precinct, shall rest with a majority of the citizens of such political subdivision. The method of such approval or rejection shall be as that known as the "Referendum."

Section 2. The right to propose laws and constitutional amendments for the State shall, in addition to being exercised by the members of the Legislative Assembly, rest with any number of voters of the State, equal to seven per cent of the votes cast at the last preceding general election before such proposal. The right to propose laws for any political subdivision of the State, such as county, city, town, district or precinct, shall, in addition to being exercised by members of its local legislative body, at present, rest with any number of its voters equal to seven per cent of the number of votes cast within its limits at the last preceding general election before such proposal. The method to be employed in so proposing measures shall be as that known as the "Initiative."

Section 3. The right to demand the referendum on any law of the State may be exercised by seven per cent of the voters of the State filing a petition with the Secretary of State designating the law and demanding its submission to a vote of the people. The right to demand the Referendum on any local law or ordinance of a political subdivision of the State as heretofore described may be exercised by fifteen per cent. of the voters of that political subdivision filing their petition with the Clerk of the county, city, town or district, as the case may be. The Initiative shall be exercised in like manner by filing the petition of like number of voters with the officer designated above to receive the demand for the Referendum. All demands for the Initiative and for the Referendum shall be filed with the Secretary of State at least six months before the general election at which they are to be submitted to the people.

Section 4. No act passed by the Legislative Assembly shall become a law in less time than six months after its passage, except in cases of extraordinary emergency, which shall be stated in said act; and if within six months after the passage of any act, a petition of seven per cent. of the legal voters of the State shall be filed with the Secretary of State asking for the repeal of such law or laws, the Secretary of State shall order an election for the rejection of such law or laws; and if at such election majority of the votes cast therefor shall be "Yes," such law or laws shall become void; and if less than a majority be "Yes," the same shall become a law.

Section 5. No approval or referendum, as provided for in this amendment, shall be ordered more than once during any year, at which times all bills shall be voted upon which may have been petitioned for as provided for in either the Initiative or Referendum.

Section 6. The election for acceptance or
rejection of all laws provided for in this amendment shall be held on the last Monday of the eighth month following the adjournment of the Legislative Assembly, at which time all bills which may have passed the Legislative Assembly and which may be petitioned for the repeal thereof, shall be voted upon as in this amendment provided; and if within six months after the adjournment of the Legislative Assembly no such petition for the repeal or passage of any law proposed or passed by the Legislative Assembly shall become laws, as provided for in the Constitution of Oregon.

Section 7. No one shall be qualified to vote at any election held for the purpose herein named who is not able to write and read the Constitution of the United States and the State of Oregon in the English language, and who is not a citizen of the United States, and who has not registered at least thirty days prior to such election, as may be provided by law.

Section 8. The Legislative Assembly or the people of the State of Oregon may have the power to provide by law for the carrying into effect the provisions of this amendment. Any part of the Constitution of this State or any law in conflict with this amendment is hereby repealed.

SECOND AMENDMENT.

That section 19, Article IV., be amended by adding thereto the following words: Provided, that a bill which has passed both houses and secures the approval of the Governor, or has by him been filed with the Secretary of State, shall, upon request of one-third of the members of either house who voted against such bill, such request and the names of such members having been entered upon the journal of either house, be submitted to a vote of the people at the next regular election in the manner provided by section 1, Article XVII., of the Constitution of Oregon, and unless such measure receive a majority of the entire vote cast at such election, the same shall not become a law.

THE NEW JERSEY AMENDMENT.

Proposed Amendments to Article IV. of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey, embodying the right of Direct Legislation by the People.

Amend article four by striking out paragraph one, section one, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

POWER TO ENACT.

1. The legislative power upon all measures for the government of the whole State shall be exercised by the Senate and General Assembly, and, in addition thereto, shall be vested in the electors of the State qualified to vote for members of the Senate and General Assembly. The legislative power upon all measures for the government of any municipal division of the State (such as county, city, town, township, borough, village, and so forth), shall be exercised by the legislative body thereof, and by the Senate and General Assembly, and, in addition thereto, shall be vested in the qualified electors thereof.

THE RIGHT TO REJECT.

2. The right to reject any measure, passed by the Senate and General Assembly, affecting the whole State, shall be vested in the electors of the State qualified to vote for members of the Senate and General Assembly; the right to reject any measure affecting less than the whole State, passed by the Senate and General Assembly, shall be vested in the qualified electors of such municipal division in so far as the measure shall affect such division; and the right to reject any measure passed by the legislative body of any municipal division of the State (such as county, city, town, township, borough, village, and so forth), shall be vested in the qualified electors thereof.

TO MAKE RIGHTS EFFECTIVE.

3. The Senate and General Assembly, at its first session after the adoption of this amendment, shall, and when necessary from time to time thereafter may, pass laws to carry the amendment into effect. Such laws may provide that measures for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety shall take effect without further act of the people, but must provide that no other measure shall go into effect until the expiration of a period fixed by the Legislature for filing petitions for a vote of the electors on any bill passed; and if such petition shall be filed, then not until a vote is had thereon. Should the law or laws to carry the provisions of this amendment into effect not be passed as hereinbefore required, or if passed be objected to by qualified electors, they, in number not less than five per centum of the votes cast at the last election for members of the General Assembly, may, within ninety days after the adjournment of any Legislature, sign and file with the Secretary of State a petition or petitions to enact a law or laws for such purpose, and the Secretary of State shall submit the law as passed by the Senate and General Assembly (if any), and such law or laws proposed by the petitioners, to the vote of the qualified electors, at the next general State election, for a choice thereof, and the law or laws in favor of which the largest number of votes shall then be cast shall be declared adopted.

TO LIMIT REPEAL.

4. Any measure enacted by a vote of the qualified electors shall not be repealed or altered without a vote of the electors on the proposed repeal or alteration.

DECLARATION.

5. Nothing in the constitution shall be taken or construed to limit the foregoing powers of legislation vested in the qualified electors, nor to require the presentation to or approval by the Governor or any other officer, of any law enacted by a vote of the electors, and all provisions therein in conflict herewith are hereby rescinded and annulled.

6. Amend paragraph five of section seven of article four of the constitution by adding thereto "except such laws as may be passed by vote of the electors, as provided in paragraph one of section one of this article, and such laws shall begin as follows: Be it enacted by the people of the State of New Jersey,"
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DIRECT LEGISLATION.

The most important question of the day. A measure of the highest personal interest to every citizen.

What Direct Legislation Is.

THE REFERENDUM. This is a constitutional provision designed to prevent the enactment of laws contrary to the interest of the majority of the people.

If any one thinks a law passed by the Legislature is bad, he can, under the Referendum, within a given time, sign his name to a petition asking that the law be referred to the people. He then circulates the petition among his fellow-citizens, and, if a certain number of the voters, say one-twelfth, affix their names, the question is sent to the polls at the next election, and the majority of voters decide it by an answer yes or no.

This principle is well known in Massachusetts. Almost every year questions about constitutional changes are referred to the people for decision. The liquor question is annually so referred. We have recently had a referendum of the question of female suffrage, for the purpose of discovering the real opinion of the people on that subject. In the New England town meeting the principle has for long been in full play. What is now required is to extend this principle to the laws of the states and cities.

The Referendum protects the citizens from bad laws which the Legislature wish to enact. But what is to be done if the people wish a law which the Legislature refuses to enact? This difficulty is met by

THE INITIATIVE. This is a constitutional provision enabling the citizens to originate laws which they desire.

If any one wants a new law, he gets it drafted, draws up a petition asking for the law, and circulates it among his fellow-citizens. If a certain number of the voters, say one-twelfth, affix their names to it, the petition is sent to the Legislature, who cannot alter the proposed law, but are obliged to send the question of its enactment to the polls at the next election. The citizens then vote yes or no as in the Referendum above described.

The Initiative is of equal use in forcing the repeal of bad laws. The principle of the Initiative is in full operation in the New England town meeting, where ten voters, or sometimes one voter, can bring up any subject for discussion and decision. What is now required is to extend the principle to the laws of the states and cities.
Representative Government.

The representative system of government established by the founders of this republic was a good thing in its day, and the only form possible at the time. Before the introduction of steam, electricity, and a well-developed post-office, it would have been impossible to convey information to the people as quickly and completely as Direct Legislation requires.

Nor was there an apparent need of Direct Legislation. The legislators had small motive for dishonesty because wealth was very evenly divided. They were generally the smartest men of their respective districts, and it was plausibly argued that a small body of smart men would make better laws than the multitude.

So long as the small body of smart men have no interests contrary to those of the people this may be true; but when their interests are different, history shows that they are apt to legislate for their own welfare, with slight regard to the welfare of their constituents.

The fathers of the republic never imagined that the time would come when, by the rapid growth of inventions, the country would become studded with corporations, wielding the greater part of the country's wealth, and hence able to buy up legislation to any extent, and run the government in their own interests in direct violation of the interests of the people.

To meet this new state of things has arisen the class of professional politicians, who consider their power so much private property to be sold for what it is worth. Our city governments are admitted to be the most corrupt in the world, and our legislatures are constantly suspected of taking bribes. That a law in the interest of the people should be killed in the senate, is taken as a matter of course.

To such a condition has our century of democratic government brought us, a condition which brings a blush to the cheeks of those who believe in government by the people, and a sneer to the lips of their opponents.

But as the sea after a storm finally comes to a level, so democratic government is destined in the end to supersede all others. Democracy begins with the first appearance of the human race in the savage tribe, and though often checked by temporary aggregations of power in the hands of individuals, constantly reasserts itself, growing stronger with every age. Let us have one more reform. Put the power completely back into the hands of the people, and we shall have an ideal republic seemingly not capable of further improvement.

How Direct Legislation Works.

In Switzerland Direct Legislation has been in use for twenty-five years, and shows itself to be what Jefferson said of the New England town meeting. "The wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government and its preservation."
The Legislation, instead of being a Sovereign Council, holding in its hands the fortunes and happiness of the people to be disposed of according to its will, is reduced to a mere advisory committee whose business it is to draw up and discuss such laws as they consider beneficial, but who have no right to enact them except when the silence of the people in not calling for the Referendum gives consent.

Knowing that the people will, if they choose, sit in judgment by means of the Referendum upon the laws they enact, and that if, through ignorance, a bad law is allowed to pass it will speedily be repealed by means of the Initiative, the Legislators naturally become the steady, honest servants of the people, discussing affairs with no other object than the people's good.

Corporations do not bribe them, for it would be useless. There is no "lobby." Rings and bosses are unknown. The profession of politics is as dignified as other professions.

During 17 years from 1891 to 1874 only 27 Federal laws out of 149 were challenged by the Referendum.

**Direct Legislation Tends To Destroy Party Lines.**

In this country each party has a long platform containing many issues. We have to support measures which we do not approve for the sake of other measures which we want. In Switzerland each issue is decided separately on its own merits.

**Direct Legislation Tends To Public Security.**

Each law is supported by a known majority of the people, and hence can always be enforced. In this country no one knows what laws have the approval of the majority. Under Direct Legislation violent reformers can do little mischief. They soon find out how many support them, and if they are in a minority, content themselves with quietly educating their opponents. Direct Legislation is thus both reformatory and conservative — reformatory of all that is bad, conservative of all that is good.

**Direct Legislation Increases the Dignity of every Citizen.**

The Swiss feel themselves truly a sovereign people; not like Americans, who, having elected their despots for a given term, sneak home, and submit, like the slaves that they are, to be robbed of their eye-teeth by the "representatives" supposed to be guarding their interests.

A Swiss who wants a new law can have it thoroughly discussed by the whole nation, by simply securing a fair minority in its favor. An American citizen who wants a new law can petition indeed, but the Legislature, even if the petition contains thousands of names, may attend to it or not, as they please. If they deign to put the bill in the hands of a committee, the committee, under the influence of corporations, may report unfavorably for years in the face of the plainest arguments, as in the case of the law allowing cities to manufacture their own gas. Then, even if the law is finally passed by the Legislature, it may be amended, so as to be almost useless to the people.
Direct Legislation Educates the People.

With the reality of power comes the feeling of responsibility. The nation becomes one great parliament. Each citizen who expects to vote on a new measure gives it his keenest attention, and thus grows in intellect, stability of character, and public spirit. In this country the difficulty, almost hopelessness, of carrying reform laws against the interests of the great corporations and the politicians tends to discourage the citizens from taking an active interest in public affairs, and keeps them in the mental state of children.

It is the glory of our people that they have established a stable democracy over a wide extent of territory, contrary to the expectations of the supporters of monarchy, who predicted its speedy downfall, seeing that democracies had formerly succeeded only in small states. It is the glory of the Swiss to have established the most perfect democracy on the face of the earth, resulting in the most honest administration of government ever known. Let us adopt the improvements shown in Switzerland to be so fruitful in good, and have in America a democracy not only great but pure.

Conclusion.

Such, then, is Direct Legislation. It will destroy political rings, bosses, bribery of legislators, and the oppression of the people by the great corporations. It is now attracting public attention all over the country. Attempts to introduce it are being made in various States. The Nationalist Club of Boston intends to present a huge petition to the Massachusetts Legislature asking for the reform.

It was by means of large petitions that the Nationalist Clubs finally carried the recent law enabling towns to manufacture their own gas and electricity. Direct Legislation can, after a struggle, be carried by the same means,—the only means, imperfect as it is, at present open to the people.

You are cordially and earnestly invited to co-operate. Send to the "Secretary of the Nationalist Club," 38 Pierce Building, Boston, asking for blank petitions. If every person who receives this notice will procure twenty-five names, we can present to the next Legislature a petition of a hundred thousand signatures.

Those who receive petitions are urged to get them filled at once. The speedy reception of numerous well-filled petitions will greatly encourage the workers who are giving their time without remuneration, and will enable them to procure funds for a more extensive circulation of petitions.

For further information see the Coming Nation, Tennessee City, Tenn., weekly paper, 50 cents a year. It has a page devoted to Direct Legislation. Also Direct Legislation Record, Newark, N. J., 25 cents a year. Copies of the present document for distribution, fifty for 25 cents.
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DEFINITIONS.

DIRECT LEGISLATION—Lawmaking by the voters.
THE INITIATIVE—The proposal of a law by a percentage of the voters, which must then go to the Referendum.
THE REFERENDUM—The vote at the polls of a law proposed through the Initiative, or on any law passed by a lawmaking body, whose reference is petitioned for by a percentage of the voters.

A SPECIAL ISSUE.

The regular issue should not have come out till March. This is a special number, issued expressly for the Address of the Direct Legislation League. Reform papers are asked to reprint this. Readers are urged to see that it is printed in as many papers as possible and given a wide circulation.

Papers Please Reprint.

ADDRESS BY THE
Executive Committee
of the
National Direct Legislation League.

To the Patriotic Leaders in all Parties, Reform Movements and the Press:

The election is over. Its waves of oratory and intense excitement have almost subsided. As Bryan says: "We have submitted the issues to the American people and their will is law." Whether you belong with the majority, who think the recent decision wise, or with the large minority, who feel that it is not wise, one thing is sure, the discussion and education have been of great value. The whole people have been to school for four months. The teaching has penetrated the remotest corners and stirred the most ignorant intellects. It has been worth all it cost and more. Yet the decision is imperfect, crude and awkward.

The American people have practically disfranchised themselves for four years. They have given to one man for that time the almost absolute power to stop any national legislation and great influence in initiating and shaping legislation. They have given to a small group of men, for at least two years, the absolute power of starting and consummating national legislation.

This system forces our political education into periods of short, intense and largely unhealthy political excitement followed by periods of reaction, lassitude and indifference. The interest which would be vivifying and wholesome if extended over four years is concentrated into four months. This is political gluttony.

It will be impossible to interest the people much in national matters for at least two and probably four years. They cannot apply that interest till the lonely day of their disfranchisement comes around again. It is worse than useless to arouse any interest which, from the conditions surrounding it, must live on itself and cannot fructify and become effective. The people at heart know this, and no matter how much reformers may deplore their indifference, such indifference, under present conditions, is both wise and necessary.

Yet political education must go on. If the casting of the ballot is not intelligent and honest, the republic is doomed. How can this political education go on where the people are indifferent? By taking advantage of the wise and wholesome division of our government into national and State and local. State and local elections come around oftener; the officers elected are closer to the people; they can be more easily influenced; they are more responsive; they are so numerous, and their powers are so limited, that it does not pay the interests that buy legislation to tamper much with them. An agitation for a State or local matter can be made effective now. Hence people will become interested in it, and that interest can be sustained and will be educational.

It will be a great deal better if that issue can be made to apply to the nation as well as to the State and locality. The regulation of the money of the country can only be attended to by Congress. It is a national issue. Interest cannot be aroused on it till that interest can be effective, which will be two and four years hence. The opening of a new street or arranging for sewers are local. Interest of course is focused on them, but the education will not be effective nationally. Direct Legislation can be applied with
great benefit either to the locality, the State, or the nation. When striving to apply it in a locality, you educate the people on a national issue.

It is not well to extend the bitter partisanship and rancor of our election campaigns a moment longer than it is necessary. A party which would grow must make its converts from members of the other parties. A strictly party organization active after the campaign is over lengthens partisanship and makes few converts.

Hence let us join in a non-partisan, or rather inter-partisan, organization for some object of common good where we can meet without bitterness and obtain an acquaintance-ship which will show us that all of the other parties are not either fools or knaves, and when the time for a national campaign comes around again each side will have an acquaintance-ship and knowledge of the others which will be valuable for getting votes for what is honestly right.

For these reasons and many more the Executive Committee and officers of the National Direct Legislation League urge the formation of local and State leagues and their persistent activity. These leagues take hold of a thing which can be applied at once in the city or town where you live which can likely be obtained in the legislature of your State which assembles this coming winter. You can arouse interest on it now, because that interest can be at once effective. Yet it is also a national issue of supreme importance. The education on it will be of great value. It is not a partisanship. Good citizens of all parties can be gathered together in these leagues. Get a league going in your own town or city. The time is very opportune now, as many legislatures are assembling, which can be influenced.

This is a people's issue. The National League cannot do the work for locations and States. If the good people of a locality or a State do not do the work themselves it will not be done. The National League will not attempt it. Its province is mainly to act as a bureau of information, a center of acquaintance, an inspirer of local work, and to attend to the national legislation as far as possible. The Executive Committee have drafted a very simple form for a local constitution; they are preparing other papers of value. In the files of the DIRECT LEGISLATION RECORD are printed proposed laws and constitutional amendments, and much other news of the movement. These and any other information or help in our power can be had without any cost.

Lastly, we appeal to you for financial aid. There are no spoils, offices or money in advocating Direct Legislation. It is purely a labor of love. We do it because we believe in it. No officer of the League receives a cent of pay. We ought to have a paid Secretary. The DIRECT LEGISLATION RECORD, instead of being a source of revenue, is the reverse. The members of the N. D. L. L. pay no dues and are not subject to any assessments. The admittance fee is only one dollar. We need money for postage, printing, etc. We rely only on voluntary contributions, which can be sent to the Treasurer, J. V. L. Pierson, Glen Ridge, N. J.

January, 1897.

ELTWEED POMEROY, President, Newark, N. J.
J. W. ARROWSMITH, Corresponding Secretary, Orange, N. J.
WALTER BREEN, Omaha, Neb.
WM. A. COTTER, Flemington, N. J.
E. M. DAVIS, Cincinnati, O.
HENRY C. DILLON, Los Angeles, Cal.
J. WARNER MILLS, Denver, Col.
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L. A. UEHLAND, Edgeley, N. D.
Executive Committee N. D. L. L.

PAPERS PLEASE REPRINT.

A PERSONAL NOTE.

Two years ago I agreed with certain gentlemen to carry on THE RECORD till the end of 1896, doing the work for nothing, if they would subscribe a certain amount. Not all was subscribed that was necessary, and I've had to pay the balance out of my own pocket; but it has been carried on, and from the letters I get, I know it has been acceptably done and has greatly aided the movement. That time expired with 1896.

I had hoped that the N. J. League might assume the financial responsibility for THE RECORD, as it was hardly fair that I should both do the work and raise the money. At my suggestion a committee was appointed, but they did nothing save as individuals.

So last month I sent out between one and two hundred letters calling for sustaining subscribers who would pay $2 for each issue, or $8 a year, for four years. The replies have been very generous and encouraging. THE RECORD will be published for at least 1897, and probably till 1900, as an 8 page quarterly. I would like to make it a 16 page quarterly, but the funds are lacking. If you can support it for $2 an issue or more or less, write for pledge blanks.

ELTWEED POMEROY.

BY-LAW SIX OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE N. D. L. L.

Drafted by Member Henry C. Dillon and Adopted January, 1897.

DUTIES OF VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE N. D. L. L.

SEC. 1. The Vice-Presidents in the several States and Territories shall act as organizers of subordinate leagues.

SEC. 2. When three or more resident citizens of any State or Territory shall apply to the Vice-President thereof for a charter as a subordinate league, and shall accompany such application with the sum of fifty cents, it shall be the duty of such Vice-President, if he approves such application, to forward the same forthwith, with his approval endorsed thereon, together with the sum of fifty cents, to the Corresponding Secretary of the N. D. L. L.

SEC. 3. Upon receiving the charter for-
any subordinate league in this jurisdiction, the Vice-President shall countersign the same and forward it, with all supplies received, to the applicants thereof, and from the date of the countersigning such charter the applicants thereof shall be held to be a duly constituted subordinate league and entitled to all the rights and privileges of a subordinate league under the constitution and by-laws of the N. D. L. L.

SEC. 4. Whenever seven subordinate leagues shall have been duly chartered and organized in the State or Territory, and shall apply to the Vice-President thereof for a charter as a State league, and shall accompany such application with the sum of seven dollars for seven memberships in the N. D. L. L., it shall be the duty of the Vice-President to approve such application and forward the same to the Corresponding Secretary of the N. D. L. L. with the sum of three and a half dollars.

SEC. 5. Upon the receipt of a charter for a State league, the Vice-President shall notify all subordinate leagues in his jurisdiction to send delegates thereof of such subordinate league and one for every twenty-five members thereof to a convention to be held at such time and place as he shall insert in such notice, for the purpose of organizing a State league, electing officers thereof, adopting a constitution and by-laws, and for such other business as may properly come before the convention. At such convention the Vice-President shall be the organizing officer, and shall preside over the deliberations until the newly elected officers shall be installed, when he shall surrender his gavel to the President of the State League, and thereupon his duties as Vice-President of the N. D. L. L. shall cease after the State League has elected a national Vice-President and the Executive Committee of the N. D. L. L. has accepted the person selected as the national Vice-President for the State.

SEC. 6. Vice-Presidents shall receive as compensation for their services and travelling expenses in organizing State and subordinate leagues one-half of the membership fees in the National League which they may collect.

SEC. 7. State Vice-Presidents are subject to recall at any time by a majority vote of the Executive Committee, and while the Executive Committee will always gladly consider, and where possible accept, suggested names from State leagues, and while these officers are the connecting link between the National and the State organizations, yet these officers are officers of the N. D. L. L. first and are subject to its jurisdiction.

THE 1897 OREGON D. L. AMENDMENT.

The following amendment has been drafted to propose in the Legislature of Oregon assembling this winter, and it is thought to stand a good chance of passing.

RESOLVED, by the House (the Senate concurring), that the following Amendment to the Constitution of the State of Oregon be, and hereby is, proposed:

Section 1 of Article 4 of the Constitution of the State of Oregon shall be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

The legislative authority of the State shall be vested in the Legislative Assembly, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. The legislative authority of the State is also vested in the electors of Oregon by and may be exercised in the manner hereinafter provided. The style of every bill shall be, "Be it enacted by the People of the State of Oregon."

Two-fifths of the members of the Legislative Assembly shall have power, by their demand entered on the journals, to refer any act, or part of an act, to the electors of Oregon for approval or rejection at the next special or general election.

Eight thousand electors, which number shall include at least two hundred and fifty voters from each of ten counties of Oregon, shall have power to require that any act, or part of an act, passed by the Legislative Assembly, shall be referred to all the electors of the State at the next general or special election, by filing their demand in writing with the Secretary of State within ninety days from the end of the session of the Legislative Assembly which passed the act.

CITIZENS' INITIATIVE.

Fifteen thousand electors of Oregon, which number shall include at least two hundred and fifty electors from each of ten counties, shall have power to propose any law, amendment to a law, or amendment to the Constitution of the State of Oregon, and require that it be referred to all the electors for approval or rejection at the first general or special election occurring not less than four months after such demand in writing shall have been filed with the Secretary of State.

Every act, part of an act, or constitutional amendment which shall be referred to the electors shall take effect, if it is approved by a majority of those voting thereon, but not otherwise.

Until laws are enacted providing especially for carrying into effect the provisions of this amendment, the Secretary of State, all other officers and the electors shall be guided by the general legislation laws and the provisions of the acts heretofore passed referring constitutional amendments to the electors for approval or rejection.

COMMENT.

This is an admirable short statement. It is clear and concise. It gives certain definite rights. It is not comprehensive. From one point of view, this is a great advantage, as a comprehensive amendment must necessarily be more or less complex and difficult to understand on first reading. And yet with this amendment made a part of the Constitution, a comprehensive system of Direct Legislation in all things, can readily be secured step by step. This is the method of evolution and progress and likely the method by which Direct Legislation will be secured, although some of its advocates prefer a fuller form at first.

It is very evident that it was not written by a lawyer, and it is probably better for that reason. The trained lawyer is very apt, in
attempting to cover everything, to do two things—first, make it difficult to understand, and hence to pass; and second, in trying to cover everything, to make so many limitations that loopholes will be found by smart lawyers. These are defects in all our laws.

The one omission of importance is that local Direct Legislation is not provided for other than it can be obtained by another amendment passed under these provisions. Then laws which relate to only a portion of the State, such as the sea coast or to the large cities, have to be submitted to all the voters of the State. Most American drafts provide the same number of signatures for the Initiative as for the Referendum, but the variation here may be wise. Also most of them make it a percentage of the vote, but a fixed number has its advantages in definiteness. Also, it is uncertain whether the Legislature can pass laws which go into effect at once, or can only pass them to go into effect not before after adjourns. But the State constitution provides that no act shall take effect until ninety days after the end of the session, except in case of an emergency, which shall be expressed in the act. But altogether it is one of the best of the recently drafted amendments, and is specially valuable in popular circulation, because it is so short and clear.

A PROPOSED KANSAS LAW.

The State I. and R League of Kansas has called a conference at Topeka, Jan. 18th, "for the purpose of recommending and urging the coming Legislature to enact into law such appropriate Initiative and Referendum legislation as may be agreed upon by the conference." Its President, W. H. Bennington, of Topeka, has issued a circular with an explanation and a proposed law. A part of the first and the full text of the law are printed below.

"To obtain full Direct Legislation we must first change the law, which seldom can be had without years of agitation; but it is possible to accomplish much by simply adopting an amendment to our present Australian Ballot Law.

"Elections are held for the sole purpose of giving to the voter an opportunity to express his interference as an elector and candidate, which can differ on questions of policy and principles of government. This amendment gives to the voter an opportunity to express his wishes at the ballot box on certain questions of policy, principle or government. The object being to enable the representative to know the will of his constituents and to stimulate him in doing it.

"This we accomplish by printing on the ballot the issues in such form that the voter can answer "yes" or "no" to each proposition (substantially the same as in this State we now vote upon constitutional amendments or for or against a proposition to issue bonds). If the voters of any district, county or State should thus favor any proposition, even by a small majority no official would hazard his scalp by refusing to obey their will.

"We believe this simple amendment will do more to make the ballot effective and the will of the people supreme than any single act of legislation yet proposed, and this, too, without additional expense to the taxpayers."

AN ACT

AN ACT to amend the Australian Ballot Law, Ch. 78, Laws 1893, so as to provide for the submission to the people at each election for national, State district and county officers, any public measure or proposition of government for their approval or rejection, in the manner herein provided.

BE IT ENACTED, by the Legislature of the State of Kansas:

That Sec. 16, Chapter 78, Laws 1893, be amended by adding thereto, at the end of said section, the following:

Provided also that any public measure or proposition of government, may be submitted to the people by petition in the same manner as is provided by law for the nomination of candidates by petition.

Provided, that not more than one public measure or proposition of government can be formulated in the same question, which shall be expressed in not more than twenty words; that no nominating petition shall contain more than two propositions, and that not more than the three first filed national or State, or the two first filed local propositions shall be submitted at any one election. Provided further, that the Secretary of State, or other officer whose duty it may be, shall certify to the County Clerks of their respective counties all public measures or propositions in the order in which they are filed, and in case more than the limited number of public measures or propositions are filed, those not certified shall be held over and certified at the next regular or special election if any of the petitioners state they wish it in writing to the proper officers within the time for filing petitions for that election.

COMMENT.

This law is another evidence that ability to draw short, simple and sound laws is not confined to members of the Legislature. Direct Legislation will bring, yes, is bringing out this latent ability for the public benefit. While not pretending to be complete Direct Legislation, this law, if passed will be a great stride toward it. It attacks the problem in a practical manner, that the only way to oppose it is to smother it. It connects with the past, as all efficient legislation should, in that it uses the methods of nominating candidates for putting petitions onto the ballot. This is almost a stroke of genius. The provisions for preventing abuse of this privilege, that questions shall not contain more than twenty words, that nominating petitions cannot contain more than two propositions, and that no more than five questions can be submitted at one election, are rather drastic. The people of California recently voted on six constitutional amendments, and after voting only two, the first two provisions are good, but it seems as if in a Presidential election the people might vote on more than three national or State questions. This might wisely be increased to five or six and the same number of local questions. In this state, local issues should be encouraged. But altogether it is one of the best measures recently proposed.
A Non-Partisan Advocate of Pure Democracy.
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DEFINITIONS.

DIRECT LEGISLATION—Lawmaking by the voters.
THE INITIATIVE—The proposal of a law by a percentage of the voters, which must then go to the Referendum.

THE REFERENDUM—The vote at the polls of a law proposed through the Initiative, many or few laws passed by a lawmaking body, whose reference is petitioned for by a percentage of the voters.

LEGISLATIVE NEWS.

Though an ardent Republican, Congressman McEwan has been utterly unable to get the resolution asking for a committee of inquiry on the application of Direct Legislation to National Affairs out of committee. Speaker Reed refused to recognize him for any purpose connected with it.

Senator Marlon Butler introduced the same resolution in the Senate, and writes about it: "My resolution asking for a committee to investigate Direct Legislation was referred, under the rules of the Senate, to the Committee on Contingent Expenses. So far I have not been able to get that committee to make a report on it, and fear I will not be able to do so before the end of the short session. The chances are that the committee will be changed at the opening of the extra session, when I hope to get my resolution reported."

South Dakota was the first this year to pass a D. L. amendment through one House. Mr. Benson, of Brown county, introduced it in the House, where it passed on January 27th. It was championed by the Populists, who all voted for it, and also six Republicans and two Democrats. The amendment passed the Senate early in March by a party vote, the Populists voting for and the Republicans against the measure. It will be submitted to the people next fall for ratification. South Dakota is the first State to try Direct Legislation. The measure is short and rather crudely drawn. It applies to municipalities as well as to the State, and has the curious provision that "not more than five per cent. of the qualified electors of the State shall be required to invoke either the Initiative or Referendum."

In Montana, Governor Robert B. Smith started the ball rolling with the following allusion in his first message: "Montana was one of the pioneer States in adopting the reform method of voting and inaugurating the Australian ballot system of nominations and elections. So well has this policy worked in purifying the elections of the country and in protecting the defenseless from unlawful influence that it has been adopted in some form in almost every State in the union. The time is fast approaching when we shall see other methods in force which will result in more easily recording the wishes of a majority of our people upon the statute books of the country. I refer to the Initiative and Referendum and Proportional Representation, and if this Assembly shall see fit in its wisdom to submit to the voters of the State a constitutional amendment providing for legislation in limited and modified form by means of laws or rules of conduct recognized where the policy of the Initiative and Referendum is in force, such action would have my cordial support."

On January 5th Member M. J. Elliott introduced a D. L. amendment in the House, which, after a very active discussion, came to a vote on January 28th. The vote in favor was 21 Populists, 19 Democrats and one Silver Republican; total 41, and against, 21 Democrats and 6 Republicans; total 27. But as it asked the necessary two thirds majority, it was lost, and lost by Democratic votes. Yet this is probably for the best, as in order to get it to stand any show, Mr. Elliott had to state that "not less than 21 per cent." should be the number for petitions, and as this is entirely too large, the amendment, if passed, would have been ineffectual and rarely, if ever, used. Mr. Elliott writes: "It took the combined force of plutocracy among the Republicans and Democrats to defeat it, and it took them twenty-three days, as it held all other legislation in check until it was defeated." Mr. D. S. Hamilton writes: "The strength it developed in the House shows that we can be successful in two more years if we set about to organize now."

In Kansas, an amendment drafted by Senator Young and Chief Justice Butler passed the Senate by a vote of 20 to 20, after a spirited debate. It was championed by the Populists and Democrats, and opposed by the Republicans. It was passed by a party vote.

On March 10th the House voted on the amendment, 76 in favor to 42 against. All of the Populists voted for it and all but two of the Democrats, and all but two of the Republicans
voted against. As it lacked eight of the necessary two-thirds vote, it was defeated.

The measure has some very good points, but is faulty in two respects. It requires 15 per cent. for petitions, which is entirely too large, and there is no method in which the electorate can provide laws to carry it into effect if the Legislature fails.

In Washington, Hon. L. E. Roder introduced a D. L. amendment modeled very closely on the New Jersey one into the House, and it passed on February 16th, by a vote of 63 to 12; the latter consisted of ten Republicans and two Fusionists. Mr. Roder writes: "It will be exceedingly doubtful if I can get it through the Senate, but I propose to work incessantly, and will sacrifice almost anything to carry it."

In Oregon, where the outlook (though the Republicans had full control) was as bright because of the tactful management of Mr. W. S. U'Ren, everything has been postponed by the dead-lock over the election of U. S. Senator.

In California no amendment has been introduced, but Mr. Brainerd C. Brown writes: "In Alameda a movement is on foot, under our Referendum ordinance, by which the temperance people are seeking to have a referenda vote taken at our municipal election next March, on the exclusion of saloons in the several precincts of the city. The proposition is to have the Board of Trustees refuse to license saloons in such precincts as the majority of the voters shall at that election vote in favor of such refusal. You have heretofore published the information that Alameda has a license of $500 a year for saloons, which license is fixed by the Board of Trustees in accordance with a referenda vote taken on the subject nearly two years ago."

The situation in Arizona is very curious, and is shown by the following extract from a letter from Hon. John Q. White, member of the Senate, asking for draft of a law which has been sent to him: "The chance of passing: We believe it possible to pass a bill providing for Direct Legislation. As we are living under a territorial form of government, there will be no need of changing a constitution, as this act would not interfere with the provisions of the organic act. A simple act of this Legislature will make it a law."

Judge J. Warner Mills, of Denver, writes: "We have Direct Legislation before our Legislature this winter in several different forms, one of which is in extending the method of petitioning for candidates and petitioning also for questions to be voted on, which your last copy of THE RECORD seemed to give Kansas the credit of having first discovered and made the subject of a legislative bill. We also have direct legislative bills applying also to Denver, and one constitutional amendment."

A most admirable bill, giving Direct Legislation to cities, has been drafted and urged by Hon. John O. Yelser, member of the Nebraska Legislature, and he feels sure it will pass.

Hon. L. C. Tidball, of the Wyoming lower house, has introduced an amendment modeled on the New Jersey one, and thinks the chances are good. Senator Frank A. Homer has introduced one in the Indiana Legislature. Amendments or laws have been introduced with some chances of passing in Iowa, Wisconsin (by Senator French), Michigan and Idaho, and without much chances of passing in North Carolina, Delaware, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Maine, Ohio, Missouri, Minnesota and North Dakota.

It is a curious illustration of the tendency of the times that the settlement of the vexed Manitoba school question by M. Laurier, the Canadian Premier, and his Liberal associates, is along Direct Legislation lines.

Religious teaching is to be conducted in the public schools (1) if authorized by a resolution passed by a majority of school trustees, or (2) if a petition be presented to the Board of School Trustees, asking for religious teaching and signed by the parents or guardians of at least ten children attending the school in a rural district, or by the parents of guardians of at least twenty-five children attending school in a city, town or village.

The People's Party has a provision for the initiative and the Referendum in its own government, and National Chairman Butler, at the request of three members, has recently submitted to the members of its National Committee a question for their voting on by mail.

THE REFERENDUM IN USE.

The Outlook recently said: "While bills to establish the Referendum are meeting with defeat after defeat, the principle of the Referendum is quietly making headway. In a very literal sense, its kingdom is being established without observation. Almost unnoticed by the daily press, the principle of the Referendum was tried on a very comprehensive scale in many of the Western States at the recent elections."

And it need not have limited States by the word Western, as the following statements of voting on constitutional amendments show. While these voting are real Referendums, the interest in them was overshadowed by the crude and awkward Referendum on the silver question. Yet they are important applications. And never before has such a record been gathered. The newspapers hardly notice them, and the returns were often not compiled till long after the exact vote on presidential electors was known. But they show how deeply rooted is the principle and how quietly but surely it is extending. There are records here from the whole State, Georgia, where two or three constitutional amendments were voted on, is not included, as it has not yet come in. With this exception, the record of State voting is presumably complete. A very important voting was taken in the city of Duluth, and some
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others in December in the cities of Massachusetts, which will be given in the next Record, as accounts have been promised. Of course there are other local votings than these and accounts of them will be welcomed.

A careful reading of these accounts will convince any thoughtful person of five things:

1st. The people are insisting more and more that constitutions be extended more and more, so that they become codes of law on which the people decide.

2d. That almost without exception there is no bitter partisan feeling in voting on measures, and that the people vote on them irrespective of how they vote on men.

3d. That much greater discrimination is used than in voting on men.

4th. That while the vote is often smaller than that for presidential electors, yet it was the more intelligent and the fully posted who voted, thus making an extra-legal but automatic self-disfranchisement of the unfit.

5th. That the decisions seem generally to have been very wise.

Of course there are other lessons to be learned from these votings, but these are enough to prove the value of its actual use.

BY JAS. E. CAMPION.

In this State there were two amendments to the Constitution voted on last November, but they were really only divisions of the same question. The first was that the Governor and other officers of the commonwealth should hold office for two years, and the second was that the Legislators should do the same. These were passed by two Republican Legislatures, indorsed by the Republican convention, and condemned by the Democratic and Populist conventions.

The total vote for presidential electors was 401,568, of which McKinley got nearly 70 per cent. and Bryan a little over 26 per cent. One hundred and fifteen thousand five hundred and five votes were cast for the first amendment and 101,236 against, and 105,699 were cast for the second amendment and 156,211 against, or about 40 per cent. for and 60 per cent. against. This shows the independence of party ties when the vote is on measures, and it illustrates how ignorant the representatives are of the real opinion of their constituents. To reject a bad measure seemed of more importance to the average voter than the triumph of his party. In my opinion, it was a most wise and just decision.

Sixty-nine per cent. and 65 per cent. of those voting for electors also voted on the amendments, but they received a larger vote than minor candidates were often given, and probably only those interested voted.

The Boston Herald favored the amendments and said: "Biennials deserved a better fate." But the Globe said:

"The advocates of biennialism rested their hopes for success on one thing, and one thing only. They hoped for such an absorbing interest in the national contest that the average voter would ignore this important State issue, and that thus the proposed innovation would be carried through by default. These hopes were sadly disappointed. The political dilletantes, the lobbyists and the would-be legislators, who long for a chance to be 'approached' and gain profit thereby, have come to grief, one and all."

The rebuke given to the advocates of biennials is so decisive that they will not recover from it for years.

BY CLARENCE LADD-DAVIS.

