

lation. The largest vote cast was on the woman's suffrage amendment, the total being 586,295. This amendment carried in 19 counties—Ashtabula, Athens, Belmont, Carroll, Columbiana, Fulton, Geauga, Guernsey, Jefferson, Lucas (the Toledo county), Medina, Meigs, Morgan, Morrow, Portage, Trumbull, Summit, Williams and Wood. In the State as a whole, the affirmative vote for woman's suffrage was larger than the entire vote on the question in California, both affirmative and negative, when woman's suffrage was adopted in that State.



Hostile interests at Columbus are reported in the Ohio newspapers as having decided on the 13th to apply to the Supreme Court of the State for an injunction forbidding the Governor's proclaiming the result of the election on the grounds (1) that several of the amendments said to be adopted did not receive a majority of all the votes cast at the election, and (2) that the law providing for the Constitutional Convention was itself unconstitutional because the legislature allowed the convention to fix the date for the special election. On the 14th the Attorney General stated, as reported by the Associated Press, that—

although the contention that the legislature had no authority to delegate power to the Constitutional Convention to fix the date for a special election may be well grounded, it had the power to direct the Convention to submit the matter to the electors of the State. "The legislature did not delegate power to the Convention," said Mr. Hogan; "it merely directed the Convention to submit the matter to the electors of the State at such a time as it might determine. The essence of the matter is submission and not time. Time is a mere incident. The legislature had no power to delegate authority but this was not authority." With reference to the contention that a majority of the vote cast on all of the amendments is necessary for the ratification of any of the amendments, Mr. Hogan said: "I have not investigated that feature, but am inclined to the belief that a majority vote cast on any proposal is all that is necessary for its ratification."

As reported by the United Press on the 14th, Attorney General Hogan said:

I am certain the Convention had power to fix the date and manner of the election. Suit against the amendments on these grounds would be futile. As to the other alleged ground, that 10 amendments should be knocked out because their affirmative vote was not as large as the majority of the total vote cast on the amendment receiving the most votes, woman suffrage, I think the Supreme Court would knock that out also.

Herbert S. Bigelow, president of the Convention, issued a statement on the subject on the 14th, in which he said:

The Constitutional arguments raised now against the successful amendments were raised in the legislature when the law calling the election was passed. Governor Harmon and the Ohio Legislature brushed

these objections aside as too trifling for notice. They are far-fetched constructions indicative of minds that have gone to seed with legal technicalities, or of Bourbon blindness that is beside itself with the fury of defeat. If there are judges of the Supreme Court who can be induced to commit this outrage and set aside on a technicality the will of the people, the responsibility will be upon them for what will follow. It would be a Dred Scott decision that they would repent of bitterly before a year had passed. That one decision would make more converts to the Initiative and Referendum than we have made in 15 years. The judicial Recall would follow that decision as surely as day follows the night. The men in whose petty minds the idea was born to fight these amendments in the courts are fomenters of revolution and dangerous characters. They display that fatal stupidity in the face of changing conditions that has characterized the beneficiaries of special privilege in every crisis in the world's history.



Civic Organization in Ohio.

One of the political results of the adoption of the Initiative and Referendum and the municipal-home-rule amendments at the recent election in Ohio, is the organization in Cuyahoga County of a legislative league to secure the election of non-partisan members of the legislature for the purpose of making the new Constitution effective in the public interest. Under the rules of this League each candidate is free to act with any political party in national affairs, but pledges himself to remain free from all political party caucusing or control on matters of State legislation which might conflict with the declaration of principles of the League.



The platform of the League pledges its legislative candidates to the short ballot, the Massachusetts form of the Australian ballot, direct primaries, conservation of child life, supplementary legislation in line with the principles of the Initiative and Referendum, effective legislation under the amendment for home-rule in municipalities, the eight-hour day and other labor demands, tax reform, recall of officials in offices created by the legislature, establishment of the Torrens system of land registration, suppression of the white slave traffic, simplification of court procedure, regulation of public utility corporations with physical valuation as the basis for service rates, merit system of civil service, scientific regulation of insurance, regulation of liquor traffic, legislative information bureau, humanizing of penal institutions, registration of lobbyists, regulation of political advertising, improvement of rivers and harbors, and provisions for using public school buildings as social centers and public forums.



