

although the count of the vote on the amendment was not yet all in.

+ +

Convention Elections in New Mexico and Arizona.

The result of the election of the 6th in New Mexico for delegates to the convention to frame a Constitution preliminary to Statehood (pp. 826, 855) resulted, according to the Albuquerque Tribune-Citizen of the 9th, in the election of 51 delegates pledged for the Initiative and Referendum, and 49 against it. Of the situation the Tribune-Citizen reports:

As was fully expected, and freely predicted by the Tribune Citizen, since the unofficial returns indicate a safe Republican majority in the Constitutional convention, the Republican leaders and Republican newspapers are pronouncing that majority the death of the Initiative and Referendum, although many of the Republicans elected pledged themselves in their platform for the measures. . . But there are Republicans in that convention who have been elected on a platform declaring for the Initiative and Referendum who cannot be controlled by the party bosses, and until they show themselves to be unmindful of their promises, the Tribune Citizen is going to take it that those men elected on a platform declaring for the Initiative and Referendum will vote that way in the convention, and upon this basis the vote in the convention, not taking into consideration men in both parties who may not be in accord, will be 51 for and 49 against the Initiative and Referendum.

+

In Arizona, which is also preparing for Statehood (pp. 585, 685, 826), the election of delegates to the constitutional convention took place on the 12th. The Democrats have elected 36 out of the 52 delegates. As they made their campaign on a pledge to incorporate the Initiative, Referendum and Recall in the State Constitution, and the Republicans contended that this question should be decided after the Constitution is adopted, those three provisions for popular control have carried overwhelmingly. John Z. White, after campaigning in New Mexico until the 6th in behalf of the Initiative and Referendum, campaigned Arizona until the 12th in behalf of the same reform.

+ +

Advisory Referendum in Illinois.

The Public Policy petition put out by the Peoria Conference (pp. 770, 802), was filed with the Secretary of State of Illinois on the 10th, with an ample number of signatures. The number necessary to secure the placing on the ballot of the three questions—(1) Initiative and Referendum amendment to the Constitution, (2) Statewide civil service law, and (3) corrupt practices law—is 110,000. When filed, the number of signatures

ascertained by the Committee of Seven to have been affixed was as follows:

Initiative and Referendum amendment.....	137,368
Civil service law	133,846
Corrupt practices law	134,010

A large majority of the signatures came from downstate counties, and not from Chicago. The petitions were filed personally by Walter Rogers, of Chicago, chairman of the Committee of Seven, Frank Bode, of Springfield, another member of that committee, and George Lee, of Springfield, representing the Direct Legislation League of Illinois.

+ +

The National Conservation Congress.

After Mr. Roosevelt's speech on the 6th at the Conservation Congress in session at St. Paul (p. 850), a controversy occurred, raised by the Illinois delegation, over the appointment of Edward Hines as chairman of the committee on credentials, Mr. Hines being a representative of the Weyerhauser timber interests and a financial backer of Senator Lorimer. He was displaced on the 7th by the appointment of G. E. Condra, Professor of Economic Geology at the University of Nebraska, President Baker explaining that he appointed Professor Condra because Mr. Hines had never been appointed either as chairman or on the committee. "It all came about," said the president, "because his name appeared at the top of a little penciled slip of paper upon which I made out the list of members of the credentials committee, but it was never my intention to name Mr. Hines chairman of the body."

+

The speaking on the 7th was distinguished by the advocacy of national control of natural resources by Senator Beveridge and a speech in opposition by James J. Hill, the railway magnate; and on this day, also, the Congress was made memorable by the unexampled enthusiasm of the ovation to Gifford Pinchot when Senator Beveridge mentioned his name. On the 8th Mr. Pinchot spoke. In his speech, which closed with an outline program for the conservation of lands, waters, forests and mines, he said:

Within the last two years, conservation has passed out of the realm of an unimpeachable general principle into that of a practical fighting attempt to get things done. It has begun to step on the toes of the beneficiaries and the prospective beneficiaries of unjust privilege, and the resulting opposition, considering the quarters whence it comes, is one of the best proofs that conservation is a live movement for the general good. Safe and sane conservation, as that expression is used, means conservation so carefully sterilized that it will do the special interests no harm and the people no good. The effort to get

things done in conservation taught us clearly, unmistakably, and with little delay, that so long as the political domination of the great business interests endures, their corrupt control of legislation will carry with it the monopolistic control of the natural resources also. This is what we face today in the effort to apply conservation.