The vote in the State of New York at the election of November, 1896, upon the Forestry Constitutional amendment, was 521,456 for and 710,505 against the same, while the vote for President was 1,423,876. In other words, of nearly one million and a half of voters only about 300,000 voters of those voting for President failed to vote upon an amendment which was little understood and which might be said to have not been discussed at all. It was shown that the argument raised against the Referendum, that the people would not vote in large numbers upon laws referred to them, is not founded upon fact. The percentage of the voters actually voting for President who did not also vote for the amendment is far less than that of the voters of the State qualified to do so who failed to vote at all. A large proportion of the nearly 300,000 voters who failed to vote upon this amendment, in my opinion, did so through forgetfulness, and the rest declined to vote for the reason that they knew nothing whatever of the subject, and were willing to leave it to those whom they believed had studied it. The large majority against the amendment shows another trait of the voters which is an argument for the further extension of the Referendum principle, and that is, the tendency of the voters when changes are to be made in the law of which they do not understand the import. This amendment was not discussed in the newspapers. One might say, at all, and the large majority of voters in the State heard of it for the first time when the ballots were handed to them election day. Not understanding the question, they believed it was safer to leave the law as it was than to make any changes whatever. This proves clearly two important facts: First, that the American voter, like his Swiss brother, is even more conservative than his legislators; and, second, that he is loath to have any changes made in the laws until he is himself firmly convinced of their usefulness and effect.

The following clipping from The Outlook explains the wisdom of the people's decision, and it was written and printed before the election.

"Some time before the assembling of the last Constitutional Convention it was discovered that the laws regulating the cutting of trees within the reservation were utterly ineffective, by reason of the lack of support in local public sentiment. In executing permits to cut the larger timber the most wanton destruction resulted, and a flagrant disregard
of the interest of the State was exhibited. After long and careful examination of the question by the late Constitutional Convention, a proviso was incorporated in the Constitution, at the instance of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, prohibiting altogether the cutting of timber on public lands. This, we believe, was the only proviso of the Constitution which received the unanimous vote of the Convention, and the ratification of the Constitution by the people seemed to place the reserve beyond reach of the lumberman's axe. But the enemies of trees were not to be so speedily outwitted, and at the last Legislature a constitutional amendment was proposed, which is to be voted upon on the 3d of November, virtually undoing the reform already accomplished, by permitting the leasing of five-acre plots."

The N. J. Journal says of it:

"The Legislature which convened after the adoption of the new Constitution first passed the proposed amendment. That Legislature was Republican in both its branches. The next Legislature, which was also Republican, ratified the action taken by its predecessor. The State Board of Fish, Forest and Game Commissioners, a Republican body, indorsed the amendment."

And the amendment was defeated by 400,000 majority, although the Republican electors had over 290,000 majority.

A LOCAL REFERENDUM, BY J. HEIDINGSFIELD.

Interested parties secured from the last Legislature an act enabling Middlesex county to issue Bonds for building a bridge across the Raritan to connect South Amboy and Perth Amboy, with the proviso that the question should first be submitted to the voters in Middlesex county. Accordingly, the ticket had at the back the question: "Are you in favor of the bridge, or are you not?" Naturally the parties interested, that is, the citizens of Perth and South Amboy, Woodbridge, etc., small towns in our part of the county who would have been the beneficiaries of the scheme, did some active canvassing in its favor, and probably would have won easily if Dr. Baldwin, in behalf of the City Club in New Brunswick, had not taken the matter in hand and worked up an adverse sentiment.

All he did was to send 10,000 handbills over the county as far as they would go showing the burden the taxpayers would have to bear in the building and maintenance of the bridge.

The vote was strictly non-partisan. While Perth Amboy went heavily Republican and South Amboy Democratic, both were almost unanimously for the bridge. The balance of the county, irrespective of their presidential vote, went heavily the other way. The bridge was defeated by something like 19,000 majority. The question is settled now for years.

In my opinion, the vote was given on its merits, pure and simple. Yet if it had not been for the disinterested vigilance of Dr. Baldwin, as president of the City Club, and the expenditure of a few dollars contributed by private parties, there was grave danger of the interested parties winning by the default and inactivity of the average voter. The wheelmen, however, made an active canvass for it and wanted it.

Last November the liquor license law which was submitted to the people received 86,089 votes in favor to 61,862 against, or a total of 147,950. The total vote for electors was 140,547, for Governor 141,801, for Secretary of State 137,318, for Chief Justice 144,539. All of the nine offices voted for received less votes than the liquor license. It was not a partisan measure, but one the people were much interested in.

BY MARTIN BRADEN.

The amendment to the constitution requiring six months' residence in Texas, county and State before voting was carried by a vote of 258,262 for and 51,648 against. Another amendment, providing that the State's surplus school fund shall be invested in farms, to be operated by the State, was overwhelmingly defeated, the vote being 101,121 for and 185,574 against.

We have within Texas quite a variety of Referendums—precinct, county and city. On a petition of the required number (think it is 15) citizens of any precinct petitioning the courts to order election in that precinct for local option, special school tax, the County must order the election. In cities and counties the Board of Aldermen and County Commissioners Court have power to order special elections for borrowing money straight or by bonds for public improvements of all kinds, exceeding in cities generally $10,000 to $50,000; counties, for bridges, jails, and court and school houses.

By E. J. TABOR, Editor of The Banner of Liberty of Minden, La.

The State elections in Louisiana are held in the Spring and the national election in November, and so there were no amendments submitted at the last election, but in April of 1896 we voted on twenty different amendments. Most of these were partisan, and rather indorsed by the State Democratic Convention, but the suffrage amendment, relating to a property qualification, met with such universal disfavor that all parties voted against it and the remaining ones were not voted on. The truth is, after the Democratic Convention indorsed them, they saw that favoring the suffrage amendment would defeat their State ticket, and a majority of their party's tickets, which created a panic among their candidates, and in their scramble for office they let their State Convention proceedings go to dwell with "His Satanic Majesty," forgetting principle or independence. The vote against the suffrage amendment was an overwhelming majority. Quite a
number of the amendments should have been sustained, but the majority, through fear of a trick, voted against the entire business.

The people have been satisfied and they are settled temporarily. I do not think there was a wise decision on some of them, but I do so far as the suffrage, the Governor's salary, Courts of Appeal, and those relating to enforcing elections and imposing local taxation are concerned. I think those relating to convicts, Confederate soldiers and one or two others, should have been passed on favorably. I think the press, in the main, agree with me.

Four amendments were voted on in Missouri. The first would have changed the Capitol from Jefferson to Sedalia, and was, as a correspondent, says, "Simply an attempt to boom Sedalia real estate." The second defined and enlarged the jurisdiction of the Courts of Appeal. The third reduced school age from six to five years in order to include the kindergarten system. And the last related to public improvements in cities of 30,000 or less.

They were not discussed in the press as all and were not party measures. They appeared in the middle of the ballot containing three square feet of surface and 280 names. They were all defeated, showing that when the people don't understand a subject they'll kill it. Yet those voting on the first amendment number 80 per cent of the presidential vote; on the second 59 per cent, on the third 62 per cent. and on the fourth 57 per cent; a good barometer of the popular interest in these questions. Yet the majority against was almost the same on all four; varying between 60 per cent. and 66 per cent. This is curious, as the total number voting varied from 380,000 on the fourth to 516,000 on the first.

A correspondent writes: "The Capitol moving was wrong. The reorganization of the courts approved by bench approved and I suppose would prove advantageous, and the vote against reducing the school age was in my opinion, decidedly wrong. It will probably come up again at the first opportunity. It obtained a large majority in St. Louis." The last one was so put on the ballot that the voter could not tell what it meant.

BY FRANK VALESH.

At the election last November nine constitutional measures were submitted to a vote of the people of Minnesota, some of them being of great importance. All of these propositions were adopted except the one for a constitutional convention which was not ratified because the present Constitution provides that constitutional conventions shall be held only "if a majority of all electors voting at said election shall have voted for them being upon laws and amendments" a majority of voters present and voting" suffices. The vote on the constitutional convention was, yes, 96,308; no, 70,688; total, 168,878 or a little less than half of the presidential vote of 343,319, and so this proposition failed of passage.

The eight propositions which passed are as follows:

First, a law to tax the unused lands of railroad corporations. At present the railroads pay a gross earnings tax in lieu of all other taxes. Some of them hold large tracts of land in the newer counties. The question was raised that this law would impose double taxation and hence be unconstitutional. So the Legislature let the people decide, and the proposition was overwhelmingly indorsed, the vote being, yes, 235,385; no, 29,530.

This is properly a law, and not a part of the Constitution, and shows how our Western Legislatures are already using the Referendum.

The second proposition is that the income derived from the internal improvement land fund shall be used for making public roads and bridges and for no other purpose. The vote stood, yes, 152,765; no, 25,991.

The third directs the Legislature to create a Board of Pardons. The vote was, yes, 130,304; no, 45,967.

The fourth declares in substance that only citizens of the United States who have been such for three months shall have the right to vote. This restricts the right of suffrage to actual citizens. Heretofore every male person above twenty-one years of age could vote at all elections provided he resided in this country one year. Now every foreign born voter must be in the United States five years before he can vote. The vote on this proposition was, yes, 97,880; no, 52,454. Thus a majority of the people voting voted to disfranchise a large number of themselves.

The fifth proposition provides that all incorporated cities and villages shall have the right to frame their own charters. A board of fifteen freeholders shall be selected under this act by the Judges of the District Court after four-sevenths of the voters decide for a new charter. This board of freeholders shall serve for life, and vacancies shall be filled as above. This is a limited home rule for cities. When the labor organizations of the State perceived the limitations regarding the selection of the charter-makers they made a slight protest, but the proposition was adopted nevertheless. The vote, yes, 107,060; no, 58,312.

The sixth proposition adopted was that no private property shall be taken [destroyed or damaged] for public use without compensation, the words in brackets were voted on. The vote stood, yes, 101,158; no, 56,592.

The seventh proposition permits the loaning of the school fund, which is very large, to public corporations within the State. Heretofore none of this fund could be invested in Minnesota. The vote was, yes, 127,151; no, 30,134.

The eighth proposition provides for the taxation of the property of sleeping car and express companies, which at present are not taxed. The vote stood: Yes, 163,694; no, 42,922.

The total vote cast in Minnesota was 313,319.
The vote for presidential electors was as follows:

Republican........................................ 193,503
Democrat-Populist.................................. 138,735
Prohibition.......................................... 4,348
National Democrat.................................. 3,222
Socialist-Labor...................................... 354

On looking over the total vote cast for each amendment, we find that on an average a little over 52 per cent. of those voting for electors voted on these amendments. But the popular discrimination was shown by the fact that 295,115 votes were cast for the first, or over 71 per cent. of the electoral vote, and only 150,454, or under 44 per cent. of the electoral vote, for the fourth. The popular discrimination was further shown by the fact that while all were carried by about three-fourths in favor of one-fourth against, the first received nearly 90 per cent. in favor; the second 84 per cent., and the last 80 per cent., while others received only 58 per cent., 64 per cent. and 65 per cent. This discrimination is far larger than for men.

I do not recall that party lines were drawn on any of these propositions. The Legislature, to a large extent, was Republican, and there was an evident disposition to give the Referendum principle the fullest possible test, without regard to the political aspects of the questions under consideration.

The fact that the vote on amendments is smaller than on candidates is due to the overshadowing interest of national issues.

The labor people are not wholly pleased with the city home rule law, because they fear that the plan of selecting the members of the board and the property qualifications will deprive them of representation.

The amendment restricting the suffrage to actual citizens will disfranchise temporarily a great many foreign voters, and some now assert that were this amendment fully understood it would have been defeated. But it was fully discussed in the papers and generally approved, and the thoughtful citizens believe that this is the wisest measure.

I am firmly of the opinion that the system of submitting laws and constitutional amendments to a vote of the people will only demonstrate its wisdom and practicability when elections for this purpose are held separately. At present amendments are voted upon at the general elections, when they are totally obscured by State and national issues and candidates. No one seems to have time to give them proper study in the midst of a heated political campaign, or to explain them properly to the voters. Let us have separate elections for this purpose by all means.

The disposition of all these propositions is permanent unless the U. S. Supreme Court should overrule some of them. Of this, however, there is not much likelihood, except, perhaps, in regard to the law to tax the unused lands of railroads, which is regarded by some as unconstitutional. But even if the Supreme Court should reverse this law, it would only open the way for a rearrangement of the entire system of taxing these corporations. That could only work to the benefit of the State. Under the present gross earnings system the railroads pay a three per cent. of their gross earnings to the State, while in some other States they pay as high as seven per cent.

On the whole, a general opinion prevails that these new laws are beneficial.

At the fall election in Minneapolis a proposition was submitted to raise $200,000 for the School Board and $400,000 for the extension of the municipal water works system, both of which were approved by the voters.

BY L. A. UELAND.

Several referendary votes have been taken in North Dakota since its admission as a State in 1889. At the same time that the Constitution was voted on there was submitted a separate paragraph for the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicants. This amendment was adopted by a vote of 18,552 to 17,393, making a total of 35,945 voting on this amendment to 33,549 on the balance of the Constitution and 38,063 on Congressman. At the general election in 1892 a constitutional amendment for increasing the debt limit from $200,000 to five mills on the dollar of the assessed value was submitted. It gave the Legislature power to double the State debt at once and further increase it as the wealth of the State increased. 3,948 votes were cast for it and 10,600 against, a total of 14,448 to 36,235 cast for Congressman.

In 1894 another amendment prohibiting the operation of lotteries within the State was voted on at the general election. 10,579 votes were cast for and 5,309 against, making a total of 15,888. At the same election the total vote for Congressman was 38,997.

At the recent election of 1896 the voters had another amendment referred to them. It received 8,472 votes for and 14,596 against, total 23,068, while the highest vote cast for any McKinley elector was 23,365, to 19,000 for any other.
Ever since its adoption there has been a constant agitation for its repeal, but so far all efforts to get a resubmission amendment through the Legislature has failed. A new constitutional convention would be expensive, its results uncertain to Prohibition as well as other questions; and so the people voted against calling one.

None of these were party measures, and no political party worked directly for or against any of them.

These amendments were published before election several weeks in most papers of this State. But with the exception of the Prohibition amendment, their merits were little discussed by either press or public speakers. Consequently, only the most painstaking and best posted were prepared to vote on them. The ignorant voter is controlled largely by tradition and habit in voting for men. To get a certain set of men elected the strongest determination is often shown by the most ignorant voters. They are the proper material out of which the most unreasonable partisan bodies are made. It brought face to face with a question of principle on which they are neither prejudiced nor posted, they are disposed to refrain from voting for fear of having their ballot cast against their own interest.

Not only did the real ignorant voters, of which class there are very few in this State, mostly abstain from voting on these amendments, but a large class as well who are intelligent enough in a general way, but who had failed to post themselves on the merits of the particular measure.

When, consequently, the measures received only half as many votes as the men, it was the most intelligent half. These voters were the best qualified, and in the main cast their ballots intelligently and consistently. The other half indirectly indorsed the representative system. They waived their right to vote on the questions of principle, but availed themselves of their right to choose men to represent them.

The reason for the Prohibition amendment receiving nearly as large a vote as the officers was that it had been fully discussed, and most voters had formed an opinion on it. As already indicated, this question is not settled yet. There is a general acquiescence in the result of the vote on the others by both press and people, and these questions are fully settled, if not permanently, at least for a long time.

There were four amendments voted on in South Dakota, and all received large majorities, but they were not properly printed or distributed, and were not the business of the Constitution, and so they have all been declared null by the courts.

South Dakota.

Nebraska.

Probably the most interesting constitutional Referendums were held in Nebraska last November. Three were submitted to the people which is double the number voted on in California and more than double that voted in any other State save Minnesota.

The provisions of these amendments show the growing distrust of legislative bodies. Five of the seven amendments on which the action of the Legislature by providing that it requires three-fifths, two-thirds or three-quarters of the elected members to pass certain laws. The eighth provides that not less than three-fourths of the members can create new executive officers and two-thirds majority can abolish an office. Two, the sixth and twelfth, require Referendums, the tenth on the merging of a smaller locality into a city, and there must be a majority in favor of it in both the city and the locality, and the twelfth requires a two-thirds vote for a municipality to donate money for internal improvements up to 10 per cent. of its assessed valuation, and for 5 per cent. more a three-fourths vote.

The eleventh prescribes secrecy of voting. Several of the others are mere detail matters. The sixth is the only radical departure from previous amendments. If it the Legislature may provide that in civil actions five-sixths of the jury may render a verdict, and the Legislature may authorize trial by a jury of a less number than twelve men in courts inferior to the District Court. Only two of the measures received either a larger total vote or a larger affirmative vote than this.

The two longest amendments received both the largest total and the largest affirmative vote; they related to the Supreme Court and the investments of the educational funds of the State. It is curious that these amendments should be referred to the people by a Legislature strongly Republican, that every one of them should be accepted by the people by an average vote of 60 per cent. in favor of 40 per cent. against, and yet at the same time the people elected a Legislature strongly Populist.

The vote on the amendments varied from 104,309 to 122,475 and the first one received the highest number of votes, yet the eighth received the lowest and the ninth the next highest, which shows that there was a discrimination in the votes cast, and that the total vote on each showed, approximately, the popular opinion of the importance of the measure.

The vote varied from 54 per cent. in favor to 70 per cent. in favor on the constitutional amendments, and yet in the voting for the eleven State officers and the presidential electors, the Populists elected one man by a plurality of nearly 50 per cent. of the vote and all the rest by majorities ranging from just over 50 per cent. to 53 per cent. That is, the range of discrimination on one man was only 4 per cent. from 49 per cent. to 53 per cent., while in the other it was 16 per cent., or four times as much, from 54 per cent. to 70 per cent. This clearly shows that when the people vote for measures there is greater judgment used by those voting than when they vote for men, and the conditions, as well as other influences, were very unfavorable to the measures.

More than one-half—to be exact an aver-
Most people were uncertain whether it was right or not. There had been a good deal of stealing, and they feared such steals were inclosed. I voted against the amendment, desiring that the Supreme Court pass on all the accounts; when it does I will vote for it. It had been cooked up in a secret committee room. The money power had some kind of bond "amendment" up three times out of four for the last eight years, and as our sly politicians have plied in the constitution that but on section may be amended at one election, they who desire to prevent government by the people have it all their own way. The bond scheme will probably be up next time, but not with my consent.

It was not a party question, though the Republicans rather favored and the Populists opposed it. The press were divided. But it was so complicated that not much attention was given to it.

The vote stood 25,327 in favor and 39,790 against, or a total of 65,117. It was thus defeated by over sixty per cent. In favor, less than forty per cent. But the vote for presidential electors was 159,272, so that about one out of three who voted for the electors voted on the amendment.

This shows three things: First, a majority of the people will not vote on a thing they do not understand and which has some arguments for and some against; second, those who do vote, will kill a thing they don’t understand where it looks as if there was some job in it; third, party lines were not followed in this voting. The division on electors was eighty-six per cent. Bryan, thirteen per cent. McKinley, one per cent. Prohibition, and on the amendment thirty-nine per cent. for and sixty-one per cent. against.

And the Pueblo Courier brings out a fourth point: The operation of the Referendum was nicely shown at the last election. Nearly all our State officers, including our representatives in the Legislature, favored the issuing of bonds to pay an accumulated debt. When the people—the constituents of those officers—got a whack at the proposition they defeated it. This shows conclusively that if the officers had had full power an authority to act an unnecessary burden would have been forced on the people against their will. We are sure that many so-called laws that are in operation to-day would not be in force at all if the people had a chance to disapprove them.

There is a general acquiescence and the matter is settled for a time; but money being involved, it will surely be brought up again, though this is the second rejection on practically the same subject.

By J. H. CALDERHEAD, of South Butte Montana.

1. The ostensible purpose of the proposed amendment voted on last Montana. November was to provide that all voters should have been citizens of the United States; the ninety days next preceding an election, the object being to put a stop to the wholesale naturalization
of foreign born residents which usually occurs just before election, and usually at the expense of the candidates for office. But the real purpose was thought to be a curtailment of the election franchise. This object was to be accomplished by the words "And upon all questions which may be submitted to a vote of the people.""

2. The Populists, suspicious of a sinister purpose, made an investigation, with the discovery as noted above. This proposed amendment was the action of the Republican Legislature of 1894, although it could hardly be said to be a party measure.

The opposition to its adoption came from the Populists, and the vote against it represents about the Populist vote of the State. The vote stood 3,350 for, 15,480 against. Only about one-third of the voters voting on the amendment.

The cause of such a light vote on the amendment was that the wording on the ballot was:

"For the Amendment to the Constitution,"

"Against the Amendment to the Constitution."

And it was placed at the bottom of the official ballot but under no party.

The attention of the voters was directed to the candidates; and owing to the great interest taken in the issue of the national campaign, the amendment was lost sight of.

The defeat of the amendment is generally satisfactory to the people of the State.

4. The papers took no part in the matter. They published everything I furnished them against it and made no comment.

This was scarcely a test of the value of the Referendum. We had a better test two years ago when we voted on the location of the Capitol. One of the largest corporations in the country attempted to secure its location, but failed after spending a vast sum of money, estimated at more than a million dollars, among the 48,000 voters of the State.

A determined effort will be made in the Legislature which meets January 4, to submit an D. L. amendment to the Constitution to the people, and if it passes the Legislature it is thought it will be adopted by the people when a practical test of its value can be made.

By J. W. HART, of Boise City.

The legislative acts embodying the amendments were published in full in State newspapers for the required number of days before the election, and the titles, of the acts were placed on the official ballot at the head of it, as follows:

1. Shall Section II. of Article VI. of the Constitution of the State of Idaho be so amended as to extend to women the equal right of suffrage.

2. Shall Section XVIII. of Article V. of the Constitution of the State of Idaho be so amended as to abolish the office of District Attorney and create the office of County Attorney.

3. Shall Section VI. of Article XVIII. of the Constitution of the State of Idaho be so amended as to separate the offices of Probate Judges and County Superintendents of Public Instruction.

The vote for the Equal Suffrage amendment was 1,000 for, and 17,090 against; the vote against it was 6,282. Total, 18,408.

The vote for the County Attorney amendment was 11,843, and the vote against it was 3,612. Total, 15,255.

The vote for the County Superintendent amendment was 11,147, and the vote against it was 3,932. Total, 15,089.

The vote for McKinley electors was 8,314, the vote for Bryan electors was 23,135, Prohibitionists, 172. Total, 29,621.

These amendments are not party measures. They were placed before the people by a nearly unanimous vote of the Legislature. The Equal Suffrage amendment was recommended in the party platforms of every State convention. The other two seem to have been regarded simply as desirable changes in the political machinery. The voting by the people does not show that party lines were drawn on any of the amendments, although there are reasons for believing that the Democrats were less favorable to the Equal Suffrage amendment that the Republicans.

You will observe from the above figures that the Equal Suffrage amendment polled the most votes, but that less than 18,500 electors voted on it, while presidential electors received in round numbers 30,000. This result is somewhat discouraging, as indicating a lack of interest in a constitutional change of the most profound importance. The issue was most thoroughly canvassed. The Equal Suffrage party received abundant assistance from the national organization, and held largely attended meetings throughout the State. It was generally believed, however, that the amendment would be defeated, and many may have thought it not worth while to vote on a foregone conclusion. Furthermore, the almost unprecedented interest in the presidential campaign no doubt tended to dwarf the Equal Suffrage question as a political issue. The other two amendments were not discussed during the campaign at all. I don't think I ever heard them referred to in any political conversation at which I have been present. They were completely overshadowed by the other issues.

There is no question as to the acquiescence of the people in the result, and there is no disposition whatever to reverse it in any quarter.

I think that the people acted wisely in deciding for Equal Suffrage, and such is certainly the enlightened opinion of our people generally. An erroneous impression has been created by the fact that the State Board of Canvassers declined to certify that the Equal Suffrage amendment had passed, on account of the somewhat ambiguous provision of the Constitution to the effect that a constitutional amendment must receive a majority of the qualified voters voting. They declined, however, not as being opposed to the measure, but because it was thought best
to have a ruling of our Supreme Court on this technicality. The Court promptly and unanimously held that the constitutional provision to refer to a majority of the electors voting on the amendment alone, and it had therefore passed.

In regard to the other two amendments, I think myself that they are of doubtful expediency, as they create more offices, and it seems to me that we have officeholders enough already for a poor and sparsely populated State. The decision of the people on these questions reflects the readiness with which Western commonwealths experiment with different patterns of political machinery.

We have an excellent and very salutary provision in our State Constitution to the effect that no political subdivision of the State shall incur any indebtedness or liability in any manner or for any purpose exceeding in any one year the income and revenue provided for that year without the assent of two-thirds of the qualified electors thereof voting at an election to be held for that purpose, nor unless before or at the time of incurring such indebtedness provisions shall be made for the collection of an annual tax sufficient to pay the interest on such indebtedness as it falls due, and also to constitute a sinking fund for the payment of the principal within twenty years from the time of contracting the indebtedness. Our Supreme Court has declared county warrants invalid which were issued in the face of this constitutional injunction.

It may interest you to know that there is a very similar provision in the new State Constitution of Utah.

By E. L. ROBINSON, of Buckley. Wash.

Washington.

Last Fall there was an amendment relative to the qualifications for electors voted on, and in my own home—Pierce county—two more Referendums on the question of ratifying and paying $6,236 and $6,936, which were debts illegally contracted by the county authorities for furnishing the Court House and current use.

These propositions were printed at the bottom of a ballot over two feet long, and with 102 names ahead of those referendary questions. Neither the amendment nor a synopsis of it were printed on the ballot, and to know what it was the voter was compelled to search in the official paper of his county, as the law provides no other means of informing him, and the papers said little editorially about it.

None of the questions submitted were considered party measures. Little was thought of them until election day, as the money issue was the engrossing subject of discussion, and the partisan workers sought to engender all possible hate and malice in the presidential contest.

The State law provides that an X at the top of the ticket, opposite a party name, votes for all the candidates of that party, and voters were urged by party bosses not to attempt to vote a split ticket. Thus the questions presented, being at the bottom of the ticket, were overlooked by all but the thoughtful and careful electors and those whose attention was directed to them by interested parties. This produced an unconscionable amount of mass ineffective, selection of voters. Those who voted on these questions were the careful, thoughtful and interested voters, and probably a wiser decision would be obtained from their vote than if every one had voted.

I reached the polls in our precinct about one hour after they were opened; seventy votes had then been polled, and it was generally conceded that they were all straight and not one on the Referendum questions. Some of our most intelligent citizens were surprised to hear of them.

In my own county the vote for presidential electors was 10,217, for Governor about 300 less, on the constitutional amendment 4,450, and on the ratification proposals, both of which were carried, 4,087 and 4,038. Thus, about forty-four per cent. and forty per cent. of the voting voters went to the bottom of the two feet of ballot and passed over a hundred names to these questions.

In the whole State 93,004 voters cast their ballots for presidential electors, and 40,002, or forty-four per cent., voted on the amendment. It was carried by 28,019 for to 11,983 against.

Our county debt ratification Referendums, in my opinion, furnish as severe a trial of the principle as will often occur. They had been submitted twice before, were submitted now in pursuance of a threat made by the County Commissioners that they would continue to submit the question until the people were disgusted enough to allow it to carry. Their resolution to submit was made after the excitement of the national campaign had become so intense as to assure them that little thought would be taken outside of party lines. These commissioners, all able politicians, have succeeded in getting their illegal acts ratified by twenty-seven per cent. of the 10,000 voters (2,742 voted in favor of the first and 2,640 for the second proposition). This is a dark picture for us who cherish the Referendum principle as a means of raising the political intelligence among the masses. Yes, but the true facts of the experiment will lead us to the investigation of the defects and arm us against their repetition. The early application of a principle is always accompanied by difficulties.

By JOSEPH ASBURY JOHNSON, of San Francisco.

There were six constitutional amendments voted on last November. The first exempted mortgages and deeds of trust from taxation, but was characterised by the Tulare County News: "No more unfair or unjust piece of legislation could be proposed than that which ex-
empts from taxation mortgages and deeds of trust, which comprises in Tulare county about one-fifth of the taxable property, under the present law, and which, if relieved from its just portion of the burdens of taxation, would increase the burden on all other property that amount, without lowering interest or being of any benefit whatever to any person except the special few in whose interest it is sought to legislate."

The second permitted the use of voting machines, "provided that secrecy in voting be preserved."

The third limited the liability of stockholders in a corporation to the shares only, and the same paper says of it: * "Amendment No. 3 is another piece of proposed legislation in the interest of the special few who are members of corporations organized to squeeze the fruits of labor out of those producing it; who find it more profitable to "bust" than continue the squeezing process."

The fourth and fifth simply provide for local self-government for San Francisco, which is now dependent on the State Legislature in many ways, but the fifth was very long and complicated.

The sixth was for woman's suffrage.

A title for each was printed on the ballot and places to mark yes or no. An analysis of the vote is very interesting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>181,105</td>
<td>38,295</td>
<td>219,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>181,052</td>
<td>38,247</td>
<td>219,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>185,565</td>
<td>33,258</td>
<td>218,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>185,467</td>
<td>33,148</td>
<td>218,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>185,333</td>
<td>33,083</td>
<td>218,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>185,299</td>
<td>33,033</td>
<td>218,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total vote cast for presidential electors was 290,466 or 87,521 more than for the average. Thus seventy per cent. of the electoral voters voted on the amendments. But the sixth amendment got eighty-five per cent. of all the voters, while the fourth and fifth got only sixty per cent. Thus the distance between the electoral vote and that on the sixth is much less than that between either the second, third, fourth or fifth and the sixth. Only seventy-one per cent. of the number voting on the sixth voted on the fourth and fifth. This clearly demonstrates that the people discriminated between what they were interested in and not interested in.

Another significant fact is that while all these amendments were passed by one Legislature, supposed to represent the people, the first was defeated by nearly one hundred thousand, and the second was carried by over forty-three thousand, and half of them were defeated.

Another fact is that the numbers for and against, save on the fourth and fifth, which are similar in nature, are not at all regular, showing that the voters voting did not follow party lines or the contrary of any leader, but voted as they saw fit. This means independence of political action.

None of these amendments were party measures except the sixth, in a limited sense, since all the parties, except the Democracy, endorsed the amendment in favor of woman suffrage.

It will be noted that the vote on the constitutional amendments was very much smaller than the vote for candidates, which is a marked evidence that only the more intelligent and thoughtful people took an interest in these important measures. And a further striking proof that it was the intelligent vote which was cast for these amendments is the fact that both the affirmative and negative vote was decidedly right, with the exception of the sixth, which was earnestly opposed by liquor dealers and the ignorant foreign vote.

There can be no doubt that the decision of the voters will stand unchallenged and will be universally accepted as final, with the exception of the suffrage question, which possibly may be resubmitted in two years, though I doubt very much that it will be.

By A. D. D'ANCONA, of San Francisco.

The vote on the charter on November 3d was as follows:

San Francisco, ty-four thousand eight hundred and twenty persons voted at the election, therefore 30,983 persons voting expressed no opinion on the charter, a large number of these overlooked the matter (I did myself), through its place on the ticket (it was printed at the head of the ticket) looked like a heading, and was, therefore, overlooked, but the greater number failed to vote from indifference, or from not knowing how to vote on the question. In my opinion the principal reasons for the defeat of the proposed charter were:

1st. The immense power centralized in the Mayor, who was given the appointment and removal of most of the officers in the city government. As this included the Civil Service Commissioners, who were to examine all applicants for deputyships in the various departments, it was claimed that the Mayor practically controlled the appointment of the 3,000 employees of the city.

2d. The fear in the minds of the Catholics that the charter was an anti-Catholic, an A. P. A. document. I think there was no foundation for this fear, but it caused thousands of votes against it.

There were numerous other minor objections, but the above were, I think, the main causes of the defeat of the charter.

AT THE ANTIPODES.

By MERRYN JAMES STEWART, of Athenree, N. Z.

At the election on December 4th last, the Government lost New Zealand. some few seats, but has an assured majority of four over opposition and independents together, and fully six of the latter are safe Government supporters. Hon. P. J. O'Regan, whose bill for the Referendum and an article from whose pen were printed in the June, 1896, RECORD, was re-elected by a largely increased majority. His bill, which for
two years has passed a second reading in the lower house, is introduced and stands a good chance of final passage this session.

At the same election the electors voted on three propositions: First, maintenance of all liquor licenses in each district for three years; second, the issue of licenses from 1 to 25 per cent. in number, and third, complete prohibition. The first two require only a majority to carry, but for prohibition it must be a three-fifths majority; but all prohibition votes are counted for reduction if prohibition is to carry, unless reduction is struck out. Maintenance got a small majority in every district but Clutha, where reduction was carried, but not prohibition, which did not get the necessary three-fifths. But as there is only one license in Clutha, this cannot be reduced without prohibition. It is only fair to say that our license laws are strict and generally well enforced.

At the last session the Government, after four years' attempts, passed through the upper house its bill allowing localities to rate land values only for taxation, if they chose. This can now be carried in a locality by a bare majority, if not less than a third of the taxpayers vote. Most laws relating to polls on local questions require a majority of the voters on the roll to be cast for it. As half of the property owners in most counties are absentees, it is well nigh impossible to get a reform through. It is not unlikely that the rate-paying franchise in local matters will be swept away in a few years on account of such abuses. Those who do not vote will have their names struck off the roll and have to apply for reinstatement.

---

From Forward, of Auckland.

The Referendum bill passed its second reading in the New South Wales House of Representatives the other day by 54 votes to 3. The bill requires a minimum poll of 100,000 electors and a majority of six-elevenths for the ratification of any measure. In the course of the debate the Premier stated that the relations of the two houses were unsatisfactory. The Council remained out of touch with the spirit of progress, and the experience of Victoria was that an elective upper chamber was even worse than a nominee house. "The choice," he said, "lay between the Referendum and a single chamber; one or the other must come about." Not necessarily so. The second chamber, in any case, is useless and dangerous and ought to be abolished. But the Referendum should be substituted for it, so as to provide the necessary check upon the single chamber, and secure that the will of the people shall be carried out.

---

From the Worker, of Sydney. N. S. W.

The chief objection to the bill on the part of most reformers will be that it does not go far enough and that it may be found difficult to put it into practice. Moreover, there will be a long delay before the Referendum can be reported to. Besides that, we do not see why a minimum number of votes should be fixed as being necessary, or why the majority should be fixed at six-elevenths. These, of course, are questions of detail, and it may be worth while to give the proposals a trial to see how they will work. It is valuable chiefly as an indication of the tendency of modern thought about the legislative machinery. What is needed is that the people should be piled up in the nature and effect of the Referendum, and while this has been done we may look for a more comprehensive and efficient measure than the Premier's little bantling. The bill has also passed its first reading in the upper house by a vote of 30 to 9.

From the Tasmanian Democrat, of Launceston.

The action taken by the Premier in proposing to introduce the Referendum to Tasmania may, we hope, be regarded as an indication that he intends to fight the upper house. He has assumed a brave attitude. Further than asserting the necessity for legislative council reform, he has, like Lord Rosebery and Mr. Chamberlain, expressed his belief in the people's voice as a final and supreme mandate in legislative matters. Further still, it is part and parcel of the programme of the Government. It is here in irrevocable black and white: "Any bill that shall have been twice rejected by the legislative council shall be referred to the popular vote, and, being carried by the voice of the electors, shall forthwith become law."

Though this is certainly a big departure, it does not go to the length of the Swiss Referendum. The little republic has been deservedly called the schoolroom of Europe. The school of Europe must be the school of the world. And, in this, the direct reference of public matters to the public themselves, lies the furthest development of democratic government so far achieved. A law for proportional representation passed the last Legislature, and at the election on January 12th last six Assemblymen and four Councillors (Senators) were elected in Hobart and four Assemblymen and three Councillors in Launceston under, as near as we can get it, the Hare system of proportional representation.

---

A MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM.

Translation of the envelope sent with blank ballots to each voter:

STATE OF ZURICH,

DEPT. 1,

B. No. 77.

Announcement on the voting according to Act 16-18 of the Zurich Constitution.

For Mr. ......................

Born 18-......................

Of Zurich......................

Residence......................

This statement is delivered by the Election Bureau. Ballots which are not deposited in the Election Bureau on the day of voting or are not deposited with the post office, the local bureau or the police post within two days of the voting day, will be sent for, and such voters will be fined one franc. Unstamped envelopes containing votes will not be forwarded by mail.
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a ballot is lost, the voter can secure a duplicate at the local bureau or the central office.  
This envelope contains two ballots. The first is a vote for Councilor and reads:  

STATE OF ZURICH.  
Ballot for the election of a member of the State Council, Saturday, June 27, 1896, 6-7 1/2 A. M. or Sunday, June 28, 1896, between 10 A. M. and 1:30 P. M.  

The qualified voters will write the name of their choice above.  
The second ballot is on two propositions, is in duplicate, and reads:  

STATE OF ZURICH.  
BALLOT FOR THE VOTING ON JUNE 28, 1896.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES OR NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Will you accept the proposition to purchase land in Friesenberg.  
2. Will you accept the proposal to purchase the Zurich Electrical Street Railway and to build new street railways?  

The qualified voter should fold up and enclose this ballot in duplicate with his own for Councilor.  
Both of these propositions were carried at the polls. The first one on the Friesenberg land purchase by 9,708 yes to 7,439 noes, and the second on electrical railway by 15,534 yes to 1,746 nays.  

NATIONAL VOTING IN SWITZERLAND.  
Translated from the Journal De Geneva by Miss Levin, of New York.  

Here are the results of the referendary votings which have been held since 1848 taken from a recent work an statistics. Since the date mentioned the Swiss people have been called to pronounce upon modifications of the constitution and upon laws and decrees which were submitted to them through the Referendum. There were no popular votings between 1848 and 1866. The results are arranged chronologically, and a "a" means an affirmative majority and "n" a negative majority.  

1848—The Federal Constitution  a 91,296  
1858—Weights and measures  a 2,906  
—Assimilation of all beliefs (religious freedom)  a 20,601  
—Right to vote in communal affairs  n 14,190  
—Factory legislation  n 62,936  
—Right to vote in cantonal affairs  n 12,010  
—Liberty of Conscience and religion  n 8,889  
—Suppression of certain punishments  n 100,266  
—Guarantees of intellectual property (copyright)  n 86,910  
—Prohibition of lotteries and of chance  n 87,726  
1878—Federal Constitution  a 9,203  
1874—Federal Constitution  a 149,186  
1873—Civil state  a 8,190  
—Right to vote  n 4,600  
1876—Bank notes  n 78,185  
—Military tax  n 38,727  
1877—Work for the poor  a 8,847  
—Military tax  n 11,190  
—Political rights  n 81,674  
1879—Subsidy for St. Gotthard Tunnel  a 106,166  

—Death penalty  a 18,967  
1883—Bank notes  a 127,794  
—Patent  a 13,079  
—Epidemic  a 196,818  
—Secrets of Education  n 149,186  
1884—Secretary of the Department of Justice  n 65,187  
—Stable article  n 48,708  
—Secrets at the Legion at Bern  n 101,186  
—Passports to commercial travelers  n 15,385  
1885—Alcohol question  a 8,835  
1887—Alcohol monopoly  a 130,186  
—Patents  a 145,384  
1888—Prosecution for vagrancy  a 88,386  
1890—Insurance against sickness and accidents  a 191,086  
1891—Retirement pensions  n 208,186  
—Popular Initiative  a 54,430  
—Customs tariff  a 61,070  
—Bank note monopoly  n 73,698  
—Purchase of the Central (railroad)  a 155,677  
1902—Regulating slaughter houses  a 12,480  
1904—Arts and trades  a 39,780  
—Right to work  a 220,409  
—Spools system  a 302,177  
1905—Diplomatic law  n 53,478  
—Match monopoly  a 45,085  
—Military articles  a 85,000  

One notes that out of 46 only 17 were accepted. The number of yes has varied for the whole of Switzerland from 2,805 in 1866 to 191,020 (popular insurance). The number of affirmative cantons has varied from 20 1/2 (popular insurance) to 0 (right to work). The thirty votings, from 1838 to 1891 furnish an average for all Switzerland of 176,750 yes (48.6 per cent.), against 187,059 (51.4 per cent.). The result of the cantons is almost identical; it gives an average of 10 1/2 cantons accepting (47.3 per cent.), against 11 1/2 rejecting (52.7 per cent.). This shows that, in spite of the diversity among the cantons, their vote generally confirms that of the people. On the other hand, because vote of the cantons is a little more favorable than that of the people, it follows that, as a rule, the small cantons are on the rejecting side.  
The States which oftenest reject are generally Catholic. The Canton of Appenzell, with five acceptances out of forty-six votings, has the record for rejections. The Canton of Lucerne, which was forty times on the side of the majority, has most often represented popular opinion in Switzerland. As the results have more often shown rejection than acceptance, one is not surprised to find the rejecting cantons among those most often in the majority, but this is not true of Tessin or Appenzell; the former is generally among the rejectors, but it rejects where others accept, while Appenzell exaggerates the number of rejections.  
Finally, one would believe that the large cantons would most often be in a majority, but these figures show that they are divided. A fact for rejoicing is that the small cantons, as a rule, have no complaints of being outnumbered, as they are often on the side of the majority. Even Soleure, which, of all the cantons, the most frequently outnumbered, has been on the side of the minority.  

