

heard of it. It was in the democratic national platform in 1900, that is, the principle of direct legislation was endorsed. The people have the right to control their legislative body, and the initiative and the referendum provide the means. By the initiative the people can compel the submission of any question upon which they wish to act, and by the referendum they can sit in judgment upon the acts of their legislators. Is that a strange doctrine? I do not know what your constitutional provisions are. My Brother Tucker says that the governor has the veto power—that means that after the legislature passes a bill the governor can veto it. Now if one man can veto the act of the legislature, why can not all the people veto it? Is it not a queer doctrine that one man is wiser than all the people? If we are going to protect ourselves against taxation without representation we must have representatives who represent, and the right of the people to have their voice heard is more sacred than the right of any legislator to vote as he pleases, if he pleases to oppose the wishes of those who elect him.

But I have already occupied more time than I am entitled to. I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you; I appreciate the opportunity to participate in honoring America's greatest orator. I am glad to participate in the celebration of this day, when we invoke the name of a patriot whose heart was linked to the hearts of his people, and whose courage reflected the courage of his nation. I am glad to take part in an occasion when you emphasize the doctrine that taxation without representation is tyranny. I am glad to utilize this occasion to discuss the subject of taxation, for the whole purpose of representative government is to secure justice. I learned in the schools that there were three kinds of government; the monarchy, the aristocracy and the democracy. The monarchy was supposed to be the strongest, the aristocracy the wisest, and the democracy the most just. If these definitions were correct, I would prefer the democracy, because justice is, after all, the only foundation upon which permanent government can rest. But I deny that monarchy is the strongest and that an aristocracy is the wisest. A government that can draw from the wisdom of all the people is wiser than a government that rests upon the wisdom of a part, for all the people know more than any of the people. Neither is a monarchy the strongest. It is said to act more quickly, but quickness is not the only characteristic of strength. I believe with Bancroft that a republic is, in truth, the strongest of all the governments because it builds its citadel in the hearts of men. I insist, therefore, our form of government is not only the most just, but the wisest and strongest, and I want it to be made stronger still by being made more just, if possible, than it is today. Because I opposed imperialism some used to call me a little American, but I will allow no one to go beyond me in estimating this nation's greatness. No one goes beyond me in his conception of the nation's mission. Do you want this nation to dominate the inferior races? I want it to influence the great races as well. Do you want it to conquer half-civilized nations? I want it to be the leader of the civilized nations. You can not go beyond me in your conception of this nation's future. I want this nation to shake every throne on earth! Not by force or violence, but by showing the world something better than thrones, a government resting upon the consent of the governed, strong because it is loved, and loved because it is good.

◆◆◆◆ FINE AND PRISON

Judson C. Clements, member of the interstate commerce commission, was asked by a representative of a New York newspaper "are you going to send someone to jail?" Mr. Clements replied: "One of the most wholesome things that could happen would be the putting in jail of some man of prominence in the railroad world. It would do more than anything else to bring about better conditions. There are a lot of men of wealth and position who seem to think that there is no possibility of punishment being inflicted upon them, no matter how far they go. Once let the possibility become a demonstrated fact that jail doors can close on them, and a most salutary lesson would be taught. It would not be necessary to put in jail all the men who ought to be there. Just let one or two who hold high positions in the social and business worlds be put behind the bars. This would act as a powerful deterrent, for men then would hesitate to jeopardize their positions and safety." When the same question was put to Commissioner Lane he did not answer directly, but showed plainly that he appreciated the inadequacy of the fine system. Mr. Lane said: "We recently made an investigation of the books of

the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway company to discover how certain fines imposed upon the officers of that company for rebating had been paid, and found that fines of \$30,000 imposed on these officers had been paid out of the funds of the corporation and charged against an account known as 'corrections in freight earnings.'"

In an interview printed in the New York World, Attorney General Bonaparte said:

"In some cases where continuous violations of the law involve a large number of illegal acts, each one of them criminal, the total fines which can be imposed have proved a sufficient deterrent. But in other cases it is the opinion of most prosecuting officers that the law can be much more clearly and effectively enforced through the imprisonment of individual defendants."

In the same issue the correspondent who interviewed Mr. Bonaparte said: "To the man who visits Washington these days and converses freely with high officers of the government certain things become plain through cumulative evidence. One of the most important of these things is that the executive, the investigating and the prosecuting departments of the government now seek the individual violator of the law who in the past has hid behind the soulless, inanimate corporation that could not be sent to jail nor made to suffer in body, mind or conscience."

In the view of some people the suggestion that these powerful men who violate the law be held to account even as the humblest man is held to account, is not to be seriously considered. But there is one way of trifling with the violation of law when the violator is the representative of a great corporation and that is through the fine system. The corporation pays the fine and, in most instances, counts it a good investment. But once bring these powerful men to the prison door and they are very ready to recognize the majesty of the law—they are very ready to plead for mercy.

◆◆◆◆ THE IRISH BILL

The London newspapers are not enthusiastic concerning the Irish bill. The Daily News regards it as a "small affair." The Morning Leader says it is not free from "disadvantages." The Chronicle says that while it makes a serious attempt to "reduce Irish chaos to order and to extend the scope of local self-government," it is not nearly so comprehensive as was Mr. Chamberlain's scheme in 1895. The Standard says that neither Ireland or England is pleased. The Telegraph says the measure is mere jugglery rather than statecraft and the Daily Mail plainly shows its dissatisfaction all along the line.

