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.]

A liquor license clause adopted by the convention on the 6th by a vote of 91 to 18, to be submitted separately to popular vote, provides for—retention of all present temperance laws and preservation of all dry territory; elimination of the brewery-owned saloon; a limit of one saloon to each 500 of population; the saloon keepers must be citizens of the United States and of good character; home rule for cities and townships on statutory regulations, and licenses automatically revoked on second conviction for violating regulatory laws.

The full form of Initiative and Referendum agreed upon by a majority of the delegates, the Crosser bill modified in detail with Mr. Crosser's co-operation, provides in substance that—

legislative power is vested in the legislature "but the people reserve to themselves the power to propose laws [legislative Initiative] and amendments to the Constitution [Constitutional Initiative], and to adopt or reject the same at the polls independent of the legislature, and also reserve the power, at their own option, to adopt or reject any law, item, section or part thereof passed by the legislature [Referendum]." A legislative Initiative petition signed by 8 per cent of the voters must be submitted at the next regular election occurring 90 days after filing; a Constitutional Initiative petition signed by 12 per cent of the voters must be submitted at the next regular election occurring 90 days after filing. Either legislative or Constitutional Initiative petitions signed by only 4 per cent of the voters must be enacted or rejected by the legislature within 60 days; if enacted they must be approved by the people on Referendum; if rejected or ignored by the legislature they go to the people for enactment or rejection, along with any different or competing proposal which the legislature may submit. Both legislative and Constitutional Initiatives, when approved by a majority of the people voting on them, are thereupon in force; and if conflicting provisions receive a majority at the same election the one receiving the highest number of votes is the law. A Referendum petition signed by 6 per cent of the voters must be submitted to the people with reference to any act of the legislature if filed within 90 days after adjournment. No act of the legislature can take effect until 90 days after adjournment (unless it is emergent), nor until approved by the people if a Referendum petition be filed within that time. Emergency measures are limited to tax levies for current expenses, and the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety; and in order to make these emergent they must be enacted by a three-fourths yea and nay vote of each House; one section of the bill must declare it to be emergent with a statement of the facts making it so, which section separately must be passed by a yea and nay vote.

Like powers of legislative Initiative and Referendum for local purposes are reserved to the voters of each village, city, county, township, school district and other political subdivision of the State. Among the general provisions proposed are the following:

One-half of the total number of counties of the State are each required to furnish the signatures of voters equal in number to one-half of the designated percentage of the voters of such county to all Initiative and Referendum petitions of State-wide scope. An official pamphlet containing proposed laws or Constitutional amendments, and arguments (not exceeding 300 words each) for and against, must be distributed in advance of Initiative or Referendum elections "to each of the voters of the State as far as reasonably possible." All the proposed sections are self-executing without legislation, but legislation may be enacted to facilitate their operation provided it in no way limits or restricts them.

Out of the 119 members of the Constitutional Convention 66 have agreed to support the measure outlined above. [See current volume, page 227.]

Municipal Election in Seattle.

At the election in Seattle on the 5th, George F. Cotterill was elected Mayor by a majority of 748, the vote reported being 31,287 for ex-Mayor Hiram C. Gill and 32,035 for ex-Senator Cotterill. Although the Mayor-elect is a well-known and active Singletaxer, he was largely supported by others than Singletaxers. His identification with the temperance movement brought him support from Prohibitionists; he was also supported by "good government" voters, their own candidate having been defeated at the direct primary; and while some Socialists followed the instructions of leaders among them to refrain from voting for Mayor, their candidate having been defeated at the primary, it is evident that Mr. Cotterill drew a strong Socialist vote. The Mayor-elect stands for a "closed town" with reference to vice, for the municipal street railway already authorized, and for public ownership of wharves and harbor facilities.

A large vote was polled for the Socialist candidates who at the primaries had won a place on the ballot. Dr. E. J. Brown, Socialist candidate for corporation counsel, got 27,157 to 35,196 for James E. Bradford. George W. Scott, Socialist candidate for treasurer, got 25,192 to 36,265 for Ed. L. Terry; C. L. Jacobs, Socialist candidate for the Council, got 14,882 votes, and David Burgess, Socialist candidate for Council, got 26,577. These votes were not due to Socialist voters alone, the voting at the direct primary which eliminates all but the two highest having shown a much smaller Socialist vote than the lowest here. For Mayor the Socialist vote was less than 11,000 at the primary.

Although a pronounced Singletaxer was elected Mayor of Seattle on the 5th, the Singletax amendments to the city charter were defeated. Mr. Cotterill got many votes from non-Singletaxers, and