[NOTE.—It will be seen by looking over this list that right after the Referendum was established in 1866, there were nine measures sent to a vote of the people, of which two were accepted and seven rejected. Then there was a wait of six years, after which one or two measures were referred to the people almost every year, with a slight increase in frequency.
in recent years. The people are getting to use it more.

It will also be seen by looking at the votes that the majorities either for or against are very irregular. The people are not always swayed one way by one party or by the advice of their legislative counselors. They seem to follow their own opinions.]

THE INEVITABLE.

Book Review by Eltweed Pomeroy.

"The Crowd, a Study of the Popular Mind," is the significant title of a recent book by a Frenchman, Gustave Le Bon, and published by the Macmillan Co., of New York, price $1.50.

The author is evidently a man of wide reading, cultured mind, logical accuracy and a certain cold insight. The book is written in a clear, compact style. It is not crowded with footnotes or references which distract. It is not a long book. It is easily read.

It author has fine analytical abilities, but scanty synthetical ones. He can criticize; he cannot construct. He can state the past, but he cannot see the future. He is afraid. He recognizes the tremendous forces working in a hitherto unknown way in modern society. One of the opening paragraphs in the preface says: "Organized crowds have always played an important part in life of peoples, but this part has never been of such moment as at present. The substitution of the unconscious action of crowds for the conscious activity of individuals is one of the principal characteristics of the present age." And a little further on he says: "The divine right of the masses is about to replace the divine right of kings."

At the close of the book he says: "Judging by the lessons of the past, and by the symptoms that strike the attention on every side, several of our modern civilizations have reached that phase of extreme old age which precedes decadence—without consistency and without a future, it has all the transitory characteristics of crowds. Its civilization is now without stability and at the mercy of every chance. The populace is sovereign, and the tide of barbarism mounts. The civilization may still seem brilliant, because it possesses an outward front, the work of the long past, and it is in reality an edifice crumbling to ruin, which nothing supports, and destined to fall in at the first storm."

The very title of the book is significant of this. A crowd is a group of individuals without unity, without coherence, without organization. If he had seen deeper, he would have called his book democracy or some such title. And so he has missed the mark. While it is a scholarly, accurate, thoughtful book, it is not an analysis of democracy. It is an analysis of bastard democracy—a crowd. It is a good book for believers in democracy to read, as it shows what democracy may be in decadence of degenerating into. It shows what to avoid.

The author is evidently in sympathy with the upper classes in our society—those who in the past have held the reins of government and who now see them slipping out of their hands. They do not understand the power into whose hands government is going. They have lost faith in themselves because they know the power has gone from their class. Not grasping the underlying strength in popular rule, seeing its first vigorous but stumbling steps, they say it is not fit. They have no faith in it. And as they see it is inevitable, they become pessimists of the future.

Some one has truly said that you cannot destroy, but only replace. The author has no suggestions as to replacing, no faith in any foundation for society, and so that book will utterly fail in its purpose. It is simply a negative criticism either of unorganized democracy, blindly striking at an order stronger than itself, which instinctively saw that here was the power which was to succeed it, and it must be strangled, if possible, or else of a democracy slowly and blindly organizing, groaning, stumbling and stretching its huge limbs and becoming conscious of its power.

Hence what Mr. Le Bon does say favorable to democracy is not said from the standpoint of a believer, and is much stronger than if written by an avowed friend. It is evident that the preface and introduction were written after the rest of the book had been finished. They both sum up and show the beginnings of a change of attitude in the author. For Mr. Le Bon is strictly fair. The true meaning of the testimony which he has been gathering and sifting and sifting through the book have impressed his mind. A few quotations will be given:

"So far as a majority of their acts are considered, crowds display a singular inferior mentality; yet there are other acts in which they appear to be guided by some mysterious forces which the ancients denominated destiny, nature or Providence, which we call the voices of the dead, and whose power it is impossible to overlook, although we ignore their essence. It would seem, at times, as if there were latent forces in the inner being of nations which might guide them."

"Even with respect to the ideas of great men, are we certain that they are exclusively the offspring of their brains? No doubt such ideas are always created by solitary minds, but is it not the genius of crowds that has furnished the thousands of grains of dust forming the soil in which they have sprung up?"

"The only important changes whence the renewal of civilization's results affect ideas, conceptions and beliefs. The memorable events of history are the visible effects of the invisible changes of human thought."

"Still, it is already clear that on whatever lines the societies of the future are organized, they will have to count with a new power, with the last surviving sovereign force of modern times, the power of crowds. On the ruins of many ideas, formerly considered beyond discussion, and to-day decayed or decaying, of so many sources of authority that successive revolutions have destroyed, a new one has risen on their stead, seems soon destined to absorb the others. While all our ancient beliefs are tottering and disappearing, while the old pillars of society are giving away
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one by one, the power of the crowd is the only force that nothing menaces, and of which the prestige is continually on the increase. The age we are about to enter will in truth be the Era of Crowds."

"Scarcely a century ago the traditional policy of European States and the rivalries of sovereigns were the principal factors that shaped events. The opinion of the masses scarcely counted, and most frequently, indeed, did not count at all. To-day it is the tradition which used to obtain in politics, and the individual tendencies and rivalries of rulers which do not count; while, on the contrary, the voice of the masses has become preponderant. It is this voice that dictates their conduct to kings, whose endeavor it is to take note of its utterances. The destinies of nations are elaborated at present in the heart of the masses, and no longer in the council of princes."

"The entry of the popular classes into political life—that is to say, in reality, their progressive transformation into governing classes—is one of the most striking characteristics of our epoch of transition."

"The masses are founding syndicates, before which the authorities capitulate one after the other; they are also founding labor unions, which, in spite of all economic laws, tend to regulate the condition of labor and wages. They return to assemblies in which the government is vested representatives utterly lacking initiative and independence, and reduced most often to nothing else than the spokesmen of the committees that have chosen them."

"Universal symptoms, visible in all nations, show us the rapid growth of the power of crowds, and do not admit of our supposing that it is destined to cease growing at an early date. Whatever fate it may reserve for us, we shall have to submit to it. All reasoning against it is a mere vain war of words."

"We are bound to resign ourselves to the reign of the masses, since want of foresight has in succession overthrown all the barriers that might have kept the crowd in check."

These quotations justify the title of this article. They render clear the mainspring at the base of the activity, often greatly self-sacrificing, of the advocates of Direct Legislation, as in it they see the systematic, orderly method for the rule of the people, the method by which that rule may be both sure and progressive, continuous and not spasmodic, connected and growing from the past, and hence stable and not isolated and revolutionary.

---

D. L. WORKERS.

Little attention has been given in The Record to the personalities connected with the movement. It is true that Direct Legislation has competitors of its workers—five definitely headed by one man of commanding genius or great organizing or oratorical ability. It is true that its best workers might be swept out of existence and the movement might be embarrassed for a time; it could not be stopped. Yet the personalities of the workers have a definite share to the principle; they have much to do with its progress. And the next few issues of The Record will contain pictures of one or two of the best-known workers and thumb-nail sketches of their personality and work.

J. W. Sullivan.

So easily first in time of advocacy, and probably of work done for Direct Legislation, is Mr. Sullivan, that he has been called the father of the movement in the United States. He began investigating it in 1888, went to Switzerland in 1888 to study it on the ground, and stayed there nearly a year. In the Spring of 1889 he published a series of letters on it in the New York Times and had an article in the Chautauquan for May, 1890. In March, 1892, his book came out. He had matter for a book three times the size, but wisely boiled it down to 120 pages, and the "Coming Nation" is now publishing a third edition. This little book, with its concise arguments and compact statements of facts, has probably done more than any other one force to crystallize the sentiment among those favorable to reforms.

As a national officer of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Sullivan succeeded in getting D. L. as the second plank in that organization's political demands, and also in getting it into practical operation in the Typographical Union, of which he is a member, and in other unions. He was the provisional president of the first national D. L. organization—soon defunct—has been connected with the N. J. League from its start, and is writing and speaking continually.

In person Mr. Sullivan is of medium height, stout, forceful. He has been connected with labor organizations all his life, is still a member of and was for a long time the head and real brains of the Typographical Union. He has just returned from a trip to Europe, where he was sent by the A. F. of L. as fraternal delegate to the British Trades Congress. For years he has been a worker in reform movements, was connected with Henry George in his memorable campaign as candidate for Mayor of New York, was associate editor of the Standard, and afterwards head editor of the Twentieth Century.
He is not a great orator, but an emphatic and compelling speaker. His writing, like his speaking, aims to convince the head rather than rouse the heart. He is a logician and marshaler of facts. And yet, curiously enough, he has written a book of fiction, "Tenement House Tales," which sweeps the gamut of emotion from laughter to tears. He is now in the prime of life, and, having traveled much, seen many reformers and studied their ideas and worked with them, he has settled his lifework down to three things, as he recently wrote in a letter—to aiding trade organization, forwarding Direct Legislation and writing stories which will touche the heart; so that his age and his country will likely be still more indebted to him. He could easily make more money at something else, but being able to get a competency at his trade, he prefers to work at it, having some spare time to devote to unrenumerative reform. He is a living example that money is not the only mainspring of activity in these times.

Richard W. Irwin.

In some respects Mr. Irwin is the direct opposite of Mr. Sullivan. He is a politician, in the old and better sense of that word. Born and bred in New England of one of the old Puritan families, he early became familiar with practical Direct Legislation in the New England town meeting. He was trained to the law and began to practice in Northampton, Mass., one of those quiet, cultivated, beautiful New England towns, where he still lives. In 1894 he was elected as a Republican to the lower house of the Massachusetts Legislature, and as he had become a thorough believer in Direct Legislation, he framed and introduced a conservative but well-drawn bill, giving Direct Legislation to such cities of Massachusetts as voted for it. He secured its passage through the House by a vote of 150 to 8, but though it was in every political platform of that State, his own party in the Senate smothered it.

Mr. Irwin was returned in '95 and championed the same measure again, but was not successful. In '96 he was promoted to the State Senate, and again championed it. He was re-elected last Fall, and has it again before the Senate; but though he has received petitions signed by several thousands of Massachusetts citizens, he is doubtful if he can overcome the inertia and opposition to it. This will be too bad, as he thinks he has done his duty to his State and will refuse another re-election.

But this work has not been fruitless, as much valuable education has been done and the principle has been worked into various laws which have been passed.

Mr. Irwin is short, stout and young, with that old-school courtliness of manner, now alas, not often seen even in New England. He is universally liked, even by those who oppose him, and if he was a little more ambitious and a little unscrupulous, he might have a big political future. But he will be what is better— an honorable New England gentleman.

Though a trained and able lawyer, he is not much of a writer on reform subjects, and so his future D. L. work will be confined to his friends and associates. No one who knows him can fear that he will change his beliefs in it. But he should be given the credit of being one of the earliest and most persistent champions in legislative halls.

A FREAK LEGISLATURE.

A Hazleton, Pa., paper says: "In the next Pennsylvania Legislature will be found one gambler, one base ball umpire, one preacher, eight men who declare they are 'gentlemen,' nineteen without occupations, twenty-seven lawyers and one pupil. Of the members, three were convicted of larceny, he was tried for murder and acquitted, three in insane asylums, while eight have been at Keeley cures and four are divorced."

THEY'RE BEGINNING IT AGAIN.

(Special Dispatch to the Boston Journal.)

Montgomery, Ala., Nov. 21.—Representative Timberlake introduced a bill into the General Assembly to-day seeking to make it unlawful for any female to wear any article of men's clothing, or any objectionable costume. The bill specifically prohibits the wearing of bloomers, tights, divided skirts and shirt waists.

Vox Populi.

By Priscilla Leonard.

True is the people's sturdy soul: The pessimist, whose narrow dread Would yield them a reluctant role Of power, may shrink to see instead In their wide hand the mighty whole, The sovereign crown upon their head.

But he whose wiser, wider view Sees the sure struggle of his kind Toward the righteous and the true, Leaves, day by day, such doubts behind. Rests on the many, not the few. And deeply trusts the people's mind.

—from The Outlook of Nov. 24, 1896.
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DEFINITIONS.
Direct Legislation—Lawmaking by the voters.
The Initiative—The proposal of a law by a percentage of the voters, which must then go to the Referendum.
The Referendum—The vote at the polls of a law proposed through the Initiative, or on any law passed by a lawmaking body, which referendum is presented for a by a percentage of the voters.

LEGISLATIVE NOTES.
The resolution for a Committee of Inquiry on Direct Legislation is number four on the roll of the present House of Representatives. But though its mover, Congressman McEwan is a Republican of Republicans, the Speaker will not recognize him even to speak on it. Senator Butler hopes to get a similar resolution out of the committee, where it is soundly sleeping, within the next few months, when we may have a Senate Committee and a report.

Senator Pettigrew, of South Dakota, has introduced and will push a bill for the submission to a popular vote at the Congressional election of 1896 of the following questions: "Shall Congress at once enact a law providing for the immediate free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1?" and "Shall the Constitution of the United States be amended as to provide for the election of United States Senators and of the President and Vice-President by direct vote of the people?"

This bill was drafted at the request of the President of the N. D. L. L. by W. S. O'Ren, of Oregon.

The South Dakota amendment, whose passage was noted in last Raccoon, is printed in this issue with comments; so is the Nebraska bill, with full account of its passage and a portrait and sketch of its author. The Washington, Oregon, Colorado and Kansas situations are described.

A determined fight was made in the Arizona Territorial Legislature, and it did pass a Direct Legislation bill applying to cities in which the last election a vote between 800 and 1,000 was cast. Unfortunately this only applies to the city of Prescott, of which Wm. O. O'Neill is the Mayor. He was also in the Legislature and drew and pushed this bill. The Referendum section reads:

"Sec. 8. No ordinance passed by any such incorporated city shall become effective until it has been published in some newspaper of general circulation for the period of twenty days. If, during such publication, there be filed with the City Recorder a written protest against the enactment of such ordinance, signed by thirty per cent. of the legal voters of such city, of which signers at least one-half shall be taxpayers of the said city, the Common Council shall, within twenty days from the date of filing such protest, order a special election to be held by the voters of said city, at which the sole issue submitted for decision to the voters shall be the ratification or rejection of the proposed ordinance. The ballot at such special election shall state the official title of the proposed ordinance, and the vote shall be "Yes" for the ratification of said ordinance, or "No" for its rejection. If a majority of the votes is in the affirmative, as indicated by "Yes," the ordinance shall go into effect as passed by the Common Council. If a majority of the votes is in the negative, as indicated by "No," the ordinance shall be rejected and annulled."

Of course 30% is too high, but this will do as a starter. The prospects next year are good, and Mr. O'Neill writes: "One of the territories is the place to centre your efforts. Every bill passed by a territorial legislature requires the approval of Congress. In the general bill drawn by me, this was provided for, and had the measure passed, it was my intention to use it in bringing the subject before Congress."

Every State legislature west of the Mississippi, save perhaps Arkansas and Louisiana, had a Direct Legislation measure before it, and so did Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, New Jersey, Massachusetts and some other States. A Michigan correspondent writes: "Our efforts in the legislature have been good fruit. Several well-attended hearings were given in Wisconsin, which were valuable educationally. In New Jersey an amendment was reported in the Senate, but as other amendments were passed prior, it is now shut out for five years by a curiously bad method of amending the State constitution. These amendments may seem discouraging, but they are really the reverse. Direct Legislation is getting known by being beaten, and its advocates are urged to intro-
duce more and more laws and amendments and push to a vote. A Nebraska correspondent writes: "Considering that this new reform idea was first started in Nebraska in 1882, and that in four short years it has been pushed to the front, has found a lodgment on the statute books of the State, what may not the future have in store for Direct Legislation! I believe in ten years, or twelve at the outside, it will have supplanted the old system in the land of the golden rod and sumac."

NOTES OF THE MOVEMENT.

The N. D. L. L. has chosen Harry W. Naeh, of Payson, Arizona; Rev. A. B. Francisco, of Galveston, Texas, and J. W. Logan of Omaha, Nebraska, as Vice-Presidents and organizers for their respective States. They all are good men, dead in earnest about the work. Suggestions are requested for active organizers in other States. Local leagues have been organized in Hamilton, O., and several other places.

A statement of the growth of the movement has so crowded out argument for Direct Legislation from the columns of THE RECORD that the editor, at the request of B. O. Flowers and F. U. Adams, editors of The New Time, will begin, in the July issue of that magazine, a series of short articles, taking up one argument for Direct Legislation at one time. Each article will be prefaced by four or five short, crisp opinions on Direct Legislation from prominent people with a portrait attached. The July article will be on "The Fundamental Political Argument for Direct Legislation," and it will be prefaced by opinions and portraits of Senator Pettigrew, Miss Francis Willard, Congressman McEwan, President Gates, of Iowa College, and Governor J. R. Rogers. When the articles are finished they will be published as a book.

This is published monthly in Chicago by Chas. B. Keen Co. at $1.00 a year, and arrangements have been made to club with THE RECORD for the price of the monthly—a dollar a year. The editor also had an article on it in the May Arena.

So many papers are now taking it up that it is hard to keep track of them, but one article needs notice. J. St. Loe Strachey, editor of The London (England) Spectator had an article in the April Cosmopolitan (not Cosmopolitans) entitled, "A Poll of the People," which every friend of Direct Legislation should read. He makes the astounding, but very clear statement, that in England in 1883 "the official ballot issued from the Conservative offices to explain and enumerate the items of the party program placed the Referendum third on the list of Unionist aims. A firm Imperial policy comes first. Then follows a strong navy. Third comes the Referendum."

A long article on the very significant Referendum in Switzerland on Feb. 28th last on a Federal Bank has been crowded out of their issue as well as some other matter. Lack of funds alone prevents enlarging THE RECORD. It has been officially endorsed by the Michigan Direct Legislation League and other leagues are invited to endorse it.

TO ARMS.

A Suggestion by Hon. Thomas McEwan, Jr., M. C.

The guns have been spiked in every direction in Congress. I am anxious, however, that your readers should know that I am an earnest advocate of D. L. My own judgment is that there is but one way to bring about this great and urgent reform, and that is by agitation in all parts of the country simultaneous with the West.

If one earnest believer in it in each county were to form a club with a meeting place in his house, or in some place that would not cost anything, and gather about him a membership of even three or four, I believe it would be very effective.

Think what an effect the mere statement of clubs in every county in the United States would have upon the minds of the public.

SOUTH DAKOTA D. L. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

This amendment has passed both houses of the 1896 Legislature, and will go to a referendum of the people of South Dakota at its next general election in the fall of 1898. It was introduced by Mr. Benson, of Brown county, and passed by a strictly party vote, and to the Populists is due the credit of passing it. In all probability it will be accepted by the people, but friends of Direct Legislation are urged to write letters about it to the papers of South Dakota, and concentrate their efforts on educating the people of South Dakota, so that they may intelligently vote on it. One good way would be to make drafts of the laws to carry this amendment into effect in both State and municipal matters and have them printed. If such drafted laws are sent to THE RECORD, the editor will see that they are given publicity and will print the best one in THE RECORD.

THE AMENDMENT.

Section 1. (Amendment.) That section one of article three of the constitution of the State of South Dakota be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 2. (Questions submitted.) The legislative power of the State shall be vested in a legislature which shall consist of a senate and house of representatives, except that the people expressly reserve to themselves the right to propose measures, which measures the legislature shall enact and submit to a vote of the electors of the State, and also the right to require that any laws which the legislature may have enacted shall be submitted to a vote of the electors of the State before going into effect (except such laws as may be necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety or support
of the State government and its existing public institutions).

Provided, That not more than five per centum of the qualified electors of the State shall be required to invoke either the Initiative or the Referendum.

This section shall not be construed so as to deprive the legislature, or any member thereof of the right to propose any measure. The veto power of the executive, shall not be exercised as to measures referred to a vote of the people. This section shall apply to municipalities. The enacting clause of all laws approved by vote of the electors of the State shall be, "be it enacted by the people of South Dakota." The legislature shall make suitable provisions for carrying into effect the provisions of this section.

Sec. 3. (Submission.) This amendment shall, if agreed to by a majority of the members-elect of each house of the legislature, be submitted to a vote of the people at the next general election.

COMMENT.

This amendment is short, simple, direct and strong. In three points it is more drastic and far-reaching than any proposed. It has one important error in language and two or three omissions which may prove important.

The error in language is in saying that the legislature shall enact and submit measures petitioned for by the people. They can pass and submit, but they cannot enact and submit, as it is the people who enact, as the last clause of the same section says. Also the legislative power cannot directly submit. They can direct the executive to submit, but it is the executive that does the submitting. It would be far better to say that the Governor or Secretary of State shall submit.

One of the unfortunate omissions is that no provision is made in case the legislature refuses to "enact and submit" a petitioned measure. What will happen then? All hope that such a case will never occur. The language is mandatory. But legislatures fail as well as others. It ought to read that if the legislature does not pass the measure, then the executive shall submit. If the executive did not obey the constitution, it would be grounds for impeachment. Also suppose the legislature amend the measure petitioned for and submit, what happens then? An amendment to a measure may entirely change its nature. Also what is the use of submitting to the people good measures which are petitioned for and passed by the legislature? Would it not be well to let those go into effect, subject, the same as other laws, to a referendaary petition. This is one of the drastic provisions which seems a little unnecessary.

The second far-reaching provision is that "not more than five per centum of the people shall be required for the Initiative and Referendum, and that is very wise, as in many places Direct Legislation will be defeated, not by open attack, but by making the percentage so high that it will not be used. 5% is ample and in State matters, it might be wise to make it less. The third far-reaching provision is that with one sentence it applies Direct Legislation to municipalities. This is very wise.

The most important omission is that there is no provision by which municipalities can apply it without recourse to the legislature, and the legislature is the only power to "make suitable provision for carrying" it into effect in State matters. An amendment should provide that if the legislature did not pass anything or if what passed were unsatisfactory, then a suitable minority of the people should have the right to propose and force to a vote of the people the laws to carry this into effect.

Also it would be well to fix the time in the amendments before laws can go into effect, and that laws which have once been enacted by the people cannot be repealed or altered without submission to the people; and while the word "measures" probably includes amendments to the constitution, it would be wiser to insert it, so as to avoid some future judicial interpretation to the contrary.

But taking it all in all, the amendment, while not perfect, is a strong one and a long step in the right direction. It needs additions, but very little direct changing, and with it, the additions will come in time.

HOW THE NEBRASKA LAW WAS PASSED.

By Hon. John O. Yeiser, Member Nebraska Legislature.

Although the principle of Direct Legislation is nearer my heart than any other legislative reform, and, although the bill which is now a law in Nebraska was my especial pride, I must confess I am unable to see exactly how it ever got through. It required hard and constant pushing, with much emphasis on the word "constant."

It never would have passed, either branch of the Legislature had it not been that it emanated from people out of power, who demanded it through their labor organizations, representatives of which placed a demand for it in the platform of the People's Independent Party when it was young and powerless.

This demand of the people through a young and vigorous party of independent men was, I think, the key-note to the whole success. It was the party lash we were able to crack. We had the votes on the floor, and, that being a fact, the members who would dare to vote against a measure giving the people a right to "vote yes or no upon every law by which they are to be governed" would, in doing so, violate his pledge, and, upon returning to the common people that elected him, invite political ostracism.

One thing which aided in the passing of the little volume entitled, "Direct Legislation," by that prince of reformers, J. W. Sullivan. This book was distributed to every member of the House and Senate, with the deliberate intention of biasing the mind of each member in favor of a pure democracy. If it
had not been for a lack of funds they would have been furnished "In Hall and the Way Out." And had the House delayed in passing the bill, I should have been tempted in some way to have gotten each Populist "In Hall" anyhow, and other hot arguments to spur them up.

The bound volumes of THE DIRECT LEGISLATION RECORD were the best field of information for argument, and were supplemented by the consular reports from Switzerland and magazine articles referred to in "Pope's Index to Periodicals," under the heads of "Referendum," "Initiative," and "Switzerland or Swiss."

After passing the bill through the House, constant work was required in the Senate—some few threats, a little coaxing, and some of Job's patience—to bring the bill to a third reading. It was not done, however, until two or three efforts had been made, when, on the last day, a motion was made to indefinitely postpone all bills which had not been previously passed, and an exception, naming this bill, was added, which carried, and the bill passed, with one voice to spare, by the aid of a call of the House.

I regret to say that in the Nebraska Legislature the question was partisan, every Republican member opposing the measure, although the Republican platforms—neither State nor national—condemns or criticizes Direct Legislation by the people. The reason they did it is unexplainable.

THE NEBRASKA D. L. BILL FOR MUNICIPALITIES.

Introduced at the Request of John O. Yester by A. E. Sheldon, of Dawes County, and Passed by the Legislature of 1897, and Signed by Governor Holcomb.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska:

THE INITIATIVE.

Section 1. The right to propose ordinances for the government of any city, or other municipal subdivision of the State of Nebraska shall, in addition to being exercised by the mayor and city council of such city or the governing authorities of such other municipal subdivisions of this State, be vested in the voters thereof as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. The word "ordinance" where used in this act shall mean and include ordinances, orders, resolves, agreements, contracts and any measure which is within the power of the legislative authorities of such city or other municipal subdivision of the State to enact or give the force and effect of law. The word "city" where used in this act shall mean and include city, county, village, town, school district or any other municipal subdivision of this State. The phrase "mayor and city council" or "city council" where used in this act shall mean and include the legislative authority of any such city, county, village, town, school district or other municipal subdivision of this State. The word "voters" where used in this act shall mean persons who are qualified to vote for the respective legislative authorities of the jurisdiction governed or to be governed by any such ordinance sought to be enacted, altered or repealed by such persons.

Sec. 3. Such proposal shall be written or printed and shall contain the full text of the proposed ordinance, and, to be mandatory, shall be signed by at least fifteen per cent. of the voters of such city making the same, and shall state after each signature the residence, with street and number, or if not able to designate residence in that way, it shall be designated by the number of the farm or tract of land where petitioners reside. At least ten of the persons signing the same shall make oath before a competent officer that they are themselves duly qualified voters residing as stated after their signatures attached to such proposal and that they believe all the other persons who signed such proposal are also duly qualified voters, and that they believe all the signatures thereto attached to be genuine. Such proposal to be filed with the clerk of such city.

Sec. 4. If twenty per cent. of the voters of such city shall request in such proposal that the ordinance proposed be a special election, a special election shall be held to the voters of such city to be voted on at a special election, the clerk of such city shall cause the same to be submitted at a special election to be called as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 5. The clerk of any such city aforesaid shall cause proposals, in which request for special election is not made, to be submitted to a direct vote of the voters of such city at the first regular election held after the expiration of thirty days from the filing of such proposal.

Sec. 6. When a request for a special election is included in such proposal, signed by the proper number of voters, the clerk aforesaid shall cause to be submitted to a direct vote of the voters of such a city at a special election which shall be called by him not less than thirty nor more than sixty days from the filing of such proposal.

Sec. 7. If the mayor and city council be convened before such proposed ordinance can be legally submitted to a direct vote of the voters, the clerk aforesaid shall forthwith present to such body a certified copy of the proposed ordinance, and the demand for the submission of the same on file in his office, together with a statement of the number of signatures appended thereto, and thereupon such proposed ordinance shall take precedence in such body over all ordinances introduced by members thereof. And if such proposed ordinance is not made law by such mayor and city council within thirty days from the filing of the same with such clerk, the said clerk shall submit the same to the voters according to the provisions of this act.

Sec. 8. If the mayor and city council shall alter or amend, before enacting the same, any ordinance submitted to it under the provisions of the preceding sections, then the ordinance so altered or amended by such body shall be submitted to a direct vote of the voters under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 9. The ordinance as proposed by the voters shall be set forth on the ballot by its
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The title, and shall be designated "as presented by Petition Form A;" the ordinance as altered or amended by the mayor and city council shall be set forth by its title and shall be designated "as amended by (legislative authority) Form 10," below shall be added the statements:

"I vote for Form A"
"I vote for Form B"
"I vote against both"

Sec. 10. If the ordinance as proposed by the voters and the ordinance as amended and passed by the city council shall together receive a majority of the votes cast on the question, the one receiving a majority of the affirmative votes shall become law and the other be deemed to have been rejected; if a majority of the votes cast are against both, both shall be rejected.

Sec. 11. If there is but one proposal submitted, the ballot shall be so printed as to give each voter a clear opportunity to designate by a cross (x) in the right-hand corner, his answer, "Yes" or "No" as approving or rejecting the same.

(REFERENDUM.)

Sec 12. No ordinance for the government of any city aforesaid in this State, except as hereinafter provided, shall go into effect until thirty days after the passage of the same.

Sec. 13. The voters of such city may, within the said thirty days, file a petition with the clerk thereof, requiring him to submit such ordinance to a vote of the voters of such city for their rejection or approval, as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 14. Such petition shall be written or printed, and to be mandatory shall be signed by at least fifteen per cent. of the voters of such city. It shall contain the title of such ordinance, or some sufficient description of the same. In other respects it shall be in manner and form as prescribed in section three of this act.

Sec. 15. If twenty per cent. of the voters of such city shall request in such petition that such ordinance shall be submitted to the voters of such city, to be voted on at a special election, the clerk aforesaid shall cause the same to be submitted at a special election, to be called by him not less than fifteen nor more than twenty days from the filing of such petition.

Sec. 16. When such petition does not request that such ordinance be submitted to the voters at a special election, the clerk of such city shall cause the same to be submitted to the voters of such city at the first regular election held after the expiration of fifteen days from the filing of such petition, and shall cause the same to be placed upon the official ballots to be used at such election.

Sec. 17. Such ordinances submitted to the voters under the six preceding sections shall not go into effect unless approved by a majority of the votes cast and against the same.

Sec. 18. All ordinances relating to the immediate preservation of public peace or health or items of appropriation of money for current expenses of the several departments of such city, which do not exceed the correspond-
certificate of proposal or petition or any part thereof which has been duly filed, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or by imprisonment in jail not exceeding one year, or by both fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 25. Whoever signs any proposal or petition under this act, knowing that he is not a qualified voter in the place where said proposal or petition is made, or who aids or abets any other person in doing any of the acts above mentioned, or whoever bribes or gives or pays any money or thing of value to any person directly or indirectly to induce him to sign said proposal or petition, shall be punished by fine not exceeding three hundred dollars or by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding one year, or by both fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 26. Any clerk of such city, county, town or school district or other municipal subdivision of the State of Nebraska who fails, neglects or refuses to comply with the provisions of this act shall be punished by a fine not exceeding five thousand dollars.

Sec. 27. The provisions of the statutes of this State relating to election officers, voting places, election apparatus and blanks, preparation and form of ballots, information to voters, delivery of ballots, calling of elections, conduct of elections, manner of voting, counting of votes, records and certificates of election and recounts of votes so far as applicable, shall apply to voting on ordinances by the voters under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 28. Form or proposal under sections three and four and other sections of this act providing for the Initiative is recommended:

To the Clerk of the..............

The undersigned voters do hereby request that the following proposed ordinance be presented to the ............... of this ............... and if not enacted therein that the same shall be submitted to the voters of this ............... at the next general election (or if a special or subsequent general election state it) for rejection or approval: "An ordinance," etc., "Be it ordered," etc.

SIGNATURES. STREET NO. RESIDENCE.

Sec. 29. The following form of petition under sections twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen and following sections providing for the Referendum is recommended:

To the Clerk of the..............

The undersigned voters of the ............... do hereby petition that the ordinance of the ............... (describe it) passed by the ............... (date) be referred to the voters of the ............... for rejection or approval.

(In other respects it should be in manner and form as prescribed for petitions under sections three and four of this act.)

Sec. 30. This act shall not become operative in any city until accepted by the voters thereof. The provisions of this act relative to the proposal of ordinances and submission of the same shall apply to the proposal of this act for acceptance and submission of the same so far as applicable. When accepted in any city in accordance with the above provisions, this act shall become operative in such city from and after the date of such acceptance. The Negroes arrived to the number of not more than one special election shall be called in according to the provisions of this act unless the petitioners for such special election shall deposit with the city or village clerk an amount equal to the expense of said election, which amount shall be forfeited to said city or municipal subdivision in case the said petitioners shall fail to carry the proposition which they favor at said election, which propositions they shall concisely state in their petition, whether it be a positive or negative proposition.

COMMENTS.

This bill is so good on its general lines that only minor criticisms can be made. The first and strongest criticism is that 15 per cent. for the petitions and 20 per cent. for an immediate election are entirely too high. These percentages should be not over 5 per cent. and 10 per cent., and the author of the bill agrees with this; but political exigencies forced these high percentages, and probably the bill would not have passed without them.

The second criticism is that there is too much detail, and that it would have been better to have provided means for the acceptance of the principle of D. L. by any municipality, and then to have empowered such municipality to make for itself within certain general lines the laws for carrying D. L. into effect in itself. There is the objection to this that it would entail a lack of uniformity over the State. But this is already done in the fact that one city may adopt and another reject it. And it is more than counter-balanced by the fact that it would be a more complete local self-government.

There are two or three detail criticisms. Section 3 would be better if it provided that every proposal with 100 or under signatures should have one person who makes affidavit, and every proposal with over 100 signatures should have two. Many proposals will be made on many different sheets of paper.

It seems as if Sections 4, 5 and 6, and Sections 9, 10, 11, and some other sections, might easily be condensed into one section about half as long. I am a little shaky about the wisdom of the exception in Section 19.

But take it all and all, it is one of the best laws recently drafted, and can be recommended to the other legislatures to pass. Its authors and main pusher, John O. Yeiser, of Omaha, deserves great credit.

THE FIGHT FOR DIRECT LEGISLATION IN KANSAS.

By Hon. H. W. Young, State Senator.

The battle for a Direct Legislation constitutional amendment was fought and lost in the Legislature last Winter. It required
two-thirds of all the members elected to each house to pass the joint resolution submitting the amendment, and the People's party had such a majority only in the Senate. Had a like majority been available in the House, I fear we should not have given as good an account of ourselves as we ought.

As it is, a campaign of education has been carried on and the Initiative and Referendum have been kept before the people and crystallized in their thought as a principle to which the Populist party is indissolubly wedded.

During the first week of the legislative session I was aided by Judge Doster, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in formulating the amendment upon which we made our fight. Its salient points were the provision that 15 per cent. of the voters might propose a public act and secure a vote upon it, or compel the reference of any law passed by the Legislature by less than a two-thirds majority; and that after any public act had been approved by the people it should be the law of the State, anything in the Constitution to the contrary. This provision seemed to us necessary to take the governing power out of the hands of the courts, as well as the Legislature, and insure the people the opportunity to govern themselves. Of course, it really meant a revolution in the form of our government and the ultimate abdication of all written constitutions. I expected tremendous objections to it at every turn, and perhaps to be compelled to abandon it, in order to get the amendment through.

I was, however, surprised to find no opposition to it. Indeed, it seemed to strengthen rather than weaken the proposition.

It was referred to the Elections Committee—my own committee. Before reporting it back to the Senate I asked that a caucus of the fusion members be called to consider it. There were twenty-nine of us out of a total of forty Senators, and all but four of the twenty-nine were there. To my surprise, even after a two-hour speech was made against what I thought the Populists taking the ground that it was impolitic to commit themselves to so new and untried a scheme and make a campaign two years hence on that issue. As the debate proceeded, however, it became evident that it would be impossible to secure the unanimous support of the party for a resolution providing for a constitutional convention, and the sentiment changed until the vote at the close of the caucus showed only two Senators against the proposition.

As we had two more than two-thirds of the Senate, I counted confidently on carrying the measure through that body without the recalcitrants. When it came up for action, however, after a short—but very spirited debate, which was listened to with almost breathless interest by packed galleries and a crowd that filled the floor, both these Senators voted and we recorded our full strength in its favor.

In the House the thing was undecided until the very closing days of the session. Its principal champion there was Speaker Pro Tem. Weilp, a Democrat, who was also a bitter opponent of the Prohibition law, and who fought for the Referendum largely for the purpose of securing a resubmission of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution. During the week that it held its place on the House calendar proposals were being made very frequently to furnish votes enough to pass the Initiative and Referendum from the Republican side, if our folks would help out one measure or another that was not altogether commendable. At one time it was voices to defeat the Oleomargarine bill that were wanted. At another it was a Stock Yards bill that they wanted to kill; and then, time and again, it was promised that if we would give fifteen votes for the purchase of an expensive building at Wichita for a State Normal School—a job on the face of it—we should have fifteen votes for the Initiative and Referendum. To all these propositions I replied, in the language of the Apostle Paul, "Doing evil that good may come, whose damnation is just."

The passage of the joint resolution might have been purchased in some such way, if the time for the reconsideration of the Normal bill had not expired. As it was, when the proposition came up in the House its champion, Mr. Weilp, moved to change the 15 per cent. to 30. This was done, and thus enunciated, it really made little difference what became of the measure. It lacked about eight votes on formal passage, although every Populist present, all the Democrats but one, and, I think, two Republicans, voted for it.

Still, the principle daily grows stronger with the people, and I look forward to its embodiment in our organic law as only a question of time.

The only law enacted during the session that materially extended the Referendum principle was that providing for public ownership of public utilities in cities, which precluded the necessity of making any more required to carry such a proposition from two-thirds to a bare majority.

It will be interesting to note, in this connection, that the Senate, which adopted the Direct Legislation resolution by the required two-thirds holds over for four years, while a new House will be elected before another regular session of the Legislature.

A REVIEW OF THE MICHIGAN REFERENDUMS.

By Hon. Albert M. Todd, Member Congress, of Kalamazoo.

On the average during the past ten years only about 10% of the ballots cast show any vote either way on the various Referendums submitted. This is due mostly to two causes: First, the vague and indefinite manner in which the Referendums are worded on the ballots. There have been twenty-nine Referendums submitted in Michigan in the past twenty years, but there have been but two of these intelligently stated, so that the voter could tell the meaning of his "Yes"
or "No." For instance, there have been six Referendums relative to the salaries of State officers, but with one single exception these have been stated on the ballots simply "Amendment to Constitution Relative to Salary of State Officers." In one case only it was stated that the amendment proposed an increase, and it was impossible for voters to learn, even from the election officers, what the purpose of the Referendum was. In the year 1887 there was submitted on the ballots "Amendment to Constitution Relative to the Liquor Traffic." It was widely known that this amendment was for prohibition, and it was the chief issue at the election, which was a spring election, and at which no State officers or Presidential or party questions were voted upon. Yet a vote was cast of 382,917 relative to this Referendum, as against the total Presidential vote last preceding of 401,186, giving about 80% of the entire electoral vote for the Referendum. This large vote probably represented 95% of all votes cast at that election, and it is likely that it was generally understood, was publicly discussed, and was a vital question. The amendment was declared lost by less than 6,000, but intimidation was practiced in the cities by the liquor interest, and the returns were also falsified in some counties, and a petition by the temperance element for a review and investigation of the returns was denied by a legislature to please the liquor interests.

Again, in 1894, a Referendum was submitted, which was plainly stated, "Amendment to Constitution authorizing inmates of Soldiers' Homes to vote where such homes are situated." The vote on this was "Yes," 127,758; "No," 29,607. This was not a Presidential year, but the vote for Governor at the same election was 418,980, giving 38% of the total votes for the Referendum, the vote being 157,965. The same year another Referendum was required that foreign-born electors to be citizens of the United States or to have declared their intention as such two years and six months previous, in order to be a qualified elector in this State. This was worded on the ballot simply "Amendment to Constitution relative to the qualifications of electors," but it must have been well understood, because the total vote on this Referendum was about the same as on the one just mentioned, and it was adopted by a majority of 83,551, so that this also, with the one just mentioned, indicates that the people are generally on the moral and right side when the question is not connected with party interests.

