

ing the City of Chicago to construct, acquire, purchase, own and maintain street railways within its corporate limits and providing the means therefor," passed by the City Council of said city on the 18th day of January, A. D. 1906, making provision for the issue of Street Railway Certificates not to exceed in amount \$75,000,000, be approved?

On this question the following was the referendum vote:

Affirmative	110,008
Negative	106,669

Majority for the ordinance 3,339

As only a simple majority is required by the statute for the adoption of this ordinance, it was legally adopted by the above vote and is now fully operative as a law.

✽

The third question had been formulated under the advisory referendum law, and presented by petition at the time when the City Council seemed about to grant a further franchise for 20 years to the existing companies. It read as follows (vol. viii., p. 749):

Shall the City Council proceed without delay to secure Municipal Ownership and Operation of all Street Railways in Chicago under the Mueller Law, instead of passing the pending franchise ordinances or any other ordinances granting franchises to private companies?

On this advisory question the following vote was cast:

Affirmative	111,862
Negative	108,025

Majority against franchises to private companies 3,837

✽

Upon the announcement of the above result, Mayor Dunne made a public statement in which he said:

The program for the acquirement of the street railway properties I do not care to discuss at present. I first wish to ascertain the attitude of the street car companies and to consult with my advisers before announcing my plans. It is up to the street car people to make the next move. They now know that Mueller certificates can be issued for the purchase of the roads and that by virtue of the approval given the third proposition on the little ballot no more franchises will be granted private street car companies. Before I take any further step toward carrying out the will of the people I want to find out what terms the companies will make. Under the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court they can occupy the streets until they sell out to the city, and now that the city has the authority to purchase, it is up to the companies to state their terms. Of course, I am disappointed that the victory is not a greater one. I am disappointed that the proposition authorizing operation of the lines did not carry by the legal majority of three-fifths of the vote cast on it, but I do not regard this as a real setback. The problem of securing possession of the roads is a tremendous one and cannot be solved in a hurry. We shall begin on the task of acquiring ownership, and by the time we are in possession I am confident that the people will have voted to give the city the right to operate. Operation always comes with ownership. It was so in London, Glasgow, and other large cities. The proposition to operate can be submitted at the first election at which it seems advisable—next Fall, perhaps. This time it had a clear majority of 10,000 votes, still I regret that it did not receive the majority of about 28,000 which would have been necessary to make it effective. I am convinced, however, that the people will vote for municipal operation at the proper time, which will be when the city gets possession of the lines. You may retard the principle of municipal ownership, but you cannot defeat it.

✽

Half of the City Council was chosen at this elec-

tion, and on the question of co-operating faithfully in the execution of the municipal ownership ordinance adopted at the election, the Chicago Tribune, an advocate of private ownership regardless of the ordinance just adopted and the public policy vote, estimates in its issue of the 4th the attitude of the new Council as follows:

For municipal ownership	28
Against municipal ownership	32
Doubtful	10

Of the ten alderman here accounted "doubtful," two were supported by the Municipal Ownership League, to whose platform they are pledged; one made his campaign as a municipal ownership candidate without that endorsement; and one is a hold-over member who voted in support of Mayor Dunne's traction policy when a large majority of the Council voted against it. The other six voted against the Mayor's policy until the collapse of the opposition, when most of them came to his support. It would seem, therefore, that as the result of the aldermanic election Mayor Dunne will have the co-operation of about 32 aldermen out of a total of 70—a majority against him of only 6. It is not probable, therefore, that any reactionary ordinance will secure the necessary two-thirds vote to pass it over the Mayor's veto, and it may be that affirmative steps will be immediately possible.

✽ ✽

The Socialist Vote in Chicago.

The aggregate Socialist vote for Chicago aldermen, as reported, is 27,715, an increase of 7,382 votes over the vote of 20,333 for mayor (vol. viii., p. 7) at the municipal election of 1905.

✽ ✽

Municipal Ownership in Springfield.

In Springfield, Ill., on the contest led by the Mayor in support of municipal ownership and operation of the electric lighting system (vol. viii., p. 345), the voting on the 3d resulted in the election by the Democrats of a two-thirds majority of the City Council. They carried all but two wards. In one of these Joseph Farris, a single tax Democrat, was defeated by a small plurality through Democratic defections; but the strongest Republican ward of the city, one that has always heretofore been carried 2 to 1 by that party, was wrested from it by a plurality of 47 by Frank Bode, another single tax Democrat: Municipal ownership and operation is assured.

✽ ✽

Municipal Ownership in Kansas City.

Elections were held on the 3d in the two Kansas Cities which are separated by the Kansas-Missouri line. In Kansas City, Mo., the Republican candidate for mayor, Henry M. Beardsley, was elected. Both the Republican and the Democratic platforms declared for the principle of municipal ownership, regarding which Mr. Beardsley is reported as the more satisfactory leader. Municipal ownership Democrats are glad of his election.

