

be provided in such fashion as to prevent its being wantonly or too frequently used. I do not believe that it should be made the easy or ordinary way of taking action. In the great majority of cases it is far better that action on legislative matters should be taken by those specially delegated to perform the task; in other words, that the work should be done by the experts chosen to perform it. But where the men thus delegated fail to perform their duty, then it should be in the power of the people themselves to perform the duty. . . . As to the Recall, I do not believe that there is any great necessity for it as regards short term elective officers. . . . I believe it should be generally provided, but with such restrictions as will make it available only when there is a widespread and genuine public feeling among a majority of the voters. There remains the question of the Recall of judges. . . . Courts have repeatedly defeated the aroused moral sentiment of a whole commonwealth. . . . By the abuse of the power to declare laws unconstitutional the courts have become a lawmaking, instead of a law enforcing, agency. Here again the settled will of society to correct confessed evils has been set at naught by those who place metaphysics above life. It is the courts, not the constitutions, that are at fault. . . . The judge is just as much the servant of the people as any other official. Of course he must act conscientiously. So must every other official. He must not do anything wrong because there is popular clamor for it, any more than under similar circumstances a governor or a legislator or a public utilities commissioner should do wrong. Each must follow his conscience, even though to do so costs him his place. But in their turn the people must follow their conscience, and when they have definitely decided on a given policy they must have public servants who will carry out that policy. . . . There is one kind of Recall in which I very earnestly believe, and the immediate adoption of which I urge. . . . When a judge decides a Constitutional question, when he decides what the people as a whole can or cannot do, the people should have the right to recall that decision if they think it wrong. . . . If the courts have the final say-so on all legislative acts, and if no appeal can lie from them to the people, then they are the irresponsible masters of the people.



La Follette and Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt's speech before the Ohio Constitutional convention on the 21st having been heralded as a political platform on which he is to take the place of Senator La Follette as the progressive Republican candidate for President, members of the progressive Republican conference gave out on the 23rd the following communication to them from Senator La Follette in reply to their assurances of support for him:

Without one word I should have known where to find you all. Nowhere are there braver, brainier fighters for human rights. Trained and seasoned in many battles, you never swerve from the straight course. Again and again you have made what those without vision call "defeat" the very corner stone of great and lasting victory. We are facing a civic

crisis. The demand for better control of government and the just solution of our economic and social problems is nationwide. The progressive platform must be thoroughly constructive and uncompromising on the great issues that are now to be fought out to a finish. It is no time for compromise either on principles or on men. It was the uncompromising course in Wisconsin that secured the wise and progressive statutes which distinguish our commonwealth. Standing solidly together, we will continue the Wisconsin way until it is the national way. I believe that time is near at hand.

[See current volume, page 181.]



Theodore Roosevelt, Presidential Candidate.

In response to the address of Governors Glasscock, Aldrich, Bass, Carey, Osborn, Stubbs and Hadley, requesting ex-President Roosevelt to become a candidate for the Republican nomination for President, Mr. Roosevelt gave out the following letter on the 24th:

New York, Feb. 24, 1912.—Gentlemen: I deeply appreciate your letter and I realize to the full the heavy responsibility it puts upon me, expressing as it does the carefully considered convictions of the men elected by popular vote to stand as the heads of government in their several States. I absolutely agree with you that this matter is not one to be decided with any reference to the personal preferences or interests of any man, but purely from the standpoint of the interests of the people as a whole. I will accept the nomination for President if it is tendered to me, and I will adhere to this decision until the convention has expressed its preference. One of the chief principles for which I have stood and for which I now stand and which I have always endeavored and always shall endeavor to reduce to action is the genuine rule of the people; and therefore I hope that, so far as possible, the people may be given the chance through direct primaries to express their preference as to who shall be the nominee of the Republican Presidential convention. Very truly yours,

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

[See current volume, page 157.]



Roosevelt's Boston Speech.

After announcing his candidacy Mr. Roosevelt supplemented his Columbus speech with one at Boston, delivering it on the 26th before the Massachusetts legislature. In the latter speech he in terms favored "direct nominations, direct primaries, including direct Presidential primaries, not only for local but for State delegates," and declared his belief "in the adoption of wisely chosen devices under which the Initiative and Referendum can be used, not as a substitute for a representative government, but to make representative government genuinely representative, to see it corrected if it becomes misrepresentative." On the subject of the Recall of judges, Mr. Roose-