

nected Seattle by transportation facilities with the rest of the world.

But has he?

Without the millions of railway builders and operators, from miners and wood choppers to engineers, Hill would have been as helpless to create land values in Seattle as a general without an army to conquer a nation. It was not Hill alone, but also the workers whom he marshaled and directed, and the millions back of them in the processes of production. Nor would Seattle land values have come at the call of Hill-marshaled railroad builders and operators by the thousand, if other thousands had not settled at Seattle to live and do business. Nor then, if all the land at and about Seattle had continued to be so plentiful as not to have grown scarce, and so uniformly desirable as to have developed within it no relatively advantageous sites for business or residence. Land values mean scarcity of the kind of land to which they attach.

We may concede that James J. Hill—all the other factors being granted—did more than any other one man, or thousand men possibly, to afford opportunity for land values to come and grow at Seattle instead of somewhere else; but didn't he get a high salary for all this work? If he didn't get pay enough for this as a worker relatively to the other workers, then the question is one of wages and not of land values.

III.

All that we have said above is intended only to warn the News away from a quagmire of its own creation in fiscal discussion. It must *read up* before it flies into the face of opinions that have been carefully worked out; it must *think* before setting up fallacies that have long since been exploded, and buttressing them with reasons that won't wash. John Stuart Mill and Henry George and all the rest may be wrong; but the News doesn't show it. It hasn't considered their reasoning well enough to be competent to show it.

With its position, however, on the Singletax as far as that reform has practically gone, we have no quarrel. On the contrary, we are glad to welcome into the preliminary work of establishing the Singletax so sincere and able and courageous a daily paper as the Rocky Mountain News. Refinements of fiscal discussion may be left to that proof of the pudding which is in the eating thereof, if once we get what the News calls for when it says, in closing the editorial criticised above, that—

the Singletax may be the most just, equitable, and

economical method yet found for raising the money which civilized communities must raise for common purposes. This claim for it is made by men whose sober intelligence and careful study give their words a deal of weight with all open-minded thinkers. The land value tax is entitled to thoughtful, sober investigation. It is being tried out in Vancouver. If it works well it should be tried in other places, and perhaps generally adopted.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE UNIQUE LABOR INJUNCTION AT DES MOINES.*

Des Moines, Iowa, Aug. 7.

Here is an outline of the whole affair:

On July 20 Car-Inspector Killam, before 16 passengers, charged Benj. L. Hiatt with being two fares short, and in insolent terms demanded that he ring them up. Hiatt denied the charge, and was corroborated by Fireman Dwyer. Hotly and profanely he refused to ring. He was discharged by Manager J. R. Harrigan, acting for the N. W. Harris Street Railway Company, which recently bought out the old control.

As this was the second time a man had been discharged in this manner, the Carman's Union took the matter up, and demanded, not a reinstatement of Hiatt, but investigation according to the terms of their contract. They received a most arrogant refusal. After due deliberation, by an almost unanimous vote, the union, 449 men, decided the night of the 4th, to walk out Saturday at 1:15 a. m., August 5th, and the decision was obeyed to the minute. Meanwhile Manager Harrigan had by August 1st, 150 professional strike-breakers from Chicago under the leadership of big Louis J. Christianson.

Before the strike the City Council and various prominent men sought some kind of agreement. Harrigan was adamant. Then the Mayor wired N. W. Harris asking his intervention. He also was adamant. One last effort at reconciliation by intermediaries was made at the eleventh hour; a proposition was sent from the union not only to arbitrate the question at issue, but to arbitrate the meaning of the section which they claimed gave them the right to demand arbitration. The street railway manager replied, Yes, if they would eliminate Hiatt. They, in turn, accepted the amendment if the management would eliminate Killam—let one discharge offset the other. Harrigan positively refused. This seemed so manifestly unfair that when the strike was declared, there was a surprising popular sentiment for the car-men.

The hired strike breakers could scarcely get places to eat. The help at the Iowa hotel all walked out. Many cafes refused to serve them. Rumors of another 100 men from Omaha did not smooth matters. "I'll run the cars," reiterated Harrigan. But when Saturday morning dawned and his new men tried to get the cars out of the barn, a crowd of some 3,000 citizens were on hand to prevent. These were sym-

*See current volume, page 829.

pathizers, the striking car-men, except a few pickets, were conspicuously absent.

