

Why is it Popular?

The Houston (Texas) Post has the habit of referring to the initiative and referendum as "an old populist dogma." In a recent issue the Post printed a dispatch from its Washington correspondent to the effect that in three states, West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Florida, campaigns involving the initiative and referendum are in progress. How does it happen that this "old populist dogma" is attracting so much attention and is so popular today? The Post correspondent tells us that the consideration of this question by the Florida legislature is due to the fact that "the people are studying the whole question with a great display of interest." The agitation in West Virginia, according to the Post's correspondent, is due to the difficulty over the election of senators at the recent session, and so strong is the sentiment in that state that the legislature has been called in special session for the purpose of enacting a direct primary law and providing for direct nomination and election of senators according to the Oregon plan. Even in Pennsylvania—corporation-controlled Pennsylvania—the people show a deep interest concerning the initiative and referendum. Referring to Pennsylvania, the Post correspondent says:

"The judiciary committee of the senate and house of representatives of Pennsylvania occasioned much surprise last week by reporting favorably upon resolutions in each house providing for the submission of an initiative and referendum amendment to the state constitution.

"When the initiative and referendum fight was taken up in the Pennsylvania legislature two months ago, the progressives under the leadership of state grange officers and leaders of the Keystone party worked vigorously for the adoption of the resolution. The progressive republican league sent Senator Clapp, one of its members, to address the judiciary committee, while the democratic federation sent Senator Owen to perform a similar service. While it is not expected that the initiative and referendum resolution will be adopted by the Pennsylvania legislature, the campaign that has been made has brought this question squarely to the front in that state."

There are a lot of things mighty popular today that have been called "old populist dogmas"—the income tax and the popular election of senators for examples. Yet men of all parties are advocating these reforms.

The antipathy of the Houston Post to these measures is not so much that they were once advocated by the populist party as it is because the Post, being the servant of special interests, antagonizes, as a rule, the measures that are devised to win for the people justice at the hands of the Post's corporation masters.

IN THE DARK

The Philadelphia North American, while trying to define the meaning of "insurgency," talks about "the populism of the early eighties and the Bryanism of the nineties" as having been "beaten back in failure for reasons that will not affect present-day reform movements."

One of the things that has prevented the success of "other reform movements" is the fact that newspapers like the North American preached reform in the off years and then supported the republican ticket on election day. The North American says that "not since Lincoln has insurgency had true leadership until now," and then, undertaking to name leaders "regardless of party labels," it selects sixteen, four of whom are democrats and twelve of whom are republicans.

The democratic party has a large number of leaders who have for more than a quarter of a century worked faithfully in the reform movement, but the North American seems never to have heard of them.

AN UNREASONABLE REASON

The bankers who oppose the guaranty of deposits say that it is unfair to make good banks pay the depositors of bad banks. That is a strange reason for a banker to advance. Does the banker think it unfair to make a good farmer pay the debt of his insolvent neighbor? Why does a bank require security if it is unfair to make one man pay another man's debt? Many a man has been driven into bankruptcy by the failure of some friend for whom he went security as a matter of accommodation and without consideration. Why should bankers refuse to go each other's security? The banker who

REASON AND UNREASON

In his dissent from parts of the tobacco trust decision, Justice Harlan says: "The 'rule of reason,' I am sure, does not justify the perversion of the plain words of an act of congress, in order to defeat the will of congress. "The court, by judicial legislation, in effect, amends an act of congress. * * * It makes congress say what it did not say, what it plainly did not intend to say and what it has since explicitly refused to say."

is willing to grow rich out of banking and yet refuses to protect depositors from loss may be called honest for a few years yet but not longer. Honesty requires guaranty of depositors, and some day the bankers will insist upon such protection to depositors as will make a certificate of deposit as good as a government bond.

CULBERSON OF TEXAS

Senator Culberson of Texas does not mince words in discussing the supreme court's trust opinion. While approving the conclusion of the court in the particular case, Senator Culberson says that in his judgment the opinion delivered by Chief Justice White is "an unfortunate one for the country," and adds:

"This opinion overrules the decisions of the supreme court in the traffic association cases as well as the many similar cases where the anti-trust act was construed as prohibiting all restraint of interstate trade and all monopolies of such trade, no matter of what character. The former construction of the act by the supreme court had been accepted and acted upon for years and congress, though often urged to do so, refused to amend the act to accord with the view taken by the court.

"This construction, moreover, was approved by the country except the extreme corporate interests. The opinion of the majority of the court as to the construction of the act is pure judicial legislation for which the trusts have been contending for fifteen years and which will be used by them to further their combinations and conspiracies against trade. Hereafter, the question will always be confused with the supposed intent of the conspirators rather than confined to the single issue of the actual existence of combination or monopoly.

