

dered by the International Freight Handlers' Union. It is reported to have grown out of the refusal, several days before, of freight handlers on the Fall River Line of steamboats to work under a non-union foreman; but the scope of the dispute appears to have been much enlarged, for the company and the strikers could not come to an agreement although, as the president of the international union, Lawrence J. Curran, said on the 24th, the union receded from the original demand. Mr. Curran said:

We offered the management every concession we possibly could make. We were willing even to forego the question of the discharge of Assistant Foreman William McCarthy, and we would not insist upon his discharge. We were even willing to arbitrate.

A suspicion is gaining ground in labor circles that the railroads of the country are forcing a policy of glutting the labor market by wholesale discharges of men. It may be possible therefore that the strike noted above has been provoked as being in harmony with that policy. At any rate many of the great railroads are discharging men in large numbers with a view, as they explain, to reducing the number of employes to the basis of 1902. The Pennsylvania system alone will discharge about 22,000 men. No cut in wages is contemplated at present, but it is believed that the glut in the labor market, caused by the discharges of men, will react upon the wages of those retained. The reason given by the roads for these discharges is decline in volume of traffic.

Another large strike began in Chicago on the 24th—a strike of machinists for a renewal of their agreement as to wages and hours with a slight increase of wages for certain kinds of work. The employers insist that business conditions are too poor to warrant an increase in wages.

The nature of the labor troubles in Colorado (p. 106) has had light thrown upon it by a public statement made at Denver on the 22d by Adjutant General Bell, who has been using State troops against strikers in the southern and west-

ern parts of Colorado. His statement refers to their contemplated use in Denver on the occasion of the city election there. While it is somewhat enigmatical, it is significant of some power of the corporations which makes him indignant. Gen. Bell says:

I shall resign the office of adjutant general probably Monday, and by the 1st of July there will be another man in my place. I don't approve of using the militia of the State to help any political movement, and I object, whether it is in a positive or negative way. I am accused of using or attempting to use the military in the late campaign. This is false, but the corporations used the militia for their purposes and instead of the militia being used to protect the people and uphold the law, that force was actually degraded to the uses of the local corporations who connived at the breaking of the law. I found last Sunday that there were many familiar faces upon the streets of the lower part of town, and that they were of the worst type of men in the West. I then discovered that the corporations had sent out all over the West and brought them here. I thought then more than ever that the militia ought probably to be in the vicinity of Denver in case of trouble, but imagine my surprise when I was given orders on Sunday night by the Governor not to call out a single man and to abandon my plan of assembling the troops for practice. It was then that I became convinced that the militia was to be used, not to enforce law and protect property, but to encourage trouble. The very men whom we used the militia to protect, imported all-round bad men—the very men I ran out of their camps—to break the law in Denver and carry the election in their interests. I am sick of the whole thing, and I will hand in my resignation, probably Monday, to go into effect as soon as I can clean up department business, which will not be later than July 1.

Gov. Peabody's reply, made on the 23d, was as follows:

I saw the papers were full of gossip about the necessity of mobilizing the militia for the city election. I saw several petitions printed in the papers purporting to be addressed to me by the Honest Election League and other independent political organizations, but I never received any formal application for troops. Riots cannot be anticipated. When they come action should be quick. I knew that eight companies of the National Guard in Denver, with artillery and cavalry, could be in the field two hours after any call for their services. I was satisfied to let it go at that. The good citizens of Denver seemed to be of the same mind,

for they did not urge me to any other policy.

The political difficulties in the Republican party of Illinois (p. 105) are still unsettled. After taking 58 futile ballots for candidate for governor, the convention agreed to a recess until May 31. Following is a comparison of the 47th ballot, the last ballot reported in these columns, with the 58th, the last one taken before the recess:

Candidate.	47th Ballot.	58th Ballot.
Yates .....	482	483
Lowden .....	403	392
Deneen .....	432	385
Hamlin .....	111	113
Warner .....	38	53
Pierce .....	33	29
Sherman .....	2	46
Necessary to a choice.....		752

Following the bolt of the Payne-Babcock faction in Wisconsin (p. 105) two Republican conventions were held and on the 19th two State tickets with two sets of delegates at large to the national convention were chosen. The regular convention nominated Robert M. La Follette for reelection as governor, and chose Gov. La Follette, Isaac Stephenson, State Senator James H. Stout and W. D. Connor as national delegates at large. The choice of the bolting convention was as follows: For governor, Samuel A. Cook; for national delegates at large, United States Senators Spooner and Quarles, Congressman Babcock, and Judge Baensch. Both conventions named the same presidential electors; the bolting convention accepting those named by the regulars, though only by a majority vote. Both conventions indorsed the national administration and instructed for Roosevelt. The action of the bolting convention was supported by the two United States senators from Wisconsin, not only by their acceptance as delegates at large, but by their speeches at the convention.

The Republican convention of Wyoming, which met on the 19th, nominated a State ticket. It also named national delegates at large, but did not instruct them.

Four Democratic conventions (p. 105) have been held this week. One of them was the Arizona con-

vention, which met on the 24th and instructed for Hearst. Another was that of Tennessee which met on the 25th and instructed for Parker. A third was that of Alabama, which also met on the 25th but voted down instructions for Parker and made no instructions at all. The fourth was the convention of Ohio.

