

cents, the present maximum, during the life of the compromise agreement.

* *

The Cleveland Traction Question.

At the second meeting of the committee of the whole of the Cleveland city government (p. 776), held on the 10th, President Andrews of the traction company submitted a statement specifying the amendments to the Baker ordinance required by the company. There were 60 in all. Answering questions from Mayor Johnson he said that the company could not be bound by "the gentlemen's agreement." He also rejected the clause in the Baker ordinance providing that if any safeguard for the city were invalidated by the courts the proposed franchise should be wholly invalid. He agreed to accept Judge Tayler as sole arbitrator in fixing the values of the present traction property. This was at the afternoon meeting.

*

At the evening meeting of the same day the committee of the whole refused to concede 36 of the 60 changes proposed by the company, but agreed to the other 24. Both sides tentatively agreed to urge Judge Tayler to act as arbitrator on valuation. The Council (four Republican members dissenting) adopted a statement explaining its position as to the proposed changes, centering upon the points of valuation, rate of fare, suburban contracts, passes for employes, time of purchase of the franchise by a third party, character of arbitration, value of pavements at the end of the grant, and provisions against allowing the franchise to continue if safeguards in behalf of the city are invalidated.

*

On the question of valuation of present property the council insists that it shall be made before referendum on the franchise, and suggests that it be made before the passage of the ordinance. by immediate arbitration by Judge Tayler and that after the determination of value the rate of fare be fixed. Upon the question of protection of Forest City stockholders the council remits the question to negotiation between The Cleveland Railway Co., The Forest City and The Municipal Traction Co., and expresses its willingness to sanction any agreement reached by the companies. On the subject of the city's safeguards the council "insists that the rights reserved to the city shall be as valid as the rights granted to the company, and suggests that while some of the provisions enumerated in the Baker ordinance may be eliminated until some other mode is suggested of making the city as safe as the company, the council will adhere to the general idea involved in the Baker ordinance, whereby invalidity of one of the fundamental reserved rights shall make the

entire ordinance invalid." The council refused to withdraw its demand that the city may nominate a purchaser at the end of four years, as proposed by the Baker ordinance, instead of 10 as proposed by the Tayler ordinance.

*

At an adjourned meeting on the 11th the company replied to the foregoing statement with a statement amounting to a refusal to make any concessions on the 36 points out of the company's 60 on which the council had taken issue.

*

Another meeting, held on the 13th, gave indications of a better outlook. At that meeting adjustments were tentatively agreed to which left only 9 principal points out of the 60 to settle. Seven are as follows: The legal safeguards; suburban contracts; the East Cleveland contention; the license provision; passes for employes; limitations upon the selection of arbitrators; the value of pavements at the end of the grant. After the determination of these questions, the remaining two, namely, valuation and rate of fare, will probably be determined, valuation by immediate arbitration, and rate of fare by agreement after the determination of the value.

* *

A Newspaper Boycott.

From mail advices it appears that a great deal of popular indignation has been aroused in Los Angeles by the refusal of the local daily newspapers to advertise or report lectures by Frederick W. Peabody, of Boston, in opposition to Christian Science. According to our advices of the 11th—

All of the daily press positively refused to print advertisements or news of the lectures, except that the Times published a report of the last one. At one of the lectures the facts were presented to the audience and resulted in a storm of indignation. The meeting resolved itself into one of protest. Ministers, doctors and even newspapermen present forcibly denounced the attitude of the press. Condemnatory resolutions were adopted by a unanimous rising vote and sent to all the papers of the city, but they were buried with the rest of the communications. Many persons sympathetically inclined toward Christian Science entered protests, declaring that its truths cannot be harmed by fair discussion.

There appears to have been no other reason for suppressing advertisements and news reports than a fear of the papers that it would lose them the patronage of Christian Scientists.

NEWS NOTES

—The bill for a constitution for a federation of the South African colonies (p. 637) passed its sec-