

House without a roll call and without even a call for the "Noes." I have seen a State Senator hand a \$100 bill to the Speaker of the House in order that the Senator's bill might be put on final passage. I once heard a party floor-leader in the House offer to deliver 19 votes for \$1,900; and the offer was not made in a whisper. I was in Governor Altgeld's office when he signed the veto of the "eternal monopolies bill" which ruined him financially,—and he knew it would ruin him.

+

Mr. Trowbridge says the "financiers are hopeful that the voters will place a check on legislation which is detrimental to the reputation" of Oregon. That is precisely what Oregon voters have been doing for eight years; and they are going to place a few more checks of the same kind—but not to please bond-buyers and financiers and would-be monopolists. They are making the laws under which they must live and do business to please themselves, keeping in mind the fact that a legislature often enacts laws to please others than the great mass of the people who must live and do business under them.

If Mr. Trowbridge had taken the trouble to consult Mr. William M. Ladd, head of one of the oldest and greatest private banking houses on the Pacific Coast, he might have modified his interview. "I would rather trust the people to vote on the thirty-two, or any other number of important measures, than any legislature," says Mr. Ladd; and he was once a member of the Oregon legislature.

If Mr. Trowbridge had taken the trouble to investigate, he would have found that Oregon, with her terrible Initiative and Referendum, adopted only eleven Constitutional amendments in the five elections from 1902 to 1910, inclusive, while at the same elections, without the Initiative and Referendum, California adopted 46 amendments. Are financiers four times as much afraid of California as of Oregon?

+

Regarding the home rule in taxation amendment, which is now getting teeth, I want to quote here, from the Oregon Journal of July 18, the very day on which Mr. Trowbridge's wild interview appeared in the Oregonian, something significant, which it attributed to the report of R. G. Dun's trade review of about that date: "The report says that the banking situation in Portland is normal, with an active demand for money and interest firm; that there is a well defined movement among bankers to decline all loans except those for legitimate business enterprises. All applications for loans for investments in real estate for speculative purposes are being uniformly declined by the banks." Do you mind that, now—that last sentence?

W. G. EGGLESTON.

+ + +

## GOVERNOR JOHNSON OF CALIFORNIA

California, August 30.

The recent appointment of Louis R. Glavis (President Taft's conservation victim) as Secretary of the new Conservation Commission of California has given very general satisfaction among progressive people and publications. It answers a great many

questions which were being asked respecting the plans of this Commission, established by the last legislature, with \$100,000 to spend in the next two years.

In a recent letter that energetic and effective leader, ex-Governor George C. Pardee, the chairman of this Commission, says that "Matters of waters for irrigation and power have been taken up in coöperation with the Department of Agriculture and the Geological Survey, and the gauging of streams is in progress."

The law which created the Commission provides that it is "established for the purpose of investigating \* \* \* forestry, water, use of water, water power, electricity, electrical or other power, mines and mining, mineral or other lands, dredging, reclamation and irrigation, and for the purpose of revising, systematizing and reforming the laws of this State" on the above subjects. This is a large order, but Governor Johnson has placed three very strong men on this Commission—Pardee of Oakland, Cuttle of Riverside and Bull of Arcata.

Another new Californian institution, the State Board of Control, has been illustrating the fundamental principle of conservatism by saving a great deal of public money. After straightening out lesser wastes in State offices this Board compelled the State Printer to follow the law respecting bids for supplies and incidentally cancelled some \$90,000 worth of illegal and needless orders.

All of Governor Johnson's appointments have justified and strengthened the reform administration of California, but nowhere has he put better men than in those two economy groups of progressives.

C. H. S.

+ + +

## THE NEW YORK TRACTION QUESTION.

New York, August 31.

There is one point in our subway problem in New York not touched on in Mr. Lebuscher's\* instructive and interesting article, to which I would like to add a supplementary note. The point in question is the difference between the bid of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Co. for an operating lease covering a system that would be complete in itself, and that of the Interborough which stipulated that the routes must be laid out so as to be of no practical value except in connection with their existing lines.

While in form accepting the 10-year lease to which the city officials are now restricted by law, the practical effect of any such condition would be that the new lines would be tied up to the Interborough for the remainder of the 75 years' contract that they hold on the old lines. This very marked difference is the reason why those who favor municipal operation have preferred the Brooklyn Rapid Transit alternative to the other, or at least laying out the lines and building them to meet that company's proposition with the hope that by the time the contracts for operation come to be actually let the prejudice against municipal operation among the public may have disappeared.