The great meeting held at Dublin for the purpose of protesting against the bill indicates the temper of the Irish people and as the measure concerns the Irish people they are, after all, the ones to judge whether it meets the requirements of the situation.

◆◆◆◆ REGULAR "POP" DOCTRINE

Recently the New York Sun said: "Joy fills Nebraska and the honest farmer exults in his honesty. How would the farmer like to have the legislature reduce the price of his grain his fruit, his potatoes?"

To this the New York World replied: "The legislature couldn't. It has not the power. The farmer does not use the right of eminent domain to raise grain, fruit and potatoes. The railroad does use it because it serves a public purpose, and is properly subject to legal regulation."

But doesn't the World know that that is regular old time populist doctrine?

◆◆◆◆ NO "RUNNING AMUCK"

Attorney General Bonaparte gave recently to the New York World, an interesting and instructive interview concerning the enforcement of the Sherman anti-trust law. Mr. Bonaparte said:

"The prosecution of corporations by the federal government through the department of justice dates back to the enactment of the first interstate commerce law in 1887 and to the Sherman anti-trust act of 1890. In the twenty years that have elapsed the record stands as follows:

"Under the Sherman anti-trust law—Bills in equity, 23; injunctions granted, 14; dismissed, 3; pending, 6. Indictments, 18; convictions, 3; dismissed, 6; pending, 9. Informations and contempt proceedings, 4; convictions, 3; quashed, 1. Total cases, 45; government successes, 20; total fines imposed, \$50,000.

"Under the interstate commerce law, includ-

ing the Elkins act—Indictments, 78; convictions, 20; cases pending, 49; acquittals and dismissals, 9; total fines imposed, \$507,100.

"In addition to the fines two defendants were sentenced to jail.

"This latter case is the sole imprisonment sentence up to date in the prosecution of corporations. One year ago in the United States district court of Missouri two men, Thomas and Taggart, were found guilty of conspiracy to obtain rebates contrary to the interstate commerce and Elkins acts on shipments of general merchandise from Kansas City to the east. Thomas was fined \$6,000 and sentenced to jail for six months; Taggart was fined \$4,000 and sentenced to jail for three months. Both sentences are held up pending appeal to the higher courts.

"The Sherman anti-trust law, if almost dormant for many years, is now proving one of the most efficient acts to check corporation tendencies. During the Roosevelt administration more cases have been brought under its provisions than during the combined administrations of Presidents Harrison, Cleveland and McKinley."

But after all it is not such a very great boast that "during the Roosevelt administration more cases have been brought under the Sherman anti-trust law than during the combined administrations of Presidents Harrison, Cleveland and McKinley." It will be noted that the total number of cases brought under that law during the last twenty years amounted to 45; that the total fines imposed amounts to \$50,000 and that not one man has been sent to jail!

Mr. Bonaparte makes it plain that there was no activity against the trusts under the Cleveland, Harrison and McKinley administrations and we know that, in the very language of former Attorney General Knox, as well as by the record presented by Attorney General Bonaparte, even the Roosevelt administration did not "run amuck."

◆◆◆◆ "TRUSTING" THE PEOPLE

In a critical analysis of Oklahoma's proposed constitution the "American Lawyer" complains because that constitution places too much power with the people and says: "It can not be said that the legislators of Oklahoma are unwilling to trust their constituents."

Why shouldn't they be willing to trust their constituents? The "American Lawyer" would seem to have it that the legislator is the haughty master instead of the mere servant. It forgets that, according to the American doctrine, government for the people is of and by the people.

◆◆◆◆ TO THE POINT

The New York Evening Post says: "The subsidy bill which failed at the late session of congress had, according to the president, 'nothing whatever in common with certain previous measures of the same name.' Nothing, that is, except the fact that it would have applied public money to the support of a private business."

Now that is right to the point and deserves a place in every well regulated scrapbook.

◆◆◆◆ GOLD, PRICES AND INTEREST

A Commoner reader sends a clipping from the Boston Commercial Bulletin, showing that in its issue of March 2, the Commercial Bulletin printed an exceptionally interesting editorial. If memory is not at fault, the Commercial Bulletin was founded, and is now edited by the father of the present governor of Massachusetts. The editorial follows:

The discussion of the effect of the steady increase in the output of gold on interest rates and prices has been marked by a good deal of loose thinking. Some economists have maintained that gold inflation in the long run has practically no effect on either prices or interest rates, while others, who are advocates of the quantitative theory of money, affirm that prices and interest advance almost in direct proportion with the increase in the production of the yellow metal.

Among those who adhere to the view that there is little, if any, casual relation between prices and the supply of gold is Charles A. Conant, whose recent exhaustive treatise on money and banking is an important contribution to the literature on that subject. Anyone, however, who has read those chapters which deal with the topic under discussion must admit that they are not altogether convincing. Mr. Conant is especially weak, it seems to us, when he attempts to minimize the value of index figures as indicating changes in prices over a long period of time, and despite all his fine discriminations we are obliged to believe that these very index