

set of figures does not afford a just comparison. Here is why:

The English railway clerk is allowed \$160 a year as "travel pay." The German rail man is provided free a house that is worth an annual rental of \$135 in Germany. Here, it would rent for from \$240 to \$360. In addition to his "salary" the French railway mail clerk is allowed \$180 "travel pay" and is also provided free with a house of a rental value of \$80 per year—a house that would rent here at from \$160 to \$300 per year. Making these little additions to the actual service pay of those "cheap foreigners," let's see how they compare with our "high salaried" railway mail clerks. We will figure the "travel pay" allowances at its purchasing power in buying a living, and for the rent allowances we will add the lowest equivalent given above for corresponding housing in this country.

On that basis the stack-up is as follows:

| | Per Year. |
|----------------------------|------------|
| In the United States | \$1,165.00 |
| In Great Britain | 1,344.30 |
| In Germany | 974.30 |
| In France | 1,288.57 |

Those "cheap foreigners," who are efficiently operating a cheap parcels post, you see, come out of the wash in pretty fair shape after all, when compared with our "high salaried" postal service men.

But even the last table does not present the whole truth as to the lie so often yapped about by the tools of the private interests in this country that are opposing the betterment and cheapening of our parcels post service.

The railway mail clerks of England, Germany and France not only get full pay while laid up from temporary injury, the same as do our rail postal men, but their governments pay those "cheap foreigners" a pension when they get old or are permanently injured—pay it for the remaining years those "cheap" mail handlers live!

There has been much capital made by beneficiaries of and cappers for privately operated public services in this country of the comparative wage paid here and abroad. In recent years, the same cackle has frequently been heard in both houses of our Congress during discussions of parcels carriage and of other factors and phases of our postal service. It is for that reason I have taken time and space in an effort to hit it as hard as I can.

* * *

THE STATE AND THE LANDLORDS.

Editorial in the London Pioneer of May 14.

That the land of a country which no man has made, its soil, its hidden minerals, even standing ground upon its surface, should be the peculiar and exclusive property of a small clique of privileged persons is in itself a monstrous injustice

to every other citizen and to the nation as a whole. Like other monstrous abuses, the institution of landlordism is one of slow growth. The original lords of manors had no exclusive ownership of the soil, but they were granted maintenance from the soil and from the labor of the peasantry in return for bearing the burdens of national defense by land and by sea, of the administration of justice and of local government. But the time came when they secured the monopoly of political power. For generation after generation they used political power to throw upon other backs their responsibilities and to increase the incomes paid to them to which they no longer had any moral claim. Since then the landlords have been compelled to share their monopoly of political power with other classes and even with the mass of the people; but till today they have been left in undisturbed possession of the ill-gotten gains which they appropriated during their season of power.

At last, by the Budget now under discussion, a beginning of redress is being attempted. All past extortions are left untouched. But a slight check is imposed on the increase of still further extortions in the future. The landlord who holds up his land against the public in order to increase to the utmost the toll he can draw from industry, and who has hitherto been allowed to escape all taxation on such land, will henceforward, it is proposed, part with one four hundred and eightieth part of its value to the state. When land, through the enterprise of the community, apart from any action of the owner, is found in future to have increased in value, one-fifth part of the increase shall go to the community which has created it, and only four-fifths to the privileged land owner who did not create it. When, on expiry of leases, property which he has not built falls into the hands of the freeholder of an estate, henceforward one-tenth of its value shall, it is proposed, be passed on by the freeholder to the state which has secured him the possession of his unearned income.

All these proposals are but small installments of social justice, and it is not surprising therefore that the privileged caste that has so long ruled the land, that has established injustice and decreed it by the laws, should now raise an indignant clamor in Parliament, on the platform, and in the columns of a certain portion of the Press. These gentlemen have so long been accustomed to seeing the affairs of the nation regulated in their interest, that they have come to consider that arrangement a part of the Divine Order of the Universe. That the nation should henceforward begin to intercept part of the wealth that otherwise might flow into their pockets, and use the fund for social reform and for Old Age Pensions is a proposal that drives them to fury. They will destroy the Budget if they can.

