

NEWS NARRATIVE

How to use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives: Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue so until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Thursday, Oct. 19.

The Chicago traction issue.

Having submitted to the City Council a recommendation (p. 438) that it order the local transportation committee (1) to cease further consideration of the extension franchise ordinance now before it, and (2) to report to the Council at its next meeting the Dunne "contract plan," and the Council having voted down this recommendation, 45 to 18 (p. 439), Mayor Dunne presented to the Council on the 16th the following message in which he proposed a single specific test question on the issue of extending or not extending the expired and expiring franchises of the existing companies:

In view of the fact that the people of Chicago, by a majority vote of 2½ to 1, last April declared that no private company should obtain a street railway franchise from the City of Chicago, and that this vote was a logical sequence to two previous votes declaring that the City of Chicago should undertake municipal ownership of the street railways, and in further view of the fact that the local transportation committee is now negotiating with the private companies for twenty-year extension franchises, I respectfully submit to this honorable body that the said transportation committee is not acting in accordance with the vote of the electors of Chicago. I, therefore, recommend that the local transportation committee be directed by your honorable body, in accordance with such expressed will of the people, to cease forthwith all negotiations with present existing private companies except as to the purchase of their properties by the City of Chicago.

Accompanying Mayor Dunne's message was a proposed order commanding the local transportation committee in accordance with the recommendation of the message. Alderman Kohout, a municipal ownership Democrat, moved its passage. This motion was checked by a motion of Alderman Maypole, a franchise extension Democrat, that the order be referred to the committee whose action it was de-

signed to direct. Thereupon Alderman Kohout moved suspension of the rules for the purpose of passing the order. Although the vote was taken upon the motion to suspend the rules, it involved the question of franchise extension. The result, which disclosed the attitude of the Council on that question, was as follows, the vote favorable to municipal ownership being "yea," and the vote favorable to franchise extension being "nay":

Yeas—Republicans: Harding, Harris Uhlir, Beilfuss, Smith—5; Democrats: Coughlin, Kenna, Richert, McCormick (5), Fick, Hurt, Scully, Hoffman, Zimmer, Considine, Riley, Norwick, Dever, Ryan, Finn, Dougherty, Sullivan, Werno, Reinberg, Bradley, O'Connell, Kohout—22. Total, 27.

Nays—Republicans: Dixon, Pringle, Foreman, Potter, Young, Bennett, Jones, Moynihan, Sitts, McCormick (21), Reese, Schmidt (23), Schmidt (24), Hahne, Williston, Dunn, Lipps, Butler, Stewert, Raymer, Larson, Wendling, Roberts, Badenoch, Eidmann, Bihl, Hunt, Ruxton, Hunter, Race—30; Democrats: Martin, Cullerton, Maypole, Harkin, Conlon, Powers, Carey—7. Total, 37.

As the extension franchise Democrats voted no, derisive cries of "woof, woof," in imitation of a wolf's bark, came from the crowded gallery.

The Chicago Council's traction referendum.

At the same meeting of the Council the referendum substitute of Alderman Foreman, a franchise extension Republican (p. 439), amended by Aldermen Werno and Dever, municipal ownership Democrats, was adopted. Following is the text of the resolution, the Werno and Dever amendments being distinguished by enclosure in brackets:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Council that the procedure in dealing with any ordinance or ordinances for the settlement of the Chicago Street Railway question shall be as follows:

The ordinance or ordinances shall be framed up for passage and voted on in committee of the whole without final action by the City Council. Thereupon such ordinance or ordinances as shall receive a majority of votes taken by roll call in the committee of the whole shall be published and the City Council shall take steps to have the question whether it or they shall be passed by the City Council placed on the ballot to be voted on by the people. The form of the proposition or the propositions to be placed on the ballot shall be formulated by the

committee on local transportation and approved by the City Council. [Provided, only one proposition shall be submitted to the vote of the people on any one ordinance that may be recommended for passage to the City Council by the Committee on local transportation, and that the Council hereby pledges itself not to recommend the submission of any proposition or propositions other than those herein provided for.] The City Council pledges itself not to pass any ordinance or ordinances that shall not receive a majority of the votes cast by the people upon the proposition or propositions, [provided, however, that before any such ordinance is submitted to the people for their approval or disapproval it and all ordinances purporting to grant franchises proposed on or before the same time shall first be submitted to the grantees named in said ordinances, for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not said grantees will accept such ordinances if favorably acted upon by the people. The answer of said grantees to be made in writing within a certain time.]

Chicago traction litigation.

A move has been made by the Chicago traction companies to secure a decision on their 99-year claims, from the United States Supreme Court before the Illinois Supreme Court can pass upon the same claims. The case in the State court is on quo warranto proceedings (pp. 264, 345) brought by the State against the companies; the case in the United States court is on appeal from Judge Grosscup's decision (vol. vii, p. 778) in a suit by New York creditors of one of the traction companies. The reason the companies seek a Federal decision first, is because it is the established practice of the United States Supreme Court to adopt the rulings of State courts on local questions, and they fear the State court decision will not be favorable to them. Consequently they have moved to advance the hearing in the United States Supreme Court, doing so on the ground that great public interests affecting the city of Chicago are involved. Although the official representatives of the public interests of the city of Chicago opposed the motion to advance, it was granted and the Federal case was set for hearing at Washington on the 2d of January next, a date so early as to preclude the possibility of a hearing before the Supreme Court of Illinois prior to that before the United States Supreme Court.

