discussion of the whole situation. He is reported to have been informed by the strikers' representatives, that they would not recommend such a conference to their national council unless it were understood in advance that the principle of a minimum wage must be accepted and would be excluded from discussion, but on the 11th the dispatches told that they had accepted the proposal for joint conference. In the dispatches that day it was reported also that all British coal mines were closed by the strike, that 1,000,000 British miners were on strike and 1,000,000 other British workmen out of employment for lack of fuel, and that a great strike of coal miners had begun in Germany. [See current volume, page 223.]

The Mill-Strike in Lawrence.

Friendly deportation of woolen-mill strikers' children from Lawrence, Mass., has been renewed. A large number arrived in Philadelphia on the 7th. [See current volume, page 224.]

For the relief of those children upon their arrival in Philadelphia, Joseph Fels sent a check to the treasurer of the local committee, Mrs. Ida Secor, with the following explanation, as reported in the Philadelphia North American of the 10th:

> In sending this I wish it distinctly understood that it is not a philanthropic gift to the sufferers. It is a part payment of a debt due these children from all who are upholding existing social wrong. Since I am not one of these, this check must be considered a gift to those whose dishonored obligation it is, to a slight degree, liquidating. Strict justice requires that if we cannot at once abolish legalized wrong then when immediate relief is needed for victims of legalized robbery, the upholders of the iniquity should be made to pay the bill. But unfortunately that is not possible. There is no way by which we can compel donations from upholders of landlordism, of private appropriation of public earnings, of tariff robbery, of private control of public highways and of other special privileges. We are helpless to enforce payment, even from the American Woolen Company, although it can be proved that this corporation has robbed these poor children by embezzling a fund intrusted to it for their benefit by the American people. The people have levied a burdensome tariff tax on themselves and turned the proceeds over in trust to the American Woolen Company to be used in paying high wages to employes. The people were induced to do this by the representations of the American Woolen Company and similar concerns, that this trust would be faithfully carried out. But the corporation has used the money instead for excessive dividends. Similar acts of legal embezzlement are being committed by other protected employers. Upholders of robbery make the false claim that there is no way by which the worker may be assured just treatment. They claim to know no cure for poverty and offer this voluntary ignorance as an excuse for continuing it. The excuse is not valid. Thirty-two years ago Henry George showed in "Progress and Poverty" how poverty can be abolished. His arguments have never been disproved in spite of numberless attempts to do so. The amount of the inclosed check I have charged in my ledger against the American Woolen Company and other supporters of legalized robbery. I advance it in part payment of a debt they owe, without consulting them, because their child creditors are in distress through their reluctance to settle. I doubt whether they will recognize the obligation, in spite of its manifest justice, since it is not legally enforcible. Consequently, if it must be considered a charitable gift, let it be fully understood that the real recipients of this charity are not the poor children from Lawrence, but the stockholders of the American Woolen Company and other upholders of existing wrongs.

President Taft's Arbitration Treaties.

President Taft's treaties with Great Britain and France, for the arbitration of differences involving possibilities of war, were ratified by the Senate on the 7th, but not until after amendments which are reported as calculated to make the treaties ineffective. [See current volume, page 35.]

As negotiated and sent to the Senate these treaties required (1) the submission of disputes between the United States and the other Powers (Great Britain or France, as the case might be) to a commission composed of an equal number of citizens of each country; (2) this commission not to decide but to recommend, its recommendations disposing of the dispute if adopted by both Powers: (3) except that if the dispute be justiciable, or upon a unanimous decision of the joint commission or of all but one member, that it is justiciable, it shall be arbitrated. To the binding agreement of clause 3 to arbitrate questions which the joint commission might thus decide to be justiciable, the Senate committee on foreign relations, under the influence especially of Senators Lodge and Root, objected on the ground that it trenched upon the future freedom of the Senate. They therefore recommended an amendment limiting the treaties in that respect, by a proviso with reference to that clause; and for this amendment ex-President Roosevelt had been strenuous.

When the question of ratifying the treaties came to vote in the Senate on the 7th, a motion to eliminate "clause three of article three" the third clause as enumerated above was carried by 42 to 40. As a tie vote would have defeated the motion, its adoption was accomplished by Mr. Roosevelt's campaign manager, Senator Dixon, who voted (unexpectedly to his colleagues) in

favor of eliminating the clause. His vote made the Lodge-Root amendment unimportant and it was not inserted. But other amendments were adopted. By these it is provided that arbitration under the treaties shall not apply to questions affecting the admission of aliens to the United States, the admission of aliens to schools in the several States, the territorial integrity of the States or the United States, the alleged indebtedness or moneyed obligation of any State, nor any question involving the Monroe doctrine or other purely governmental policy. Thus amended the treaties were ratified by a vote of 76 to 3.