The mob gave the strike-breakers to understand that they could not run those cars, and began throwing brick-bats at the windows. Some 20 of the city police did what could be done in such a crowd. They had declared beforehand that they would not permit any to carry weapons of any kind, and several of the strike-breakers were relieved of iron clubs wrapped in paper. The demonstration against these interlopers was so unmistakable that they fled in all directions. A number of them had to be disguised by "we walk" badges to get safely to the train.

Harrigan was loud in blaming the city police; but no regular police could cope with such numbers, and the Commissioner of Public Safety said he would not deputize strike-breakers as police. The fact is, that public opinion was so overwhelming that Harrigan had to fail. The imported strike-breakers were regarded as foreign barbarians.

After one day's experience without cars Mayor Hanna got the Council and some of the wisest heads together and asked the city attorneys, H. W. Byers and Robt. Brennan, to procure an injunction. The District Court issued it. It enjoined the street car company and its contract employes from further inconveniencing the public by this strike, and to resume operations Sunday afternoon, August 6, at 5 o'clock, waiving all differences pending a thorough investigation. Hiatt was to run his car and all to go on as before the trouble. The car men acquiesced cheerfully and reported for duty at 5 o'clock. Harrigan sullenly responded, but with threats of moves to annul the injunction. Everything is now as usual—for the present.

The people of Des Moines congratulate themselves that with all the mobs of Saturday morning preventing the moving of the cars, and of the afternoon seeing the strike-breakers out of town (from three to five thousand), not a person was killed nor more than two or three slightly injured. The most prevalent sentiment was a general jocular contempt for hired outsiders coming in to meddle with the business of our own citizens. This includes Harrigan himself, a new man, who has few affiliations here, and with a reputation as a professional strike-breaker. Inspector Killam got out of town with his family secretly.

The union men believe that the company's first move was intended to bring about a strike in order to bring in a new lot of men before the new contracts with the old men are made in October.

And now the question of whether the injunction of the District Court now in force will be sustained by a superior Iowa court; or by the Federal Court if that court shall be found to have jurisdiction. It may have, for much of the stock of the company is held out of the city.

Great credit is accorded on all hands to Mayor Hanna for preventing or minimizing the evils of the strike (by closing the saloons, he doubtless saved lives); and to the city attorneys, and the District Court for the injunction. All the papers gave both sides fair play.

LONA INGHAM ROBINSON.

THE NEW YORK TRACTION QUESTION.*

New York, August 8.

By a vote of more than three to one, the citizens of the city of New York decided in 1894 in favor of the municipal construction of rapid transit roads. Before the vote it was the general opinion, as reflected in the newspapers and in the resolutions of civic bodies, that municipal construction practically meant municipal operation. Indeed, the majority of those who voted in favor of the proposition believed that the city would operate its own roads, and voted for municipal construction for that reason. It was with a distinct shock that the community learned the authorities had made an operating contract for the present subway with a traction corporation for 75 years.

The contract contained other conditions unfavorable to the city. How favorable it was to the operating company was soon shown by the fact that the company was able to predicate upon it bonds and stocks exceeding in amount the cost of construction. The aroused public then secured amendments to the rapid transit law, which would prevent further improvident gifts of such franchises.

+

In accordance with the law as it now stands, the Public Service Commission, or rather its predecessor, the Rapid Transit Commission, laid out what is now known as the Triborough route. This may not be ideal, but at least it was the consensus of the competents.

Pursuing the statute, the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court appointed commissioners to consider and report as to the justice and advisability of the proposed route. The Commission held long and protracted sessions, at which all taxpayers had a right to be heard, and at which testimony and arguments were given pro and con. The favorable report of the Commission was confirmed by the Appellate Division. This was long before the Public Service Commission came into being, three years ago.

It was the duty of the Public Service Commission immediately to set in motion the machinery provided by the statute, and advertise for bids. The amended rapid transit law provides that the Commission could advertise for bids either for construction and operation or for construction alone; and it further provides that bids may be requested for the construction of small sections. This latter provision was inserted for the purpose of increasing the number of competitors, and thus securing the lowest possible price. It is obvious that there are very few concerns, if indeed there is more than one, that could undertake a contract involving over a hundred million dollars.

Instead, however, of immediately soliciting bids, the Public Service Commission allowed more than two years to elapse. Not until last summer, when the indignation of the sardine-packed straphangers threatened the abolition of the Public Service Commission, did it begin to advertise for bids.

*See The Public, current volume, pages 636, 734, 806