But today the preponderance of political power

rests with the workers, if they only knew how to use it. It is with the workers that the final decision will rest whether landlordism shall triumph over the Budget, or whether the new basis, more just and more democratic, for the finance of the country, shall be widened and extended from year to year. Money is needed to defend this country not only against foreign powers, but also against poverty, disease, ignorance, and destitution; not only to defend it, but to make it worth defending. The principle of the Budget is that the money needed shall come in the first place from the values which the community itself creates, from luxuries and from the superfluities of the very rich. It is called a triumph for Socialism. It is, at any rate, a triumph for common justice and common sense.

* * *

THE INITIATIVE AND THE REFERENDUM.

A High School Graduation Essay.

To restore the rule of the people and thus insure clean politics, to trim our governmental lamp so that it will shine more brightly, to maintain a republican form of government in fact as well as in name, are the objects of the Initiative and Referendum.

The Initiative provides for new legislation. Any new law may be proposed by a petition signed by a fixed percentage of the voters in any political division. The Referendum provides for the submission of all or certain legislation to the people for approval before the measures become law.

In this country the people should be the only rulers, and this principle in legislation will restore to them the rights which our present representative form of government does not protect. This is going back to first principles. There can be no better or more representative form of government than the New England town meeting which Professor Bryce described as "not only the source but the school of democracy"; and of which Thomas Jefferson said, "It has proved to be the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government and its preservation." Popular self-government in this country originated with the compact drawn up and signed in the cabin of the Mayflower, and the same principles were recognized in the Articles of Confederation established by the Thirteen Colonies, and later in the Constitution of the United States.

The terms Initiative and Referendum are derived from the Latin "initium," to introduce, and "referre," to carry or send back. We have the idea in our own New England town government. Legislation may be initiated by any ten citizens who petition for an article to be put into the war-

rant. The town meeting is itself the referendum, at which all citizens may by voice and vote approve or reject the measures proposed. Nothing can be more democratic than this method of self-government, where the voice of every citizen may be heard, and the vote of every citizen must be recorded. It is truly "government of the people, for the people and by the people," and should ensure equality and perfect liberty.

Municipalities cling to the town meeting as long as possible. Brookline, with her vast wealth still maintains it, and desires to perpetuate it. Boston remained a town until 1822, when the population reached forty thousand; and it was well governed. The change in form of government was opposed by John Adams and Josiah Quincy, who cautioned their fellow citizens against giving up the method of self-government which had so well preserved their liberties and rights. The result of the change proves their wisdom.

It is not practical, however, to assemble all the voters of a city, a county, a State or a nation. Therefore representative government has been substituted; and if the people could be truly represented, nothing better could be desired. This condition, however, does not obtain. Persons elected to represent the people do not carry out the will of the people. Sometimes they can not because they do not know it. What is everybody's business is attended to by nobody. The corporations, especially the public franchise corporations, make it a business to influence legislation. Through their representatives they enter the primaries and try to secure the nomination of men who will do their will. If one man is more willing to do this than his opponent, they do their best to secure the election of that man. If the man elected is not their choice, he is seen and won over, if possible, to the side of the corporation. The corporation is neither Republican nor Democratic in politics. If a Republican will answer its purposes best, its influence is cast for him; otherwise a Democrat is favored. As Jay Gould is reported to have said, "I am a Democrat in a Democratic county, a Republican in a Republican county, but an Erie Railroad man all the time."

It is not always or often a matter of straight bribery. Plausible arguments are used; business associations, social influence, railway passes, situations for friends, flattery and sometimes threats;—all these are ready weapons. If a bribe is offered it is usually sugar-coated—a tip on the stock market, some shares of stock free, a large retainer for the lawyer, a contribution to the church, a box of fine cigars or a case of old wine; the inducement varies with the character of the legislator. There are able lawyers and public men who as lobbyists do better than they can in office or at legitimate law. These men can be depended on to look out for the interests of their