In this State the voters have favored economy in government and in salaries, but voted in favor of an increase in the salaries of Circuit Judges twice, when such increase stated for the public good. The Spring election of 1893 a Referendum was submitted "Relative to salaries of State officers," its purpose being to increase the salaries. The returns were forged and the number of votes favoring the increase was fraudulently erased and changed so that it was reported as carried. But on a review by the Supreme Court the amendment was declared lost.

The Referendums submitted in this State have not generally been considered party measures, but they afford valuable data on the education of the people. Some of the Referendums, particularly those relating to salaries of State officers, have been resubmitted, as either the people or the officers interested were not satisfied with the former result.

I think the decision of the people, where the votes have been honestly counted and returned, and where the Referendums were clearly stated, would, in every case, show a majority for good government and advancing the status of citizenship and morality.

The press appears largely to be swayed by corporate interests, and the people have not voted often as dictated by the press.

There should be vigorous measures taken compelling the proper authorities to clearly set forth the nature of the Referendums voted upon, on the ballot, as this is one of the chief failings in the law; and my own estimate that the nature of these amendments, which I have only had knowledge of through the papers, has escaped my memory on election day, and I could not always find election officers who could inform me. This certainly is "criminal negligence" on the part of the officers who dictate the wording on the ballots.

VOTING IN MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS.

According to the liquor regulation law in Massachusetts, the question of licensing saloons is submitted to a referendum every two or three years in the cities of the State. Such a referendum was held on Dec. 15, 1896. The figures on this vote are interesting as showing that when the people get used to voting on a principle which directly concerns them and have it come up regularly, that few refuse to vote or refuse to vote than vote for men. This is not always true about sporadic or occasional referendums or referendums on subjects in which the people are not interested. And it has been argued from this that fewer people would vote on measures than on men; that it required the vivacity of a personality to interest and bring out voters. The figures of this election confute this.

In the city of Boston there were two questions submitted—the license, which received 39,426 in favor and 26,829 against, or a total of 66,255, and the question of doing away with all surnames for the Common Council and paying each member $300 a year salary. This latter received 35,246 in favor to 26,703 against, or a total of 61,949. This total is between 4,000 and 5,000 less than the vote on the license question, and quite accurately gauged the opinion of the importance of the two questions.

The total vote for Street Commissioner was 59,802, which is 6,453 less than the license referendary vote, or about 90% of it. The Boston Herald commenting on this, says:
"The candidates for Street Commissioner were at the top of the ballot, while the space for marking on the license question was at the bottom. Ordinarily, the vote falls off in the descent of the ballot, but in this instance the rule was not followed."

The average vote cast for Alderman was 63,547 or 2,708 less than the license referenda vote or nearly 96% of it.

The average vote for members of the Common Council was just 63,000 or 3,235 less than the license referenda vote, or about 95% of it.

In Lynn, the vote for license was 6,108 and against it 3,921, or a total of 10,177; and the total vote for Mayor was 9,890, or 227 less. For School Committee, it was 1,784 less, or 83% of it, and for Assessor for three years it was 2,752 less, or than three quarters of the license vote.

In Chelsea, the vote on license stood, 2,348 in favor to 2,580 against, or a total of 4,928. The vote for Mayor was 96% of this, for Alderman was 95% and for School Committee, it was 88%.

In Cambridge, the vote for license was 3,472 and against, 5,753, or a total of 9,625. This has been a no-license city for years with large majorities against license, and so here, as there was no probability of a reversal of a settled civil policy, there were 299 more votes cast for the majority candidates than on the license question, but the average vote cast for Alderman was 5,433 or only 57% of the license vote.

In comparing these votes, one thing is very noticeable, that the cleavage on the license question did not follow the same lines as that on candidates; that is, that many voters will follow their party in voting for its candidates, but are independent when it comes to measures.

THE MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM IN TORONTO.

By F. E. Titus.

The forty-sixth clause of the conditions annexed to the agreement between the City of Toronto and the Street Railway Company made Sept. 1st, 1891, provided that no cars shall be run on the Lord's day until a Sunday service has been approved by the citizens by a vote taken on the question.

That agreement was ratified by an act of the Legislature of Ontario.

Subsequently the Legislature provided that the submission of the question of Sunday service should be in pursuance of a by-law of the City Council, which should define the character and extent of the proposed service.

On the 26th of March, 1897, an agreement was made between the City and the Railway by which the character and extent of the proposed service was agreed upon. Thereupon the by-law was formulated and passed the first and second readings before the City Council, to be read the third time after approved by the popular vote.

The voting took place on May 15th. The total vote for was 16,433 against 15,963. Majority 460. Total 32,396. The Toronto Globe declared it to be one of the most exciting contests that has ever taken place in this city.

No other election took place at same time. At the municipal election in January last the total vote was about 22,000.

The question had been voted on twice before. The first time it was defeated by about 4,000, the second time by 973. This was in 1893, and the vote was for 13,128 against 14,101, total 27,229.

I think it will be acquiesced in generally. The anti moved for an injunction to prevent the cars running last Sunday, but this application was refused. The Railway Company contended that the people having approved of the Sunday service, it was not necessary to wait for the third reading of the by-law, but they were entitled to run at once. The Judge (Ferguson) before whom the application was made, held that this contention was correct. The cars ran last Sunday, and there were no arrests.

The elements conspired to help the street cars—a heavy rain falling just as the churches were dismissed at noon, consequently the cars were filled with church-goers.

There was considerable talk of recount and of upsetting the vote on the ground of bribery, but I think the objections will be allowed to lapse.

The Toronto Globe, of May 17th gives the following about this referendum.

"For weeks the chief, if not the sole, topic of conversation upon the streets, in the clubs, the churches, and even in the household, has been the Sunday car by-law. The struggle has been a severe one. A very great majority of the ministers went into the fight with the greatest vigor and enthusiasm, and in the majority of cases carried the machinery of their church organizations with them. The other side had a good organization and enjoyed the support of many citizens who occupy the highest position in the commercial and social world. Both sides were confident of victory and made every preparation to poll the full vote. That their laudable efforts had been eminently successful was evident when the ballots were counted."

"At an early hour on Saturday morning it was evident from the busy appearance of the streets that there was some unusual excitement. The streets were crowded with vehicles of all kinds, and in front of the various committee rooms long lines of carriages assembled awaiting orders to bring voters to the polls.

"There were 148 polling stations, and the average number of votes polled at each was about 220, which gives an average of one for every two minutes of the time during which the polls were open. Both sides were well equipped with scrutineers and other assistants, and the anti had the benefit of the services of a large bicycle brigade by means of which constant communication was maintained between headquarters and the various polling stations."
"An analysis of the vote is chiefly interesting in the relation which it bears to the statements and assertions made upon the platform during the campaign. Speaking generally, it may be said that in the districts where the population is most dense and the areas of breathing space per resident is smallest, there was a large majority for the cars, while in those districts which immediately surround the public parks and upon the lake shore to the west the majority of the residents do not want Sunday cars."

THE MOVEMENT FOR THE MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM.

Nothing is more significant of the trend of the times than that as soon as the proposed charter for Greater New York became public, there was at once an outcry that it should be submitted to the public. Hon. Abraham Hewitt, ex-Mayor of N. Y. said about it:

"The Croton waterworks scheme was submitted to the people, and the rapid transit plan was submitted to the people, and I see no reason why the same principle should not apply to the charter of Greater New York."

"In a country whose government is founded on popular suffrage, it is unwise to impose a government which the people had no hand in creating or passing upon. The judgment of the people is wiser, in my opinion, than the wisest men who ever sat in a public commission. I entreat you, gentlemen, not to attach your names to any document which, after fair examination and discussion, shall be found to have deprived the people who were to be governed of the power to govern."

The Chamber of Commerce adopted unanimously a set of resolutions presented by Charles Stewart Smith, calling on the Legislature to pass an amendment which shall cause the charter to be submitted to the people affected by it before it is finally acted upon by the Legislature.

The City Reform Club went further and said there should be not only a Referendum on the Charter but one in the charter. This is well expressed by a paragraph from a letter by Hon. Edward M. Grout of Brooklyn, to the Charter Commission:

"I have examined with care the published preliminary draft to the Greater New York charter, prepared by your sub-committee, but I find no provision therein which in any way provides for municipal ownership of gas or electric lighting or of street railroads. I take the liberty, therefore, of suggesting that, in specifying the powers of the municipal assembly of the Greater New York, you add a section which will authorize that assembly to submit to a popular vote, at any time, the provision that the city acquire or construct and operate gas or electric light works, or street railroads, surface, underground or elevated, either in whole or in part."

How it is growing in other places is shown by extracts from a letter sent by the Central Federation of Labor of Troy, N. Y., to the Committee on Charter.

"The Central Federation of Troy, representing and on behalf of the residents organized workingmen of this city, would respectfully urge upon you to insert in the new charter the following provisions, to wit:

"All civic franchises, such as lighting, transit, etc., hereafter granted, shall be submitted to a Referendum vote of the voters of Troy. The same principle to apply to the extension of present franchises and rights.

"All present franchises and grants to be limited to a duration of thirty years from date of adoption of new charter.

"All expenditures for city improvements, exceeding $25,000, shall be submitted to popular vote for ratification."

"When one-fifth of the total number of the legal voters of the city shall petition properly signed by them to the constituted civic authorities asking for a submission to popular vote of the questions, "Shall the city acquire and operate lighting plants, railway plants?" etc., the said shall be printed in ballot form and submitted to the voters at the next election for a "Yes" and "No" vote, and in the event of a majority voting in the affirmative, the said authorities shall at once proceed to put into effect the expressed will of the citizens."

IMPRESSION OF LEGISLATIVE WORK FROM THE INSIDE.

By Hon. L. E. Rader, Member of Washington Legislature.

Your invitation to write of my impressions of the workings of a legislature recall to mind the closing lines of a fugitive poem, with a Will Carlton rhythm to it:

"He writes from out in Denver, an' the story's mighty short;
I just can't tell his mother, it'll crush her poor heart.
An' so I reckon, parson, you might break the news to her—
Bill's in the legislatur', but he don't say what fur."

To the uninitiated the workings of a legislature would seem to be a matter of course—just start the thing going and it will run itself. Imagine a good business man selecting a corps of clerks—in many cases without any regard for competency, honesty or experience—all more or less unknown to each other, and expect them to conduct his business successfully! Add to this the further fact that said business man should demand that two years' work must be done in sixty or ninety days, with no power to annul or change the work done, and you have a sample of the average legislature. Candidly, what can the people expect from the "workings" of such a body?

The first ten days of a legislative session are consumed in organization, introducing bills, waiting for them to be printed and placed upon the desks of members, preparatory to entering upon their consideration. Then usually follows a senatorial fight, which is the most demoralizing feature of any session, absorbing
the entire attention of the members, corrupting many and preparing them to be ready and active tools of the hordes of lobbyists infesting the capitol. Often times committees have been appointed for senatorial purposes, not at all efficient and rapid legislative work. During the senatorial fight it is difficult to secure full committee meetings, much less to secure intelligent action on measures in either of the legislative bodies.

Legislation—the true business of a legislature—has thus "gone glimmering" for more than half of the session. Scarcely a bill has gone to third reading and final passage in either house. Indeed, I believe I will not err when I say that fully two-thirds of the bills of a session are passe during the last two weeks. The haste consequent upon the desire of the members to see various pet measures become laws, and the persistent activity on the part of the lobby in the interest of corporations and classes, make these closing days of the session the most interesting and dangerous. This period is the most trying, also the most harmful, to the intrepid legislator, who is endeavoring to guard that great army of constituents who are unrepresented in the "third house." Had such a man numberless eyes, ears and tongues, and a brain capacity beyond any yet known, he would have need of them all in order to successfully combat all the schemes for robbery and plunder that are hatched in the lobby's incubator during these closing hours.

Here is the condition—it is not a theory. Work is done on the electrical plan—the "railroading" is now entirely too slow. Bill after bill is hurried through with barely an opportunity to read the title as you turn the leaves of your files. Efforts to check such hasty work are futile, for the necessary trades have been arranged and the deals made, and the "you support my bill and I'll vote for yours" process goes merrily on. Along with this helter-skelter game goes numerous conference committees. Pick an average legislature, with ten or twenty men therein, full of the fumes of smoke and bourbon, and there you have a sample of the average legislative machinery. Here is where bills involving perhaps millions of dollars are passed upon. Is it any wonder our legislatures are a failure?

What is the remedy? Make the fireside of the court of final resort, lop off one branch of the legislature, reduce the number of members of the remaining body to not more than 25 or 50, according to the size of the State, pay the members by the year and make the session continuous. When the people have power to pass upon all legislation a large body is unnecessary, besides a small body can work more rapidly. Giving all their time to the work, it would enable legislators to consider all matters with proper care and permit them to make a special study of their work. They could concentrate the labors of other States and other nations, and apply such as would prove beneficial to their own commonwealth. Better and more capable men would occupy seats in our legislative bodies, and length of service would be considered an advantage to the people, hence men of experience would be found there. Give us these changes and the "workings of a legislature" would not be so slovenly and so unproductive of good results.

By Hon. Persifor M. Cooke, Member Colorado Legislature.

The almost obsequiousness of State officials and the fear among those benefiting by present conditions early showed me what was the position that the Legislature occupied. Before we finished, both classes proved that they knew how to care for their own. And this strange thing was the ease with which they succeeded by appealing to party prejudices, to the selfishness of men or friendship to individuals or fear of offending certain interests.

I think there are too many "checks" on legislation. There for the alleged purpose of preventing vicious hasty legislation, they equally operate to prevent good, and in these days of the public school and newspapers, freedom to act is of more importance than checks. If the people's representatives betray them, have it so there is no question about the responsibility, and let the people at them.

Two houses is a mistake. Legislation by one is constantly hampered by allegations by interested parties of what the other will do or not do. Jealousies between the two prevent a bill being mounted, a bill which passes one house goes to the other, and is apt to be there neglected, because the members are only interested in their own.

By the time a bill has filtered through one house it's pretty well sized up, but some measures were snaked through one without change on the plea that they would be made right in the other. This tends to lessen the sense of responsibility.

The veto power to-day is in the wrong place. It is hard to get away from the one-good-man principal idea, instead of accustoming the people to own themselves. The Governor is surrounded in the privacy of his office with the public knows not what influence, and if he does right it is indeed to be wondered at.

Some committees have too much work and others have nothing to do, and so measures are delayed; some are held back willfully; some are delayed through the paid services of a clerk; then some are advanced or retarded on the calendar. The chief trouble is that usually a bill for the general good gets a "God bless you" from citizens, while the private interests, whose hands are to be held from picking and stealing, will come up and work against it by fair means and foul.

Then, almost every legislator is new at his business and has his experience to gain, and that takes most of the session; no amount of urging would induce application to work in the first ten weeks, and during the last three it was of little avail.

We are paid a per diem and the session limited to ninety days. This limiting the
session is a first-class way to prevent legislation. If the pay were so much per term and the Legislature were to sit at its own expense after the ninety days, they would accomplish better work, and yet not sit too long. Now, in the last days much bad legislation is rushed through and the good prevented.

I believe that we must have the Referendum so that the people may, in sober second thought, sit in judgment on the action of their representatives; that the government may be carried on in each case by the consent of the governed, and in the Initiative to compel unwilling servants to act, and in both the only means whereby public opinion may really express itself, or may be truly ascertained.

By Hon. W. S. U'REN, Member of the Oregon Legislature.

Our Oregon Legislature failed to organize because of vices that are an inseparable part of the system of government by a political party. The minority in a partisan legislative body has no rights. The party or faction that elects the Speaker has absolute power. The minority cannot obtain a hearing for any bill or resolution, nor even get one reported from a committee, except as a favor—never as a matter of right and justice. The minority has no appeal to the people on the merits of any measure, but is absolutely at the mercy of a partisan majority, which desires, first and above all things, the destruction of the opposing party and the defeat of its important measures, regardless of their merits.

Therefore, every possible effort is put forth by every faction in our legislatures to elect the Speaker; not because that insures passage of their bills, but because it does promise them a hearing in committee or before the House. Our experience in Oregon last Winter was the logical result of the system of lawmaking by a party.

In the House of Representatives were twenty-eight Mitchell Republicans, one Mitchell Democrat and one Independent Republican—just one-half the members. On the other side were thirteen Populists, three Union Bl-Metallists, three Democrats, four Free Silver Republicans and seven Gold Standard Republicans—five minorities combined, being just half the members of the House. This combination was possible; first, because the minority has no rights; second, because of the dislike and distrust felt by these Republicans for John H. Mitchell, candidate to succeed himself as United States Senator. Either half could have forced the other half to help organize at any time, but neither dared to do so, for fear the other would by some trick or scheme elect the Speaker and control the House.

The Populists offered to assist either faction of the Republicans in the election of a Republican Speaker satisfactory to the Populists, if they were assured of the passage through the House of two bills providing for registration of voters and for representation for the three parties on the ballot, election, and amendment to the Constitution for the Initiative and Optional Referendum.

If a reasonable number of voters could by petition have compelled the submission of these measures to all the people at the ballot box, the Populists would have taken chances on any Speaker rather than to refuse to organize. With such a direct power of appeal to the people on any particular measure, the majority would not seek to prevent the legislative consideration of any measure on its merits, either by pigeon-holing the bill or denying a hearing to its advocates.

Therefore, such a hold-up of a legislative body would be impossible in a State having the Initiative and Referendum in operation. This would have been impossible also without the election of a United States Senator by the Legislature. But the policy of the Republican factions would probably have allied itself with the Populists if there had been harmony among them on the Senatorial question.

It seems to me that our recent experience is only a prelude to the example of a representative government—a very valuable object lesson, showing the need of election by the people, not only of all important officials, but also—when demanded by a reasonable number of voters—a yes and no vote by the people at the ballot-box on any act of those officials.

More power in the hands of all the voters and less power in the hands of the officers.

**EUROPEAN NOTES.**

*By J. W. Sullivan.*

In the trip to Europe which I have just made, I made no systematic inquiries as to Direct Legislation. I had other work to do. But I happened on some significant points regarding the subject, which I herewith give to the readers of THE RECORD.

The British Trade-Union Congress considered about eighty resolutions. Before they were entered in the programme these resolutions, most of which had been sent in from the different unions, were printed by the central committee and distributed to all the local unions. Some of the latter bodies amended a few of them, and many instructed their delegates how they should vote on certain of them, such as those either of general interest or of particular interest to any one trade. All the resolutions were back in the hands of the central committee two weeks before the Congress met. The Congress itself had no power to amend a resolution. It was obliged either to reject it or accept it as it had been returned from the local unions. Here was a form of the Initiative and Referendum practiced by more than a million men.

Voting on important measures is common in practically all the British unions. A few years ago the members would say of a
measure: "It has gone to a membership vote." Now they often say: "It has gone to the Referendum." The word Referendum is becoming familiar to the general mind.

The feeling in favor of the Referendum in England is, though indefinite, widespread. Some magazine articles on the subject have been published, some of the newspapers keep the idea before the public, and two or three pamphlets calling for its adoption have been issued. But there is no organized movement in its support, and the lack of exact information regarding it among the reformers was notable.

In France I found a Direct Legislation League at work. Every Frenchman not a supporter of the old conservative parties is a "Socialist" or an "Anarchist." As a matter of fact, the greater part of the political work of the "Socialists" is either to achieve what was already in the United States or to oppose the public questions. In the revolution Two of the Socialist parties of Paris—there are five in all—have Direct Legislation as one of their planks. The two parties number at least 50,000 men. The head of the Direct Legislation League in France is M. Edouard Vaillant, a member of the Chamber of Deputies. He is well informed on the subject, and is earnest, energetic and hopeful in his support of the principles involved.

In Switzerland two referendary votes recently taken will illustrate the wisdom of the people and the facility with which they can settle public questions. In the Fall of 1866 the Swiss Congress passed, by a large majority in both houses, a law which centralizes the control of the army. As the law had stood previously, each canton controlled its own troops, in time of peace, in many respects. The lawmakers believed there would be little or no opposition to the change they proposed making. But their constitutional amendment went before the people, and at the polls November 3, '95, it was rejected: No, 289,751 votes; Yes, 197,178. Thus again was the will of the people asserted in favor of republics.

The second vote alluded to was taken last July in the city of St. Gall. It put an end to an experiment of mingled municipal charity and class insurance. In the Summer of 1894, after a long discussion of the question, the City Council decided to submit to the people a scheme providing for weekly payments to the unemployed of the city from a fund maintained in part by the city municipality and in part by the poorest of its working classes. The scheme was adopted by the Referendum in '95. It obliged all the male workers who earned 6 francs ($1) or less a day to pay a certain sum—not more than six cents a week—to insure themselves against pauperism when out of work. It went into operation on July 1, 1895. That is, the obligation to pay dues then began. The payment of the insurance began January 1, 1896. It lasted just sixty days, and then the people suppressed the whole thing by another referendum. In a population of 31,000 the total number of workers who earned 5 francs a day more turned out to be 4,220. Of these 2,015 were Swiss citizens and 1,005 were foreigners, 30 per cent, thus being shown to be men attracted to Switzerland by the higher wages paid there than in their own country. An other classification of the 4,220 insured presented this comparison: Number "domiciled" in St. Gall, 2,162; number not in the canton long enough to gain a legal residence, 2,118; that is, the majority of these poorest workers were of the floating population.

In the six months—January 1 to July, 1, '96—430 of the insured declared themselves out of work; that is, about 10 per cent, of the whole number of this 430, 205 were day laborers. The skilled trades ran: Carpenters, 11; cabinet makers, 8; tailors, 7; shoemakers, 7; bookbinders, 6; bakers, 5, etc. Printers were exempted from the law, even those who earned less than 5 francs a day, as the typographical union has its own out-of-work fund.

Of the 430 unemployed 67 drew no money, some of them finding work immediately and others not having observed all the requirements of the law. Of the 363 who drew insurance, 77 took it for the whole term permissible, 60 days, and 67 for 30 days or less. The rest drew from 19 to 60 days. The average amount drawn was about $11, the highest, $26, the least, $1.80. The receipts for the fund were: Dues paid by the insured, 21,674; municipal subsidy, 4,000 francs; interest, etc., 111 francs. Total, 23,757 francs. Expenses: Sum paid the insured, 22,934 francs. So the scheme was not a financial failure. Then, why did it go down? Here are the reasons: It is to be observed that only 10 per cent, of the insured found themselves obliged to have recourse to the fund. This 10 per cent, included many, if not most, of the sort of men who always will be in need. They were the mentally and morally and physically weak. Why should the rest of the working classes be forced by law to maintain them? Ought they not be a burden, if a burden at all, on the whole community?

The large majority of the St. Gall wage-workers felt that they need not fear being out of work for so long a time as to drive them to ask for public aid. The qualified and industrious workers are fully self-supporting. In France trades know no slack seasons.

Difficulty was found in collecting the dues. The poorest and the idler were usually in arrears. But they were on hand to draw the full amount of their insurance as soon as the law let them touch it. As long as their right to draw lasted they refused work.

With this experience before their eyes, the majority of the citizens of St. Gall—the wage earners—voted November 8, 1896, the abolition of the out-of-work insurance.

The Legislatures are passing, and in many cases have passed, out of the hands of the people, and are now regularly bought up by money furnished by the corporations in a "book" that understands to procure such legislation and to prevent such legislation as they desire, and who renders no account.—N. Y. Evening Post.
BOOK REVIEW.

"President John Smith," by F. U. Adams, published by Charles H. Kerr & Co., of Chicago, at 10 cents, is a recently issued book of 290 pages of closely written reform matter, thrown into a story which is at times very vivid. If it was half as long it would be twice as effective. As it is, it is a strong book and well worth reading.

The first half of the book was written three or four years ago, right after the World's Fair, and, with the exception of the first chapter, it is an economic treatise on the industrial and political conditions leading up to our times. The last half deals with the election of John Smith to the Presidency in 1900 and the wonderful events of those years, though in the midst of it are a series of essays on different phases of economics, which are called the speeches of John Smith before his election. These are admirably written, show a keen insight and strong grasp of a situation, but they are not speeches, and they are one of the things which make the movement of the book drag.

While the words "Direct Legislation" and "Initiative and Referendum" are not used hardly a single time, the whole book is permeated by the spirit of Direct Legislation. In many places the words "rights of the people" are used as synonymous with "Direct Legislation," and the last sentence in the book, which sums up the work of the two Presidential terms of John Smith, is "The rights of the majority of the people shall no longer be abridged."

This short review of a strong book cannot be better closed than by a few extracts, almost taken at random, from the speeches of John Smith, which presumably express the best thought of the writer:

"The burdens which now rest upon the country can never be removed until the people are given a voice in the management of their political affairs."

"Representative government is a failure. It is wrong in principle and criminal in practice. It should have been repudiated fifty years ago when its defects were discovered. * * * * A representative government is one in which a number of people delegate to one of their number, or to several, the power to pass laws and transact business in which all are interested. The men they select as representatives are also interested. The theory is that the best men will be selected. In practice, it does not come to pass."

"The history of State legislatures and city councils in this country is a history of revolt and openly paraded corruption. * * * * The record is a shame to civilization, and the people should have wiped out the iniquitous system a generation ago."

"The people should not be compelled to surrender their rights to a representative. It may be policy to transact certain routine work by a representative body, but on all laws, issues and large expenditures, in which the whole people are interested, and by which they must be governed, the people should cast the vote yes or no. * * * * There should be no higher authority than the people."

USING SAME MEANS, THOUGH FAR APART.

WASHINGTON.

From the Seattle (Wash.) Daily Times.

Assemblyman Way also secured the passage of an act providing for voting on constitutional amendment at the next general election relative to what is known as local option in taxation. This amendment provides that it shall be optional with each municipal corporation in the State to fix and determine by majority vote of the qualified electors voting therein as classes or classes of property upon which taxes for municipal purposes shall be levied, which tax shall be uniform as to persons and class.

The object of this amendment is to enable cities like Seattle to exempt manufacturing enterprises, if they so desire, and the passage of this bill and the large exemptions in the revenue laws are great victories for Mr. Way and the single taxers.

NEW ZEALAND.

From the Industrial Banner.

A short time since we announced the passage by the New Zealand Parliament of a bill to give municipalities the option of taxing land values only in raising the local revenues. Cities are excluded from the operation of this measure.

News from New Zealand, through the San Francisco Star, of a movement in Tauranga county to give to the law in question local effect, with the demand for a poll, as it is called, had on the 19th of January been signed by 15 per cent. of the voters, and in one of the three ridings of the county by a majority.

As the present mode of local taxation in New Zealand is like our own, and as the demand for a poll is being promoted by single taxers, the reasonable expectation from this news is that the county will adopt the method of taxing land values irrespective of improvements, exempting both personal property and improvements.

WE ARE COMING.

We are coming, we, the people,
Rising in our conscious power;
Many ages have we waited,
Hungered, thirsted for this hour;
For the tyrant and oppressor
In our presence soon shall cower.

We are coming, we, the people,
We, the outcast and oppressed,
We, the scorned of all the nations,
Coming from East and West,
North and South, the wide world over,
Like the sea which knows no rest.

We are coming to our kingdom,
Pressing on to claim our own;
We shall rear the "golden city;"
This our task, and ours alone;
Yes, the stone so long neglected
Shall become its corner stone.

Yes, the time has come for action,
Freedom's voice is heard at last,
Calling to the sleeping nations—
Mammon's minions shudder past—
And the people's foes shall vanish;
Like dry leaves before the blast.

As they catch that far-off echo,
How the hearts of men are stirred;
How with tears their eyelids glisten
(Freedom is a wondrous word),
And, in joyful acclamation,
Now the "people's voice," is heard.
-Northern People, of New South Wales, Australia.

IT HAS ARRIVED.

It is said that no public man has really arrived at a national reputation till he has been caricatured by Puck or Judge, and
that no reform is really worth anything till the New York Sun has jumped on it with both feet. If this is true, Direct Legislation has arrived, because the New York Sun said editorially of it on March 14th last:

"Next to the worst kind of money there is or can be, nothing is half so dear to the Populist heart as the Initiative and Referendum. There is a wealth of sound about the combination. There seems to be a spell, something of magic and incantation about it. It is a sort of charm and word of gramarye. Abracadabra; now you see it and now you don't. Thousands of thoughtful citizens have derived as much comfort from the mere mention of the Initiative and Referendum as they would get from a square meal. There is little doubt that the constant repetition of the words "Initiative and Referendum" soothes the nerves, promotes digestion, helps stammering, relieves jumping toothache, removes dandruff, makes warts disappear without pain and hair grow on the smoothest face, prevents chillsblains, takes the squeak out of shoes, strengthens the memory, is an infallible cure for coughs and colds, when taken in time, and in the full of the moon is a sure remedy for moths, grease spots and insomnia. Swarms of locusts have been frightened out of Kansas by the constant invocation of the sacred words. When the days are long enough, cows, pigs and hens may be best called home by this impressive and favorite Populist cry. In short and in long, with Initiative and Referendum all wonders may be achieved and all impossibilities made easy."

THUMB-NAIL SKETCHES.

J. W. ARROWSMITH.

By Geo. W. Hopping.

Mr. James W. Arrowsmith, of Orange, N. J., one of the pioneers in the practical Referendum movement in New Jersey, is a young man, having entered this world on June 23rd, 1860, at Liberty Corner, N. J. His birthplace and forbears are suggestive of his character.

Compelled by sickness to leave Carroll College, Wis., he studied law with John Schoup, at Somerville, N. J., but was again forced by ill health to give this up, and he took to business. Though a Democrat by inheritance, by this time he had become an Independent in politics, seeking the truth and fearlessly following it, often to his pecuniary disadvantage. While identified with the Prohibition party, the fate of a monster petition to the New Jersey Legislature set him to thinking of the useless expenditure of time and energy in endeavoring thus to influence legislation. Shortly after a conversation with a veteran reformer turned his attention to the Referendum movement, then in its unobtrusive educational phase. His friend thought that the evolution of the representative system had so developed the inherent defects and dangers in it that the time was near for launching Direct Legislation into the political world. This was in 1889; and he was also influenced by reading Boyd Winchester's book, "The Model Republic."

With Mr. Arrowsmith to see a truth means to teach it with all the powers of his trained, logical intellect, and with an unquestioning devotion and faith in its ultimate success. With his friend alluded to and Mr. Henry A. Beckmeyer, of Newark, N. J., he immediately made an informal organization of The People's Power League, and slips were printed and circulated to rouse sympathy with the Referendum. Receivers were merely requested to sign their names and addresses to the following:

"Platform: The people shall have the power to propose legislation and to vote direct upon laws passed by the legislative bodies."

This, which began in 1891, was the decisive point in Mr. Arrowsmith's career. While taking an active part in reforms of all kinds, he has held the conviction that the Initiative and Referendum are the only safeguards for liberty and peace for this or any other country.

By letters to leading Prohibitionists, he leavened that party and brought Direct Legislation into their conventions and platforms. He has been an active member and First Vice-President from its start of the Direct Legislation League of New Jersey, which succeeded The People's Power League in 1893; and when in the summer of 1896 the National League was organized he was made its Corresponding Secretary, though not present when it was organized, and he has been very active.

It is largely due to his efforts prior to 1892 and since that the people were prepared to receive J. W. Sullivan's book.

In person he is tall, slender, and graceful in his movements. He has a good voice, places his thoughts in logical order when
speaking in public, his address is pleasant, and he has a certain old-fashioned deliberateness and stateliness of utterance which is now seldom seen and is very effective. He has spoken much in public, and is always heartily welcomed. He has written for a number of papers and magazines, and *The Coming Nation* has published a little pamphlet by him on D. L. which has had a wide circulation and done much good. His written style is clear, concise and weighty.

This hasty sketch scarcely conveys an adequate idea of the valuable work done by Mr. A. He has lately resigned a valuable mercantile position to take the editorship of *The Bloomfield (N. J.) Record*, and his pen is waging trenchant warfare for the truth. Much has been done by him in the past for D. L. because he believed in it; in his constant, fervid nature, that belief shows no sign of slackening, hence much may be expected in the future.

*Note by the Editor.*—The friend so modestly alluded to in the above article is the writer of it. Mr. Hopping is not only a "veteran reformer" but also a pioneer in the Direct Legislation work. When few others had even heard of it, he was active in its advocacy.

JOHN O. YEISER.

*By Walter Breen.*

Mr. Yeiser, one of the most untiring advocates of Direct Legislation in Nebraska, was born some 31 years ago in Fayette county, Kentucky.

His family was one of the pioneer settlers in the Republican valley in Nebraska.

He studied law for some years in Case & McNeney's law offices in Red Cloud, and at 15 years of age was admitted to the bar at that place, being one of the youngest, if not the youngest member ever admitted in the State. In 1889 he was married to Miss Hettie Skeep at Red Cloud, and shortly afterwards removed to Omaha and opened a law office. It was in this year that the Farmers' Alli-

ance and Independent movements began to break up the old parties in Nebraska, and in the November election of 1890, the Populists secured control of the State legislature and Senate. Mr. Yeiser, like many other Republicans, cut himself adrift from that party, which had become and is to-day in Nebraska a railway party, and worked hard for the success of the Reform forces, being identified with the Populist party as an active leader that early. At the State Populist convention in 1894, his name was brought forward as candidate for Attorney-General, but though nominated in the convention he declined the honor. Last Autumn he was nominated and elected to the State Legislature for Douglass county. It was during this Legislature that he introduced three bills which, if enacted, would have given complete Direct Legislation to Nebraska. One bill, house roll No. 68, after a tremendous fight in both House and Senate, was finally squeezed through, and this gives the Initiative and Referendum to the people in towns, cities and villages on a basis of 15 per cent. of the voters signing the petition. Only for Mr. Yeiser's efforts this bill would have shared the same fate as the other two Referendum measures (the Populists lacking a few votes of having a majority in the Senate it was necessary to have a few reform Democratic and Republican votes to carry it through). Mr. Yeiser has been a frequent contributor to various magazines, among them the Arena, Nation, etc., and is author of "Labor as Money," an economic study on the subject of scientific money. At present he is engaged in an ambitious work on social statistics and political economy, which when it will be given to the world some years hence, will doubtless add to Mr. Yeiser's reputation as a deep student in these matters. Mr. Yeiser believes that the next decade will witness the advent of the Initiative and Referendum in all branches of government in Nebraska.

THREE TYPICAL VIEWS OF LEGISLATURES.

*From The Newark (N. J.) Sunday Call of April 4, 1897.*

The Legislature was incompetent, and its record demonstrates it, from beginning to end. Its incapacity prevented measures which the bosses would not have objected to, while reforms which might have injured corporations or the bosses were easily throttled.

*From The Representative (Minneapolis, Minn.) of April 15, 1897.*

The Legislature is defunct. It was marked by a few virtues and a thousand crimes. The members return home to receive the curses, loud and deep, of their disappointed constituents. The defeat of the Douglas bill, and of every other measure aimed against the corporations, will be difficult to explain.

*From The Tulare County News (Calif.) of March 25, 1897.*

Thank God, they have adjourned, and may the people never again be cursed with a similar aggregation of bold party politicians and jobbers in legislative council.
A Non-Partisan Advocate of Pure Democracy.
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DEFINITIONS.

DIRECT LEGISLATION—Lawmaking by the voters.
The Initiative—The proposal of a law by a percentage of the voters, which must then go to the referendum.
The Referendum—The vote at the polls of a law proposed through the Initiative, or any law passed by a lawmaking body, whose reference is petitioned for by a percentage of the voters.

---

NATIONAL MATTERS.

Senator Butler writes recently:

"As you know, I have been trying for some time to pass a resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee to inquire into the feasibility of applying the Initiative and Referendum to Federal legislation, but there is considerable prejudice in the Senate against creating special committees, especially when the object in view is one to which the Senate is not especially friendly. The cry is always raised that a regular committee of the Senate should make the investigations. I have never been able to get my resolution reported by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

"Recently I have made a new move by wording the resolution so that it would not have to go under the rules to that committee, and the new resolution instructs the Committee on Privileges and Elections to make this investigation. I succeeded in getting it to a vote on June 23d and passing it through the Senate. Senator Allen is a member of this committee, and promised me before I passed the resolution in this shape that he would see the matter investigated and a report made. He will, of course, have the power to make a minority report, covering the whole question, even if the majority of the committee is unfriendly. By this resolution the committee is positively instructed to make this investigation and report. It is very probable that there will be a majority and a minority report, and that the majority will report against us, but that is immaterial, so that we get a report.

"I had intended to speak at some length on the resolution, but those who were managing the Tariff bill, seeing that I was determined to press this matter, agreed to interpose no objection to the passage of the resolution if I would not take up time to discuss it. Of course, I readily agreed to this, for I prefer to make my speech on this question at the regular session of Congress, after the reports have been made."

This matter is now in good shape, thanks to Senator Butler's efficient work. It is a pity that he is not on this committee to carry on the work, but readers are urged to write to Senator William V. Allen at his home, Madison, Neb., urging him to make a strong report, and giving him such information as will help him in this.

Senator Pettigrew's bill to submit to a Referendum at the Congressional elections of 1898 the questions of the free coinage of silver and of the election of Senators and President by the direct vote of the people, has caused quite a little stir in Congress and among the reform papers, in which last place it is universally commended. Uncle Sam, a Democratic paper in Maryland, says of it:

"Submit these questions to the people? Well, we'll be jinged! What do we pay Congress for, anyhow? How on earth will our President ever get rich if the people make the laws? Senator Pettigrew must be crazy. I want to see both these questions adopted by the people, but these silly Senators want us to do the work, while they draw the salary. Besides, this would be putting the Initiative and Referendum in operation, and that, we all know, is anarchy."
MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM IN THE SOUTH.

So much more talk about D. L. has been heard in the North and West that it is a pleasure to record its actual operation in a purely Southern city and an old one, and one which has been regarded as very slow and conservative. Last winter the Legislature of Alabama changed the charter of the city of Mobile, permitting ownership of waterworks and sewers, after a referendum had been held on these questions. In June the Mayor called the attention of the Common Council to this change in their charter, and the Council unanimously voted that the election should be held. The citizens took it up and an active campaign was fought over the two questions—the building and ownership by the city of a waterworks and a sewer system. The vote took place on August 2d and resulted in a vote on the waterworks of 2,188 in favor to 464 against; total, 2,647; and on the sewers of 2,145 in favor to 505 against; total, 2,650, or a majority of four to one for both. Concerning it Mayor Bush said: "I know that the people now taken is in the right direction." Various city officials spoke of it as a "great victory," as "glad to see his Republican friends in the midst of the fight, and the gold and the silver men and all had been patriotic enough to lift Mobile out of its unenviable position," that "the people had displayed their good sense," that "the people of Mobile can be trusted to do what is right for their homes," that "the colored people were generally found on the side of progress." And the Daily Register of Mobile closed a long editorial with: "The city took a prodigious step forward yesterday."

SOME CONSTITUTIONAL REFERENDUMS.

Mr. H. P. Blount, of Atlanta, Georgia, the vice president of the National League, has obtained the following information from the Georgia Secretary of State:

In 1894 there was an amendment submitted to the people to increase the Supreme Court judges from three to five by appointment. It was defeated by a vote of 59,912 against to 57,897 for, or a total of 117,809. At the same election W. Y. Atkinson, the Democratic candidate for Governor, received 121,049 and James K. Hines, the Populist candidate, received 96,886, or a total of 217,935. Thus the division was not on party lines, as it was recommended by a Democratic Legislature, and a little over half of those voting for Governor voted for the amendments, but, according to the U. S. census, there were in 1890 398,122 males of voting age in Georgia, so that only about half of those entitled, voted for Governor.