The classification of good trusts and bad trusts has at last received the highest judicial sanction.

"Against this I agree absolutely and thoroughly with the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan and if the opinion of the chief justice is adhered to in this and in the tobacco case, as I presume it will be, the law ought to be amended at once so as to express beyond judicial interpretation that view of the law which has heretofore obtained and which has met the approval and requirements of the country."

WHY NOT REQUIRE NOTICE

There is increasing protest against the partnership which the federal government enters into with law-breakers when it issues licenses to sell liquor at retail in dry territory, but every attempt to break up this partnership is met with constitutional objection. There is one line of attack, however, to which the liquor trust would find it difficult to make a constitutional objection. Why not require the publication of notice before the issuance of federal license? A law requiring the applicant to publish notice of his intended application and to serve written notice on the local executive authority would practically put an end to boot-legging, for no one could afford to advertise his intention to violate the local laws. This would dissolve the partnership between the government and the law breakers.

TURN ON THE SEARCHLIGHT

A Washington dispatch, carried by the United Press, says: "After a hearing fraught with startling disclosures, the house committee on expenditures in the state department was convinced that it is on the trail of some 'peculiar ways of doing business' in that department. "The payment of \$5,000 to Frederick Hale, son of former Senator Hale of Maine, from the boundary commission fund on the sole authority

of a blank voucher O. K.'d by Secretary Knox, was revealed by Disbursing Officer Morrison. The committee issued another subpoena for Knox, and he will be asked to explain the payment to Hale.

"Morrison also astounded the committee by declaring that the long lost voucher on which Chief Clerk Michael of the department was given \$2,450 to pay for a portrait costing \$850 has been found by a messenger in a quantity of waste paper on the floor of his own office a week ago. Pinned to the voucher when it was found, Morrison said, was a note of explanation by Michael.

"'Did you try to find out how the voucher came to be on the floor of your room?' Chairman Hamlin (dem., Mo.) asked.

"'No, I discussed it with no one,' said the witness.

"'Don't you think it was placed there by some one?' asked Representative Davis (rep., Minn.)

"'That is my impression,' returned Morrison.

"Morrison declared that he had turned over the voucher to the chief clerk of the department, who had asked for it.

"Under a hot cross-examination by Hamlin and Davis, Morrison declared he had never received a receipt for the money from Michael.

"O. H. Tittman, superintendent of the geodetic survey and chairman of the boundary committee, testified that his \$20,000 appropriation had in some way been raised to \$25,000 and the additional \$5,000 had been paid to Hale. He knew nothing of the payment and no explanation was made to him."

Would it not be the part of wisdom for the people to bring about a change in administration of federal affairs in order that the searchlight may be turned on in every department of government.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP DAY

Rev. Thomas M. Evans of Fullerton, Neb., has sent to newspapers and prominent men throughout the country the following letter:

As superintendent of Christian citizenship in the Nebraska Christian Endeavor Union No. 1, I am seeking to promote a high standard of citizenship among all classes. It has occurred to me that a day, to be known as "Good Citizenship Day," would greatly advance said citizenship.

In order to secure a general consensus of opinion concerning the movement, I am this day sending out more than 100 personal letters to our foremost statesmen, clergymen, editors and reformers, so that we may have in the very beginning of the movement the influence of the leading men and women of the nation.

Much has already been done along this line. The flag, as its floats over the schoolhouse; the observance of Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays; also of Thanksgiving and Memorial day and the Fourth of July all create sentiment in a right direction, although the observance of the latter has been so secularized and given over to sport that we do not get out of it what we should in the development of citizenship.

We therefore suggest that the Sunday just preceding our national birthday be known as "Good Citizenship Day." That day will remove it farthest from anything like party politics; it cannot well be secularized; it will not be legalized as other holidays. It will simply be observed as a custom, like Mothers' Day.

It will be a day for children's programs, in the interest of the citizenship of this nation, whose God is the Lord; a day on which from "loyal hearts and true" shall be sung those songs which helped our fathers to build "truer and better than they knew;" a day on which new songs shall clear away many discordant notes now in our national life and impress upon the minds of our youth and the incoming millions the principles which have made the United States of America preeminently the leader of the nations in the cause of civic righteousness.

CONSISTENT

Commending Mr. Underwood for his attacks on Mr. Bryan and denouncing Mr. Bryan for his attitude on public questions, the Richmond Times-Dispatch (in another editorial in the same issue) says: "The direct election of senators is one of the fads of the politicians of this later day, and once the people have had the opportunity of studying this question, now that their representatives in their legislatures are to act upon it, we believe that they will prefer to abide by the old ways and refuse to give their support to a measure which takes a great deal from the states and gives the people of the state nothing, absolutely nothing, that is worth having."