The hearing of this action by the Federal Supreme Court may be better understood from the following report in the Chicago Record-Herald (a franchise extension paper) in its issue of October 17:

The United States Supreme Court yesterday advanced the hearing of the Chicago cases relating to traction matters, as appealed from Judge Grosscup's decree, to January 2, 1906. This early date of hearing will have an important bearing on the ninety-nine-year rights in Chicago, and may result in a decision by the Federal court of last resort, before the Spring election in Chicago, at which the ordinances proposed by the traction companies will go before the people. It may be possible also to get a decision by the Federal Supreme Court before the final hearing by the Illinois Supreme Court, which has been counted on by the city's attorneys to give a decision that would form a precedent for the Federal Supreme Court. The action of the United States Supreme Court caused much satisfaction in New York and Chicago yesterday, so far as traction officials and financiers interested in ninety-nine-year rights were concerned.

A New York dispatch published in the same paper of October 18, contributes still further to an understanding of the significance of this action by the Federal court, while indicating also the policy of the companies with reference to franchise extension:

A reorganization and consolidation of the Chicago City Railway company and the Chicago Union Traction company will take place, according to financiers interested in the companies, as soon as new franchises shall have been secured from the Chicago City Council and confirmed by a referendum vote. Since the ruling of the United States Supreme court, advancing the hearing of the traction cases to January 2, bankers identified with the controlling financial interests of the two companies have discussed frankly the plans that are under way to bring about the reorganization, which, it is said, will be accomplished within six months. The traction financiers are confident that the Federal Supreme Court will give the companies much more in the way of 99-year rights than Judge Grosscup gave them, and that a decision by the court will be given before the city election next Spring, when the voters are to pass upon the ordinances. In the event of a favorable decision, it is figured, the rights of the companies will be so apparent to the public that there will be no question about an overwhelming vote in favor of the franchises.

Officials of the City Railway company denied on the 18th the correctness of the foregoing report,

attributing it to stock-jobbing interests in New York.

The municipal campaign in Cleveland.

One more debate between Mayor Johnson and his adversary, Mr. Boyd (p. 440) has taken place in Cleveland. This came off on the 14th and is reported to have been attended by a far greater crowd than either of the other two. Apart from the debates, the excitement has intensified with the holding of ward meetings on both sides, and the calling into service of Mayor Johnson's large circus tent within which Mayor Johnson and his supporters have done much of their effective campaign speaking heretofore.

New York city Republican politics.

The substitution of Frank Moss for Charles E. Hughes as the Republican candidate for mayor of New York (p. 440) was not carried through, and on the 16th this nomination was offered to William M. Ivins. Mr. Ivins was formerly a partner in business and adviser in politics of Mayor Grace, under whom he once held a high financial office in the New York municipal government. A leader in the movement for the Australian ballot in the late '80s, which was opposed by the Democrats under the leadership of Gov. Hill, and supported by some of the stronger Republicans, Mr. Ivins gradually transferred his political allegiance to the Republican party. Upon accepting the present nomination of that party for Mayor Mr. Ivins made this statement of his position on the question of municipal ownership:

On the question of municipal ownership I wish to make clear my position. I believe that every franchise that has lapsed should at once be acquired by the city. I believe that every franchise that has been forfeited should be at once put into the way of acquisition by the most relentless pursuit of the parties who acquired that franchise unrighteously. I believe that there should be no new grants of franchises in perpetuity whatsoever. I believe that all the wealth created by our community should be held in perpetuity by the community and for the use and benefit of our community, and not for the aggrandizement of large numbers of individuals.

Nomination of Hearst for mayor of New York.

The formal nomination of Wil-

liam Randolph Hearst as the candidate for mayor of the Municipal Ownership League for mayor of New York (p. 440) was made on the 12th at Carnegie Hall. In accepting the nomination he briefly summarized the principles of the movement as follows:

Honesty and efficiency in office.

Prosperity and progress for the people of this city.

Public ownership of public utilities to the end that taxes may be reduced, the service improved, and the conditions of employes bettered.

To this Mr. Hearst added:

I am running for Mayor of this city and not for Governor or any other position. If I have any business ability I shall devote it all to the conduct of the business of the city. If I have any other qualities that may be of use they shall be placed entirely at the service of the people of this city.

Following is the platform upon which Mr. Hearst was nominated:

The platform upon which the Municipal Ownership League appeals to the public is honesty. Honesty in politics, which means government in the interest of the people that cast the votes and pay the taxes. Honesty in administration, which means expenditure of the city's revenue for the benefit of the citizens and not for the benefit of trusts or private interests. Honesty in administration of all matters affecting the welfare of the people, and especially honesty in the administration of life insurance, that most sacred of all trusts. This platform is put before the people because honesty is now lacking in practically every department in the city's affairs.

The Municipal Ownership League is absolutely and permanently committed to the advocacy of municipal ownership. Public necessities and public values created by the people should be owned by the people. We demand the immediate establishment and operation by the city of a plant for the sale and distribution of gas to all citizens. We denounce the signing of the dishonorably planned and passed Remsen Gas bill, which would have put the city permanently and hopelessly at the mercy of the Gas Trust. We demand for the people gas at half the price now charged, at a price that will make heating by gas in the humblest homes cheaper than heating with coal at the present extortionate coal prices. In the coming mayoralty term of four years the city will grant subway franchises, the value of which is so great that it can scarcely be estimated. It runs into hundreds of millions of dollars. All of this should remain the property of the people. We demand the construction of these subways by the city, and their operation by the city, as soon as the