In 1896 an amendment to increase the Supreme Court judges from three to six and to elect them by the people was carried by a vote of 104,901 to 50,475 against, or a total of 155,376, and an amendment that the State School Commissioner shall be elected by the people, instead of being appointed by the Governor, was carried by the overwhelming vote of 166,557 in favor to 8,967 against. At the same election W. Y. Atkinson received 123,557 votes and Seaborn Wright, the Populist candidate, 85,977, or about 54,559, and the Presidential electors received a total of 163,061, or less than the vote cast for either Governor or the second amendment, and a little more than that cast for the first amendment. But at all of these voting only from a third to a half of those who might vote did.

The reason why the first amendment received a smaller vote than the second is probably because of an ambiguity in the question of the people electing the Supreme Court judges, and that point will likely be called in question soon.

The 1895 Legislature, by the requisite two-thirds vote, agreed to submit the following amendment to the people in the election of November, 1896:

Section 2. Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed in either House of the General Assembly, and if the same shall be voted for by two-thirds of all the members elected to each of the two houses, such proposed amendments, together with yeas and nays of each house thereon, shall be entered in full on their respective journals, and said amendments shall be submitted to the electors of this State for adoption or rejection at the next election of members of the General Assembly in such manner as may be prescribed by law. The proposed amendments shall be published in full at least three (3) months preceding the election, and if a majority of the electors voting at said election shall vote for the proposed amendments, they shall become a part of this Constitution. But the General Assembly shall have no power to propose at the same session, nor to the same article oftener than once in two years.

It was expressed on the ballots as follows: "Proposed amendment to Section 2, Article 14, of the Constitution, substantially as follows, to wit: 'Giving the General Assembly power to propose amendments to three articles of the Constitution at the same session.'"

This seems a misstatement, as nothing in the text of this amendment limits the number of amendments the General Assembly may propose, save that they can't propose two to the same article. The amendment itself is very badly drawn, and the clause "If a majority of the voters voting at said election shall vote for the proposed amendments, etc.," probably will make it almost impossible to amend the Constitution, as in order to carry, an amendment will have to have a majority of all the votes cast for members of the General Assembly, and not a majority of the votes cast on it. Thus the total vote in the State for Presidential electors was 1,090,889, while 163,077 were cast for this amend-
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ment and 68,518 against, or a total of 229,-516, or less than a quarter of those voting. This is probably the reason the amendment was submitted in a quiet way, with ambiguous wording and a lying title at a time when other issues engaged the people's attention. It is an illustration of how the people can be deluded under the Referendum. The information in this article was obtained from the Secretary of State's office and over the signature of the chief clerk, and a fee was charged and paid for the information.

The last Texas Legislature submitted to the people three constitutional amendments, and they were voted on on August 5th last. The first was to permit the formation of irrigation districts in West Texas. A writer in the Southern Mercury states two very strong arguments against this amendment, which is really a law, so long and detailed it is :

"This will confer on three State officers extraordinary and dangerous power.

"It will be adopted, if at all, in August. The next Legislature of Texas will not meet in regular session until 1889. In the meantime the Governor, Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Attorney General will constitute a board—to do what? Not only to make rules and regulations necessary to put this machinery into immediate operation, but to make rules and regulations as complete as the Legislature now has to enact laws.

"Two or three of our neighbors having between them only ten to twenty-five acres of irrigable land will, under this law, be able to organize an irrigation district to include our 200-acre homestead, together with their ten to twenty-five acres, and I will be powerless to prevent them from organizing a corporation, and its assets may include only their property and ours. They may elect themselves its officers and take the entire management of it on themselves, notwithstanding we may own ten times as much of the assets as they do. They may mortgage our 200 acres at $15 per acre, say at $3,000, issue bonds against them to run forty years, with an annual interest charge of 6 per cent. and a further annual charge of 2½ per cent. to create the sinking fund I have above mentioned. They may go further, and tax our 200 acres, according to their pleasure, to run an irrigation plant, pay its expenses, etc. And they may default in payment of interest and have our 200 acres sold by order of court under foreclosure proceedings and so force us to lose our home. My wife and I may not mortgage the property, but those neighbors, without our consent, and over our solemn protest, will be able to do it under this law."

The second amendment permitted certain counties to give aid in the construction of railroads by the issuance of bonds or other evidence of indebtedness when authorized thereto by a majority vote of any such county. And the third amendment made valid that part of certain illegally issued county bonds which were held by the State as a part of its school fund, but did nothing for the balance of the bonds held by private parties. Hon. H. C. Kearby says of this:

"Validate these bonds to the extent of the State's investment and repudiate them to the extent that the citizen has invested in them, and from that hour and forever after, the certificate and seal of your highest officers ought to and will stand discredited and dishonored among all thoughtful, candid and honest men. Our people are fair-minded, and want supreme justice meted out to all alike. If the amendment had read to validate such bonds in the hands of all purchasers it would have excited the admiration and pride of all Texans and secured their unanimous support. The amendment is dishonorable. Texas invited capital to come here and invest in these bonds. Texas now says by this amendment, we will pay our State, but we will prey upon and rob the citizen resident and non-resident."

The Southern Mercury says:

"The election was the quietest ever held in Texas. Not one-tenth of the people voted at all, and of those who did, the reports, as far as received, show that they opposed the bonds and bondage sought to be fastened on the people by these amendments."

It looks as if, despite the light vote, the people had done right in defeating those amendments.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

I. LEGISLATIVE REFERENDUM.

One-fourth of either house of the State Legislature shall have the power to refer any act or part of an act to the voters affected thereby, at the next general election, only to take effect if approved by a majority of those voting thereon.

II. CITIZENS' REFERENDUM.

Five thousand voters of New Jersey shall have power to require that any act or part of an act passed by the State Legislature, shall be referred to the voters affected thereby at the next general election, only to take effect if approved by a majority of those voting thereon, by filing their demand with the Secretary of State not more than ninety days after the adjournment of the Legislature which passed the act. Earlier than which date no law or part of a law whose reference is not called for under this section shall become operative.

III. CITIZENS' INITIATIVE.

Ten thousand voters of New Jersey shall have power to propose any law or amendment to a law or to the Constitution of the State of New Jersey, and require that it be referred to all the voters affected thereby, to become a law or a part of the Constitution if approved by a majority of those voting thereon, at the first general election occurring at least two weeks after such demand shall have been filed with the Secretary of State.
IV. UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWS.

Whenever any law or part of a law shall have been declared unconstitutional by any State court, the Executive shall submit it to all the voters the same as if it had been initiated by ten thousand voters, and if approved by a majority of those voting, it shall be a law of the State notwithstanding anything in the Constitution to the contrary.

V. ARRANGEMENT.

Until laws are enacted especially providing for the enforcement of this amendment, the Secretary of State, in referring measures providing for ballots and all other necessary matters, shall be guided by the general election laws and the provisions of the acts herefore passed referring constitutional amendments to the legal voters for approval or rejection.

VI. EXEMPTIONS.

All laws for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health or safety, may be excepted from the operation of this amendment, if passed by a three-fourths vote of each legislative body.

REFERENDUM CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

By Clarence Ladd-Davis, of the New York Bar.

In drafting Constitutional Amendments providing for the Referendum, two things must always be kept in mind—first, that it may meet hostile legislators, and afterwards a much worse and stronger enemy for evil—hostile courts, who will interpret such amendments. A curse of our country to-day is judicial legislation and the interpretation of State and United States constitutions by judges often biased, occasionally influenced.

In my opinion, there should be contained in all such amendments a provision providing that if the Legislature fail to pass the laws necessary to carry it into effect in detail, such as the manner of counting and certifying the votes, of the calling of special elections, of advertising and bringing to the public attention the full text of the laws to be voted upon, that the people might of their own motion, and without any legislative enactment, bring before the people for direct vote such laws as may be necessary to carry into effect the plain provisions of the Constitution.

Second. There should also be a provision in the Constitution that after the people had once exercised the Referendum upon a question, the Legislature should not have the power to pass any act upon the same subject, without submitting the same to the direct vote of the people; otherwise a corrupt and venal Legislature might pass laws the harmful effects of which, while far reaching and extending over an incalculable number of years, could not be prevented by any action which the people might take within the time allowed them for the Referendum and the vote.

We must remember that in making this fight all the combined forces of machine politics and of plutocracy, not alone in the State in which such amendment may be adopted, but of the United States, will be brought to bear to discredit and to render void the first Referendum State Constitutional provision which may be enacted.

It is essential that these amendments be properly and clearly drawn, and contain neither too little nor too much of what is necessary for their absolute and unqualified effect. We who have the Referendum in our hearts must remember that often corporation and plutocratic lawyers and judges will have the interpretation of these provisions, and that they may pick more flaws in provisions drafted by laymen in one minute than they could pick in a year in those drafted by a trained constitutional lawyer, who knew his business and whose heart was with the people.

Under existing conditions, where a large number of the judges of the courts of last resort are lawyers of the highest training, and many of them former corporation attorneys, and unconsciously or unconsciously in favor of plutocracy and of existing institutions, and conservative to the last degree, if there is anything that is needed in the drafting of reform measures it is technical and high legal learning and ability. In all ages the worst thing that reformers have to fight is to be reformers; "For hell," as the poet says, "is paved with good intentions," and when there is brought into the drafting of reform constitutions or laws a combination of the best of intentions and ignorance of the exact situation and of the basic principles of constitutional law, the amount of damage that can be done by well meaning persons who do not understand, may be as bad, if not worse, than any damage that can be afflicted by our enemies.

No Referendum Amendment should, in my opinion, be allowed to be passed and put in operation in any State until it has been submitted to the best legal talent obtainable, who believe in the Referendum and are experts in constitutional law. If this is not done, a defective amendment may be passed, and the Referendum agitation may, in consequence, receive a setback from which it may not recover for many years.

THE BREAK-DOWN OF LEGISLATURES.

From Harper's Weekly.

Legislatures in a great majority of the States assembled early in January. Most of them have already adjourned, and the record of those which are still in session is practically made up. With only rare exceptions the people are profoundly dissatisfied with the work of their representatives. In some cases incompetency and inefficiency during the regular session have forced the calling of an extra session to transact absolutely essential business; in others weeks have been wasted in deadlocks over the choice of United States Sena-
tors, and in Oregon the entire session was thus wrecked; in still other cases, and these the most numerous of all, the law-makers have passed many unwise, reckless and mischievous measures, or have only been restrained from such action by earnest expostulation of the people.

There is a practical break-down of our legislative system. It has ceased to be a representative system. Popular education is more general than ever before; the standard of public morality is higher than it used to be; the present efficiency of men in private business was never approached in the past. Theoretically the men chosen to a Legislature represent the people. If the people are gaining in education, morality and efficiency, the men whom they elect to make laws for them should reflect this improvement. Yet there is general agreement throughout the country that legislators were never before so careless in the framing of laws, so ignorant as to the fundamental principles of government, so open to corrupt influences.

Most unrepresentative have legislatures in many States become that they pass bills which are plainly opposed to the interests of their constituents, or are only deterred by the most energetic demonstrations on the part of the people. The new Constitution of New York requires every bill affecting any city to be submitted to the Mayor of that city after its passage at Albany, for his approval or disapproval. If he objects to its enactment, the Legislature may still pass it again, and if the Governor shall sign, it may become a law; but the plain intention of the constitutional provision is to furnish official evidence of local sentiment on the subject, with the expectation that such expression will be decisive. Nevertheless, the last Legislature in every case where a Mayor disapproved its action passed the bill a second time, often with the expression of contempt for the opposing sentiment to which the Mayor had given voice.

A controversy over street railway franchises in Chicago recently came to a head in the Illinois Legislature. There was no doubt whatever as to the feeling of the people most affected by the proposed legislation. It was made plain in every possible way—through the press, by public meetings, by statements sent to the capital. Chicago was as nearly unanimous as a great city ever can be in opposing a bill which would give the present street railway companies a monopoly of transportation privileges for fifty years. Yet the obnoxious bill was easily pushed through the Senate, and was only halted in the House by the holding of an impressive mass meeting in Chicago, at which cool-headed speakers successfully rebuked those representatives who should be faithful to the interests of the people.

What is the explanation of all this? Why do our legislators decline in intelligence, efficiency and character as the standard of each of these qualities rises among the masses? Why has the relation of the law-maker to the general public undergone so revolutionary a change that the ancient title "representative of the people" has become often an absurd misnomer? Why do we have to hold public meetings and to organize committees to visit State capitals while our Legislatures are in session to keep them from passing unwise, unjust and corrupt measures, to which the great majority of the voters are opposed?

The answer to all such questions, puzzling as they seem at first thought, is really very simple. Legislatures as they were originally conceived are breaking down because the representative character of their members has changed. They have not ceased to represent somebody. They are as responsible now as they ever were in the past. But they represent a small organized element of the voters which is under the control of the "machine," and they are responsible to the boss of that machine. The founders of our system of government expected that legislators would heed the wishes of those to whom they owed their seats. They do not recognize that obligation still. The only difference is that a large proportion of the members now secure the nomination which results in their election from an "organization" of a small number of the voters in one party. Knowing that the people had nothing to do with their choice, they feel that they owe allegiance only to the machine which gave them their seats.

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN OPERATION.

By J. K. Calkins, Secretary Ruskln Co-operative Association.

Even those who thoroughly understand Direct Legislation in theory, and believe in its efficiency, can not appreciate the excellence of its practical workings until they have seen it in actual practice.

The Ruskln Co-operative Association, of Ruskln, Tenn., has now given this system of expressing the will of the people several months' trial, and I do not think there is a member of the colony who would wish to return to the former method.

So long as there were only twenty or thirty stockholders the weekly "town meeting" method of transacting business was bearable, but when the colony reached a membership of upwards of eighty voters, such method became unwieldy and very unsatisfactory. The discussion of proposed methods, in open meeting, was apt to result in harsh speeches and the drawing of factional lines. Voters were often swayed by prejudice and sometimes by passion, instead of being calmly judged by the reason and mature judgment. This was the tendency of the "stockholders' meetings," and even the members of a co-operative association are not entirely exempt from the influence of an evil system. Again, our applica-
tions for membership were read in open meeting by the secretary, and without being able to quietly consider the qualifications of the applicant, the members are called upon to vote yes or no, and very often regretted their action afterward.

Now this has been changed. The following extracts from our by-laws will clearly explain our method of applying the Initiative and Referendum, and also the imperative mandate:

"The board of directors shall constitute the legislative branch of the association, and may take such action as they deem necessary for the good of the association; provided, such action shall not conflict with the provisions of the charter or by-laws: and provided further, that their action shall be subject to the decision of a majority of the stockholders by means of the Referendum, whenever 25 per cent. of the members shall demand that such action be referred to them; and when in the opinion of the directors a change in the by-laws is necessary, they shall have the power to initiate such a change. But refer it to the stockholders for final action by the Referendum.

"Twenty-five per cent. of the members shall have the right to initiate any measure or policy they see fit; and when such number of members shall present the desired measure to the directors the latter shall refer the same to the stockholders for final action by the Referendum.

"Every Monday morning the secretary shall post all applications for membership handed in by the board of examiners, together with the recommendations of said board, in a conspicuous place in the president's office, for the inspection of members, and on the following Saturday afternoon a ballot on such applications shall be taken. The polls shall be open between 6 and 8 o'clock p.m., and shall be under the direction of an election clerk to be appointed by the board of directors. The canvass of the votes shall be made and the result thereof declared by the board of directors.

"The stockholders of the association, by a majority vote of those voting, shall have power to remove, by the imperative mandate, on petition of 25 per cent of their number, any officer whom they have elected to his or her respective office, and replace him or her with another for the unexpired term.

"These by-laws may be altered or amended upon the initiative of 25 per cent. of the resident stockholders, subject to the approval of a two-thirds vote of the members voting, the ballot to be taken after two weeks' public notice has been given of the proposed change."

From our practical experience since adopting the above, we can all testify to its success. We think any other form of government we have ever seen tried. We use printed ballots containing the name of the applicant and the report of the examining board, or a clear statement of the measure to be voted upon, with a space after each for the voter to write yes or no, and each voter has a week in which to quietly consider the application or the question to be submitted.

Direct Legislation is unquestionably the most direct and practical method of securing a pure democracy that has ever been devised, and the shortest road to all desirable reforms.

THE PEOPLE, LORD, THE PEOPLE!

EBENEZER ELLIOTT.

When wilt Thou save Thy people?
O God of mercy! When?
Not kings and lords, but nations;
Not thrones and crowns, but men:
Flowers of Thy heart, O God, are they?
Let them not pass like weeds away—
Their heritage a sunless day.

God save the people!

Shall crime bring crime forever,
Strength aiding still the strong?
Is It Thy will, O Father,
That man shall toil for wrong?
No! say Thy mountains. No! Thy skies;
Man's clouded sun shall brightly rise
And songs ascend instead of sighs.

God save the people!

When wilt Thou save the people?
O God of mercy! When?
The people, Lord, the people!

Not thrones and crowns, but men:
God save the people, Thine they are,
Thy children, as Thy angels fair!
Save them from bondage and despair!

God save the people!

TWO DIRECT LEGISLATION BOOKS.

By Eltweed Pomeroy.

RITTINGHAUSEN'S DIRECT LEGISLATION.

It is not often that a book nearly half a century old, whose author is dead and which was written in a foreign language and for an alien people and for a special purpose—to arouse that people after a great revolutionary movement had failed—will bear translation and publication in a country which the author never visited, probably never studied, hardly mentions in the book, and likely did not think of when he was writing the book. Yet that is what has been done with the little sixty-four-page book, entitled "Direct Legislation by the people," by Martin Rittinghausen, which has been translated from the French and published in the Humboldt Library, New York, at 15 cents each.

The reason of this book's unusual vitality is not far to seek. It lies in two things. Despite a certain old-fashioned stiffness, which, instead of hindering, rather gives a quaint flavor to the book, the style is clear, direct, dispassionate, and the translation is good, and it deals with principles. It is not an ephemeral political
pamphlet, dealing only with contemporary conditions, but states fundamental truths which are as true and applicable to-day and here and there as they then and there. For instance, when he says: "Far better would it be to comprehend the nature and the essence of democratic government than to believe one's self much about the reforms which that government ought to bring about," or "The united interests of the vast majority; those are the sources of the best social interpretation of right that can be arrived at in this world," you feel that he is stating universal truths.

Secondly, though written for a French, Swiss and German audience, and to suit their conditions between 1850 and 1860, it is very pertinent now and here. His "reasons why democracy should openly declare itself the enemy of the representative system" fit so exactly our conditions that they will be given almost in full. Either the man was a prophet for our country, or else the conditions there and then were so identical with ours here and now that the same remedy, which in Switzerland has corrected these evils, will correct them in the United States.

His nine reasons are as follows:

"1. The representative system is a remnant of ancient feudalism. It had a reason for existence when society was composed of corporate bodies or classes of various kinds, charging their delegates with a specific command. But it no longer has this reason for existence, since these corporate classes have disappeared. In doing away with the spirit of the middle ages, the cause, the people should have done away with the effect."

"2. It is absurd to represent a thing by its diametrical opposite, black by white, the general interest of the people by a particular interest opposed to it."

"3. Representation in government is a fiction and nothing but a fiction. Representation does not exist, unless that term is applied to a continual antagonism of those whom one is to represent."

"4. Even if there happened to be a case of genuine representation through some undiscoverable paragon of a representative, the majority of the votes of a country would still remain unrepresented."

"5. In the elections, the intriguer has the advantage over the honest man, because he will not shrink from a number of methods that are disdained by an honorable candidate; the incompetent has an advantage over the man of ability, because three-fourths of the electors vote, and always must vote, without knowing and without being in a position to judge the merits of the candidate. Besides, in this mendacious system of government, the election is itself an absurd sham. You either ask the voter to cast his ballot according to his own personal convictions, upon the strength of his acquaintance with the capacity or honesty of the policy of the candidate, in which case you admit it impossible; or you ask the voter to cast his ballot for a candidate nominated by a convention, and then you have no election at all; you merely have a nomination secured through a small coterie, itself dominated by motives of personal interest. Accordingly, experience proves that in every representative assembly five-sixths of the deputies are mediocrities."

"6. In a representative assembly many upright natures change their character entirely; the honest man is there, the readiest to repudiate his own convictions. There are temptations to which it is only possible to expose men under penalty of seeing them succumb. One of these temptations is the power to enrich one's self or one's family, to rise in the worldly scale; that is to say, to oppress one's fellow-creatures without incurring any responsibility whatever. Hence, continual apostasies and the impossibility of ever creating a well-ordered majority."

"7. The fear of not being re-elected is absolutely without influence upon the conduct of the unscrupulous representative. The more he violates the confidence reposed in him, the more certain he may be of re-election. Hence the most detestable politicians have the longest legislative careers; they survive the fall of all regimes."

"8. Under the influence of this same tendency, every representative assembly must necessarily be worse than the one preceding it."

"9. Representative assemblies are the incarnation of incapacity and evil intent, from a legislative and political standpoint. In legislation they make continual onslaughts upon the liberties of the people or surrender the slender patrimony of the poor to speculators. Politically, the situation is still worse, if that be possible."

It needs no eagle vision to see how truly these words apply to our own legislatures.

This book is short and slight. It has only eight chapters, and their titles, Chapter I., "Direct Legislation by the People, or Genuine Democracy"; Chapter II., "The Plan"; Chapter III., "Objections"; Chapter IV., "Some General Considerations"; Chapter V., "The Representative Theory of Government"; Chapter VI., "The Strength of Direct Legislation"; Chapter VII., "The Assumption of Practicability"; Chapter VIII., "Making of the Law," show its scope, which is not thorough and complete. The book containing the full argument for Direct Legislation is not yet written. It contains no arguments from facts, for the simple reason that there were very few facts made when it was written. It brings out some few, now dead, personal antagonisms. Its illustrations from contemporary history are scant, but easily understood. Its detailed plan is cumbersome and has never been adopted, and interesting only as showing the practical ideas of that time. It is not illuminated by poetic imagination, nor lit up by the fires of fierce denunciation, so as to be a widely popular book. It appeals to the head, and not to the heart. And the belief in the people by its author, the descendant of an old, aristocratic house, is so strong and its logic for Direct Legislation so clear and convincing that it is read by both friends and foes of that subject.

A few of his paragraphs concerning Direct Legislation will close this brief review:

"Direct Legislation asks the people only to understand their own interests. This is all that
any one can ask without being guilty of an act of folly."

"The masses are endowed with an inimitable capacity of going straight to the heart of a great legislative question and deciding it in accordance with the principles of eternal justice and natural equity, with which their interests must always remain accorded. From this capacity and good faith can manifest themselves but seldom among a body of pretended legislators, who, in addition to their class interests, are blinded by pride and prejudice. Who has not observed the spontaneous intelligence with which the masses will settle questions that for ages have been rending the hair-splitting brains of the privileged classes without being determined? In a recent discussion of Direct Legislation one opponent, a widely-known literary man, wanted to know how the people could be asked to settle the grave question of the separation of Church and State, a question which the most learned disputants can give no solution of. There was a subdued murmur among the audience at this question, and a workman asked leave to speak. 'The people,' he said, 'will decide that those who want to pray may say their prayers. Religion is a private affair.'"

"There was no fault in the revolutionary movement that was not committed by the educated students; no apostasy, but that of a leader. Neither educated men nor leaders framed a proposed measure that could be depended upon, either on principle or as a practical measure."

"Robespierre, wishing to sacrifice Louis XVI, was quite right in opposing all appeal to the people, and I am convinced that had the Reign of Terror been organized on a democratic basis—if such an expression may be employed—had the sections been charged with the duty of passing judgment upon all the enemies of the public weal in their respective neighborhoods, the horrors perpetrated by the pro-consuls and the savage-minded committees then ruling in Paris and in other cities would have been as save."

"Democracy, remaining true to its principles, will go forward, and the first step in advance and in freedom from the representative world is Direct Legislation by all the people. We defy the whole world to prove the contradictory with any appearance of logic and common sense. Direct Legislation is the only government worthy of an enlightened nation, the only government through which the theory of the sovereignty of the people becomes an accomplished fact."

THE PEOPLE OR THE POLITICIAN?

The above is the title of another little book of sixty pages, written by E. L. Taylor, and published by Chas. H. Kerr & Co., of Chicago, at 10 cents each.

It contains a very vivid statement of the legislative incapacity and corruption which is growing worse every year in our country, and a strong advocacy of Direct Legislation from the same source as the same thought in a variety of forms, most of them clear and striking. One of the opening paragraphs is: "The Republic which only a little more than a century ago was founded on principles which were a revelation to enslaved mankind, and which shook the foundations of empirics until tyrants feared their rule was drawing to an end, has become as corrupt and oppressive as the monarchy which sought in vain to crush it. The government which acknowledges the sovereign will of the people as the only source of its power gives the people no voice in the making of the laws by which they are governed, and they, looking on, see their liberties barred away, see themselves sold into industrial slavery, and are powerless to prevent it."

There is one argument often used which he demolishes so nicely that it is worth repeating. "We are familiar with the cry, 'Elect good men. From the universality of the belief that we have only to elect good men to have all our difficulties disappear, one would suppose that the people were ignorant of the fact that they had elected good men in the past. Then to elect good men it is necessary that they should first be nominated. Any one who will reflect upon the remote connection which exists between the voters of this country and the machinery by which nominations are made will become convinced that the difficulties in the way of the election of any man by the people, whether he be good, bad or indifferent, are insuperable so long as the influence of the politician is so great that he can nominate practically whomsoever he may choose."

Many other arguments are as well put and as clear as this, but he repeats the same thought very often, and at times gets to the verge of hysteria. He has touched very few other of the many strong arguments for Direct Legislation, but the title does not imply any more, and from the standpoint which he has taken it is a striking and strong contribution to the literature of the subject.

THE INITIATIVE IN SOME SWISS CANTONAL CONSTITUTIONS.

Translated by Miss Ella Levin, of New York.

Constitution of the Canton of Vaud, March 1st, 1885:

Article 27—The following shall be submitted to the vote of the people:

First—Every proposition coming from 6,000 active citizens.

Second—Every law or decree of the Grand Council, if a Referendum is demanded by 6,000 citizens, etc.

Canton of Turgovie, January 27, 1889:

Article 3—When at least 2,500 demand the promulgation of a new law or the abrogation of an existing law, etc., etc., the Grand Council shall be obliged to consider the proposition, and to submit its deliberations to the vote of the people.

Canton of Neuchâtel:

Article 38—The right of the Initiative belongs to the people, to each member of the Grand Council, and the Executive Power. Popular Initiative is the right to propose to the Grand Council the adoption, elaboration, modification or abrogation of a law or decree.
The proposition shall be made by not less than 3,000 citizens.

If the Grand Council rejects the proposition, or modifies the text of a proposition which has been demanded, the question shall be submitted to the people, but the Grand Council may present the reasons for the rejection, or a proposition of their own with the others.

Canton of Soleure, October 23rd, 1887:

Article 18—By virtue of their right of Initiative, the voters may demand the abrogation, modification or promulgation of the laws or decrees coming from the Grand Council. All the ends above enumerated shall be made by simple petition or by the presentation of a fixed or settled proposition; this shall be in writing, and shall be considered by the Grand Council within two months from the time of presentation.

A popular vote shall be held; first, if it is demanded by 2,000 voters; second, if the Cantonal Council does not assent to the demand. At the time of the popular vote the Grand Council may present a modified proposition of its own.

Canton of Zurich, April 18th, 1869:

Article 29—The right of initiative gives to the voters the privilege of demanding the abrogation, promulgation or modification of a law, etc.

This demand shall be made by simple petition or by the presentation of a fixed proposition. Every similar demand coming from the citizens or a constituted body shall, if it is approved by one-third of the Grand Council, be submitted to a popular vote. The author of the demand, or the representative of the body from which it comes, shall be admitted to the Grand Council to give his reasons, if the demand is approved by twenty-five members of the Council. In the same manner a popular vote shall be taken if it is demanded by 5,000 voting citizens, etc.

The Council may present a modified project to the people when that proposed from the people is submitted to vote.

Canton of Grison, May 23rd, 1880:

Article 3—The Grand Council shall submit to a vote of the people if it be demanded by 5,000 voters.

First—All proposals, the promulgation of new laws, etc.

Second—All proposals to abrogate or modify laws, etc.

The Grand Council shall present these propositions to the people, accompanied by their own suggestions, etc.

Canton Unterwald:

Article 86 of the Constitution of the half Canton of Nidwald was modified October, 1895, so that now but 400 signatures are required to make the Grand Council consider an initiative demand. Formerly 800 signatures were required.

The half Canton of Obwald also possesses the right of Initiative.

THE SWISS LANDESGEMEINDEN OR FOLK MEETINGS.

By Philip Jamin, of Geneva.

Translated by Miss Ella Lowin, of New York.

The history of the Folk Meeting in Switzerland is the history of the beginning of Direct Legislation.

In the Canton of Uri the Folk Meetings take place annually on the first Sunday in May at Berzingen, half a league below Aldorf. All the citizens must appear, swords at their sides; these men form a circle, in the centre of which sit the Councillors and three officers of the canton. In extraordinary and urgent cases the Folk Meeting can be called by the Council or Landrath or by seven men of seven different families.

On the day of the meeting the magistrates assemble before the house of the President of the canton; then this body traverses the villages, led by the President carrying the sword of the canton, the retired Presidents, carrying sabres decorated with the cantonal colors. When they mount their horses their swords are taken by domestics, who have followed. At the head of the procession are the citizens who have the rights of residence, armed with halberds. Following these come the drum and fifé corps of the canton, ornamented with silver, and they can be heard at a distance. The most distinguished of these is called the Faureau of Uri. Next is the Grubb-Sautier or first husser of the canton, armed with a large sabre and followed by the other husser, dressed in the cantonal livery and carrying sabres. Then follows the servant of the President, who carries a small box, in which are the seal and Constitution of the canton and the keys to the treasury and archives, and after him the President, ex-Presidents and magistrates, and the procession is closed by the protocol, the registrars and those who have the administration of the canton and the common people.

On arrival they dismount, and the President takes the sword of the canton and, accompanied by the retired Presidents, advances to the centre of the circle formed by the people, where there is a table, on which they place the box or treasure, the law and the registers of the canton. Near this table are chairs for the President and the most ancient of the General Secretaries of the canton. They face other chairs, in the first row of which are the retired Presidents, the other chief authorities and the national clergy, who assist in the assembly, and in the second place are the State Councillors. The circle is surrounded by the patriots, all carrying their swords, some seated, some standing.

The assembly is opened by prayer, during which the people kneel. Then they listen to the demands that the seven men (called strong, according to old custom) make, when the President advances the people, and directs the most ancient of the Secretaries
to read the demands of the seven men. After this the people vote inclusively upon which of these demands shall be considered before the assembly on this day, or at the after meeting, or at the Communion of the Ascension, or which shall be referred to the Council. Then they are asked if they will confirm for one year, the Constitution, councils, tribunals, seals and all the ancient and honorable customs of the canton. It is for the people to decide whether pluralities or majorities of the Council shall decide a question; whether Council voting in the past shall have the sanction of the people; whether a special tribunal shall be constituted and many other matters. Usually the people unanimously give their approval to all these things.

Then the President takes the oath of office, which is called the oath of the country, and the other officers, and finally all the people take similar oaths and the Constitution is read.

It is usual in these meetings, whether annual or extraordinary, to deal with those questions in which the canton is immediately interested, those which, because of immediate need, cannot be referred to another meeting, those in which the Council or Landrath has acted or referring certain ones to it now or to one, two or three Landraths.

On the first question which comes up the President asks the advice of the oldest ex-President, then the advice of the next oldest, and so on, and then the advice of the people, and where they have different opinions the matter is put to vote, a majority deciding.

When these matters are disposed of, the President asks the people what shall be done with the sword of justice, the seal of the canton, the law, the Constitution, the keys of the treasury and the archives; he resigns all these charges, pushes the table from him, and another is put in his place and he takes his place at the head of the ex-Presidents. The officers put away from the President, providing the retiring President has not served more than a year, who, under his oath, he names as President, and he names the, retiring President. Should the retiring President have served for two years, the Secretary asks him whom he names. Then the Secretary puts the question to the people, and the voices carry it for or against.

The newly elected President leaves the circle, coming up to the table, and the Secretary reads his duties and the Thirteenth article of the law against cabals, when he takes the oath dictated to him by the oldest Secretary, in the presence of the entire assembly. The same course is followed with the Vice President or Statthalter, the Treasurer and the Secretaries.

In all these elections and for the decision of the more important affairs of state each person expresses his opinion by raising his hand; a hussar is in position to count the people, and oft-times the people part into sections, according to their opinions. At the end the President is conducted home by the magistrate, on horseback, with a guard of hussars and the music of fifes and drums.

Besides the annual meeting, it is customary to hold three other meetings, one called the After Meeting, which is convoked the day fixed at the Annual Meeting: a second, which is held on St. Mark's Day, April 25th, and the third on the Feast of the Ascension. All questions of religious government, new taxes and tariffs, the taking in of new citizens, and all matters which can be altered are brought up before these meetings. In the Canton of Uri the right of the seven men to make proposals ceased in 1883; now each man has that privilege. While there have been some changes, the tendency is to retain the ancient customs.

In the middle of the sixteenth century there were eleven Folk Meetings, one in the Canton of Zug, two each in the Cantons of Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden (Nidwald and Obwald), Glaris, Appenzell (Trojen and Hundwyl). In Schwyz and Zug these meetings stopped in 1848, but it is in Schwyz that the oldest records are to be found, standing back to 1523. In the Canton of Uri the electors have refused since 24th, June, 1896, their adhesion to the new Federal Constitution, and have named their deputies to the States Council, and it is a nice question how it will be decided.

THE RAILWAY QUESTION IN SWITZERLAND.

In Switzerland complete publicity of accounts of the railway companies is enforced with a uniform system of bookkeeping, no watering of stock is allowed, and dividends beyond a certain amount go to the State. The government fixes both the passenger and freight rates, the number of trains and cars, that all lines go into union stations, the roadbed and various other details. But despite this very strict control, both of the finances and of the traffic, there was a growing restiveness among the people and a desire to own and operate the railways. In 1879, by an affirmative majority of 163,160, the Swiss voted a subsidy for the St. Gotthard tunnel. This and the other great tunnel and a few short lines have been owned and operated by the government for years, but the sentiment for government ownership had not grown strong enough in 1891 to carry the proposition to buy the Central Railway, one of the most important lines. This was negatived by a majority of 156,671 votes.

But the feeling has been growing steadily stronger, and on October 1st, 1896, the whole question was submitted to the people by an initiative petition and carried by a vote of 221,222 for and 171,671 against, or a majority for of 49,551. The full text of the proposition voted on is very interesting, and is as follows:

"The construction and operation of railroads for the ordinary and public transit of persons and merchandise is the duty of the Confederation. The railways of Switzerland shall be administered by a Railway Council
elected by the people. In minor details of the large companies the advice of the local governments shall be obtained. The civil service of the railways shall be the same as for other Federal affairs. The insurance funds established in favor of the railway employees shall be maintained without change.

The net profit of the railways should be employed to facilitate transit, diminish rates for persons and merchandise and to decrease the debt. A Federal law shall determine the manner of procuring funds, organization, working management and superintendence of the state railways as for private lines; it shall also fix the subsidies to be furnished sections desiring new lines. The engagements of the Federation for the tunneling of the Alps of Western and Eastern Switzerland shall be maintained.

"2. At any time the Confederation is authorized to acquire lines now or in the future in operation. The purchase price shall be twenty-five times the annual report and half the cost of operating during the ten years previous to the purchase of the lines. In the determining of this net product the following factors shall be considered: proportion of the payments or cost of renewal (repairs), a sufficient amount to the sinking fund, a sufficient number of employees and sufficient salaries for them, and the subsidies of the Confederation and the cantons.

From twenty-five times the annual report shall be deducted a sufficient sum to place the lines in complete repair, including the roadbed, stations, engine houses, etc., etc. The purchase includes all the property of the interested companies. If the purchase price of all the stock of the railroads calculated on this basis does not reach two-thirds of the cost of construction or working capital, then the price shall be increased to two-thirds of the working capital. The Federal Council shall decide on all points in litigation.

"3. Before purchase of all roads is made, the Confederation is authorized to acquire the working of single lines. By January 1st, 1898, it shall take to itself, on the basis outlined, the management of the Swiss Central, the Juras-Simplon, the just-proceed Swiss, and the roads of the Swiss Union. All construction or purchase of material for working shall be at the expense of the Confederation, with the right of recourse to the companies, according to Article 2.

"It shall take all the personnel into its service, reserving the right to dispose of employees, according to its pleasure, and shall pay all, to the companies from 1898 to 1902, inclusive, an annuity representing the net product for the years 1888 to 1892, inclusive, calculated according to Article 2. On January 1st, 1903, the Confederation shall take all the railroads. The price of acquisition to be determined at that date shall be less the debt of the companies in obligations, if assumed by the Confederation, and shall be settled by the payment of the balance either in coin or in Confederation titles. The smaller lines shall be acquired as soon as possible.

There has been much hesitation on the part of the National Government to frame and pass the laws to carry this clearly expressed will of the people into effect. Several papers and many people have urged another initiative to make the Government act, and the Journal de Genève during the winter spoke as follows of the Gutschwy Committee, which secured the signatures to the initiative petition voted on last fall: "The Gutschwy Committee, which has not judged it well to help forward the names that have been sent them for the expropriation of the railroads, thus explains itself in a memorial sent to the Federal Council. The following is the main passage: 'The purchase has been decided by a vote of the people in a manner clear and precise, and belongs, we hope, to the past. In leaving for the moment the authority to take such an important step in the hands of the Federal authorities and taking the rank of spectators, all the responsibility is thrown on our representatives. If, within the specified time, a law is presented to us which guarantees the purchase of the railroads in the sense and spirit of the Initiative, then we will sustain it without reserve, as we did the law on the accountability. But if the law mistakes our intention, we shall join those who consider the good of the Swiss people of more importance than the interests of the railroad companies.'"

But without the aid of this committee an initiative petition for this purpose was started and the necessary signatures procured, according to Der Gratianer, of Zurich, of March 30th last. But it will probably not be filed, as the Federal Council (or Bundesrat) has made investigations concerning purchase price, etc., and on March 25th, 1897, in an able report, said, among other things:

"1. In the Bundesrat's opinion, a fair purchase price would at this time call for 964,384.-769 francs.

"2. The best way to pay for the roads is to issue bonds.

"3. With government bonds issued at 3 1/2 per cent. interest, the income derived from government ownership of railroads would be sufficient to pay

(a) Running expenses.

(b) Interest on bonds issued for the purchase.

(c) A sum into a sinking fund sufficient to buy all these bonds by 1962.

(d) A surplus net income of 2,108,000 francs a year to be used as a surplus for equalization of annual income or in reduction of transport charges.

"4. Perhaps the Government could even sell railway bonds at par with only 3 per cent. interest, leaving a net annual surplus of 4,437,090 francs.

"In the estimate of purchase price, the Bundesrat did not take into account what it considers fictitious railway stock."

Last fall the national legislature had appropriated 5,000 francs for two years to ascertain the exact wages of the railways' employees.

Thanks are due to Miss Ella Levin, of New York, and Max Burgholtzer, of Buxton, Ore., for translations.
A SWISS OPINION ON RAILWAYS.

By Rev. Adolph Roeder.

The movement of Direct Legislation in Switzerland in the past three months presents two interesting phases. On one of them—the restoration of railways to state ownership—on which a vote was taken on the 4th of October, the Gruttkaner of Zurich comments as follows:

"The vote was especially surprising in Canton Berne. He who knows the local conditions knows that the Conservatives, and especially the People’s Party, have suffered a very painful defeat in their unfruitful opposition. We now know that if state proprietorship of the railroads is ever to be realized Berne will be a stronghold for that fact. That the old canton of destiny, St. Gallen, also moved along in the same line is not less gratifying. When we knew its result we said: ‘So long the cause is good.’ Right bravely have Aargau and Baselland stood up, and the minority vote in Tessin and Graubunden was much larger than one might have hoped. Everywhere an awakening of public conscience! The whole inner Switzerland has this time held its own. That Zurich, Basle, Appenzell, Glaris, Thurgau should line up in strong numbers in favor of the law was expected by friend and foe. Especial mention should be made of this fact, that the superfluous ‘yes’ of the metropolis Zurich absolutely balance and more than balance up, the negative majority of the Cantons Neuenburg and Geneva. "On Zurich the Confederate advancement continually counts. All in all, the 4th of October, 1896, was a good day. Its device runs: ‘The Swiss railroads to the Swiss.’"