This Progressive League of Cuyahoga County has made the following nominations: For State

Senators, Stephen S. Stillwell, Harry C. Gahn, Abraham Kolinsky, Walter W. Pollock, Anthony B. Sprosty; for Representatives to the lower House, E. W. Doty, Thomas Farrell, William Davio, Hal D. Banks, David Gibson, Dolo E. Mook, Lamar T. Beman, Chester R. Williams, C. C. Bultman, B. D. Nicola, P. S. Grady, Monroe Curtis, and Clayton C. Townes.



State Organizations of the Progressive Party.

A full State ticket with George B. Hyson as the candidate for Governor, was nominated by the Progressive Party of Delaware on the 11th. [See current volume, page 874.]



While the regular Republican convention of Maryland was in session at Baltimore on the 11th, removing Roosevelt Electors and nominating a State ticket, many of the delegates were co-operating with the Progressives with a view to naming Electors by petition.



A convention of the Progressive Party for Wisconsin, meeting at Milwaukee on the 11th, adopted the following resolution recommended by the committee on resolutions:

Your committee deems it necessary that there be in the field a complete State ticket which the members of the Progressive Party can heartily indorse and support at the November election. The State Central Committee is hereby directed to hold a meeting not later than Sept. 24, 1912, and if in the judgment of that Committee at that time there is no State ticket in the field which the Progressive Party can consistently support, either in whole or in part, then said Central Committee is hereby authorized and directed by this Convention to make such nominations as shall be necessary to insure a complete State ticket, every candidate of which supports the national candidates of the Progressive Party and is in sympathy with the principles of that party.

Presidential Electors were chosen.



Cancellation of the Cunningham Claims.

The Cunningham Alaska coal land claims, which precipitated the Ballinger-Pinchot controversy and the retirement of Secretary Ballinger from President Taft's cabinet, were canceled on the 13th by Ballinger's successor, Walter L. Fisher, who is now Secretary of the Interior. The land involved in the claims has been ordered restored to the public domain. The cause for the cancellation is fraud, the charge being that blanket patents were manipulated through "dummy" entrymen, who were to give their land to the Cunninghams later. [See vol. xiv, page 1266.]

Mexico.

In spite of prognostications of a new revolutionary uprising to start in the City of Mexico during the celebration of the anniversary of Mexican independence on the 16th, the day passed off quietly, with a big military parade and without disorder. In his message to the Mexican Congress, which opened on that day, President Madero declared that the revolution was practically ended, and ascribed the spread of the belief that the government was weak to a few persons whose ambitions were unsatisfied in the revolution against Diaz, and to certain newspapers, which, he alleged, had given "false and exaggerated news." After stating that almost all of the war loan already had been expended, the President said it would be necessary to authorize another loan. [See current volume, page 876.]



Conflict Among British Land Reformers.

In opposition to the Memorial of the "Land-Values Group" in the British House of Commons, to be found in full at page 16 of the Appendix to the first report of the British departmental committee on local taxation,* and which declares for the taxation of land values in Great Britain, a Manifesto is issued by the "Public-landownership Parliamentary Council." The announced "object of this Council is to establish gradually the public ownership of land by *purchase*, on the basis of the national land valuation" now being officially made; that of the Group is to *tax* on the basis of the same valuation, and to exempt improvements and other industrial products. [See vol. xii, pp. 486, 508, 561, 588, 823; current volume, pages 731, 835, 880.]



Alluding to the controversy between the "Group" and the "Council," the latter makes this statement in its Manifesto:

We are strongly of opinion that public landownership alone can permanently secure for the public the social values which admittedly attach to land. We recognize that land values are a proper subject for taxation, and that the distinguishing characteristic of land—its unalterable position—makes it a peculiarly fit subject as a basis for local taxation. It would be a mistake, however, to exaggerate the social effects which can be produced by a policy of taxation alone, and we believe that it is only when the public is its own landlord, that full advantage can be gained from land from the point of view of public revenue. We do not regard the revenue consideration, important as it is, to be the aim or object of the extension of public landownership. It is to the benefit and economic advantage of the public, rather than to the revenue to be derived from the public, that we look for the main justification of the policy which we advocate.

*Wyman & Sons, Ltd., Fetter Lane E. C., London, England, or any British bookseller. Price 1 s. 4 d.