

guage in Brittany. The ministry had issued a circular forbidding the use of this language in preaching and catechising in the Breton churches, and a Republican deputy from Brittany interpellated the ministry on the subject, denouncing the circular as vexatious and tyrannical. He said, incidentally, that over 740,000 inhabitants of Brittany can speak no other language than the Breton. Replying to this interpellation, the premier, M. Combes, defended the circular as a necessary measure in the interest of the national language. He was sustained by the chamber by a vote of 349 to 185.

It is reported regarding the revolution in Morocco (p. 649) that France has warned the sultan of the probability of European interference if fighting near Tangiers is continued. This report, however, was described on the 15th, by the premier of Spain, Senor Silvela, as "inaccurate." Of the progress of the revolution, but little information is available. The sultan's army is said to be demoralized, and rumors of his abdication are afloat. But the reports are not authentic.

In the United States the most absorbing news of the past two weeks, that regarding the coal famine (p. 648), is losing its hold upon the public mind, if, indeed, the circumstances themselves are not rapidly changing for the better. At any rate the complaints of shortage are less noticeable. In Chicago the special grand jury investigating the subject (p. 648) made a remarkable report on the 19th. While it presented indictments against 17 individuals and 27 corporations, charging them with conspiracy in restraint of trade, it reported nevertheless that the coal shortage was "not owing to or appreciably influenced by any conspiracy or combination in restraint of trade or any attempt to forestall the market." The unfortunate condition of affairs is attributed by it "primarily and principally to the recent great strike in the anthracite coal fields," which, as it asserts, "resulted in a reduction of approximately 25,000,000 tons in the output of anthracite coal—an equivalent of 50,000,000 tons of bituminous coal." It finds, also, that with the falling off in supply there was a great increase in demand; and that the railroads and the mine owners have been doing all in their

power to relieve the consequent distress. "Individual instances of breaches of contract and extortion" are referred to, but the jury finds "no evidence that these have been due to anything but individual unfairness or greed; nor does it find these instances to have been more numerous or more exasperating than might be expected in the circumstances." Yet, while finding "no evidence that the present condition of the coal industry is owing to or is appreciably influenced by any company or combination in restraint of trade," and while "convinced that under the conditions enumerated the natural law of supply and demand accounts sufficiently for the high prices prevailing, the jury does find that there exists in the city of Chicago, and in the State of Illinois outside of Chicago, and in the neighboring States, certain combinations in restraint of trade within the meaning of the statutes." Therefore, it files the indictments referred to above.

A Chicago matter of more importance, both locally and financially, is the movement for public ownership and operation of street railways, which has now reached a critical point. The most important street railway franchises of the city are about to expire, unless they are protected, as the street railway owners contend, by a law of 1865, which may possibly operate to extend all street car franchises until 1964. This question was raised in the early '80's, and was compromised by an extension for 20 years, the companies to pay a \$50 tax annually on each of their cars, and the question of the old 99-year extension—from 1865 to 1964—to remain meanwhile in abeyance without prejudice to the rights of either party. Upon the approach of the termination of this 20-year extension, and in view of the enormous majority of the vote in Chicago last spring for municipal ownership of public utilities, Mayor Harrison recently appointed a committee of aldermen and citizens to consider the subject. The committee drafted a bill enabling the city to take over and operate the street car systems upon approval by a majority of those voting upon a referendum demanded at any time by 10 per cent. of the registered voters. We gave the substance of the bill as recommended for submission to the legislature by the committee (p. 569) about a month ago. It is now known as the "Finn" bill.

A few days thereafter this committee met in conference with the standing committee of the city council on local transportation. An irreconcilable difference of opinion arose, strongly indicating an aldermanic influence against the "Finn" bill and apparently originating in the offices of the street car companies. At a subsequent conference of these two committees, held on the 8th, Alderman Jackson proposed a substitute measure which is now known as the "Jackson" bill. It provides, with reference to the referendum, that municipal ownership shall not be adopted without a majority vote not merely of those voting on the question but of the registered voters, and that municipal operation shall not be adopted without a two-thirds vote of those voting upon it as a separate proposition. No demand by petition can be made for a referendum. Other objections are raised to this substitute, but the principal and most impressive one rests upon the statement that the bill was drawn and is being pressed by the legal advisers of the street car companies. No action was taken by the committees at their joint meeting, and on the 12th Alderman Jackson introduced his bill personally in the council.

The question of recommending this bill to the legislature came up before the Chicago council on the 19th upon a motion to substitute the "Jackson" bill for the "Finn" bill. After a sharp debate the substitution was made by a vote of 48 to 19.

Meantime the traction interests are striving to secure an extension of their existing franchises. Representatives of the Eastern interests are on the ground; conferences have been held, some of them secret, between street car representatives and aldermen; and all kinds of rumors as to offers made for extensions are in the air. Nothing is reported definitely and reliably, but it is believed that the companies are willing to offer compensation to the city, to agree to some kind of municipal acquisition clause, and to improve the service.