THE SWISS REFERENDUM ON A NATIONAL BANK.

Few people are aware how important and how similar to our own are the questions which are agitating the Swiss people. The echo of our last fall campaign on the money question are still ringing in our ears. The 28th day of last February in Switzerland ended a campaign on the money question, on far more scientific lines than our own, and it, too, ended in a defeat of the Radicals or Progressives. The issues in this campaign have not been reviewed in our magazines and barely mentioned, much less clearly stated, in our press. Yet they are very significant. There are at present eighteen cantonal, three cantonal and private and thirteen private banks in Switzerland. By the law of June 14th, 1881, banks may be organized to any extent, with the approval of the Government, which has the right to limit their note issues. But to issue notes a bank must have a capital of 500,000 francs, and must keep a metallic reserve of 40% of the notes out, and the remaining 60% can be in commercial paper, or other securities or in the cantonal guarantee, but a bank cannot issue more than twice its paid up capital, and twenty banks have the cantonal guarantee. These banks are under very strict government supervision; so strict that when the law was passed it was said they would go out of business, and yet in 1896 the banking capital was $55 per capita; in Great Britain it was $120, and in the United States $33.69, and in Germany $44, so that Switzerland is well up, and the circulation has increased from under a hundred million francs in 1881 to nearly twice that amount in 1896, or from nearly $7 per capita to nearly $16.

For years there has been an agitation for a national Swiss bank, completely owned and operated by the National Government, which should issue the money of the country and be a bank of deposit, discount and exchange as well. This resulted in a submission to the people on October 31st, 1889, of a proposition for a single great bank, with a monopoly of note issues, which was defeated by a vote of 286,126 against 296,177. The Bank of France, seventeen and a half to four and a half cantons in favor. After this the law of 1881 was passed.

In 1890 the Federal Council sent a message to the Federal Assembly on it. This is similar to the message of the President of the Congress. This is inserted almost in full, because it states concisely most of the arguments against such a bank.

MESSAGE OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL TO THE FEDERAL ASSEMBLY.

Concerning the revision of Article 39 of the Federal Constitution. (Of December 30th, 1890.)

All the great banks of centralized power to issue notes in Europe, whether with or without a monopoly, such as the National Bank of Belgium, the National Bank of Denmark, the Bank of the German Empire, the Bank of England, the Bank of France, the National Italian Bank, the Bank of Peys-Bas, the Bank of Norway, the Bank of Austria-Hungary, the National Bank of Roumania, the Bank of Spain, etc., with the single exception of the Bank of Russia, are instituted on the basis of private exploitation of the issuing of money. The starting of the monopoly of notes or paper money is an innovation of economic importance so considerable that it is a serious matter for another country to undertake another course.

Partisan politics can only be hurtful when it agitates the solution of a purely economic question, and, probably, these influences will be quickly felt in the state bank. Political and economic interests have each its particular point of view, which cannot be confounded without injury to both: one has need only to guard against the possibility of seeing the bank used detrimentally for the demands of political wars and interests, or the heads of the bank will be exposed to the temptations from each of the opposing parties and the credit of the bank attacked.

Under the regime of private banks the credit of state and of the bank remain independent; under a state bank there is but one credit. The private bank can sub-
assist by itself; it has no need of a state guaranty any more than have the foreign banks of private or centralized emission of money.

The best form for our country appears to be, as exists elsewhere, a private bank, placed under the efficacious supervision of the state, and at the direction of the latter to co-operate with the representatives of commerce and direct interests. It is under this form that the just mean between the interests of the state, general economic interests and the particular interests of commerce will be reached. This it is that can offer the best guaranty of the accomplishment of the grand economic task which encumbers it, without being burdened with interest foreign to the matter.

Finally, under this form, the private bank gives to the state, that is to say, to the Confederation and the cantons, a participation in the benefits without involving them in actual losses, while under a state bank both losses and gains would be shared.

But the main reason for the Department of Finance declaring for a bank having the character of a private institution is to be found in the fact that, according to international rights, private property is protected in case of war, while state property becomes the prey of the vanquisher. Also the holdings of a state bank, as well as the deposits confided to it, would be in danger in case of war. Precisely at the moment the bank is called upon to render the greatest service to commerce there would be general defiance, and each one would hasten to withdraw his deposits.

But the movement for a complete government issue of money had grown so strong that only the next year, on October 18, 1891, the Federal Assembly submitted to the people an amendment to the Constitution where it declared it should not be in the power of the Federal Assembly to "establish a monopoly of the issue of bank bills, nor decree the obligatory acceptance."

The new article was as follows:

"The right of issuing bank notes and all other credit money shall belong exclusively to the Federation.

"The Federation may exercise the monopoly of bank notes through a state bank or through a private, central, share bank under reservation of the right to repurchase and under the control of the Federation.

"The bank invested with monopoly shall have the duty of acting in Switzerland as the regulator of the money market and of facilitating exchanges. Not less than two-thirds of its net profits, after deducting a fixed reserve fund and a dividend sufficient to compensate the capital, shall belong to the canton.

"The bank and its branches shall be exempt from all imposts by the canton. Only in case of necessity in time of war shall the obligatory acceptance of its notes be decreed by the Federation.

"Federal legislation shall prescribe other regulations concerning it."

This was adopted by 231,578 votes in favor to 158,681 against. It remained for the national legislature to decide whether the bank should be run by public or private funds, etc. In 1894 they prepared a project, but there was so much opposition to it that it was laid over and revisited in the summer of 1896, when the revision passed the National Council by a vote of 89 to 43, and the Council of the States by a vote of 27 to 17. Very quickly the signatures of 83,000 electors (only 30,000 are needed) were secured to petitions for a referendum of this law, and it took place about eight months after the law had been passed, and ended in its defeat by a vote of 244,219 against to 194,465 in favor. The law is a closely printed pamphlet of eight pages, and was sent to each voter by mail. It was followed at private expense by a flood of pamphlets and newspaper articles, and was discussed in many meetings and other ways.

DIGEST OF FEDERAL LAW CREATING A BANK OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION.

Passed the Federal Assembly June 18, 1896. Voted on by the Swiss people February 28, 1897.

I. General provisions.

Article 1. The Confederation founds a bank, called "Bank of the Swiss Confederation," with the exclusive right of issuing bank notes.

Its chief function is to regulate the money market and facilitate operation of payment. It will also serve as treasury of the Confederation gratis, in so far as called upon.

Article 2. The Confederation guarantees all the operations of the bank.

Article 3. Principal office at Berne. May have branches anywhere in Switzerland, with consent of central government.

Authorized to acquire existing banks and to continue them as branches.

Each canton may insist on having a branch in its territory.

In establishing agencies, preference given to existing state and cantonal banks.

Article 4. Capital 25,000,000 francs, to be paid in before operations begin. May be increased by Federal Assembly to 50,000,000 francs.

Two-fifths of capital reserved for cantons to subscribe; three-fifths the Confederation will answer for, and also the balance not provided by the cantons. The Confederation will raise its share by issuing bonds.

Cantons need not subscribe, but if they do, they are responsible for their proportion.

All the shares must be held by the Confederation or by the cantons or certain public bodies, but not by individuals.

Article 5. Cantons cannot tax bank, with specific exceptions, as to stamps or cheques, etc.

II. The operations of the bank:

Article 6. Operations of bank limited to issue of notes and discount.

(a) It may discount Swiss notes (not over three months and two good indorsers).
(b) Buy drafts on foreign countries.
(c) Loan on security, such as bonds, etc., but not on shares of stocks nor for over three months.
(d) Buy public bonds for temporary holding.
(e) Receive deposits on account current, with or without interest.
(f) Buy and sell gold and silver on its own account or for others.
(g) Issue certificates for gold or silver.

Art. 7. The bank must accept without charge all payments on account of the Confederation and its departments, and pay out for the Confederation and its departments as far as it has funds.

Also, it must, on the demand of the Confederation, receive on deposit and manage, without charge, any bonds or other such property confided to it by the Confederation.

III. The issue and redemption of bank notes:

Art. 8. The bank may issue any amount of bank notes up to limit fixed by Federal Assembly.

Bank notes are manufactured, retired and destroyed under surveillance of Federal Department of Finance.

They are in denominations of 50, 100, 500, 1,000 francs, but in extraordinary cases the Assembly may authorize smaller denominations.

Art. 10. The total value of notes in circulation must be covered by bullion, foreign coin and discounted notes; the metal reserve must be at least one-third circulation.

Art. 11. The bank must also have a reserve sufficient to cover all short obligations, viz.: Due in ten days.

Art. 12. Regulates payments at Berne and at branches.

Art. 13. Must accept its notes at par.

Public offices must do likewise. Beyond this their acceptance cannot be enforced except in case of war.


Art. 15. Worn bills.

Art. 16. Jurisdiction of courts.

IV. Accounting, profits, reserve, reports:

Art. 17. Accounts submitted to Federal Assembly.

Art. 18. Twenty-five per cent. of profits goes to reserve. From balance interest not exceeding 3½ per cent. is paid on capital. In case there is not enough, the difference is taken from reserve. The balance goes to cantons.

Art. 19. Reserve invested in Swiss and foreign national debts. No interest allowed on it.

Art. 20. Reserve belongs to bank. Only taken to make up 3½ per cent. interest and losses in capital.

Art. 21. Rate of discount and interest to be published. Weekly balance and annual report.

V. Administration:

Art. 22. Council of auditors and local committees, also board of directors and local boards.

(Acts. 23 to 38 govern details of management.)

VI. Surveyance by Federal Assembly:

Art. 39. Auditing committee provided for.

VII. Penal provisions:

(Acts. 47 to 40, penalties for counterfeiting, etc.)

VIII. Temporary provision:

(Acts. 48 to 50, provide for interim before law goes into operation.)

Notice four significant things about this law which were probably main causes in its defeat. By Art. 1 it would have the exclusive right of issuing bank notes. At present many of the cantons have banks which they own and operate which issue bank notes. These could be required and continued as canals, and the taking away from them of the power to issue notes would almost force them to become branches. This means a great centralization of power, to which the Swiss have always been opposed, and this centralization would be the more tremendous from the fact that it is put in the control of one set of men, the power of discounting notes. This is the Swiss people clearly saw.

Second—The bank notes to be issued could not be really money for the people, as the smallest denomination, save in “extraordinary cases,” was to be 50 francs or 100, and this is far too large for ordinary retail transactions. Hence this money would only be money for wholesale and for bankers.

Third—While three-fifths, and perhaps the whole of the capital, was to be furnished by the National Government and obtained by them by the issuance of bonds, on which they would pay interest (Art. 4), the bank notes issued were to be completely covered by bullion, foreign coin and discounted notes, and “the metal reserve must be at least one-third of the circulation.” (Art. 10.) Thus the notes are really based on the credit of the nation, and yet bonds are issued on which the nation pays interest to provide a fund amounting to the total value of the notes, and one-third of this must be bullion or coin. It is hardly probable that these bonds could be marketed at less than 3½ per cent. interest, and yet that is the largest amount of interest which the capital stock can receive, and until a reserve is laid aside, which probably will not be for some years, it may not get that (Sec. 18.) It looks as if this was a scheme to furnish either a very small circulating medium or a large, secure investment for capitalists in the bonds of the Confederation, a large market for gold or silver and bullion and coin, and at the expense of the Swiss National Government, and these would ultimately discredit the whole scheme.

Fourth—The time of discounting was to be not over three months (Art. 6, a and c.) This is all right for cities, but farmers, when they
want a loan, usually want it on land for more
than three months.

Notice further how clear and concise are the
provisions of this law. He who runs may read
and understand. When a matter has to be submit-
ted to the people, it has to be made clear. But let
the Swiss people speak for themselves. Here are
some extracts, both for and against, from Swiss
newspapers:

"A Simple Laborer" gives his reasons for
voting against the bank as follows: First, be-
because it is an arduous and
national danger," and gives the usual reasons —political power, booty in case of war, etc.

A German economist, Hartung, is quoted.
He compares the private bank to a vessel sail-
ing well-known seas; the state bank to a vessel
in unknown waters. He considers Swiss
securities and national honor at stake.

A "proclamation of the Democratic Com-
mittee" declares that the approaching vote
will mark a solemn period in the national
history. The Socialist party stands like a
single man in favor of the bank. But you
would, for the sake of being compliant toward
the Socialists, launch our country on a finan-
cial venture without precedent? It is pro-
posed to establish a bank with power to issue
notes, and which shall be responsible to an
limited extent. It is to confide the power of
disposing of the national credit to a force of
functionaries, named by the political power.
It will not furnish abundant capital; it will
make money cheap. The law makes it im-
possible to make loans that can be hypothe-
cated, and refuses agricultural credit. There
is a single amendment offered the agricul-
turist or laborer. It will be entirely in the
hands of the politicians. Although these are
services which it could render, there is not one
of them that could not be rendered by a Swiss
National Bank, created by the living forces of
our industry, and commerce, and outside of
political influence, but under the supervision of
the Confederation. We stand for such a bank,
with the almost unanimous approval of the in-
dustrious and commercial associations of Swit-
zerland. All are implored to go to the polls and
vote against the impending disaster. This pro-
clamation is signed by various men, "in the
name of the Electoral Democratic Com-
mittee."

A set of resolutions passed by a meeting
embraces the following points:

Considering, first, that the state bank pro-
porates in some degree the credit of the state with
the economic credit of the country; second,
that this last cannot prosper unless it has the
support of the commercial world of Switzer-
land, which should have a large share in its
direction and administration; third, that com-
merce, for the security and elasticity of its
credit, needs a bank bill and not a state note
that will be subject to fluctuations caused by
politics; fourth, that the political basis gives
the organization of the former the neces-
sited responsibility of the state over to the en-
gagements of those to whose interest it is to
cause fluctuations; fifth, that the central
bank, projected by the Union of Commerce
and Industry, will have all the advantages of
the state bank, and will yet enjoy the finances
or credit of such a bank. It is, therefore,
decided to reject the law, and to engage all the
voters to vote "No" on February 28; to lend
their strength against forming a Swiss national
bank, to be the safeguard of the national
credit, and for the economic and political in-
derpendence of the country.

The following is an almost literal translation
of an appeal for the bank issued by a committee.
It is almost the only one in favor in the cli-
plings received, and very interesting:

"Article 93 of the Federal Constitution, voted
in 1891 by 70,000 majority, gives to the Con-
federation a monopoly of bank notes, by means
of state banks under a special administration,
or for means of private banks under the ap-
proval and control of the Confederation. This
seemed a good solution. The Confederation
does not take the responsibility for the notes;
each bank assumes responsibility for its own
issue. Although the law does not oblige any
one to accept them, the notes have become true
money. It is a disgrace to the good sense of
the people to have allowed the bankers to issue
and put in circulation almost 200,000,000 of
notes. The substitution of the state note is a
question of order, logic and justice. In the
countries on our borders, the banks have fallen
into the hands of special persons. One sees their
millions helping great industries and large
speculations, but they do not assist the people.
One should remember that the question of a
state bank is not new. It is long since a large
number of workers pronounced in favor of it,
and they will again speak for it. A state bank
will be a popular bank in the best sense of the
word. Private banks will be obliged to follow
its lead, and the laborer, the farmer and
commerce will profit.

A great number of spectres are flaunted at
this moment. But they are the horrors of im-
beciles—and those interested.

Suppose we admit "political influence." This
is no greater in a pure state bank than in a
bank supervised by the state. And have we
not the fine example of our cantonal banks?
No one dare say that politics play a part in the
Bank of Zurich. The state bank will be organ-
ized, after being submitted to the people in
such a way that "influence" will be impossible.
The administration will be given, not to ruined
politicians, but to experienced financiers, under
the supervision of the Federal Assembly. If it
is a choice between the politician and bad
financiers, and for the other the politician, you
expect to have perfect politicians while a few
men have the money with which to buy them?
You cannot have sound private morals while
there are certain poor persons that will yield to
the temptations of gold. You cannot have
patriotism, citizenship, or a healthy nation while a minority of the men control the finances, and live on the others.

The risk of war and invasion are no greater for the state banks than for the commercial banks. In case of war, the military authorities decide what shall be seized, and the seizures include cannon, arms, horses, men. Why are you not afraid for the existing cantonal banks? There is as much danger for them as for a state bank.

Bankruptcy is the hideous cry raised against the state bank by those who confound the state and the bank credit. We believe those persons who desire to limit the responsibility of the bank, and to keep the credits distinct, to be sincere. But they know well that the bank will make advantageous transactions, and that the profits will far exceed the losses. One should not be surprised at the eagerness of the capitalist to get his nose in the bank; if it were such a bad business he would quickly turn his back. Since he wishes to participate in the bank, and make it a "mixed" affair, it proves that the bank is good business; it is why we wish to make it purely a state bank.

Up to the present the liberty to issue notes has led to bad results. It has been proved that such notes do not have the credit that would be given to a central bank. Besides, a central bank would render more service to the masses than can a private bank. If the state bank is not purely a state bank, it will favor the millionaires and the large transactions, and will not recognize the working classes. The state, on the other hand, will see every advantage in encouraging the large numbers of people who, on their part, will work for the success of the bank.

All banks make good profits. The bank of Vaudois made a million that was pocketed by the officers; they made it easily; it came while they slept. The adversaries of our project talk about dividing such profits among the masses; others doubt it about the profits. According to the calculations, on the most modest basis, there will be at least two millions, 60 centimes per head, without counting the profits from other activities of the bank. And we do not speak of the profit on the monopoly of bank notes. No one can say, after that, that the institution will not touch each person. Our point of view is diametrically opposed to the adversaries of the bank. With a state bank the Confederation will pocket at least ten millions each year. This sum will facilitate the question of insurance in case of rest from work, old age, sickness or accident. And this sum will also make it easy to solve certain cantonal questions.

To create a state bank in which affairs flourish—this is our firm conviction—is to advance towards the creation of a federal bank hypothecaire (power to mortgage), so urgently and so long demanded by the principal organs of the agriculturist.

It is a most important step towards relieving the onerous conditions of the small farmer.

Is it not a noble thing to replace our can-

tonal banks with a state bank that shall have power to mortgage? Ah! we understand perfectly the anxiety of our enemies, and their desperate fight against the state bank. Since 1814 to 1866 private banks have diminished in number, but have increased their issue of notes. During that time their profits have been 33,580,040 francs, raised from the people, furnished by the traders in their notes—that is, by the whole country. This manna, which is not celestial, has fallen to a few of the bankers. The day has come to return to the people what is theirs and take away the privileges of a group of persons but little interested in their welfare.

We have arrived at an important day; the vote will undoubtedly decide the course of action for years to come. The work of the state bank is due to men—in whom we have the greatest confidence.

Vote "Yes" for the state bank: it is consenting to dethrone the bankers, the financiers and capitalism.

Advance resolutely, affirm those who will vote "No" that is why we wish to make it purely a state bank.

Voters! Dear Fellow Citizens! Proclaim once more our faith in a future of prosperity and justice. Let our word be The Bank to the People! Long Live the Swiss Confederation! In the name of the sections of Grütli.

The Sections of Geneva.

The matter is well summed up in a letter from M. Philip Jamin to the writer. He says: "The state bank has been rejected by 244,219 no and 194,485 yes. This result has surprised both advocates and adversaries. Two days before the election one of the most clever chiefs in its advocacy said it would carry by a majority of little votes, notes, and some even went so far as to prophecy 40,000 majority. Although the campaign against led by capital was conducted with great vigor, the bankers were doubtless of the result.

"By the significant number of signatures, 88,000, on the referendum petition, one might have guessed the refusal if one had not learned that a certain number of signatures had been obtained by pressure made by the rich on poor electors. A newspaper in Neuchâtel has demonstrated this fact, and it is now proof of the necessity of substituting the obligatory for the optional referendum."

"The majority who rejected the law is not strong enough to discourage its advocates. The law will be remodeled by the Legislature and made less 'statistic,' or centralizing, but its great lines will remain, and in a short time a new project will be presented to the people and likely accepted. Such has been the fate of many reforms in the past, and one may predict that it will be so for the state bank."

"The enormous profits realized so easily by private banks have been published, the harm done in many circumstances to the resources of the country by the banks is well known. In 1870 the Bank of Porrentruy alone realized in one day 600,000 francs profit in exporting bullion collected in Switzerland, while at the same time the Federal Treasury was obliged, in order
Sept., 1897.
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to feed the public coffers, to buy English pounds, paying 25 francs 25 centimes. The Bank of Lucerne gave to its shareholders in 1896 17 per cent. interest.

Per inhabitant 25 francs specie and 60 francs in bank notes circulate through Switzerland, and the 60 francs in bank not at such an enormous advantage to the banks and make them a privileged class. The cantonal banks are nothing else than small state banks. The cantonal banks of Fribourg, of Lausanne, of Thurgovie and others realize large profits, and a part of these profits are deposited in the hands of the cantons. Thus, in Fribourg a large sum, 800,000 francs, made by the cantonal bank, has been appropriated to the university, and this bank of Fribourg realized 915,815 francs clear profit in 1896. The knowledge of these things acquired by the people during the debates on this Referendum cannot fail to act advantageously in the future.

"The present system has resisted the innovators, but it would be a mistake to conclude that it will still last a long time, notwithstanding the powerful minority of Missoula."

The only American comment which seemed written by one who grasped the situation, and which I have seen, was in the Chicago Times-Herald which concludes: "The people have carefully considered every subject which has been brought to their attention, and have seldom made mistakes. Unusually good, sound political economy has triumphed, as was the case in the Referendum in the matter of a government bank."

In looking over the vote by cantons, it is significant that the affirmative majorities came from the more progresive cantons, and those with large cities and with cantonal banks, such as Zurich, Berne, Thurgovie, Argovie, and the negative majorities came from the more backward and Catholic cantons, such as Fribourg, Vaud, and the smaller or country cantons, such as Uri, Schwytz, Zug. This last shows that it was not an agrarian measure. Including the half cantons, sixteen cantons voted against. In Geneva, 15,000 voters, 12,977 voted, or over 88 per cent., showing that a measure can bring out almost all the people. In conclusion, this is an admirable instance of the spirit of a purely democratic movement. It is advocated for some years by the Radicals, is brought up for discussion and a voting in 1891 against the opposition of government and mixed with some crude and bad features. It is defeated, but the agitation is continued, and the discussion gradually eliminates the crude and ultra-Radical features, until finally the principle either captures the government, or they, finding the movement is becoming very strong, strive to capture it, and draw up a scheme too centralizing and too conservative to submit it to the people, who, despite that it is a government scheme, reject it. But, Mr. Jamin says, this scheme with its bad features eliminated probably will be referred to the people within the near future and adopted. Meanwhile many cantons have been making experiments in control of state banks. Can progress be made in any safer and better method?"

The Peace Society of Geneva, copies of the law submitted, the ballot, pamphlets on each side, newspaper clippings and other information have been received. Thanks are due to Hon. Edwin H. Webster of the New York Observer for the English digest of the law used and to Miss Eila Levin, of New York, and Mr. Walter Breen, of Omaha, for translations of the French and German matter from which extracts are given.

PARLIAMENT IS OVER.

From the London Clarion.

Parliament having broken up at a comparatively early date, and after a comparatively uneventful session, a casual review may not be such a hopeless waste of time as might at first sight be suspected.

As a representative assembly the House of Commons can hardly be considered a success; as a legislative machinery it is little better than a failure; as a sample of that mingled cant, hypocrisy, double dealing, incapacity, selfishness, cowardice and bluster which we call statesmanship, it is about as good, or as bad, as might be expected, considering the materials of which it is composed.

The lawyers, colonels, brewers, financiers, place hunters, company mongers, manufacturers and railway directors, whether calling themselves Liberals or Tories, are actuated by one and the same intention, namely, to protect their own interest at whatever cost to their constituents or to the State. The rest of the people's representatives mainly consist of Provincial Radical Bigwigs, who know little of politics; aristocratic young Conservatives, who know less, and a dozen or so of nominal Labor members, who wear silk hats, and strive more or less successfully to resist temptation.

That much could be expected from such an assembly, even if its members really desired or attempted to do their best, cannot be supposed. But its members have neither the knowledge, wisdom nor industry to make them effective politicians; nor have they, except in very few instances, sufficient earnestness, self-sacrifice or honor to desire the welfare of their country at the cost of their own disadvantage. In short, they cannot do what they undertake to do if they would, and would not care to do it if they could.

Mr. Wallace, M.P., in an article in the Progressive Review, says that two-thirds of the members it is impossible to regard with anything like intellectual respect, and that a large section of the House seldom is there at all. Barely a tenth part of the members listen to the debates, hardly a quarter of them take part in the divisions, and of these a large proportion lounge on the terrace or in the smoking room, and simply walk into the lobbies to give their votes with the "eyes" on "nose" as the whip instructs them, and knowing or caring nothing of the merits of the matter their votes are to decide.

And what of the events of the session and their effect on the fortunes of parties and persons? Something has been done by the Conservatives to an extent for the persons this year for their services at the last general election; as something was done for the landlords last year, for the same reason. And now something yet remains to be done
for the publicans, who had a still larger share in the great Conservative victory. In addition, large sums have been spent on the Royal Navy and the Royal Jubilee; some £2,000 has been found to increase the miserable wages of the laborers in the royal docks, while some £250,000 is to be spent on a royal yacht. Much sham indignation has been forthcoming over the barbarities of individ- uals. Turks in Armenia and Crete, and many specious excuses have been made for the barbarities of Christian Englishmen in South Africa, and the Government have passed a Compensation for Injuries bill, which many of their own supporters did not relish, and only a few of the Radical opposition had the courage to oppose. Generally speaking, it may be said the Government have improved their position, and the Opposition, by its apathy, insincerity and disagreement, is hopelessly discredited and disgraced.

But the above brief review can give satisfaction, even to those who believe, or profess to believe, in party government by professional politicians, it is difficult to suppose; while it is becoming more and more obvious to the sane and earnest minority who are anxious for the progress of their country, that Parliament, as an institution, has almost outlived its usefulness, and is rapidly becoming a tedious and mischievous absurdity. M. B.

SWISS LOCAL REFERENDUMS.

To illustrate the great variety of subjects which the people are called on to decide, the following tracts are given from Der Grosserometer, of Zurich: "At the city election of Berne (Dec. 20, 1896), eleven propositions were voted on and all carried. They were as follows:

1. A new primary school for girls, 3,529 for, 914 against.
2. Establishment of a third gas reservoir, 4,080 for, 255 against.
3. Enlargement of the city water reservoir, 4,230 for, 216 against.
4. Renovation of Cornhouse cellar, 2,722 for, 1,717 against.
5. Berne-Neuenburg street railway, 3,541 for, 751 against.
6. Deficit appropriation, 3,396 for, 941 against.
7. City budget for coming year, 3,493 for, 757 against.
8. Alignment plan for southwest part of city, 3,674 for, 461 against.
9. Alignment plan for Alpen street, 3,762 for, 413 against.
10. Alignment plan for Muris street, 3,759 for, 437 against.

And to the initiative petition demanding proportional election of the Legislature of the Canton Berne, there were on April last 13,500 signatures (12,000 are only necessary). This meeting was started at a meeting of its friends in the city of Biel, where it was decided that signatures should be gathered by various political bodies, dividing them up according to the strength of the organizations.

In the Canton of St. Gall a law fixing the interest on mortgage debts as not to exceed 4%, and providing that anyone exacting more than that was liable to a fine of from 200 to 3,000 francs, and in grave cases the judge could inflict further punishment, such as imprisonment, etc., was accepted by a vote of 22,602 in favor to 13,858 against.

In Zurich the question of the increase of the municipal police decided by the municipal council has been submitted to the obligatory referendum and carried by a small majority. The district of Aussenhili, one of the most noted for riots, pronounced against this increase. And by a vote of 40,564 yes to 14,697 no in the canton and of 14,463 yes to 6,146 no in the city of Zurich, the people accepted a law fixing the age of consent at fifteen years and on other moral sex reforms. This law was drawn by Philip Jampfl to be excellent and the vote progressive.

In Basle the decision of the Grand Council to build a crematory has been ratified by 3,576 yes to 3,197 no.

In the Canton of Berne, on February 28th last, an appropriation to railways was carried by a vote of 50,571 yes to 15,855 no.

And they rejected, by 21,523 no to 12,514 yes the plan to institute a fourth course in the Normal School at Rorschach.

LOCAL REFERENDUM IN NEW YORK AND MASSACHUSETTS.

Few people stop to think that under the Raines law in New York State there are referendums continually occurring. There are four propositions voted under this law—first, on saloons; second, on stores: third, on drug stores, etc.; fourth, on houses of prostitution. The New York Voice of August 5th has an admirable map showing the townships which voted dry, etc., and an elaborate table. It says: "More than 180,000 voters of New York State have declared at town meetings since the Raines law went into effect that they want no saloon in their locality. In 264 townships of the State each of the four propositions were voted down. They voted out even the drug stores. In 26 more townships all propositions were voted down except the permits to drug stores to compound alcoholic medicines, which amounts to practical prohibition."

Massachusetts is getting a fine reputation for its roads, and it is due to two things—its State Commission, established four or five years ago, which maps out the work that needs to be done, estimates the cost and advises the local authorities; and second, to its town meetings, where they have the most direct form of Direct Legislation. These town meetings can call on this State Commission for information and a part of the expense. According to the Springfield Republican, the Commission is receiving from various towns six times as many petitions as
can be granted, and the legislative appropriations have risen from $300,000 in 1894 to $600,000 in 1896, and nearly double that amount last year.

TWO RECENT SWISS REFERENDUMS.

In March last the National Legislature decided to submit two amendments to the Federal Constitution to the people. The first gave to the Federation the right of surveillance over the policing of the forests and the mountain regions, and the second gave to the Federation the right to legislate on the "commerce in food wares and in other articles of household use and ordinary objects which may put in danger health and life," but "the execution of these laws will be put into the hands of the cantons under the supervision and with the finances of the Confederation," save that "the control of the frontier importations belong to the Confederation."

These two show how carefully local self-government is guarded. They were submitted to the people on July 11th last, and the exact and final advices have not yet come in. It is understood that both have carried.

A SHORT ARGUMENT.

From the San Francisco Examiner.

It has sometimes been urged as an objection against the Referendum that when constitutional amendments and other propositions are submitted to popular vote the number voting upon them is never equal to the number expressing a choice among candidates for office. The supposed objection is really one of the most forcible recommendations of this method of lawmaking. When only those who take an interest in a proposition vote upon it, the unfit automatically disfranchise themselves, with no compulsion or ill-feeling, and the decision arrived at is much more likely to be a wise one than if every man on the register had taken a hand in it.

A GOOD THING.

In Switzerland there is a Federal Labor Bureau to give information on questions of law. In its report for 1896 the bureau says it answered 1,151 questions, and of these 976 were answered verbally and 175 through the mail. The causes prompting these questions were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custody and accidents</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages demands</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of contract</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>976</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no charge for the giving of these answers.

When, in the winter of 1894 the N. J Direct Legislation League was looking for some one to introduce and push an amendment in the Legislature, it asked Hon. Thomas McEwan, Jr., who had just been elected, a Republican from a strongly Democratic district, and, though a new member, made leader of the House. Without a moment’s hesitation he accepted, saying he believed thoroughly in Direct Legislation. He has since proved this belief, both by eloquent words on many platforms and by deeds which have shown these words were not empty.

Mr. McEwan was born in 1854, is a lawyer by profession, and was a civil engineer. He is a politician connected with the Republican party by years of work in its various organizations, and has served in various offices, from Assessor up, and is now in his second term in Congress. For instance, he has been a delegate to and secretary of every Republican convention of Jersey City and Hudson county for fifteen years. Despite that he’s a lawyer and a politician, he’s a good man—perhaps he’s the exception that proves the rule. However, people may cuss his independence and virility of action—and some of his own party have been active in that field—no one has ever charged him with corruption, and personal contact only deepens the confidence and esteem every one feels for him.

In person he is of medium height, has a good figure, rather slender, with the snap and vim of a young man. His hair and beard are the dark reddish brown of an energetic nature. His expression is frank and open. He is quick in decision and resourceful. He is a member of some church and a consistent
one, and he has hosts of friends. He is a charming companion, a ready and eloquent speaker, a good writer and a man of affairs.

He is one of the vice presidents of the N. J. League, both a literary and financial contributor to The Record, and whenever he can hit a crack for Direct Legislation he does it. He has introduced D. L. resolutions in the last two Congresses and in the last Republican National Convention, only to see them smothered, but he is up and at it still, and the cause has much to hope from him in the future.

GEORGE H. STROBELL.

On April 19, 1882, George H. Strobell, of Newark, introduced resolutions for a Direct Legislation plank at the Prohibitionist State Convention at Trenton, N. J. They were tabled, but were the first clear Direct Legislation resolutions in any political convention in this country.

Mr. Strobell is still a young man at the head of a firm of manufacturing jewelers. Who, despite the hard times which have almost paralyzed the making of luxuries, has done and is doing a profitable business. He is not only a keen, good business man, but a good man. He is an active church member, and has been known to almost paralyze a prayer meeting by the independence and application of his remarks. He's not afraid to call a spade a spade.

Caring nothing for a political future for himself, he took up the Prohibitionist cause years ago. He has stumped as a candidate who did not stand a ghost of a chance of being elected, edited, issued and largely paid for a paper to forward the Prohibitionist movement, and worked in a great variety of ways. But gradually he has been growing larger than that one issue, and when in 1896 the Prohibitionist party refused to take up any other issue than the liquor one, he and it parted company, though he left warm friends in it.

He has been an active worker in and a vice-president of the D. L. League of N. J. from its very start. He has spoken for it in many platforms, for he's a convincing talker, has written many articles, and done much work. He is of German descent, and has the German indefatigable love of work; and within this current month has said to the editor of The Record: "I'm a political party and haven't any reform work on hand. You are writing for many papers, editing The Record and running your business. It's too much to do alone. Can't I help you with The Record?" The offer was a welcome one. It was accepted in the spirit made, and after this number Mr. Strobell will be business manager and assistant editor of The Record. From its start he has been a financial contributor, and for the work he undertakes he will not receive a cent of pay. It will be as the past work on The Record has been, entirely a labor of love, but certainly not less effective because of that. He does not know that this character sketch is going in, and he can't prevent it in this issue. In the future he can; so we won't let the opportunity be lost.

The constitutional amendment on another page is Mr. Strobell's work, with hints from the Oregon amendment and some suggestions from others. It is far harder to write a short thing than a long one, and, though the writer has seen and studied almost all the D. L. amendments and laws drafted and proposed, this comes nearer his ideal for shortness, clearness, simplicity and scope, and it is the work of a layman and not a lawyer, of a business man trained to write business letters. With Mr. Strobell's aid, The Record can be made a better tool for getting Direct Legislation.

A CONTRAST.

At the winter session of the Swiss Federal Congress, according to Der Gruender, of Zurich, there were 69 measures introduced, and 25 of these were passed, but not a single law amongst the measures passed. The main propositions were the general appropriation bill and a commercial treaty with Japan.

In the last U. S. Congress there were 24,000 measures introduced, and in the last session of the N. Y. State Legislature 147 bills were passed. Oh for a little Direct Legislation in ours!

A WARNING.

Translated from L'Echo, of Geneva, Switzerland.

A week has gone by since the voting. At Berne the general impression is that the vote was a warning to the central power to be economical. This is exactly the impression of the Republique Francaise of Monday. This impression will produce an effect.
A Non-Partisan Advocate of Pure Democracy.
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DEFINITIONS.

Direct Legislation—Lawmaking by the voters.
The Initiative—The proposal of a law by a percentage of the voters, which must then go to the Referendum.
The Referendum—The vote at the polls of a law proposed through the initiative, or on any law passed by a lawmaking body, whose reference is petitioned for by a percentage of the voters.

CONTENTS.
The matter for The Record is growing so full and many-headed that a table of contents is almost necessary. Readers will find after a few editorial notes, news of the movement and of the organizations working, accounts of actual Referendums, usually commencing at the East and going West, then trade union and other Direct Legislation, foreign matter, book reviews, miscellaneous, and it will end with two or three thumb-nail sketches of D. L. workers. Particular attention is called to the articles on Trades and the Referendum in Australia, as giving new and very pertinent matter.

NEXT YEAR.
The growth of matter has so forced the enlargement of The Record that, while it would be self-sustaining on the old basis of eight pages, it is not on the new one of sixteen or twenty pages. It has been so much expense and work that we seriously thought of turning it over to the Texas people, but on consulting some of its friends and sustaining subscribers the feeling against this was so strong that the idea was abandoned. One correspondent writes: "I regard The Record as the most valuable paper our cause has; a large part of this value has been on account of the absolute ab-
sence of any sign of partisan bias. I never learned from its columns that your own political parties want the Referendum, for I know something of the continuous labor and sacrifice that its editing and publication requires, but I most earnestly hope you will not give it up yet. The circumstances are such that it is impossible for others to do your work. The quarterly does more good in encouraging our hearts and hands than you can possibly imagine."

A prominent Chicago editor writes for a full set, because he can not get anywhere else such a mass of facts. The editor of one of the big Boston dailies says: "Be sure to send it to my house. I read it and have reprinted most of the September issue in my paper, and a good part has gone into the editorial column." The editor of a well-known reform paper writes: "The Direct Legislation Record is inspiring. Wish I could say as much of all the reform papers I see. It is doing a very good work." A prominent trade unionist said it had more facts in the square inch than any paper he knew of. Many others might be given.

SUBSCRIPTIONS.
The Record will be carried on. It takes no ads; there is no fund to support it; it depends solely on subscriptions, sustaining and regular. Many friends have allowed their subscriptions to expire. Can not you renew for yourself and a few friends, if not sent to two or three libraries or to the members of your Legislature, etc. It is 25 cents a year or ten subscriptions for $2.00. It clubs with The New Time for $1.00 for both, with The Arena for $2.50 for both, with the new Texas Direct Legislation, The Coming Nation, Appeal to Reason, The American Fabian or any 50 cent paper for 65 cents; with The Nonconformist, The Federationist, The Representative or any dollar paper for $1.15.

A NEW D. L. PAPER.
On Dec. 1 of this year was issued the first number of a new paper entitled Direct Legislation. It is a comely sixteen-page paper, measuring 8½ x 11 inches and is issued from Stephenville, Texas, by Judge King, the managing editor and Austin A. King the publisher, but there will be a corps of editors and correspondents from every State in the Union. It will come out on the 1st and last of each month and be devoted exclusively to Direct Legislation from a non-partisan standpoint. Judge King writes more emphatically that he will work for a restoration of all political power to the people by the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, and says further: "We are gathering strength on all sides and feel confident that we will be able to have a constitutional amendment submitted in Texas at our Legislature, which meets January, 1899, and if so, it will carry." This paper will cost 5 cents a copy, 25 cents for six months and 50 cents a year, and you can get it and The Record for 65 cents a year.

THE MOVEMENT IN ILLINOIS.

STATE CONFERENCE ON DIRECT LEGISLATION A SUCCESS.

By Mrs. Meribah E. Williams Walker.
Early in 1897 three devoted adherents of Direct Legislation—Messrs. Fred. Freeman, Ambrose Smith and L. D. Raynolds, editor of the Chicago Express—believing that the State was ripe for a forward movement, issued a call for a mass-meeting to discuss a
The Direct Legislation Record. Dec., 1897.

plan of action and the feasibility of a State Conference.

The Sovereign Citizens of America was organized, with William P. Black, President; Fred Freeman, Secretary; Judge C. D. F. Smith, Mr John M. Hess, Mrs. M. E. Walker, Vice Presidents; Miss Winnifred Smith, Statistician.

The work was vigorously pushed, and it soon became evident that the State Conference, organized, an imminent demand. Simultaneously the Swiss and German societies planned for educational work on Direct Legislation, under the superintendency of a committee of fifty representatives of societies favoring Direct Legislation.