It is quite probable that both of the companies look to get their financial backing from the same source.

\*See current volume, page 848.

and possible indeed that they may be secretly in alliance. But if that is the case, the discrepancy in their bids would indicate that they have hoped to either wheedle or force our public officials into granting the lease most unfavorable to the City, yet if they should fail to do so that they will not let the enormously profitable enterprise escape them for lack of putting in a more favorable bid.

To accomplish the first named they would naturally depend on the support being given them by the Mayor, who as Mr. Leubuscher says, has so steadily disappointed us all, and who is probably influenced by his adherence to the requirement for a city-wide fare as a paramount consideration. Ignoring entirely the fact that to go up and down Manhattan Island, inasmuch as people rarely want to transfer from one line to another, it makes no difference whether one fare covers all the lines or there is a separate fare for each.

E. J. SHRIVER.

### INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

#### SENATOR BRISTOW AND ARIZONA.

Solomoni, Kansas.

As there might be some injustice to Senator Bristow's being classed with Senators Heyburn and Bailey as having voted against the Arizona Statehood bill, the following statement by Senator Bristow should be considered: "The President has seen fit to refuse his approval to that proposition [recall of judges] and has declared that, so far as he can prevent it by the exercise of his Constitutional prerogative the Territories shall not be admitted as States unless the people conform to his notion as to what they ought to do in regard of office of their judges. To my mind it is an arrogant presumption upon the part of the President of the United States."—Congressional Record, page 4282.

E. Z. BUTCHER.

## NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, September 5, 1911.

#### Demanding a Federal Judge's Impeachment.

An Associated Press report went through the newspapers east of the Rocky Mountains last week, which stated in substance that several citizens of Seattle had been indicted in the Federal court for conspiring to obstruct Federal justice. It now appears that these persons had not been indicted, and that their alleged offense consisted in setting on foot a petition to Congress for the impeachment of the United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington—C. H. Hanford.

Judge Hanford is the same Federal judge who

interfered in the Recall election in Seattle last winter, for which he was popularly denounced as a judicial tool of monopolies, and was overruled by a superior Federal judge. [See current volume, pages 34, 60, 151, 156.]

The present movement against Judge Hanford grows out of what appears to be an attempt of a railway combination to override the City Council of Seattle and the Supreme Court of the State of Washington. The railway is a trolley road named the "Seattle, Renton and Southern Railway Company." Its charter fixes the rate of fare at five cents within the city limits, but it refuses to recognize this limitation beyond the old limits. A question of transfers is also involved. The other lines in Seattle, merged in one ownership, concede transfer rights between one another, and are willing to concede them with the S. R. and S., but the latter refuses. In a litigation in the State courts, the highest court of the State sustained the people's contention, and they either refused to pay extra fares or demanded receipts for the excess. But now the S. R. and S. company, defeated in the State courts, carries the question into the United States courts, and for ailing in that purpose has a non-resident bondholder bring the suit. The suing bondholder is Augustus S. Peabody of Chicago, who sues as a trustee. He brings his suit against the City of Seattle and the S. R. and S. Company, asking an injunction to prohibit, among other things, the S. R. & S. from refusing or failing to collect additional fares between the old and the new city limits. In this suit and on the 22d of August last, Judge Hanford issued a restraining order, ex parte, requiring the S. R. & S. to collect additional fares between those points—the old and the new city limits,—and ordering passengers to submit. This was the situation when the acts were done which are charged to have been in obstruction of Federal justice.

A mass meeting was called by the Seattle Star, one of the Scripps league papers, for the purpose of supporting a petition it was circulating for the impeachment of Judge Hanford by Congress. This meeting was held on the 25th. It packed a large pavilion, and 5,000 people are reported to have been present. Oliver T. Erickson, who was recently elected to the Seattle Council at the head of the poll, presided. Among the other speakers were State Senator Bryan, and ex-Mayor Fawcett of Tacoma. An effigy of Judge Hanford is reported to have been burned outside the meeting. Speakers are accused of advising disobedience to the Hanford injunctions, but this is denied. At any rate the call for the meeting and the concerted action of the meeting was to petition