+

Among the other speakers on the 8th were Francis J. Heney, John Barrett, Henry S. Graves and the president, Alfred L. Baker. When Henry Wallace of Des Moines, editor of *Wallace's Farmer* and a member of the Country Life commission appointed by President Roosevelt, had been elected president of the Congress by unanimous vote, Gifford Pinchot having declined, ex-Gov. Pardee, of California, chairman of the committee on resolutions, reported the platform of the Congress, which was adopted. It declares that—

we live under a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and we repudiate any and all special or local interests or platforms or policies in conflict with the inherent rights and sovereign will of our people. Recognizing the natural resources of the country as the prime basis of prosperity and opportunity, we hold the rights of the people in these resources to be natural and inherent, and justly inalienable and indefeasible, and we insist that the resources should and shall be developed, used and conserved in ways consistent both with current welfare and with the perpetuity of our people. Recognizing the waters of the country as a great national resource, we approve and indorse the opinion that all the waters belong to all the people and hold that they should be used in the interest of the people. Realizing that all parts of each drainage basin are related and interdependent, we hold that each stream should be regarded and treated as a unit from its source to its mouth, and since the waters are essentially mobile and transitory and are generally interstate, we hold that in all cases of divided or doubtful jurisdiction the waters should be administered by co-operation between State and Federal agencies. . . Approving the successful efforts of the United States to provide homes on arid lands through irrigation, we indorse and commend the reclamation service and urge its continuance and the extension of the same policy to the drainage of swamp and overflow lands, to be carried forward so far as appropriation through co-operation between States and Federal agencies. . . Recognizing the vast economic benefit to the people of water power derived largely from interstate sources and streams no less than from navigable rivers, we favor Federal control of water power development; we deny the right of States or Federal government to continue alienating or conveying water by granting franchises for the use thereof in perpetuity, and we demand that the use of water rights be permitted only for limited periods with just compensation in the interests of the people. . . Approving the withdrawal of public lands pending classification and the separation of surface rights from mineral, forest and water rights, including water power sites, we recommend legislation for the classification and leasing for grazing pur-

poses on unreserved public lands suitable chiefly for this purpose, subject to the rights of homesteaders and settlers, or the acquisition thereof under the laws of the United States, and we hold that arid and non-irrigable public grazing lands should be administered by the government in the interest of the small stockmen and homeseekers until they have passed into the possession of actual settlers. We hold that the deposits of minerals underlying, particularly mineral fields, iron ores and phosphate deposits, should be leased for limited periods not exceeding fifty years, but subject to renewal, the royalty to be adjusted at more frequent intervals, such leases to be subject to such regulations as to prevent monopoly and unnecessary waste. We hold that phosphate deposits underlying the public lands should be safeguarded for the American people by appropriate legislation and we recommend the early opening of the Alaskan and other coal fields belonging to the people of the United States for commercial purposes on a system of leasing, national ownership to be retained. . . We earnestly recommend that the States and Federal government acquire for reforestation lands not more valuable for other purposes, and that all existing forests publicly and privately owned be fully protected by State and Federal governments. . . We favor the repeal of the timber and stone law. We indorse the proposition for the preservation by the Federal government of the Southern Appalachian and White Mountain forests. . . We recommend that the public and private schools instruct the youth of the land in the fundamental doctrines of conservation. We realize that the fullest enjoyment of our natural resources depends upon the life and development of the people physically, intellectually and morally, and in order to promote this purpose, we recommend that the training and protection of the people and whatever pertains to the health and general efficiency be encouraged by methods and legislation suitable to this end. Child labor should be prevented and child life protected and developed. Realizing the waste of life in transportation and mining operations, we recommend legislation increasing the use of proper safeguards for the conservation of life. And we also recommend that in order to make better provision for preserving the health of the nation a Department of public health be established by the national government. We recommend the adequate maintenance of a national conservation commission to investigate the natural resources of the country and co-operate with the work of the State conservation commissions; and we urge the legal establishment and maintenance of conservation commissions or corresponding agencies on the part of all States of the Union. Nothing in these resolutions to be construed as questioning the rights of the States or the people of the United States guaranteed under the Federal Constitution.

The Congress adjourned without day on the 8th.

+

The Ballinger Committee.

The Congressional committee for investigating the Ballinger case (pp. 513, 518) was called to meet at Minneapolis on the 7th to decide upon its