The writer knowing the value of concert of action, invited representatives of the Swiss and German societies to meet with the Sovereign Citizens for that purpose. The invitation was soon extended to other organizations advocating Direct Legislation, and a joint State Conference Committee of 112 members was appointed, the committee, as follows:

President, William P. Black; Vice President, Julius Wegman; Corresponding Secretary, Fred Freeman; Recording Secretary, Leopold Saltiel; Historian, Meribah E. Walker; Treasurer, Frank Stauber; Committee on Judiciary, Judge C. D. F. Smith, John M. Hess, Addison Blakely; Committees on Ways and Means, Frank Stauber, E. O. Towne, Julius Wegman.

The State Conference met, pursuant to call, Nov. 18, 1897, in Willard Hall, Chicago. At the early opening hour at least 100 delegates were on hand to begin the arduous two-days' labor. Secretary Fred Freeman called the house to order, announced the purpose of the call, and declared that the movement, though upon a political-economic question, was to be conducted upon a purely educational, non-partisan basis.

He then introduced General Herman Lieb, who had been unanimously elected Chairman of the temporary organization, and Leopold Saltiel, the elected Secretary.

General Lieb, the well-known veteran of the United States army, like a warrior with the enemy before him, marshaled his forces at once for the fray.

The usual committees were appointed and communications called for from the Corresponding Secretary. Many prominent men who could not be present sent encouraging greetings. Among these we mention Rev. Dr. H. W. Thomas, Father James M. Hagan, Messrs. Samuel Gompers, P. J. McGuire, David J. Inglis, L. A. Bateman, Eltweed Pomeroy, A. J. Caruthers, Col. Sellers, R. S. Thompson, E. S. Wheelock and others.

General Lieb delivered an eloquent address, followed by Frederick Upham Adams, one of the editors of The New Time. Mr. Adams' address put the question on the plane of patriotism and humanity. It will be published in pamphlet form, that the public may have opportunity to read it.

Permanent organization of the Conference followed. Captain P. Black; fifteen Vice Presidents from the various societies represented; Secretaries, Leopold Saltiel, Dr. Cresup, J. Ross Carpenter; Treasurer, Frank Stauber.

Report of the Committee on Credentials showed 150 delegates present and over 300 elected and "on the way." Elgin, Peoria, Du Quoin, Marseilles, Little York, Rockford, Ottawa, Winnetka, Rock Island, Joliet and other places were represented. Honorary delegates from Madison, Wis., Springfield, Ohio, and Washington were also present.

The speakers of the evening session were Seymour Stedeman, Senator Sidney B. McCurdy and Mrs. Meribah E. Williams Walker. The latter paper being historical, not only of the present movement, but containing snap-shot views of the 4,000 years' battle of the people for the liberty of self-government, was requested for pamphlet publication. Many thanks of the Historian are due to the valuable paper The Direct Legislation Record for condensed statements of present status in the United States.

The remaining day and the second day were devoted strictly to the business for which the conference had met.

The Judiciary Committee reported by their chairman, Judge C. D. F. Smith, the status of the question before the law and the steps necessary to secure the Initiative and Referendum in State and municipalities.

The report of the Committee on Resolutions, after spirited discussion, was adopted, as follows:

Resolved, That the people are the source of sovereign power.

Resolved, That all laws derive their authority from the people and should be subject to alteration by a majority of the people at any time.

Resolved, That the people are capable of legislating for the preservation of their rights, and that all departments of government are properly subject to the legally expressed will of the people.

Resolved, That people governed by a law have the inalienable right to demand a Referendum vote on that law.

Resolved, That the limited use of the Initiative and Referendum in municipal matters, and the more extended use of the same method in other countries, have demonstrated not only the right of the consent of the governed as a basis of authority but the very great wisdom of regularly determining the consent of the governed with regard to each specific measure. It has prevented the enactment of corrupt measures. It has prevented the enactment of proposed measures in behalf of special interests. It would forever establish popular government and reverse at once all tendencies toward monarchism or an improper centralization of governmental power.

Resolved, That it is the sense of this convention that a State constitutional convention ought to be held as soon as possible for making such amendments to the present constitution as may be deemed advisable, and as will provide for the fullest operation of the theory of Direct Legislation.

Resolved, That in all municipal matters
where the use of the Referendum is possible

The friends of Direct Legislation avail

themselves of its use, and that this association

undertake immediate steps for a campaign
to secure the enactment of a law by the
State Legislature authorizing the use of the
Initiative and Referendum in all matters of
municipal legislation.

Resolved, That this conference recommends
to the Legislature the following amendment
to the constitution of the State of Illinois,
and that a committee be appointed to secure at
least one hundred thousand (100,000) electors' signatures to a petition and memorial
asking for said amendment:

Section 5, Article XIV—

"Amendments to this constitution may be
proposed by five per cent. (5 1/4) of the electors of
the State, the basis of which calculation shall be
the number of votes cast for all of the
candidates for Governor at the last
gubernatorial election. upon the presentation of
any such amendment to said constitution to the
Secretary of State, who shall then submit
such amendment to a vote of the electors
at the next ensuing election of State officer
or of State officers, and on any two or
more amendments are thus presented for
submission at an election, the one having
the greatest number of petitioners shall take precedence.

Plan for State organization and propaga-
ganda resulted as follows:

President, Addison Blakely; Vice Presi-
dents, General Herman Lieb, Captain Will-
iam P. Black, Chris. Scheumer, Julius Weg-
man, Lucinda B. Chandler, Frederick Uph-
ham Adams, Dr. Charles A. Lewis, Dr. R. J.
Parker, George Mca. Miller, Hon. George
S. Bowen, Meribah E. Williams Walker,
Henry B. Holt, Francis R. Cole, John Z.
White, H. C. Carter, Leo Hornstein, S. M.
Biddison, Senator S. B. McCloud, Dr. A. R.
Harned, Seymour Stedman, Herman Al-
schulier, J. B. Goode, John D. Potter, J. A.
Humphreys, Dr. R. Leeper, Secretary; Sec-
retary, Fred Freeman, 714, No. 21 Quincy
street, Chicago, III.; Treasurer, Frank Sta-
uber; Financial Secretary, Miss Winnifred
Smith; Historian, Statistician, Press and
Literature, Meribah F. Williams Walker,
152 Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill.

The plan of organization is based on vig-
orous local work, township and precinct or-
ganization, which may be formed by seven
citizens (women as well as men) who believe
in and advocate D. L., local societies to
unite for county, district and State work.

The propaganda is to be advanced by
press, literature and speakers and a series
of county conventions and July celebrations
throughout the State.

A petition for an amendment to the State
Constitution will be at once put into circula-
tion to secure 100,000 signers, who are to be
elected in the State; it will be presented as
a memorial at the next session of the
State Assembly.

Members at large of the State Executive
Committee were chosen as follows (This
number is to be increased by one member
from each Congressional District, to be

elected by the district): J. Whipple, A. W.
Thomas, O. E. Woodberry, W. H. Bond, W.
S. Busch, George McCa. Miller, Leon Horn-
stein, L. D. Raynolds, Dr. Cresup, E. O.
Towne, G. Mahme, C. A. Darrell, W. H. Mc-
Guire, Willis N. Calkins, Leopold Salkiel,
Dr. Charles J. Lewis, J. A. Hopp and J. Ross
Carpenter.

The historian proposed an historical flag,
to be carried through this battle for the lib-
erty of self-government to the final victory,
where it will be unfurled from the Capitol
as a signal of hope to the world, and then
deposited in the State Historical Museum of
the Capitol.

The unique feature of this historical ban-
er is to be the enrollment on the heavy silk
colors, in silver and gold, of the names of
the hosts who believe in and advocate Direct
Legislation. The proposition was adopted
with enthusiasm, the red, white and blue
chosen as the colors of the Direct Legisla-
tion movement, and several names, with the
twenty-five cents for enrollment, were im-
mediately handed in. Names should be sent
at once to the historian as above.

The convention adjourned with the best of
good feeling prevailing after the most spir-
itied two days' discussions, every member ap-
pointed an organizer, agitator and educator
for the momentous problem before them.

OTHER D. L. LEAGUE
IOWA.

By John M. Work, of Des Moines, Iowa.

The Non-Partisan Direct Legislation
League of Iowa was organized on the even-
ing of the 20th instant, in the parlors of
the Social Settlement House in this city. We
gave up the idea of having a mass-meeting,
developing that it was better for a few good
men and true to place the league on its feet,
and then present the matter in definite or-
ganized shape to the multitude. I was
elected President of the league, and Mr.
George Shelley Hughes was chosen Secretary.

These two indispensable officers were the
only ones elected, as it was the sense of the
meeting that the remainder should be de-
ferred until there were more members to
choose from. We adopted a short, concise
constitution as follows:

CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I.

The name of this organization shall be
THE NON-PARTISAN DIRECT LEGISLATION
LEAGUE OF IOWA.

ARTICLE II.

The purpose of this league shall be to as-
sist by every legitimate non-partisan means
in procuring the adoption of the Initiative
and Referendum in local, State and national
affairs; also proportional representation and
the imperative mandate.

ARTICLE III.

The league shall have all the powers
necessary to carry out the above named pur-
pose.
ARTICLE IV.
Any person, without restriction as to age, sex, political or religious belief, may become a member of this league by signing his name to this constitution or authorizing the Secretary to do so.

ARTICLE V.
The officers of this league shall be a President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer, each of whom shall discharge the duties generally appertaining to their office. The officers shall hold their offices for one year and until their successors are elected, unless they are sooner recalled by a majority vote of the members voting thereon. One person may act as Secretary and Treasurer.

ARTICLE VI.
This constitution may be amended at any regular meeting of the league by a majority vote of the members voting thereon.

The league starts out on its career with twenty members and bright prospects of increasing the number indefinitely, as I have discovered in the brief time that has elapsed since the organization meeting. The plans of the league will be more fully developed at the next meeting, but I presume that we shall make a charge upon the Legislature this coming winter.

I find on examining the subject under the constitution, laws and decisions of this State that a constitutional amendment will be necessary in order to apply it to state-wide legislation; that a city or town can not apply it to its own affairs without an act of the State Legislature giving permission to do so; that the Legislature can enact a law permitting or compelling cities, towns and other local subdivisions to apply it in their affairs.

Our endeavors will therefore be limited to securing a constitutional amendment and a law applying the reform to local matters. I also find that we already have no less than eighteen instances of the Initiative, and many more of the Referendum. For example, no water works, gas works, or electric light plants can be authorized, established, erected, purchased, leased, or sold, or franchise extended or renewed, unless a majority of the legal voters voting thereon vote in favor of the same at a general or special election; and the Mayor is compelled to submit such questions to such vote upon the petition of twenty-five property owners of each ward in the city, or of fifty owners of any incorporated town.

IN OREGON.
By J. D. Stephens, of Milwauke, Oregon.

At the Bimetallic League of Portland, on November 15, a resolution was passed to work from now on for the election of men pledged to the Initiative and Referendum and the Populist money plank. This league represents the Populists, Democrats, Silver Republicans and Prohibitionists. The two men who have opposed D. L. came over, and will work with a will for it.

The Silver Republican Conference in Salem, this State, on October 5 adopted in its platform, in addition to its money plank, the following:

"We demand Direct Legislation, the Initiative and Referendum and Imperative Mandate, full and absolute rule by the people, and the voting for candidates by the primaries."

I think now we will not have any trouble in getting the Democracy to endorse D. L. and work for it, particularly as they are beginning to realize that they can only get the support of the other reform elements unless they do. Then the Legislature last winter was such a corrupt, incompetent body as to demonstrate the hopelessness of such a body enacting any reform laws at all. So I am satisfied we can win with the two-plank platform. Mr. Hofer, editor of the Salem Capitol-Journal, is out for it, and many other papers will follow. It looks as if the State would turn on D. L. and the Congressional ticket on money.

DRIFT.

One of the most significant signs of the popular appreciation of the importance of our law-making bodies is the fact that the Chicago Record has drafted a short, simple bill for postal savings banks, printed it in its paper with many editorials, and has circulated thousands of copies of it in pamphlet form, with petitions which have been signed by many thousands under Direct Legislation this work would be ten times as effective. But that it is being done now is very significant.

Another significant sign is the plan proposed by ex-Gov. John Turney, of Tennessee, for reforming his State Legislature, which at present contains 193 members, assembling once in two years for seventy-five days and being paid $4 a day. Judge Turney proposes to cut the Senate to ten and the House to twenty, total, thirty, and pay them $10 a day. The Knoxville Tribune states the arguments for and against nicely:

"Judge Turney's assertion that a few members of the Legislature do the work is true. The majority do nothing more than draw their pay and vote under the direction of the leaders—or if they do anything it is to introduce unwise or petty bills. Each member feels it his duty to introduce a number of bills, and it is often the case that by trading votes unwise and injurious bills become laws. If the number of members were reduced and the Senatorial and Representative districts made larger, a better class of men would be secured as a rule."

But the mere question of reducing the cost of a legislative session is really of minor importance as compared to the question of securing better legislation, less legislation, stopping the passage of foolish laws and dead laws, too many of which now enumber the books. There is unquestionably need of legislative reform—improvement in the character of legislators. Too many incompetents are elected to the Legislature. A better class of men, as a general thing, is needed—men of character,
integrity, capacity. By reducing the number and improving the quality of legislators the State would greatly improve its ability to legislate at lower cost, and perhaps the number of members and better pay would or ought to operate beneficially to the State. One thing should not be lost sight of in the consideration of this proposition. There is complaint in Tennessee, as in most States, of legislative bickering and the consequent high cost of bargain and sale, the purchase of law-makers and control of legislators by lobbies. It is easier to bribe a small body than a large one. The present House of Representatives has ninety-nine members. The Senate has thirty-three. By controlling seventeen members, a majority of the Senate, the lobby can prevent the passage of any bill that may be introduced. That is to say, seventeen members out of a body of 133 can defeat any bill. If the number were reduced to ten Senators and twenty Representatives, six Senators could prevent the passage of a bill. While it might be able to enact such legislation as it desired, the lobby by controlling six Senators could defeat any bill, no matter how much its passage might benefit the State. This is the danger of small legislative bodies. But if the Legislature were reduced to fewer members, as Judge Turner suggested, it ought to result in securing a better class of men—men of character and ability—men less liable to be corrupted by the bribe-giver or controlled by the lobby.

The correct remedy of Direct Legislation is apparently unknown, but the very fact that the evil is recognized and discussed is encouraging.

* * *

The Nashville American answers a newspaper critic as follows:

"Certainly it is right and in keeping with Republican institutions that there should be broad representation. The ideal legislative body would be that happy medium where there was broad enough representation to satisfy every community and where each representative is not only directly interested in a single measure which is passed or defeated that session.

"The House of Commons can not seat more than half of its members, but this causes no inconvenience, as only one-fourth or even one-eighth of the members attend its sittings. If an important vote is taken the members are rung in from the clubs about London, marched through the tellers and marched out again to the theatre, the dinner party or the club which they have just left. Otherwise the occupants of the House are composed of the Government and opposition lead-ers and a few stragglers. As a rule hardly over fifty men are watching the course of the public business; 650 of the 694 members of the House of Commons are dummies, who register their hurried votes according to the direction of the party whip. As far as legislation goes, they take no part in it whatever. The party leaders have supreme sway, and have it in the name of broad representation. It is a farce and a sham to have broad representation when the r-representatives do not represent, but delegate their power to a clique of a half-dozen men."

* * *

The leasing or selling of the city gas works has been a burning issue in Philadelphia, and a Referendum on the question has been proposed and so strongly advocated that the Council officially asked the City Solicitor, John L. Kinsey, whether it could be done at the coming city election in February. The gist of his reply is as follows:

"The proposition presented doesn't involve a consideration of the many elements which would enter into an inquiry whether or not Councils have the general power to submit to a popular vote the question indicated, but asks merely whether this can be done at a fixed time and upon a given occasion, at the coming municipal election in next February."

"I am obliged to assume, of course, that an opinion from me is not desired upon the broader and more important question, whether the right resides in Councils to direct the holding of an election at which the people may be given an opportunity to make known to their representatives their views and sentiments upon this or other like matters. I therefore refrain from entering upon this field of inquiry."

"The said election is one regularly provided and defined by statutory and constitutional enactment for fixed and particularly named purposes. The officers thereof are selected and sworn to perform certain specified duties. An elaborate system has been provided by the Legislature for the supervision and regulation of the various electoral details. But nowhere is valid statutory provision made to furnish the machinery or prescribe the methods for the holding of the same time and place of an election to determine questions of a character other than those appointed. Such rights as Councils may possess in the premises do not depend upon or result from enactment of any statute, but are incidental to larger and more comprehensive powers."

"It follows that as the election officers are required to perform only the duties which the acts of Assembly prescribe and to follow the directions of these acts in all respects, they could not be compelled, in their character as such officers, to assume other duties, or to perform other acts than those legally imposed upon them by the terms of the statutes. Hence no obligation would rest upon them to receive or count the ballots cast upon a question such as theirs wishes and sentiments upon the numerous duties appurtenant to the carrying on of an election to decide a question of this nature."

"In the absence of a voluntary arrangement with the entire body of election officers, there thus appears to be a serious difficulty in the way of the suggestion to hold the election for this purpose at the time designated.""

Part of this seems very specious reasoning. It does not follow that because officers are directed by law to do a certain thing, that they can't be directed to do another thing. It does not interfere at all with the doing of their statutory duties. But the very fact that it is
proposed and actually discussed is significant.  

On the evening of Oct. 29 last President McKinley was the guest of the Commercial Club of Phoenix, and in the course of his speech he said:

"Responsible citizenship comes from direct participation in the conduct of the government and imposes equal responsibility upon every citizen. If we could quicken and increase appreciation of this responsibility and every citizen was made to feel its weight and importance, it would go far toward improving our political and national life.

"The government and people are inseparable under our system. We could not separate the government from the people if we would and we would not if we could. This unity is the strength of our political structure. Our public policies and our public laws are properly determined by the people. The people, therefore, have every incentive to noble purpose and right action in government. They are the beneficiaries of the government and have every reason to love our institutions and regard our laws, because they support and make them."

In these few words he has voiced one of the best arguments for Direct Legislation. But really are "our public policies and our public laws" "determined by the people"? They ought to be, but are they?

One of the most logical and significant of political platforms ever put out was the one adopted by the Liberty party of Ohio on May 28 last. This party is an offshoot from the Prohibition party and contains a number of very earnest, energetic and able men and women who are also very logical in carrying arria to its proper conclusion. The platform was written by R. S. Thompson, the editor of the New Era, of Springfield, O., and it begins:

PREAMBLE.

The Liberty party of Ohio acknowledges the authority of God in public as well as private affairs. It holds that, as governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the people should have the right to vote directly on any legislation when they so desire.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

In order, therefore, that the principles of liberty may be preserved and the government be made a government of the people, by the people and for the people, we declare for the adoption of the Initiative and Referendum, by which the power of the people can be exercised in government.

WILL PUT TO VOTE.

We pledge ourselves as a party when placed in power to faithfully enforce all laws. We further pledge ourselves to present to the people for adoption legislation covering the following reforms:

Then follow twelve planks. One of these, of course, is a strong prohibition plank, but even a saloon-keeper could support their party, because it does not promise to enact any of these reforms, but to submit them to the people, and most saloon-keepers feel very sure that they have their constituency behind them.

At one time D. L. articles in magazines were rare; now they are plentiful. Only a few years ago it would be noticed that even in an article in the "Initiative and Referendum" in the November Arena. Senator Marion Butler is the author of a scholarly paper on the same subject from a constitutional and legal standpoint in the October issue of the Boston Magazine. Harold W. Nash, the Arizona vice-president of the N. D. L., has commenced a D. L. department in the Pick and Drill, a weekly published in Prescott, Arizona. Elwood Pomeroy continues his series of articles and symposiums in The New Age. The October one was entitled "The Social Argument for Direct Legislation," the November one "The Individual Argument" and the December is, "Representation Does Not Represent." Also he had articles in the October American Publix and the November, "A Way to the White House." R. S. Thompson has had long and able articles in The New Era, published at Springfield, Ohio, and Wharton Barker has commenced to write profoundly on it in The American, published at Philadelphia. The Southern Mercury, of Dallas, Texas, the Nonconformist, of Indiana; The Medical World, of Philadelphia; The Coming Nation, of Rusk, Texas; The Star, of San Francisco, are a few of the papers which are giving it great prominence.

Harper's Weekly recently diagnosed our municipal system in an editorial on the Louisville conference of the National Municipal League, and it sums up the conclusions of that conference as follows: "Municipal misrule, maladministration and inefficiency are not local or accidental matters, but general conditions existing in all the cities of the country. "The cry for municipal reform is the same whether coming from the Eastern or the Western man, the Northerner or the Southerner. There is but little variation. 'Nearly everywhere the conduct of municipal affairs has fallen into the hands of the least responsible and least trustworthy classes. There is a widespread belief that the expenditure of public money produces less than its legitimate fruit for the public welfare. Other evils, now widely prevalent, constitute material factors. The enforcement of the law, especially as to offenses against good morals, has become difficult and uncertain. The political influence of those who gain their livelihood through the vice or follies of the community is scandalously great, and a recognized system of traffic in the peace of impunity for their transgressions is fully established in some cities and is rapidly growing up elsewhere. Extortion is practiced upon others besides criminals and purveyors to vice; statutes, ordinances and police regulations are enacted only too frequently that politicians of high and low degree may be protected from privilège de disgrâce in the form in some places wealthy corporations now pay the reigning boss a fixed price for protection against this form of blackmail as regularly and as with as little disguise as they employ counsel.'

"If the conferences have taught municipal
reformers that this is the average condition of the average city, they have also taught them that it is not due to the maintenance of a particular form of government. It exists alike in cities having responsible mayors and in cities where divided responsibility prevails; where there is a single chamber legislature and where the bicameral system is in operation; where the State interferes on the slightest provocation and where there is substantial home rule.

But it is hopelessly at sea regarding any remedies and does not see that the way out is to put the power in the hands of the people, where it belongs.

---

A BOSTON REFERENDUM.

By James E. Campions.

A good example of the power of the people to control their own affairs vs. the politicians and capitalists is found in the recent referendum vote in Boston, on the question of consolidating the two chambers. The act reads as follows: "The President, twelve Aldermen at large and twenty-five Ward Aldermen shall sit and act as one legislative body, and shall constitute the City Council of the city of Boston."

The act would reduce the membership from eighty-seven to thirty-eight. Proportional representation for minority parties was not mentioned, and no referendum clause was inserted to put a check on the action of the Council. In the absence of these safeguards the plain people looked upon the measure with distrust, and although the leading politicians of both old parties favored the act, it was defeated by more than 6,000 in a total of 56,000 votes.

It was a case of the politicians and capitalists against the people, but by the wise use of the ballot the latter won.

---

RHODE ISLAND CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION.

The last Legislature authorized the appointment of a commission to prepare a revision of the constitution for submission to the Legislature, and afterwards to the people. The Providence Journal of November 24 gives two of their changes which are pertinent to THE RECORD. The old constitution provides that the Legislature shall not have power without the express consent of the people to incur State debts to an amount exceeding $50,000, except in certain specified emergencies. The proposed substitute would increase that power tenfold, or permit the Legislature to borrow up to $500,000. This is probably wise, as much trouble has been occasioned in the past by the very small limit.

For the future amending of the constitution, the following is proposed, which is a long step in the right direction. Similar provisions are in other constitutions:

"Sec. 2. At the general election to be held in the year —, and in each twentieth year thereafter, the General Assembly shall by law provide that the question, 'Shall there be a convention to revise the constitution?' be decided by the electors of the State qualified to vote for general officers, and in case a majority of the votes cast shall be against voting at such election on said question shall vote in the affirmative, the General Assembly, at its next session, shall provide by law for the election of delegates to such convention. No revision or amendment of this Constitution, agreed upon by such convention, shall take effect until after three years, and shall be submitted to the electors of the State qualified to vote for general officers, and adopted by a majority of those voting for and against the same.'"

THE RECORD will give other details later.

---

CONNECTICUT'S CONSTITUTIONAL REFERENDUM

By James L. Coeles, of Farmington, Conn.

On October 4 last the people of Connecticut voted on a constitutional amendment, but it can hardly be called a Referendum. Our constitution belongs to the backwoods, to the times of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore. It gives the forty boroughs of 400 inhabitants the power to send two Representatives to Hartford, and confines the Representatives of a city of 100,000 to the same number. Our government is not one of human beings, but of grass-plots. The little grass-plot on which I live, which supports only 3,000 human beings, sends two members to the House of Representatives, and the grass-plot known as New Haven sends only two. Every amendment has to pass the gauntlet of two Senates, two sets of grass-plot representatives and two Governors, so that amendments are of little account anyhow. This particular one requires that every elector shall be able to read this grass-plot constitution in English. Under the old amendment of 1835—there have been only twenty-nine amendments since 1835—an elector of under 50 was not required to be able to read any article in the constitution; if he could read it in Arabic that was enough. The thing is not worth talking about. There was practically no opposition to it. As a result 41,577 voted for it, and 4,535 against it, or a total of 52,112, which is thirty per cent. of the presidential vote of last year. Ninety-three per cent. of those voting favored and seven per cent. opposed, while last year sixty-three per cent. voted the Republican ticket, thirty-three per cent. the Democratic-Populist, and four per cent. were scattering. This shows that on the measure there was a far greater unanimity among those voting than on candidates. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 12 said of it:

"The adoption of this amendment almost unopposed may be assumed to indicate a growing sentiment against voters unable to read the laws of a State. Foreign voters in Connecticut made no effort to defeat it. Every town in the State voted in the affirmative. One county gave a negative vote of but one in twenty. The towns in which the opposition was strongest have but a light
bring out the vote, so that when we find 141,075 votes cast at a special election as against 255,991 cast for Governor in 1895, when party spirit was at greatest fervency, and when we consider that the vote must only have been of those who were the most thoughtful in the State, the fact that forty per cent, of the vote of the State was cast would indicate that the people generally upon matters which are submitted directly to them are becoming deeply interested and thoughtful.

The first amendment would not draw to the polls those who do not believe in limiting the powers of the Legislature or that it is well to place in the constitution matters which should be left to the action of the Legislature according as public sentiment may change from time to time.

The second amendment would not favorably attract to the polls many who questioned the justness of limiting the powers of the Governor, and under this amendment if the Senate, which, under our law must confirm nominations made by the Governor, should be of a different political faith from him, it could reject the best men when chosen by him for office and keep doing so, and leave him to choose from those not so well fitted an appointee to fill the vacancy during the interrim between the sessions of the Legislature.

The first and second amendments were carried by small majorities. The third amendment was the one which many people and newspapers thought would be carried by a large majority, as it merely gave to women a right which they had the privilege to exercise under a legislative act for several years and until the same was questioned and decided unconstitutional by the Courts of this State; but, strange to say, the third amendment was defeated.

I am led to believe that if the matter that was being voted upon was the making or rejection of a law, that would necessarily appeal more strongly to the people, and the vote would have been decidedly larger, and I think that a forty per cent, vote cast upon such amendments as these is indicative of a growth of a desire upon the part of people for the Initiative and Referendum.

I find on examination that former constitutional amendments received only from nineteen to twenty-eight per cent, of the vote of the State. It seems to me that the sentiment is growing strongly amongst the people in favor of the right of voting upon laws for themselves, and the granting of that right would in my judgment give fewer and better laws, and do away with the necessity of tinkering with the constitution so frequently.

THE PHILADELPHIA REFERENDUM.

The city of Philadelphia has both a Referendum and been wanting another. Its Common Council submitted to a Referendum at the regular elections on November 3 the question of taxing the city for $12,300,000, which money is to be spent in a variety of public improvements. Considerable indignation was aroused by the manner this was submitted. The Philadelphia Ledger says:
“Across the top of one ballot, on the inside, were the words, ‘Debt may be increased.’ On the outside in the same position, was, ‘No increase of debt.’

Both of these lines were printed in very heavy block type—so heavy, in fact, that they could be read by the elderly from a far distance. The words ‘No’ and ‘May’ could plainly be seen by the official who marked the number.

Some voters endeavored to fold their ballots that the heavy lines would not show on the portion presented to the view of the election officers, but the man who received the paper always unfolded it and pointed to the passage in sight. Then he knew whether it was a vote for or against the loan.

In a number of divisions it is known that the official who received the loan ballots kept a private memorandum of every vote that was cast.

And it said in its editorial columns:

The workers, Dave Martin’s henchmen, the ‘youngers’ and ‘heaters’ of his faction did work faithfully for the loan; if anybody doubts that they did, let him go to the Fourth, the Fifth and the Sixth wards for the passage of the loan, so few against. They besieged every poll, they button-holed, caajoled, threatened voters to vote for it. They withheld ballots from those who desired to vote against it; they imposed upon the ignorant and illiterate voters; they used a form of ballot which, if not deliberately intended for the easy perpetration of fraud, had that effect. There was nothing that David Martin and his workers did not do to defeat the public will and power.

But though it was opposed to the loan from its start and deplored its passage, its editorial of November 5, concluded:

“Considering all these facts, we can well take courage from the returns of the vote on the loan as presented to us by the ‘bosses’ of the court and the city, and say that they’d rather trust the people than this Common Council. But there are two sides to this question, and the Philadelphia Press says editorially:

“That the adoption of the loan bill met with popular approval was shown by the unanimity of favorable comment much more than by the majority that voted for it.

Mayor Warwick said:

“The verdict of the people upon the loan impresses me with the fact that the people are anxious to get things done, and that they consider such a measure to be necessary. So far as the city goes, yesterday’s expression upon the loan question means progress.”

W. W. Foulkrod said:

“It seems to me that the passage of the loan bill is in the proper direction toward putting Philadelphia upon a footing with the other large cities of our country. Many items are essential to the comfort and health of our citizens, and there are others that are classed by some people as luxuries.

William T. Tilden, chairman pro tem. of the Business Men’s League, said:

“In my judgment, under the circumstances, wisdom counsels the passage of the loan bill.”

Librarian Thompson, of the Free Library, said:

“The result of yesterday’s election, so far as concerned the library, is naturally a matter of satisfaction, and I hope that it will be almost a unanimous opinion in Philadelphia that the better housing of the Free Library is a matter of such moment that steps shall be taken to attain it. At the present moment, may be pursued with enthusiasm.

And many others could be given

The vote on it was 81,850 for, and 69,490 against, a majority of 19,360, or 58 per cent, for, and forty-four per cent. against. The total vote was 156,870, which is sixty-five and four-tenths per cent. of the presidential vote of last year.

The total vote for candidates on the ticket ranged from 156,889, only nineteen more than on the measure, to 158,540. This plainly shows that when the people are interested in a measure they will vote for it, and against the will of a few candidates.

But that about one-third of the voters as shown by the Bryan McKinley vote of last year should not vote for any thing or person shows that the vote is not for the Philadelphians.

The Referendum which the Philadelphia people wanted and did not get is shown by this resolution introduced into the Common Council, and when only fifteen members were absent, defeated by a vote of sixty four to fifty-four.

WHEREAS, The Philadelphia Gas Works are the property of the people, for the disposal of their property; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the question of leasing or not leasing the gas works be voted upon by the citizens at the next general election, and the ballot shall contain the word, ‘For leasing the gas works,’ and ‘Against leasing the gas works,’ and that the City Commissioners prepare the necessary ballots."

City and State of Philadelphia, says very truly:

"Such refusal to permit the owners of a great property, valued at over $50,000,000, to say whether they shall part with it or keep it is worthy of the severest condemnation. This will be attributed, and with good show of reason, to corrupt motives on the part of faithless public servants.

And Dr. Taylor, editor of the Medical World, writes:

"Philadelphia is not a free city; it is not governed by its people, but by its politicians and corporations. But the people do not know what is the matter, do not know their rights, do not know their helpless condition."

These two things will illustrate the bastard sort of thing many present Referendums are. The politicians submit to the people things which are either immaterial to them or which they feel sure the people will pass. They refuse to submit to the people the matters which the people really want to vote on and which should defeat. The Referendum is sporadic and under the control of the politicians, just so long will it fail to show its full results, will it be used by the politicians as a tool, and result in indifference on the part of the people.

In most cases it will be better than nothing, but not much. When it is a regular thing and the desire for voting comes from the people, then they will be interested and its good effects fully felt.

TENNESSEE’S REFERENDUM.

During the heat of midsummer the people of Tennessee voted on the question submitted to them by the last Legislature whether they would have a constitutional convention to frame a new constitution or not. It was not held at the time of the regular elections; nothing else was voted on at the same time; there was a very languid interest in the question, though the opposition was general and generally known. It was defeated by a vote of 22,450 for to 113,158 against, or 68 per cent. against and 17 per cent. for. The total vote—135,608—is 42 per cent. of the presidential vote of 1896, but in that vote 51 per cent. was Democratic-Populist, 46 per cent. Republican and 3 per cent. scattering, which shows that the voting for men usually requires a smaller number of votes to be had than in voting for measures; in other words, that the voter can much easier decide
on the wisdom of a measure than on the character of a man. It also shows the absence of partisanship.

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN OMAHA.

By Walter Breen, of Omaha.

The last session of the Nebraska Legislature enacted a law in favor of Direct Legislation weighed down by a cumbersome requirement necessitating 20 per cent. of the voters of the city or county to sign a petition before the City or County Clerks would be compelled to print the question on the official ballot. The Direct Legislation League of Omaha, sixty days before election, determined, however, to make the effort and get the required number of citizens to affix their signatures to the petition. The lists were printed and generally circulated, but as D. L. was a new thing to most of the voters, getting signatures to the number of 5,000 was no easy matter. The reason it was necessary to get such a large number of signatures was the fact that last year being presidential year the county vote exceeded the normal by about 4,000 or thereabouts. Next year it will be sufficient if we obtain about 3,700 names. The result was that when the time came for printing the official ballots it was found that about 1,000 names were all that had been secured, and, as is usually the case, the most of these were secured by a few tireless workers like Mr. J. W. Logan, John O. Yeiser and a few others. The City Council and County Commissioners were appealed to, but without success. Being dense, thick-headed Republicans, they could not get it through their heads what the L. and R. was, and so the matter had to this time go by default. There was, however, a Referendum taken on the following questions, and the voting thereon was interesting: Question No. 1—Upon the issuing of $50,000 in county bonds in aid of the Trans-Mississippi Exposition, the ayes stood 12,252, against 3,707, not voting 1,502. Question No. 2 was on the issuing of some refunding bonds for poor-farm property which the county had sold years ago, but could not give a good title, so had to repay purchasers; the vote stood for 12,061, against 3,749, blank ballots 1,467. So both these propositions carried, as there was over two-thirds majority in each case. As there was a strong fight made for and against these bonds, it is interesting to note the fact of the large percentage who voted for either on no; in fact, this indifferent vote, if added to the nay vote, would have defeated the two questions, as it required a two-thirds vote to carry. Again, in round figures, the total vote for the heads of the five tickets on the large blanket ballot aggregated 17,950 votes, and as the bond question was on a small slip of paper, it shows how keenly alive the majority of voters were to all questions when 15,950 expressed their wishes in this matter. The D. L. League here will be in the field in good season next year, and by commencing early there can be no doubt but that the requisite number of signatures will be obtained to the D. L. petition, so that next autumn the people of this county and city can have an opportunity to vote their sovereign pleasure on the adoption of this question of questions.

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN TRADES UNIONS.

The field for study of the actual workings of Direct Legislation indicated by the heading has never been fully covered. Mr. Sullivan in his book published in 1892 gave some very pertinent facts, but many have transpired since and are taking place all the time. Accordingly the editors of The Record sent out a circular letter to the secretaries of about seventy-five organizations, and a number of very full and interesting answers have been received. The first batch of these follows; others will be printed in later issues, and a regular department will be devoted to labor Direct Legislation for awhile. The editors will be glad of any information which may be sent in. To summarize, in one sentence, their answer—Direct Legislation is working well in labor organizations and is being extended in scope, power and usefulness and is arousing and educating the rank and file.

THE CIGARMAKERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION.

By G. W. Perkins, President.

The Referendum in our association is almost as old as the association itself, and we have had both the Initiative and Referendum in full force since about 1880. All questions of any nature whatever, including the nomination and election of officers, are subject to the Initiative and Referendum. The following, section 213 of our constitution, states the gist of our method—the full regulations are too long to print:

"Sec. 213. Each local union shall have the right to propose, through the columns of the Official Journal, amendments to the International Constitution. Each union is required to act upon every amendament at their meeting next following the receipt of the Journal containing such amendments, and report to the International President. Unions failing to comply with this provision shall be fined $5. But no union shall be fined for not taking action on a proposed amendament unless the same has been submitted by the International President by circular. Any amendament receivng the endorsement of at least twenty unions shall be submitted to a vote of local unions within thirty days."

Time and space will not permit me to give a detailed vote on the many questions that we have had to vote on, but in my judgment the rank and file of our organization would not tolerate an amendament abrogating the system of Initiative and Referendum.

About one-third of the membership usually vote. In my judgment the reason so large a
number abstain is that these questions are voted on at the regular meetings of the union, and not at the shop and their homes. Usually all members at the meetings vote. I favor a compulsory system of voting, and section 12 of our constitution provides in the voting for international officers that:

"Every member of the International Union, eligible to vote at the election for officers, as in this article provided, shall be fined the sum of fifty cents for the failure to so vote, the same to be paid within eight weeks, or, failing in what manner soever, it shall be credited."

The decisions arrived at are very good, and the amount of intelligence and discretion displayed in voting is remarkable. These questions, when submitted, bring about discussion not only in the factories, but in the meetings, and even the most dull are compelled to listen to argument and to, at least, think over these questions. The result is a constant raising of the standard of intelligence of our membership. I hold that the cigarmakers of this country, chiefly through the policy of the Initiative and Referendum, are better prepared and better able to meet the demands of government, etc., than any other craftsmen in this country.

Not only have we the Initiative and Referendum about laws, but also on the question of strikes. If the local union of New York desires to go on a strike for any reason they would submit all the facts to the head office, where it would be set up and sent to every local union, and a majority of local unions would decide whether they shall strike or not.

The international officers are also nominated and elected by popular vote, so that our members not only make their laws but elect the officers to execute them, and we now only have conventions once in five years.

To my mind it is a plain proposition, that those who have a voice in making the laws are bound to have more respect for them and live with greater contentment and satisfaction than they would if they had no say in making such laws. It is true even if a better law was otherwise made. In our case the members make the laws themselves, and it enables the executive to say: "These are your own laws; you helped to make them." Result: There is no serious fault-finding against our laws.

THE REFERENDUM IN THE CIGARMAKERS.

By W. C. Roberts, in the Chicago Dispatch.

The members of the Cigarmakers' International Union have, by Referendum vote, indorsed every amendment and resolution adopted by the convention held recently in Detroit. There were ninety-five amendments and thirty-three resolutions passed by the 245 delegates, and, according to the rules of the union, they had to be indorsed by a majority of the 28,000 members voting, or they would become a part of the laws. The result is remarkable from a union standpoint, and shows that the men who are guiding the organization along the sometimes rocky path of trade unionism are in thorough touch with the rank and file.

The system by which the cigarmakers make laws is not universal with labor organizations although there are many which require a referendum vote on all questions of vital importance. The cigarmakers, however, are acceded the front rank in this sort of legislation, and by their long step their hard have built up a system which places them far ahead of all other trades. There is no disputing this fact, as every prominent labor man in the country has always pointed to the laws of the cigarmakers as worthy of being copied by their own organizations.

During the past four years there has not been a labor organization that has not lost members except the cigarmakers. Every fraternal society and other voluntary organizations have made the same complaint. But while they were and are still complaining of loss of membership the organized cigarmakers have increased in numbers.

Among the changes in the Constitution made by the convention and ratified by the membership, the following are probably the most important:

1. Making the amount of out-of-work benefit that can be drawn by a member in any one year $54 instead of $72. Three dollars per week is given to the unemployed and can be collected during three periods of six weeks each.

2. No member can obtain out-of-work or other benefits unless he has paid weekly dues for two years. The old law reads one year.

3. Dues hereafter will be thirty cents a week instead of twenty cents. This does away with the paying of assessments.

4. The terms of all officers shall be five years. The officers elected last February would have held office under the old law for three years, but a resolution was adopted making their terms begin January 1, 1897, and end December 31, 1901.