✽

In Kansas City, Kan., where Mayor Rose, a single tax Democrat, was elected mayor a year ago on a municipal ownership issue (vol. viii., pp. 9, 855), a prohibition issue was stirred up, the closing of the

saloons being demanded of Mayor Rose by the State authorities, although all other river towns in Kansas are "wide open" and Kansas City also has been for 20 years, and this became an issue of the election for aldermen on the 3d. Aldermen opposed to Mayor Rose's policy were elected, and he thereupon resigned as mayor with a view to raising the issues more distinctly by becoming a candidate for re-election at the special election to be held at an early day to fill the vacancy. Meanwhile, E. E. Venard, president of the Council, a Republican and opponent of Mayor Rose's local policy, will be acting mayor, with authority to enforce the prohibition law as its enforcement has been demanded by him and his followers of Mayor Rose. Mayor Rose's chief of police, Vernon J. Rose, has also resigned.

* * *

The Milwaukee Election.

At the mayoralty election in Milwaukee on the 3d, Mayor Rose, who secured the Democratic nomination for re-election by a bare plurality, was defeated by Sherburne M. Becker, a wealthy young Republican, of whose purpose in politics there are as yet no other indications than of personal ambition. Following was the vote:

Becker, Republican	22,565
Rose, Democrat	21,010
Arnold, Socialist	16,720

The Socialist vote is reported as about the same as for mayor two years ago. It is 2,000 less than for President in 1904. There will be eleven Socialists in the next Council. In the present one there are ten. The Socialist leader in the Council was defeated for re-election, but two new candidates were elected.

* * *

Municipal Ownership in Cleveland.

By a vote of 21 to 11 on the 2d, the City Council of Cleveland adopted Mayor Johnson's ordinance appropriating \$40,000 for the extension of the municipal lighting plant. This plant was established by the city of South Brooklyn, which has been annexed to Cleveland (vol. vii., p. 633), and through the annexation has brought over what Mayor Johnson regards as the nucleus for a complete municipal lighting system for the whole city, to be owned and operated by the city. The ordinance was bitterly opposed by the minority of the Council on the ground that municipal ownership of public utilities is more inefficient than private ownership.

* * *

In his movement for municipal ownership and operation of the traction system (vol. viii., p. 806), Mayor Johnson is opposed by the report of the franchise committee of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, made on the 3d which recommends that—

a new franchise be granted to the Cleveland Electric Railway Company over its entire system within the city for a term of twenty-five years, upon the basis of fare as follows: Five cents for a single cash fare and the same rate if transfer is desired; transfer upon a transfer to be given on all cross-town lines; tickets to be sold without transfer rights at the rate of three for 10 cents, or fifteen for 50 cents, or thirty for a dollar.

* * *

Municipal Ownership in Buffalo.

In Buffalo the movement for a municipal lighting

plant (vol. viii., p. 541, 595), while supported by Mayor Adam, is reported to have encountered the opposition of a majority of the aldermen in violation of election pledges. At the municipal election in November, 1905, most of the candidates elected were of the party pledged in its platform to the immediate establishment of a municipal electric lighting plant and to the referendum principle; and at the same election the establishment of this plant was advised by popular referendum. Accordingly, the Comptroller, with the sanction of the Mayor, inserted in the annual estimates an item of \$250,000 for the purpose of buying a lighting plant; but the aldermen struck it out. To denounce this as disloyalty on the part of the pledged aldermen, a large mass meeting was held on the 29th at which ex-Congressman Robert Baker was the principal speaker. Mr. Baker expressed the sense of the meeting, subsequently declared by resolutions, when he said:

The people of Buffalo have spoken. They spoke with no uncertain voice on November 7th. By a vote of four to one they gave directions to their servants that certain things should be done. The question, therefore, is why are these demands not heeded? Why are these orders not carried out? Are the people paramount or are the special privilege corporations the controlling force in your government? Why is it that in every large city in the union we witness the spectacle of this defiance of the people's will? The cause is not difficult to discover. It is found in the fact that our big cities offer opportunities for loot beyond anything that the world has ever known before. Everywhere the condition is the same; everywhere the same spectacle is presented. New York, Chicago, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Saint Louis and countless other cities of lesser importance all display this same seeming contempt by public officials for those who have elected them to office. "Scratch a Russian and you find a Tartar" is a common saying. With equal truth and probably with greater accuracy one could say, "Scratch a sore in the body politic, delve for corruption in our municipalities, and you will inevitably find the slimy trail of the special privilege corporations." . . . Do you realize that the great insistent, persistent corrupting force in our large municipalities springs from the action of probably not to exceed a score of men, the multi-millionaires of the United States. I have just returned from Chicago, which is in the throes of what appears to be a political contest, but which is nothing more nor less than an economical contest, a contest by J. P. Morgan and his friends to retain the power to tax the people of Chicago millions a year through their control of its public utilities. In like manner your contest is one by Morgan to retain control of the power to tax you through the General Electric and International Traction companies. I am glad to say, however, that the signs of the awakening of public intelligence on this subject are wellnigh universal. The people are getting educated as to the "benefits" they receive from private exercise of government functions, and the size of this meeting indicates that Buffalo is not going to lag behind in the race in which our great cities are engaged to see which shall be the first to take back to itself control over all its public utilities and operate them for the common good. When they do that we may expect a healthier political condition, a higher moral tone among our public servants, and I also think that many who are now engaged in thus exploiting the people will then turn around and become its most efficient and truest public servants.

* * *

Democratic Politics in New Jersey.

Following the convention of Democrats at Newark, N. J. (vol. viii., p. 856), at which a permanent organization "for true democracy in New Jersey" was formed, with John Moody as president, Mr. Moody has issued an address defining the character and purpose of the organization. He states that:

there were 206 men in attendance; the conference was