

irrigation, the one thing that you must know, whether you know anything else or not, is that water runs down hill.

No man can construct an irrigation system until he understands that. When he understands that, then all he has to do is to dig a ditch with a slope to it and he can carry water anywhere. There is a principle as fundamental as that in the discussion of this question, as fundamental as that water runs down hill, and that is that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable; that God never made a human being good enough to be put at the head of a private monopoly and decide, without appeal how much he would charge for a thing that he alone could sell and everyone else had to buy. We do not trust a judge to decide his own case. No judge in Christendom is allowed to decide his own case because we know the unconscious bias of a man in favor of himself. We have as good men in this country as anywhere in the world, but we haven't a man good enough to act as a juror and be one of twelve men to decide a case in which he has a pecuniary interest. We do not reflect on any man when we tell him to stand aside, that he cannot serve on a jury because he has an interest, and yet if we believe in a private monopoly we allow a man, not a judge, but just a man selected by stockholders of a corporation which is organized solely to make money, and for no other purpose—we let him decide a question where the interests of the people are on one side and his interest on another side. Wherever there must be a monopoly, it should be a government monopoly administered for all the people.

I have been for many years of the belief that whenever a franchise is given by a city, a state, or a nation, for the control of anything that is in the nature of a monopoly it should be limited to a few years and that there ought to be in every such franchise a clause allowing the power that granted it to resume it at will on reasonable terms.

And now, my friends, how do you secure yourself against injustice? If we are to talk about these great propositions, if we are to ask people to put up hundreds of millions of money in order to build great dams, to reclaim great tracts of land, we must understand all the questions that enter into it. When we come to a great proposition, especially if this proposition involves demands on the part of combined capital to take advantage of these great forces of nature, I think there is just one protection and that is the greatest invention in the art of government in a hundred years, known as the initiative and the referendum. That put into the hands of the people the power to make their own laws.

It is not a new idea. We have applied that idea for a long while, but we are extending the applications. We have known for a long while that an amendment to a state constitution is submitted to the people. They select agents to write it, but the people themselves must sit in final judgment upon it. Could we pay a higher tribute to the intelligence of the people? Could we give a clearer endorsement to the idea that the people are the source of power? As far back as I can remember, whenever a city wanted to issue bonds, the question had to be submitted to the people. Why? Because that was a very important thing and the more important the action, the more necessary that the people should speak. Within the last generation, we have been putting into the charters of cities clauses providing that no franchise can be granted until the people of the city express themselves at the ballot box. It has been a great safeguard and now many states have adopted the initiative and referendum. Sometimes an effort is made to repeal the initiative and referendum but it can not succeed when the people understand the influence back of the attempt to take this power away. A power once deposited in the hands of the people, will never be taken away when the people understand what is being done. We have a great controversy in this country and it is to be found in every state. It is between the people and great consolidations of capital that want to take advantage of the people. They are controlled by those who do not trust the people, but the people have confidence in themselves. No matter whether the people vote the democratic ticket, or the republican ticket, they are willing to trust the people with government—the confidence of the people in their own capacity does not depend on party lines. I used to think that all the good was in my party and all the bad was in the republican party. I am wiser now.

I know that the spirit of democracy in the United States is bigger than any party; that it is big enough to control all parties and that when

the line is drawn between the demands of the few on one side and the rights of the people on the other, and this is understood, no matter what party is in power, the people will trust themselves and not surrender this final power over government.

I have only touched on some of the issues that have been brought in by suggestion and by inference. I am out here because I am interested in this great southwest. I came out here first more than a quarter of a century ago. I have been returning from time to time throughout these years. Your people have not been more proud than I have been of the wonderful prosperity. Your people are not more interested than I am in your soil, and in the conservation of all the waters of your rivers. I expect to see this go on until you will store all the flood waters in the mountains and not a drop of waste water find its way into the ocean. All the water that God pours on your mountains throughout the year will be saved in order that it may contribute to the productiveness of the fields and furnish food and other necessities for man. I am here to bid you God-speed in this great undertaking.

These men who gather here and give of their time and of their enthusiasm are like people who live upon the higher ground and catch the light of the sun's rays; while those in the valley are still in darkness; but the sun will ascend, and information will spread, and as these subjects are better known you will find the militant hosts of all the western country standing behind these leaders. As the information spreads, all the people of this nation will catch up the spirit, and as you join them in reclaiming the swamps in their sections, they will join you in reclaiming the arid lands of the west. Understand one another, we will go forward in the spirit of brotherhood and lift our nation to the highest possible achievements here, and then I believe we will stand together and lead the world. I am hoping and praying that this nation may soon enter the league of nations.