5. The sessions of the International Union will be held every five years on the second Monday in September, unless otherwise ordered by the local union.

The organization is run on business principles. Under a wise provision of the cigarmakers, the president is not handicapped by a secretary or other official, but he has complete control of the business of the organization. He is held responsible for the carrying out of all instructions issued by the membership, but when his decisions are objected to by any member an appeal can be taken to the Executive Board and finally to a popular vote of all members.

The president is a straight-out trade unionist, without any frills. He is not a dreamer in any sense of the word, but is a practical official. In labor circles his advice is always sought when an unusually difficult problem is to be solved, for the reason, it is said, that his decisions are never influenced by friendship nor warped by prejudice.

THE UNITED GARMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA.

By Henry White, General Secretary. Offices 28 Lafayette Place, New York.

The Referendum and Initiative are a part of our constitution, as follows:
"ARTICLE XXIV.

"REFERENDUM AND INITIATIVE.

"Section 1. Three or more local unions, each of a different State, can instruct the General Secretary to issue a Referendum vote of the whole national organization upon any legal question of general importance, this said question to be put in a definite and concise form.

"Sec. 2. When the General Executive Board considers a question which may arise, of general importance, a Referendum vote must be ordered.

"Sec. 3. The General Secretary must issue a vote as ordered within two weeks and must receive answers from local unions within six (6) weeks from said date.

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of a local union must call a special meeting and announce his union's vote by sending the names of the ayes and nays of those present at said special meeting; a majority of the total vote cast of the national organization being decisive."

It has operated successfully. We have found that the membership votes intelligently on the propositions submitted, but they must be presented in a simple form. On Sept. 1 we submitted eight amendments to our constitution, which are typical of the questions. This explanation accompanied the text of the amendments in the circular sent each Local Union and shows what they were:

"Amendment No. 1 proposes to combine the present per capita tax of 5 cents and the quarterly assessment of 25 cents, which amounts to 13½ cents per month per member. Owing to the difficulty of collecting the quarterly assessment and the manner in which some unions seek to evade payment, the convention unanimously recommends that the per capita tax be fixed at 12 cents (1½ cents less than the present amount) and that the quarterly assessment be abolished.

"Amendments Nos. 2, 3 and 4 deal with the changing of the time for holding the General Convention. The Convention favored the present date of May, the best and most suitable month, because the trade at that time is usually the busiest and the unions therefore would be in a better condition to send delegates and transact business.

"Amendments Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 are intended to enforce stricter and more business-like methods of keeping financial accounts and records, both by the local and general officers."

They were carried by a narrow margin, thus showing the interest taken, the division of opinion, and that the members do not apathetically acquiesce in the recommendations made even by their own General Convention. In January, 1896, fourteen questions were submitted and carried by majorities ranging from 63 to 98 per cent.

I think that the Referendum and the Initiative principles should be extended to public questions, but these questions should be stated in such a manner as to be readily comprehended by the ordinary mind, otherwise the Referendum would be a failure.

"If the question of granting franchises was submitted to Referendum vote, the corporations would not have the influence they now have and could not obtain the valuable privileges as a gift or for small compensation. Another great advantage which the Referendum principle would give would be that questions would be decided upon their merits irrespective of the position parties may take, and trades unionists would exert a great moral influence and take a public part, which they could not if partisan action were required.

THE PATTERN MAKERS' NATIONAL LEAGUE OF NORTH AMERICA.


Our constitution was adopted, and all amendments by Article XXI are adopted or rejected by our membership, and Section 9 of Article IX. reads as follows:

"No levy or assessment shall be made unless approved by a majority vote of all members of Associations attached to the League, the result of said vote to be forwarded to the General Secretary-Treasurer within thirty (30) days after notification."

So that all financial questions not specified in the constitution must be submitted to all the members. These were in the constitution at its adoption in 1887, and have remained unchanged since. All other questions out of the ordinary are submitted first to the members for their approval or rejection.

The Referendum is used on an average about four times a year, though there have been six this year, with a seventh now pending. These are mostly of a financial nature. The number of votes cast ranges from fifty to seventy-five per cent. of our membership, though in one instance it fell to thirty-three per cent, but in a re-vote on the same question it rose to nearly seventy-five per cent.

I do not think there is a general abstention from voting, as I believe, if asked, those who do not vote have and could tell a good excuse. Those who do not understand or who do not care should not vote.

I am of the impression that all matters now submitted will continue to be. Men, I find, love to manage their own business.

While our questions are mostly financial, the interest taken in them, the demand for fullest information connected with these Referendums, speak well for the use of Direct Legislation. It is used so fully in labor organizations not of a composite character, that in them it can hardly be extended further. But in composite ones, notably the American Federation of Labor, its extension is only a matter of time.

The experience of all who have considered it has been to prove that the people can be trusted. They are to-day demanding more
of a voice in matters affecting them. Personally, I strongly favor it, and have found its workings in our league most excellent.

IN CANADA.

Motion passed at Thirteenth Annual Session of Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, held at Hamilton, Ont., September 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17:

"Delegate Walsh moved, seconded by Delegate O'Connor, that this congress is of the opinion that the principle of municipal local option ought to be extended so as to give municipalities the power of adopting three fundamental reforms demanded by or organized labor, namely: (1) Proportional Representation, by abolishing the ward system and adopting some form of the single vote; (2) The Initiative and Referendum, by providing that any measure must be submitted for decision by popular vote if a certain percentage of the voters petition therefor; (3) Tax Reform, by lessening taxation on industry and increasing it on land values. We submit that the wisdom of these reforms can best be tested by practical experience. We therefore urge the Provincial Governments to make such changes in their Municipal Acts as will give municipalities the opportunity of gaining this practical experience for themselves, and of enjoying the benefits of these reforms when proved successful."

THE SWISS REFERENDUMS OF LAST JULY.

By Philip Jamin, of Geneva. Translated by Miss Ella Levin, of New York.

Since 1874, the national authorities have had the right to make laws for the preservation of the forests and the re-wooding of the higher Alps. Of course these laws were useless for such cantons as Vaud, where they have a good forest regime, but it is very clear that these laws have been very advantageous in many of the cantons. Since their application, thoughtless denuding of the forests has ceased, and new forests have been grown on the brows of the mountains, where they serve as ramparts against avalanches, protecting the villages below.

Seeing the efficacy of these federal measures, it became a question whether it was wise to limit their actions to the upper regions only, and not by a constitutional amendment to extend their action to the whole country.

Despite the fear of centralization which restrained many voters from approving his extension of federal authority, the decree of March 19, 1897, revising Article 24 of the Federal Constitution by giving to the national authorities the surveillance of all the forests of the country instead of a control of the forests of the upper Alps or higher mountains only, was carried by a vote of 98,178, or 70,907 majority. This majority was plainly foreseen, as there was no opposition to this partial revision, and this was a reason for the smallness of the vote. The attitude of the voters would have been different if a new article had been proposed. Although cantonal committees were formed for and against, the people were not deeply stirred as they have been on such questions as increase of military service, taxation, etc. In cantons which have no forests, like Geneva, Bale, etc., the vote would have been very small if the second question had not been voted on at the same time.

The second question submitted gave to the national government the control of the importation, transportation and sale of food or other article which may endanger the health of the people. The objectors urged, not without reason, that the Chambers asked of the people an increase of power without presenting a digest of the law; thus the voter might regret his vote when the law elaborating the increased power was passed. This, they urge, should not be repeated too often, as the value of a law depends greatly on its wording. Then it was feared that it would create a crowd of analyzing and examining officers, and experience proves that functionarism once engaged in that direction proceeds with a happy heart. They also thought it might be a blow to cantonalism or local government and wished that in matters relating to public health, each canton should legislate, regulate and execute.

Those favoring the law said that it was a protection to the consumer against adulterations, which were becoming more and more numerous and dangerous, and they said, with a good deal of force, that the cantons were incapable of affording sufficient protection, as the laws varied, and that the other cantons were at the mercy of the poorest cantonal laws in most of these matters; hence they thought it the task of the confederation.

This second referendum passed by a vote of 162,250 in favor to 86,855 against, or a majority of 75,395. The total vote on this was 249,105, and on the first one it was 243,263. At the end of June (this voting took place on July 11), the population of Switzerland, according to the government statistics in Der Grütliwender of September 9, was 3,072,810, and the citizens having a right to vote numbered 716,883; thus just about a third of the voters exercised their right to vote on these two measures. In Switzerland, we think that those not interested, should refrain from voting, and it illustrates the fact recently remarked on by the president of our republic, that the vote cast showed the interest felt by the people in any subject, and that on one which touched them vitally, there was a large vote, but on other questions the vote was small.

THE REFERENDUM IN AUSTRALIA.

CONSTITUTION-MAKING.

By Frank G. Tudor, of Hawthorn, Victoria.

There are five separate colonies on the Australian continent and Tasmania is very near to the mainland. For years there has been a growing desire for federation to manage telegraphs, railways (which I am thank-
ful to say are owned by the colonies), defences and many other matters which can be better managed federally than by individual States.

Late last year each of the colonies, with the exception of Queensland, passed a federal enabling bill, which resulted in ten delegates being elected by each colony. Western Australia did not follow this method, but Parliament (or practically the the premier, an unbending Conservative,) selected the ten.

This convention met in Adelaide, S. A., in March, and made fair progress with the constitution. Many say it is modeled on the United States Constitution, with improvements. The convention was adjourned to Sidney, N. S. W., where they met early in September and have met every day for several weeks, often sitting twelve to fourteen hours a day.

The first difficulty was over equal representation of States in the Senate. That was agreed to, and then the battle for the solution of deadlocks between the House and Senate, and for three whole days the debate centred around the Referendum as a solution. One of the curious plans proposed was the dual Referendum, by which a law had to pass both a majority of the States and a majority of the voters. The Conservatives prevailed, a national Referendum was knocked out, but a dissolution of both houses was agreed to.

Despite its defeat, the educational effect has been marvelous, as the debate was watched with keen attention. It is felt by many that our future depends upon the work of the convention. Nearly every newspaper on the continent has published leading articles on the Referendum and its effects, and I quote from a leader in the Melbourne Age of Sept. 23, which paper has a larger circulation than the next half-dozen newspapers in this colony, and of course carries great weight: "As to the vote against the Referendum given in the Sidney convention, it is almost certain to be reversed in Melbourne, if our delegates can only learn wisdom from experience."

This paper has been the greatest educator in this colony of Victoria on all reform questions, and I have no doubt the Referendum will be adopted when the convention meets in Melbourne next January.

Our parliamentary elections took place on Oct. 14, and the ninety-five members in the House are entered as follows:

| For Referendum in federal deadlocks | 57 |
| Against | 18 |
| Unrecorded | 30 |

Protectionists | 71 |
Free traders | 24 |

For one man one vote | 46 |
For dual vote | 21 |
Unrecorded | 6 |

For woman suffrage | 49 |
Against | 29 |
Unrecorded | 17 |

For Scripture League claims | 24 |
Against | 51 |
Unrecorded | 20 |

But if we take their views as shown in detail in the Melbourne Age we find that seventy-seven favor and eighteen oppose the Referendum, and you may take that as the feeling here—viz., about four to one in favor. But we haven't much chance of its passing the upper house, and all alterations to our constitution require a majority in both houses.

Taking the election campaign as a whole, many persons have a better knowledge of the Referendum than ever before. At all the meetings which I attended if the candidate did not refer to it he was asked a question about it.

Mr. Tudor has sent a number of Australian papers, and clippings from them will show the strength of the movement. All through there are scattered notices similar to these first two:

"A meeting to hear the views of Mr. J. W. Bilton was held last night. Mr. F. Tudor presided."

"The candidate said he was asked to stand as a labor candidate. He favored one adult one vote, as absolute justice to the 'opposite' sex. All the objections that had been raised against female franchise had been urged against that for the workers. The Legislative Council should be mended or ended. He would support the Referendum. This could be used for the settlement of the Bible in State schools question. [A voice: It ought to be dead.] If the majority of the people wanted the Bible in State schools they should have it. Another question which should come under the Referendum was local option, which he was strongly in favor of. He favored a progressive tax on land values irrespective of improvements."

"Mr. F. T. Hickford, one of the candidates for the East Bourke boroughs, addressed a large meeting of the electors in the Alfred Hall.

"He said he wished to speak straight out from the shoulder, regardless whether he obtained votes or not. He was in favor of federation. The Senate should be represented on a proportionate basis, and he believed in the double dissolution, and if that should be ineffective, in the Referendum. [Hear, hear.] In some cases the Referendum would practically do away with Parliament. [A voice: A good job.] It might be a good job for some people, but not for members of Parliament."

Some clippings from the debates, as reported in the Melbourne Age, will be interesting as showing how the matter is regarded. The debate is on the amending of the Federal Constitution:

"Mr. Trenwith—It should be of such a character that if a considerable majority of the people arrived at the conclusion that a change was necessary, there should be nothing in the Constitution act to enable an insignificant minority to defy the majority and prevent the adoption of the necessary amendments of the entire commonwealth. An example which should not be forgotten was the ex-
treme rigidity of the American Constitution and the endless heartburnings caused by the impossibility of making really necessary alterations to it.

"Mr. Leviensaid the proposal was, as far as he could see, diametrically opposed to the principle of equal representation in the Senate already granted to the States. It would permit of any single State being overruled and overruled it, whether of State or of right.

"Mr. McCay remarked that the member for Barwon (Mr. Leviens) was the first in the House to refer to equal representation as a principle. It was nothing of the sort, but merely a concession held out as a necessary inducement to the smaller colonies to join the federation. The Constitution certainly ought to allow the majority of the States to rule in matters affecting their own interests.

"Mr. Stoughton contended that if the smaller States, which were still very dubious about entering the federation, were induced to fear the weight of equal representation in the Senate, their position ought to be kept inviolate. It would amount to inveigling them into the federation if the Constitution were so framed that the States which had made no secret of their desire for proportional representation were allowed the means of giving effect to that desire almost immediately after the establishment of the commonwealth.

"Mr. Gray supported the proposal of the member for Richmond. It was clearly unreasonable to give one State—it might be the smallest in the federation—the power to coerce all the other States by objecting to reforms.

"Mr. Salmon said it would be a retrograde step to accept the amendment after agreeing to grant equal representation to all the States.

"Mr. Maloney trusted the Constitution would be made so elastic that it might be changed just as the majority of the people who had to be governed might desire.

"Mr. Carter said if anything were distinctly asserted by the Attorney-General it was that there was no chance of federation unless the States were given equal rights. That being perfectly clear, the clause conferring equal State rights on the smaller States to the mischief that those clauses were to be abolished. As proposed, it would be made possible for any State, after having come into the federation on an equal basis, to have that right taken away. He would not care to go into a partnership wherein the partner holding the larger interest could kick him out at a moment's notice. If the government wanted the smaller States to join in the federation an alteration should not be made which would lead them to stand out.

"Mr. Denkin thought the proposition was almost a reversal of the decision to concede equal representation in the Senate. To strike out the words proposed was equivalent to agreeing to equal representation in the Senate for only a limited time.

"Mr. Moule said he would rather have an indefinite expression on an explicit question from the government.

"The Attorney-General said he had explained the inherent difficulties of the dissolution method—the disinclination that members of the Legislature would have to the risks and inconveniences, the dislocation of business and arrangement of procedure that it would involve, and the uncertainty of the verdict it would yield after all—and it now seemed to him that the Referendum offered a better prospect of giving proper effect to the will of the people than any other method. If there was one principle gaining ground, not only in Liberal, but in Conservative circles, it was that of giving the people a direct and easy mode of inquiring into, and regarding the people that the business of government, they themselves upon difficult and disputed public questions. The Referendum was inevitable. Its general adoption was only a matter of time. It was the height of absurdity to have two agents—the one the predominating agent, the other the restraining agent—and that when these two agents could not agree as to what was to be done with regard to the business of the people that the business should come to a standstill. Would such a process be tolerated in any private business? The principle of the Referendum had been carried in New South Wales, and the proposal to have a majority of the States was rejected.

"Mr. G. H. Reid, Premier of New South Wales—Their duty was to so arrange the Constitution that, in matters which were peculiarly national, the national voice should prevail, and that in matters which involved State rights the voice of the States should not be drowned by the national voice. When the federation had settled its houses and the spirit of the people had emerged, provincial and parochial distinctions would disappear, and national unity would ensure. There would be no distinction between a voter of South Australia and a voter of West Australia, or a voter of New South Wales. [Cheers.] He admitted that, on some subjects, that would be wrong. That was on subjects peculiarly involving State rights. Just as he refused to hand over the destinies of the 1,300,000 people of New South Wales to the smaller States on national matters, so he declined to hand over the destinies of the 300,000 or 400,000 people in the smaller States on the questions of State rights. The misfortune of the omission and the misfortune of the dual Referendum was that it a question arose in which the voice of the nation came into conflict with the voice of the States, all those complex, costly and slow expedients seemed to him to resemble a series of ditches into which the commonwealth could flounder, finding itself at last in the biggest ditch of all, finding itself at last, after infinite labor, in the same dangerous and the same envenomed state in which it began. He asked the smaller States to say what they would have to be so specially safeguarded that the rule of majority should not have its way. If there were such rights he was prepared to recognize them and put them into the Constitution, where they could not be interfered with.

"Mr. Dobson—That is impossible. You must answer your own questi—. How to prevent the national voice from drowning the State voice.

"Mr. Reid—In any question where the rights of the States were concerned as geographical entities he did not see how any one could refuse to those rights in the Constitution.

"Mr. Dobson—What about their rights as human entities?

"Mr. Reid—What was the distinction between the human entity on one bank of the Murray and the human entity on the other bank? [Laughter.] If there was, for God's sake, let them put it in the Constitution. If there were any which required them to distinguish between the people of the various colonies, those rights should be put in the Constitution because it was the only safety-valve for them. [Hear, hear.] There must be a finally in the Constitution, and they would be on the right side of the hedge by saying that the finally should rest with the people. [Cheers.] Could we not make the risks and inconveniences a means of solving difficulties in a constitutional manner? He would put into the Constitution every State right that ought to be safeguarded, and when he had done that, he could ask his friends from the smaller colonies to aid him in
providing that in all matters of national policy, in all matters of daily life, we should regard the people as an Australian human entity, with no interference from the old countries.

Mr. Isaacs—They had arrived at the decision that States had rights in conceding the principle of self-government to the Aborigines. To further the idea was not unreasonable that State rights should be acknowledged in the final arbitration of disputes in the Legislature.

Mr. Higgins: Referring to the double Referendum, said he would have nothing to do with a Referendum that was a delusion and a sham, which led the people to believe that they were protected by a Referendum when they were not protected at all.

A correspondent sums up the situation before the final vote as follows:

"Some form of Referendum is essential, and the divergence of view among the larger colonies on the point as to which form of Referendum should be established is the rock upon which the convention may split. Having secured the double dissolution, it will be questioned whether there should be a dual Referendum, that is to say, a Referendum requiring a majority of Senate votes as well as a majority of House of Representatives votes, or whether there should be a general appeal to the people without regard to State distinctions.

"The greatest stumbling block in the way is West Australia. Sir John Forrest has apparently no intention of coming into the federation at present, and he and the representatives of that colony are simply evoking the passive energy of votes towards shaping the Constitution to a form that will suit them when they deem it advisable to join." The next day, Sept. 23, the question came to a head as follows:

"Mr. Carruthers then moved 'That if a conference of the two houses failed to bring an agreement the question in dispute should be submitted to a national Referendum.'

"The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 13
Noes 27

Majority against the Referendum 14

"The new clause, as finally adopted, provided, 'That in lieu of dissolving the House of Representatives alone, both houses of Parliament may be dissolved simultaneously, and such dissolution the proposed law fails to pass, with or without amendment. It may be referred to the members of the two houses deliberating and voting, and shall be accepted or rejected, according to the decision of three-fifths of its members present sitting and voting.'"

The Melbourne Age, commenting on this editorially said:

"It was hopeless to fight against a combination between New South Wales and the smaller colonies; and after a vigorous protest the Victorian representatives surrendered to the inevitable, confident that the whole thing will be eventually altered. In order not to lose the double dissolution, the Victorians in the end voted for Mr. Carruthers' proposal, and after a half-hearted attempt to insert the Referendum as a final mode of settlement, any further consideration of the deadlock issue was reserved for the January convention.'

And the day after, in a two-column editorial, said:

"That our local Tories should be in a spasm of terror at the Referendum is quite in the natural course of events. It is an appeal to the judgment of the people at large, and such an appeal to the colonial Estates means something which is many degrees more dreadful than an application to Beezlebub. Hence we are assured, in columns of pitiful reiteration, that the Referendum is a monster so dreadful that no British community can see its face and live. That it is working with admirable smoothness in the Swiss Constitution which has no weight on the Tory terrorist. And that the forensic of English statesmen and parliamentarians have advocated the adoption of the Referendum into the English Constitution in no way reflects on being the pet bogy of the colonial Conservative."

"All sorts of dangers, it is suggested, may be hid in this terrible machine that will make the people the arbiters in intercolonial disputes. But we are never told in what the danger can possibly consist. Certainly it is not true to say that the Referendum used as an arbiter between the Senate and the House of Representatives is an appeal to popular ignorance. It can never be invoked until the matter in controversy has been elaborately discussed in Parliament, in the press and on the platform. Therefore the merits of the dispute necessarily must be well digested by the people. The truth is, the plea of danger is the old excuse. Everything is dangerous that is new, and especially perilous if the people are to have a hand in it.'"

THE REFERENDUM IN AUSTRA-LIA AND NEW ZEALAND,
Condensed from an Article by Lilian Tomn in the Contemporary Review, August, 1897.

No less than five of the Colonial Parliaments were occupied in discussing Referendum bills during the last parliamentary year. In four of them—New South Wales, South Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand—these bills were government measures, and in Victoria, though introduced by a private member, was supported by the government, who had appointed a r-v-wl commission to inquire into the subject in 1894. None of the bills, however, became law that session, the farthest advanced being that of New South Wales, which was thrown out in the upper house. There is nevertheless every likelihood of the Referendum becoming law in the near future, especially as it is proposed to submit the Australian Federation act to the popular vote. In South Australia, at least, it will be no innovation, for an experimental Referendum on this question was actually taken there at the time of the last general election in April, 1896, in consequence of a parliamentary resolution.

The constitutional interest of the Australian Referendum lies in the fact that it is an attempt to incorporate into a monarchal government of a parliamentary type a highly democratic expedient peculiar to a republican and federal State.

The great fact about the Australian Referendum is that it is not an attempt to constitute the people sovereign, but to substitute their assent for that of the upper house should the upper house continue to reject a bill passed by the lower house. The government bill which aimed at establishing the system in New South Wales was entitled "A bill to provide means of legislation in case of disagreement between the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly," while the Victoria bill went a step further and inserted a clause that bills submitted to the Referendum and accepted by the people should bear the following style: 'An act passed by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly and
with the approval of the people of Victoria." All mention of the Legislative Council is omitted. The New Zealand bill, which was entitled: "An act to refer to the electors of the colony certain motions or bills for their decision. That act had wider scope and provided not only for a Referendum when the two houses should disagree, but also that both houses might by a resolution submit any motion or bill to the vote of the electors. All the bills provided that when a measure should have twice passed the lower house and should have been twice rejected by the upper house, or should have been amended in such a way as to amount to a virtual rejection, or if the other house should fail to pass or reject the bill within a certain time, then it was open to the lower house to pass a resolution submitting the measure to the Referendum. The governor, on being notified, would publish the law in the official gazette and fix a date for the popular vote to be taken. Thus provision was made for three debates in the Legislative Assembly—before a bill should be submitted to the people—two debates on the bill and a debate on the resolution. In New South Wales before the resolution could be carried it had to be supported by an absolute majority of the members on the roll. This bill further provided that at least 100,000 valid votes must be recorded at the polls before the bill could become a law. The number was afterwards reduced in committee to 80,000, but the clause is in itself interesting as an expedient to force people to vote. Copies of the law were to be posted in all courthouses and post offices and school houses for at least a fortnight beforehand, and in New South Wales copies of the proposed law would be given gratis to any applicant. The machinery used at a general election was applied to the Referendum. The New South Wales bill provides that in the event of a Referendum and a general election coming together, both should take place on the same day and at the same time. This clause has now been omitted from the last New Zealand bill and it was expressly provided that the Referendum should not take place on the same day as a general election or a licensing election. The clause also provided that the vote be taken through post offices, in which case the postmaster would act as a returning officer. The reason for this is the great saving of expense.

A clause in the New South Wales bill gave any fifty electors the right to appeal against the returns. It is generally provided that if a bill be negatived at the polls the question shall not be brought up again for three years; the New Zealand bill adds the qualifying clause, "when 10,000 citizens should demand it." Should a majority vote for the bill it is then to be sent to the Governor for his assent, as if it had passed the upper house in the regular course of events. The Referendum in no way affects the Governor's right of veto, except in New Zealand. There a bill accepted by the people is to become a law on a date to be named by the Governor by proclamation. His assent seems to be unnecessary.

The New Zealand bill further provided that both houses might decide to refer a question to the people, in which case the same procedure was to be followed, but the people were only to be consulted on a general motion or resolution, not on an act of Parliament. Should the answer be affirmative, the duty of at once preparing a bill to give effect to such alteration or proposal devolves on the Colonial Secretary and must be brought in within ten days of the opening of the next session of Parliament.

It will be noticed how very different the Referendum as proposed in Australia is from the Referendum in Switzerland. There the voting is chiefly on a bill which has passed both houses. Only in one case does the law provide for a Referendum in case of a dispute between the two houses—when they disagree as to the necessity for a revision of the Constitution. This has never yet occurred. The Swiss people usually vote on the Initiative of a fraction of their number. The movement comes from below, not above. Nothing like this has been proposed in the colonies. The Referendum depends on the option of Parliament. This form was tried in the canton of Berne, but it did not work at all. The minority were always demanding an appeal to popular vote and the majority would never accede to their request.

Though the Australians have gone to Switzerland for their idea, yet the system proposed is quite new and original. The arguments by its supporters are based on the defects of representative government in general and of the Australian upper house in particular, which obstructs legislation. In Victoria it was said that the upper house had rejected fifteen bills since 1891 and that a bill to prevent plural voting was rejected three times and the Legal Profession's Amalgamation bill no less than five times. In New South Wales it was said that the Mining bill had been hanging on for twenty years.

To sum up. The Referendum is to be introduced into the Australian parliamentary system to settle questions of dispute between the two houses. The people are not to be supreme legislators, but arbiters. The possibility of a Referendum on non-disputed questions is considered in New Zealand, but in that case it is not proposed to refer a law to the people, but a resolution couched in general terms and the reply is in the nature of a mandate to the representatives. For my own part, I do not think it will be often resorted to should it become law. The Referendum is apt to prove a very conservative agent. Swiss experience has proved that the people are invariably opposed to anything of a far-reaching or radical nature. The result would, therefore, probably be the victory of the upper house over the lower. At all events the Australian Referendum is highly interesting as an attempt by five of the great colonies at the antipodes to solve the question of the upper house by substituting the popular vote for the second chamber.

Then none was for a party; Then all was for the State; Nor rich nor poor, but equal all Within the city's gates.—Mackay.
MONEY IN THE NEW YORK CAMPAIGN.

The papers all over the country have been filled with accounts of the money spent in the last New York campaign. D-sults there is considerable exaggeration, but if only partially true, the amounts spent are enormous. The Chicago Chronicle of Oct. 19 said of the Republicans:

"The committee wants $3,000,000. General McAlpin reported that it would be impossible to raise that amount in New York, mainly on account of the defection of rich men to Low. Secretary of the Interior Cornelius N. Bliss, at General Tracy’s request, saw many of the rich recalcitrants at the Union League Club Sunday, and from what he learned became discouraged. He saw Senator Platt immediately afterward, and the appeal for outside aid resulted from their meeting.


"This list of State bosses he appealed to, in person to E. R. Grinby, the Florida boss; John S. Clarkson, the Iowa dictator, and to General Harrison, of Indiana, Senator Thurston, of Nebraska, and other influential Republicans who are in New York.

"From the Republican national committee Platt has already received the whole of last year’s surplus, namely, $150,000. He has asked the committee for $350,000 more. A million has already been assessed and partly collected from local corporations and candidates.

"This leaves $1,500,000 to be apportioned among the bosses to whom Platt has appealed, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew S. Quay, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark A. Hanna and George S. Cox, Ohio</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Cabot Lodge, New England</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William E. Mason, Illinois</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James S. Clarkson, Iowa</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"To be added to:

- Receipts from the national committee...$150,000
- Paid by national committee...$50,000
- Assessed on corporations and candidates...1,000,000
- Grand total...$5,000,000

"Platt’s appeal for aid is based upon the claim that not only the Republican organization of New York city, but Republican organizations in all cities are jeopardized by the New York assault on bossism.

"He has enlisted the interest of the McKinley State bosses by promising to them the New York delegation in the next Republican national convention, while winking at Manley and Clarkson.

"The Chronicle is informed that the replies received and read at to-day’s meeting were satisfactory and that the McKinley bosses will levy assessments on Republican protected manufacturers, railroads and trusts throughout the country, as requested by Platt, at once.

"The whole of this great fund will be available in New York a week before the election, and will be spread broadcast in every election district to round up the floating vote for Tracy and undermine the strength of Seth Low."

The New York World gave the following estimate of the Tammany and other funds:

"Tammany is the organization whose campaign funds will be most easily estimated. In the light of past experiences the following estimates were furnished of preliminary assessments by a man familiar with the finances of the hall:

- County ticket—Four coroners, $1,000; two city court judges, $2,000; two Supreme court judges, $10,000; registrar, $5,000; sheriff, $1,500; district attorney, $5,000; mayor, $10,000; comptroller, $7,500; president of the council, $10,000.

- Colonel Ruppert resigned his nomination for the latter office because he could not stand the high assessment.

- Randolph Guggenheimer, slated to succeed him, is associated professionally with many corporations. His assessment will probably not be as much as Colonel Ruppert declined to give. He has the power to appoint committees which will derive away and pay for franchises and other public privileges.

- From other sources not mentioned under oath the Tammany city campaign committee expects to raise that amount to $100,000. Rich mond and Queens will pay their own expenses. That is all they are asked to do. Richmond will run to $15,000 and Queens will use about $35,000. Kings county expects to raise about $30,000 for its county ticket.

- Tammany will want from thirty-five assemblymen, thirty-five aldermen and fifteen members of the council about $1,000 each. That is a conservative estimate, making a total of $35,000. These contributions do not come direct from the candidates. They and their friends secure as much money as possible and the district makes up the odd dollars. In Kings county the corresponding offices will cost less, only about $40,000.

- The Tammany campaign committee will distribute a grand total of about $275,000. The Low forces had already spent $27,000 in the preliminary canvases for votes, rent and other expenditures necessary to organization up to the time of Seth Low’s acceptance of the nomination.

- The Citizens’ Union is sparing no effort or expense to enlighten voters, and the cost of literature and its distribution will be fully $20,000. They expect also to spend $25,000 on the speaking portion of the campaign. Other expenses will bring the figure up to about $125,000.

- The Republican party will have more money to spend than ever. There are many big moneved interests involved in this campaign. Among the followers of Eddie Gube, Jake Patterson, Abe Gruber and John Reisenweber, it is talked this will be the richest harvest since Quay carried New York in 1888."

Can ever a time of that amount of money be honestly spent? Is not the reason of it the franchises, laws and favors which both local and State lawmakers can give or withold? Direct Legislation will vest the final giving of those things in the people. It will take away the incentive for owning the legislatures, and hence for gathering and spending large campaign funds.
LEADERS DON'T KNOW.

Even the well informed and high minded political leaders don't know what the people want. The late Governor Frederic T. Greenhalge, of Massachusetts, has been held up as one of the most devoted, able and noble of our recent public men. In his annual address of 1895 to the Legislature, he said: “I think that the time is ripe for a thorough and decisive consideration of the great question of inaugurating biennial elections in this Commonwealth.”

In his 1896 address, he said: “The public mind appears to be growing more and more in favor of biennial elections.” He died, and the Lieutenant Governor Roger Wolcott succeeded him as Governor. Mr. Wolcott has been re-elected Governor, and is looked on as a worthy successor of Governor Greenhalge. He, too, is an able, honorable gentleman, and he strongly favored biennial elections, and was so successful in his advocacy of them that the 1896 Legislature voted to submit to the people two amendments to the constitution establishing biennial elections. These were passed by a Republican Legislature, commended by the Republican State convention, advocated by Republicans on the stump, particularly by Governor Wolcott in his campaign speeches. They were not opposed by the other political parties. One or two small non-political organizations and a few men opposed them.

The Republicans carried the Legislature and State offices, Governor Wolcott was re-elected, and yet in his 1897 annual address to the Legislature he said: “In 1896 two amendments to the constitution establishing biennial elections were submitted to the people for their ratification and adoption. On both these important questions, which have demanded so much time of your predecessors, the decision of the people was so emphatic as to afford little encouragement for an early renewal of the discussion.” The best of men, the ablest of politicians, don’t really know what the people want. The only way is to ask the people.

Notes on Pennsylvania’s first Constitution, drafted in 1776, put into effect in 1777:

“All bills were to be ‘privileged for the consideration of the people’ before they went to a third reading, and except ‘on occasions of a sudden necessity,’ no bill was to become law till the session of the Assembly after that in which it originated, thus practically establishing a Referendum.”—Paul L. Ford, in Political Science Quarterly.

“Switzerland stands first in the world having a carefully arranged scheme of judicious help for discharged prisoners and advice for all who need. —Revs. S. J. Barrows, before the National Prison Association.

“$5 reward to any one who can give a single decent argument against Direct Legislation.”—Plain Facts, of Dubuque, Ia.

The lightning is strong; the torrent is strong; the earthquake is strong, but there is some-thing that is stronger than all these—it is the enlightened judgment of all mankind.—Daniel Webster.

THUMB-NAIL SKETCHES.

By J. W. Logan, of Omaha, Neb.

Walter Breen was born in London, England, and when about seventeen years old came to this country and settled at Lincoln, Neb., which, after a short stay, he left for

Omaha, where he has been for nearly twelve years. He is in the real estate business and has made a success of it. He is always to be found among reformers, was one of the first to enter the People's party and has worked actively for it, refusing any office or position. He is secretary of the Omaha Philosophical Society and has read many papers before it, being particularly interested in cremation.

He is one of the Executive Committee of the National Direct Legislation League and Secretary of the Omaha D. L. League, and has done much active work, particularly in securing the passage of the D. L. law in the Nebraska Legislature last winter. Notes on the movement from his pen have often appeared in The Record.

In person Mr. Breen is of medium height, slender, of energetic nature, with very pleasant, winsome manners. His mind is open to all subjects; he is a good conversationalist, forceful writer and an indefatigable worker. With a few more good men like Mr. Breen, Direct Legislation will finally be accomplished.
DR. DAVID INGLIS.

By G. R. Weiherk.

The subject of this sketch, the President of the D. L. L. of Michigan, Dr. David Inglis, is a little below the average height, but well proportioned; very dark of eyes and hair, spare of build and sanguine of temperament; he could equally well have professed as a scholar or as an ascetic. Whilst his calmness, composure and control of violent mien and movement show the finish of his education, the thoughtful forehead and steady gaze convey the impression that although the intensity of his feelings or sentiments may, impel him, yet his judgment will never allow them to carry him too far or in a wrong direction.

David Inglis, son of Dr. Richard Inglis, formerly professor of obstetrics in the Detroit Medical College, and grandson of Rev. David Inglis, of Berwickshire, Scotland, was born in Detroit, Mich., on December 27, 1850. He obtained his early education in the public schools of the city, and, graduating from the High School in 1867. After spending one year in the literary department and another year in the department of medicine of the College of the University of Michigan, he attended the Detroit Medical College and graduated as M. D. in 1871. In 1872 he received the "ad eundem" degree from Bellevue Hospital Medical College, and spent the two subsequent years in medical study in the cities of Berlin and Vienna. In 1874 he associated himself with his father, who died a year later, in the general practice of medicine, but his interest and studies were directed mainly to diseases of the nervous system and the mind.

Dr. Inglis became a member of the Detroit Academy of Medicine in 1875, and was one of the originating members of the Detroit Medical and Library Association, whose constitution was in a large measure drawn up by him, and whose president he was in 1884.

He is also a member of the Michigan State Medical Society, the American Medical Association, and of the American Neurological Association. He also has contributed to the literature on medical and other journals, and articles like "The Relation of Insanity to Our Social Organization" have been read with interest.

Dr. Inglis has held successfully, in the Detroit Medical College, the position of instructor in histology, professor of practice of medicine, and since 1888, professor of nervous and mental disease.

He was appointed visiting physician to Harper Hospital in 1876, and has been attending neurologist to that institution since 1886, and to St. Mary's Hospital since 1880.

Married in 1877 to Miss Jennie Baxter, daughter of General Henry Baxter—leader of the Seventh Michigan regiment in its famous crossing of the Rappahannock—they are the happy parents of five children, their home is all that love, refinement and the culture of high ideals can make it, the centre not only of the immediate family, but also of a large circle of friends and acquaintances.

A life-long student of sociology, the doctor recognizes the superiority of the co-operative over the competitive system of the production and distribution of wealth; but he feels that the system is not only bound to come, whether we want it or not, but is already vitoriously established here in the form of trusts and syndicates, which are now even competing for, and, the absolute possession of the government, whether by a class or by the people, will decide the question, "Will the incoming reconstruction of our economic system be a blessing or a curse?"

If the people obtain possession of the government it will be socialism implying the brotherhood of man, eradicateatig poverty, vice and crime; if any one class monopolization of classes, an increase the possession of the government, it will result in a merely more scientific syste: of the production and distribution of commodities in the interest and for the benefit of the rulers; it will put the profit system with its concomitant evils, poverty, vice and crime; classes will become rigid castes and bar High pressure, and our glorious civilization, which was so full of promise, will die of the same cause and share the same grave with its predecessors.

But he firmly believes in the intelligence of our people. The people want to have the control of the government, but do not know how to obtain it. The people have been fooled so many times by designing and unscrupulous men, seeking office for self under platform promises never intended to be kept, that it looks with distrust on all candidates and their promises. The doctor says, therefore, it behooves us to disseminate the idea of Direct Legislation among the citizens wh: their minds are not befogged by the clouds of partisan, class and personal interest, oratory and literature; that is, between the elections, and the elections that take place necessarily will be only a record of the success of our endeavors.

The doctor recognizes that the principle of D. L., or so-called "free trade" is, after all, the only thing absolutely prohibitive of class rule, and this explains the phenomena, he says, that while these classes may favor ethical or economical reforms, they are always in a unit in fighting to the bitter end that which will sweep them and all their vested rights out of existence.

BOOK REVIEW.

Reprinted from The Outlook of Oct. 25.

CONSTITUTIONAL STUDIES, STATE AND NATIONAL, by James Schouler, LL.D. Published by Dodd, Mead & Co.

Few even of those who have made a special study of constitutional history have any clear conception of the development of our State Constitutions, and of the extent to which these documents, formerly adopted by delegates without reference to the people, have become the instruments through which the people directly determine the most important questions. Prof. Schouler in his recent development of development Prof. Schouler has come to sympathize with our first impression," he says, "is unfavorable. So much constitutional detail seems needless. * * * But when we have compared State Constitutions, such prejudice softens. * * * Breadth, not tolerance, characterizes these later schemes of State government. Dislike of monopolies, of class and money-making privileges, though visible, is not destructively manifested. If some impatient or niggardly constraint can be pointed out in a State Constitution, it is only on rare occasion. If rulers seem now and then hampered in action, it is because the rules are subjects in the Old World sense no longer, because American citizens are keenly sensitive to the public shortcomings, and apprehend the temptations which beset those temporarily over them through their own suffrage. Sooner or later the best thought of each generation will become a law into the marrow of these State Constitutions." Prof. Schouler's account of the development of our State Constitutions, not only regarding the scope of the subject, but also historical, and the provisions relating to the qualifications for the franchise and for officeholding, the manner of selecting officers, the limits upon the terms of judicial, legislative and executive offices, and the power of the Legislature, is an inspiring record of the advance of democracy.