The Ohio convention referred the question of unit rule to the national delegation, refused to instruct for any one, and named as delegates at large Will S. Thomas, John A. McMahon, Ed H. Moore and Charles P. Salen. Salen is Mayor Johnson's lieutenant. The Republican and the so-called "reorganizer" newspapers report the result as a victory for the "reorganizer" faction; but the names of the delegates at large, the fact that M. E. Ingalls was defeated for delegate at large, the refusal to instruct, the defeat of the "reorganizer" candidate for Secretary of State, and the adoption of an emphatic plank in the platform demanding 2-cent fares per mile on Ohio railroads (which was opposed by the "reorganizers") indicate that the "victory" was barren.

Prior to the Ohio convention, Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, was elected, along with John H. Clark, as a district delegate from the 21st Congressional district of Ohio, he having refused to allow his name to be considered in a proposition to name the four latest candidates for governor as delegates at large. Upon being chosen as a district delegate, Mayor Johnson spoke to his Congressional convention — which nominated for Congress Edmund G. Vail, the candidate of two years ago—as follows with reference to presidential nominations:

I sincerely hope that the Ohio delegation to the St. Louis convention will go uninstructed. The best results have always been obtained when the Democrats of the nation have gathered together not instructed for some particular candidate, but simply standing upon the great and eternal principles of the party. We are told that the Senate of the United States is hopelessly Republican and it would do us no good even if we should capture the lower branch of Congress and elect a President. I am not here to dispute the statement that the Senate is Republican, but I do take issue with any

statement that it would be useless for the Democrats to elect a President. A few years ago an unknown young man way out in Missouri, commenced to talk about honesty in public life. He was elected Circuit Attorney. From that moment millionaires as well as the cheapest political grafters learned that Joseph W. Folk believed what he said. Mr. Folk pursued the crooked millionaires as well as the cheap grafters and landed them in the penitentiary. The supreme court resolved itself into a jail delivery commission and set the prisoners free. The end is not yet in the chase for criminals in Missouri and to-day this fearless young Democrat is as good as nominated as candidate for governor. There are political grafters in Washington. We know that to our sorrow. Perhaps Mr. Folk could find labor for his talents as the President of the United States, aiming his giantlike blows at official rottenness at Washington. I am not attempting to forecast the action of the coming national convention, but the fearless Joe Folk should be kept in mind.

Subsequently, in an interview in explanation of this speech, Mayor Johnson is reported as saying:

I believe that the two wings of the Democratic party can unite upon this man. As the situation now stands the two factions of the party are clearly defined by the candidates themselves. Judge Parker represents the "conservative" Democracy, so-called, and W. R. Hearst, the "radical" Democracy. Now it will follow that if Judge Parker be nominated the Hearst fellows will sulk in their tents. It is unlikely that there will be any real bolt, but there will be ill-feeling and no disposition to hustle for the success of the ticket. I do not mean to apply this to Mr. Hearst, for I believe that he will personally support the Democratic nominee. On the other hand if Hearst be made the nominee we should find the same condition true of the other wing of the party. The Parker fellows will revolt, secretly if not openly. So in either event the outlook for Democratic success would be very discouraging indeed. Folk is unidentified with any faction of the party. He is a plain Democrat without any entangling alliances. I take it that he is not really objectionable to David B. Hill or Mr. Cleveland, and I feel quite sure that he meets the approbation of Mr. Bryan. More than any other man I can name at this time Joe Folk would bring peace into the party and foster its chance of success. And I don't want it to be understood that Mr. Folk is my choice. He is not that, exactly. There are men in the party who stand more nearly for the things in which I believe and whom I would rather see in the race for office. But such men, as I have said, would be antagonized by the other wing of the party were they successful in landing the nomination, and I realize that the success of the

ticket must come largely through a compromise candidate. In nominating Folk either faction would have to make its concessions, but such concessions would be for the present good of the whole party. I am not sure that Mr. Folk will regard any efforts which may be made to put him at the head of the ticket as friendly ones. I do not think that he is seeking Presidential honors. He is as good as elected governor of Missouri, and it is unlikely that he will be anxious to give up a sure thing for an uncertainty, even though the uncertainty be the Presidency of the United States. But it is also quite improbable that if the nomination were tendered him that he would refuse. No man has ever done that. The honor of being the leader of a great party is much too great to be turned aside.

In further promotion of its policy to secure direct popular expression of opinion on questions of government, like that on the traction question in Chicago (p. 55), the Referendum League of Illinois, 52 Dearborn street, Chicago, have begun the circulation of a petition for a vote next Fall throughout the State of Illinois, under the Illinois "public policy law," on three propositions. The petition reads as follows:

To the Secretary of State, Springfield, Ill.: We, the undersigned, registered voters of the State of Illinois, respectfully petition that the following questions of public policy be submitted to the voters of the State of Illinois, at the regular State election, to be held in the said State of Illinois on Tuesday next after the first Monday of November, A. D., 1904, and file this, our petition, as provided by statute:

Shall the State legislature amend the primary election law so as to provide for party primaries at which the voter will vote under the Australian ballot directly for the candidate whom he wishes nominated by his party, instead of voting for delegates to convention or caucus; the primaries, throughout the entire district affected by the offices for which nominations are to be made, to be held by all the parties conjointly at the same time and polling places. This law not to prevent the nomination of candidates by petition as now provided.

Shall the State legislature pass a law enabling the voters of any county, village or township, by majority vote, to veto any undesirable action of their respective law-making bodies (except emergency measures) whenever five per cent. of the voters petition to have such action referred to popular vote. This law to apply only to such localities as may adopt the same.