The Roosevelt-Taft Campaign.

An active and by no means friendly campaign for the Presidency has begun between President Taft and ex-president Roosevelt personally. President Taft left Washington last week for a speaking campaign in the West. He spent the 8th in touring eastern and northern Ohio, closing the day with a speech at a large meeting in Toledo. In his Toledo speech, Mr. Taft took up Mr. Roosevelt's policy of "recall of judicial decisions," saying:

> This is a remarkable suggestion and one which is so contrary to anything in government heretofore proposed that it is hard to give to it the serious consideration which it deserves because of its advocates and of the conditions under which it is advanced. What this recall of decisions will amount to if applied to Constitutional questions is that there will be a suspension of the Constitution to enable a temporary majority of the electorate to enforce a popular but invalid act. . . . A most serious objection to the recall of decisions is that it destroys all probability of consistency in Constitutional interpretation. The majority which sustains one law is not the majority which comes to consider another, and the obligation of consistency of popular decision is one which would sit most lightly on each recurring electorate, and the operation of the system would result in suspension or application of Constitutional guarantees according to popular whim. We would have then a system of suspending the Constitution to meet special instances. But the main argument used to sustain such a popular review of judicial decisions is that if the people are competent to establish a Constitution they are competent to interpret it, and that this recall of decision is nothing but the exercise of the power of interpretation. This is clearly a fallacious argument. The approval of general principles in a Constitution on one hand and the interpretation of a statute and consideration of its probable operation in a particular case and its possible infringement of a general principle on the other hand are very different things. The one is simple, the latter complex; and the latter, when submitted to a popular vote is much more likely to be turned into an issue of general approval or disapproval of the act on its merits for the special purpose of its enactment than upon its violation of the Constitution. Moreover, a popular majority does not adopt a Constitution, or any principle of it, or amend its terms, until after it has been adopted by a Constitutional convention or a legislature, and the final adoption is, and ought to be, surrounded with such checks and delays as to secure deliberation. . . . Would we not, in giving such powerful effect to the momentary impulse of a majority of an electorate, prepare the way for the possible exercise of the greatest tyranny? Finally, I ask what is the necessity for such a crude, revolutionary, fitful and unstable way of reversing judicial constructions of the Constitution? Why, if the construction is wrong, can it not be righted by Constitutional amendment? An answer made to this is that the same judges would construe the amendment and defeat the popular will as in the first instance. This assumes dishonesty and a gross violation of their oaths of duty on the part of the judges, a hypothesis utterly untenable. . . . Such a proposal as this is utterly without merit or utility, and, instead of being progressive, is reactionary; instead of being in the interest of all the people and of the stability of popular government, is sowing the seeds of confusion and tyranny.

Mr. Taft's speeches in Chicago, where he came on the 9th, are along the same lines of cleavage between himself and Mr. Roosevelt; and on the 9th Mr. Roosevelt announced that he also would take the stump. [See current volume, pages 201, 219.]

Edward F. Dunne's Platform.

As the progressive candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of Illinois at the direct primaries in April, Edward F. Dunne, formerly Mayor of Chicago, published his platform on the 10th. Its principal declarations are as follows:

> (1) Abolition of the State Board of Equalization, its functions to be performed by a commission of experts appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate, who shall sit the year around in open session and preserve minutes and records of its daily proceedings. (2) A direct primary law applicable to United States Senators and Presidential electors. (3) A corrupt practices act limiting the amount of a candidate's election expenses and requiring the publication of the same before and after election. (4) Legislation providing for an amendment to the State Constitution permitting the enactment of laws providing for the Initiative and Referendum. (5) Consolidation of the park boards of Chicago into one body under city control.

[See current volume, page 111.]

The Ohio Constitutional Convention.

Woman suffrage in Ohio is to be an issue before the people of that State at the ratification election, the Constitutional Convention having on the 7th adopted the woman suffrage amendment by a vote of 76 to 33. As there are 119 delegates, this is a majority of 17 over all. The amendment will be submitted to the people as a separate proposition. [See current volume, page 227.]