Proceedings before the anthracite arbitration commission (649) at Philadelphia seem to be drawing slowly toward a close. The Erie company continued offering evidence on the 14th, 15th, and 16th, when it was

followed by the Scranton company, which gave way to the D., L. & W. on the 17th. The next in turn was the Temple Iron Co., which first claimed the attention of the commission on the 20th. Upon the eve of his departure to attend the mine workers' convention at Indianapolis, Mr. Mitchell made a farewell address to the commission on the 17th, in the course of which he referred to the charges that the miners had lessened the output of coal since the strike, thereby contributing to the coal famine. On that point he said:

As the commission is no doubt aware, several days ago I addressed a communication to all the anthracite miners, urging them to cooperate in increasing the output of the mines, for the purpose of relieving this suffering. The miners tell me that the production cannot be increased by them; that, in most cases, the companies are failing to furnish them as many cars as they could load. In other words, the regular turn of cars will not amount to as much as the men are accustomed and willing to load, so that they cannot increase the output of the mines. We have 3,000 men who have been refused the right to work. I believe the miners and operators are doing what they can to get coal, but the operators can at least put our 3,000 men to work. They are charged, of course, with being criminals. It is alleged that they left their jobs, but if they are going to have a term of peace for some years in the anthracite fields it seems to me they ought to stop fighting now and that any desire to punish men by the companies ought to cease.

The mineworkers' convention which Mr. Mitchell left the hearings of the arbitration commission to attend met at Indianapolis on the 19th. It was the 14th annual convention of the United Mineworkers of America. In his annual report to the convention, as president, delivered on the 20th, he strongly denounced "government by injunction," and on the subject of the incorporation of labor unions submitted approvingly the following opinion by Clarence S. Darrow, of Chicago, the legal advisor of the miners before the arbitration commission:

The demand for the incorporation of trade unions is the last trench of those who oppose organized labor. It is impudent and presumptuous. No friend of trade unionism ever believed in it or advocated it, or called for it. It is demanded to-day by those interests and those enemies who have used every means at their command

to oppose trade unionism, to counteract its influence and to destroy it. How the labor organizations shall manage their own affairs is not the business of the corporations or the employers.

In concluding Mr. Mitchell referred in these terms to the offers of political positions which he has received since coming into national prominence:

I want to announce, in language not susceptible of misinterpretation, that I am in no wise responsible for the use of my name in this connection. I am not without ambition, but my ambition is not in the political field.

Political frauds in Colorado at the recent elections have cut deeper into partisan adjustments than might have been inferred from the fraudulent returns against the Australasian taxation amendment known as the Bucklin bill (p. 595); the legislature being now in a turmoil, with the Senate divided into two hostile bodies. The fight began on the 19th, when the lieutenant governor, presiding, a Republican, refused to recognize the Democrats of the elections committee who offered a majority report against several Republican contestants. He recognized the Republicans of the committee, however, when they offered a minority report seating the Republican contestants, ordered the roll called on the adoption of the minority report, and refused to admit the votes of the Democrats whom it reported against. The Democrats refused to abide by this decision and elected one of their own number to preside. He called the Senate to order accordingly and the Democrats responding they adopted the majority report. The Democrats are in possession of the Senate chamber. In the House the same partisan fight resulted in the expulsion of 6 Democrats and the seating of 11 Republicans. Partisan lines are crossed here and there, the issue being the United States senatorship. Senator Teller is a candidate for reelection, supported generally by the Democrats, and his adversary is ex-Senator Wolcott, who is the leading Republican candidate. The first vote was taken in the two houses separately on the 20th with the following result:

Democratic Senate—Henry M. Teller, 25; not voting, 1.

Republican Senate—Edward O. Wolcott, 9; Frank C. Goudy, 4; Irving Howbert, 2; John W. Springer, 1; Jesse Northcott, 1; N. W. Dixon, 2.

House—Henry M. Teller, D., 25; Edward O. Wolcott, R., 18; Frank C. Goudy, R., 13; Irving Howbert, R., 6; N. W. Dixon, R., 3.

On the 21st the anti-Wolcott Republicans took possession of the chamber of the lower house to prevent the Wolcott men from holding a joint session with the Republican Senate. The Democrats of the House held a joint session on the same day with the Democratic Senate at which 25 members and 26 Senators were present. This was enough to elect a United States Senator, but six of the number refused to vote. Henry M. Teller received 45 votes on this joint ballot.

A deadlock in a senatorial election exists also in Delaware, where the first balloting, on the 21st, showed this result:

Vote for the long-term Senator in the Senate: Addicks, 6; Dupont, 1; Higgins, 3; Kenney, 7.

House: Long term—Addicks, 14; Dupont, 7; Kenney, 14.

House: Short term—Addicks, 13; Higgins, 7; Dupont, 1; Salisbury, 14.

Senator Charles W. Fairbanks, Republican, has been reelected senator from Indiana; Senator Orville H. Platt, R., from Connecticut; Senator A. B. Kittridge, R., from South Dakota; Senator H. C. Hansbrough, R., from North Dakota; and Senator Thomas C. Platt, R., from New York. From Illinois, Albert J. Hopkins, R., is elected in place of Senator William E. Mason, R.; from Arkansas, James P. Clarke, D., in place of Senator James R. Jones, D.; from Utah, Reed Smoot, R., in place of Senator Joseph L. Rawlins, D.; from Michigan, Russell A. Alger, R., in place of Senator James McMillan, R.; and from Missouri, Wm. J. Stone, D., in place of Senator George G. Vest, D.

NEWS NOTES.

—The National Board of Trade closed its thirty-third annual convention at Washington on the 15th.

—The sultan of Sulu was reported from Manila on the 19th as having died of cholera several days before.

—Henri Opper, best known as M. de Blowitz, Paris correspondent of the London Times, died at Paris on the 18th. He was 77 years old.

—An international customs congress, composed of delegates from American republics, began its sessions at New York on the 17th.

—On the 20th the amendment to the Illinois Constitution (p. 649),