I think from your applause that you feel as I do, that the reservations are insignificant compared with the moral forces of the league. Before there were any reservations I hoped it would be ratified without reservations and such changes as were thought necessary might be made afterwards in the league of nations. But after I found we could not have ratification without reservations, then I was willing to accept any changes a majority desired until we could change them in the league of nations.

When we have great issues in this country, why should we divide our people over the phraseology of contingent reservations that will never be needed until all the moral force of that treaty had been exhausted? Even if I were willing that my nation should turn aside from pressing domestic problems, and deal with this issue as the permanent issue of the campaign, I would not be willing to take upon myself the responsibility of what might happen abroad while we quarreled at home. I believe that this league of nations will present to our nation the greatest opportunity that any nation ever had, and that we ought to enter that league and as the greatest moral force in the world, throw our power and great prestige on the side of justice as between nations large and small and speak peace to a troubled world. Ours is the only nation that can do it.

There are great world problems. The people of the southwest while struggling with local questions—great to them and great to the nation but small in comparison with the problems of the human race—will join with the people of the whole nation in doing their duty to all the world; they will make this nation an example to the world, solving here the problems of this generation in the interest of humanity, and leading the world in its march to higher ground. (Thank you.)

THE NINETEENTH AMENDMENT

The promulgation of the nineteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States must be reckoned another great landmark in the history of American democracy. A hundred and thirty-one years ago, when the constitution went into effect, it was considered to be a fairly revolutionary document. The men who made it were generally looked upon as being considerably in advance of their time—dangerously so, some opinion held.

Yet those men, with all their adventuring, proceeded, of necessity, very cautiously. They were more concerned for the foundation than for the superstructure. Their plan was a com-

promise, worked out to reconcile many opposite opinions and theories, and it left much to future adjustment. If the convention could have looked forward seventy years and foreseen the crisis over slavery it might have been more specific about that institution. As it was the question was sidestepped. The word "slave" does not occur in the constitution, but it provided for the enumeration of some persons held to service in fixing the basis of representation.

States' rights were supposed to be strongly buttressed by the provision requiring the election of senators by the legislatures of the states, while members of the lower house were to be elected by the people upon a basis of population. This was a direct recognition that the states had a peculiar and equal relation to the federal government aside from that sustained toward it by their people. The convention could not look ahead to a time when it would be recognized that it was more important that the people should be represented in the senate than that the states should be.

These things illustrate how caution and compromise shape the structure of the constitution, and what followed illustrates how the growth of democracy made necessary its reshaping by amendment. The convention while it could not foresee wherein the constitution might fail to fit future conditions, realized the probable necessity of changes as the superstructure grew, and provided the means. The first ten amendments, indeed, followed so closely upon the adoption of the constitution as to make them virtually parts of the original.

The constitution and democracy thus grew together and their progress is now marked by four or five great national landmarks. Any one of them would have amazed the most radical member of the constitutional convention of 1787. The proposal of any one of the measures thus marked would have broken the convention up. The adoption of any one of them at the time probably would have prevented the formation of the union. These landmarks are the abolition of slavery and negro suffrage, the election of senators by the people, the prohibition of the liquor traffic and women's suffrage. All of these great changes came within a period of slightly more than half a century. Only one proved a severe shock to the constitution, yet any one of them would have wrecked it at the start.

That shows both the wisdom of conservatism in its place—and the constitutional convention in Philadelphia was such a place—and the necessity of change with progress. Slavery had to be recognized, if only over the left shoulder, to get the government going. Then with the coming of a new industrial, political and moral era it had to go. The ambassadors of the states had to go when the states as sovereigns declined and the people as sovereigns came up.

What is true of those changes is true of the latest ones. They became inevitable with the necessity for them. Prohibition and women's suffrage are developments of a democracy that goes in these days more and more to the common welfare, right back to the very kernel and preamble of the constitution. They were not dreamed of by the makers of that document, and yet they are of its essence and spirit. They expound its morality and justice as truly as Marshall and Webster expounded its politics.—Kansas City Star.

OUT WHERE THE WEST BEGINS

Out where the handclasp's a little stronger,
Out where the smile dwells a little longer,
That's where the West begins;
Out where the sun is a little brighter,
Where the snows that fall are a trifle whiter,
Where the bonds of home are a wee bit tighter,
That's where the West begins.

Out where the skies are a trifle bluer,
Out where friendship's a little truer,
That's where the West begins;
Out where a fresher breeze is blowing,
Where there's laughter in every streamlet
flowing,
Where there's more of reaping and less of
sowing,
That's where the West begins.

Out where the world is in the making,
Where fewer hearts with despair are aching,
That's where the West begins;
Where there's more of singing and less of
sighing,
Where there's more of giving and less of buying
And a man makes friends without half trying,
That's where the West begins.

—Arthur Chapman.