

lican candidate for Governor of Illinois, returned to Chicago on the 23d from a six weeks' campaign through the State, in the course of which he made 180 speeches and enrolled 20,000 Republican supporters. A "welcome-home" luncheon was given him at the Grand Pacific Hotel on the 26th.

+ +

#### Initiative and Referendum in Illinois.

A State meeting of the Initiative and Referendum League of Illinois is announced for October 3 at the I. O. O. F. Building, Springfield, to which the public are invited, and at which there will be the following program:

2:30 P. M. Address by the Chairman. Report of Committee on Amendment, by Harold L. Ickes, Chicago. Discussion.

8 P. M. Address of Welcome, Mayor John S. Schnepf, Springfield. Addresses by Judge Edward F. Dunne, Chicago, on "The League's Position on the Amendment"; Edwin R. Wright, President Illinois Federation of Labor, Austin, on "Organized Labor and the I. & R."; Senator Frank W. Burton, Carlinville, on "The I. & R. in the Last General Assembly," and Senator Walter Clyde Jones, Chicago, on "The I. & R. the Issue in the Next Campaign."

+ +

#### Attacking Direct Legislation in Oregon.

Enemies of Direct Legislation in Oregon have begun legal proceedings to secure such an interpretation of the Direct Legislation laws of that State as would make them practically ineffective. The point has to do with two petitions for a vote against certain University appropriations. Fraud and forgery in obtaining signatures to the petitions is charged. This would be unimportant in itself, since it would raise only a question of fact in a particular instance; but the cases are so brought as to call for a construction that would require the Secretary of State to verify the authenticity of every signature to an Initiative or Referendum petition, and thereby practically to nullify the whole system.

+

W. S. U'Ren was appointed by the Secretary of State to assist the Attorney General in defending the suits mentioned above. The propriety of this appointment was bitterly questioned by the lawyers who brought the suits and who are locally believed to have another and further purpose than the throwing out of the particular petitions involved. On that score the Secretary of State is reported as saying:

I have enlisted the support of Mr. U'Ren in the legal struggle because I consider the very existence of the Initiative and Referendum to be at stake, and have selected him as the one man in Oregon most worthy of the defense of these laws. If the courts should uphold the case of the University through the allegations specifically directed at the Secretary

of State's office it would practically put the Oregon system out of business for once and all. The complaint alleges that this office should pass upon the legality and the validity of all the signatures attached to Initiative and Referendum petitions. The absurdity of this plea will be appreciated when it is remembered that for three months or more the University people have had lawyers, detectives, photographers and experts at work, trying to pick out the alleged forged signatures on the University petitions. If the court should hold that the Secretary of State must determine the validity of signatures, it will mean that the office would have to be closed and the entire force sent out on gumshoe expeditions to pick the bad names from the good on all petitions filed hereafter. In my opinion, the death knell of these measures would be sounded should the courts rule the appropriation petitions off the ballot on the technical grounds set forth by Judge Slater. If there has been fraud perpetrated in obtaining these signatures sufficiently to disqualify them, they certainly should not be allowed to go on the ballot. With this alleged fraud I have absolutely nothing to do, nor will Mr. U'Ren. I am not asking the assistance of these men because I am opposed to the University appropriations. In fact, I am highly in favor of them. But there have been numerous minor and petty allegations made in the complaints directed at the office of the Secretary and at the mode of procedure in filing referendum petitions.

+

The first contest in court was over a motion by Mr. U'Ren to compel the plaintiffs to make their complaint more definite by specifying the signatures alleged to be forged, fictitious and fraudulent. The lower court judge denied this motion on the 16th, and his decision will be reviewed in due course by the Supreme Court of the State. The trial on the main questions will probably begin this week or next.

+ +

#### The Singletax Fight in Oregon.

Upon the application of the Clackamas County Initiative petitioners to the Secretary of State of Oregon to put the Singletax question upon the ballot in that county for referendum-voting at the Fall election of 1912, the question went to the Attorney General for an opinion, and he has ruled against them. [See current volume, pages 824, 844.]

+

This ruling enables the Initiative petitioners to go into the courts themselves and at once, and thereby to secure through mandamus a decision on the question at issue in time to avoid any judicial obstruction to their policy that might have been pursued by the opposition had the Attorney General's decision been favorable to the petitioners. In the latter case the adversaries of the petition could have decided whether and when to resort to the courts. They might have waited until the eve of