

has yet filled the mayor's chair. He has been an outspoken advocate of municipal ownership, and his record is the best guarantee of his fidelity to his belief. He is a democratic Democrat, who has supported Bryan and who presided at a meeting held in honor of Gov. Altgeld, when such action required a high measure of political courage on the part of a Justice of the Supreme Court.

One probable result of the political situation is likely to be the final removal from public life of New York's most discredited charlatan—Jerome. His present political plight would be pitiable, were it not an example of tardy retributive justice. He made to himself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness with a faculty little short of insanity. His contempt for the public which he had twice deluded was so great, that he believed he could get away with the trick a third time; but even public gullibility has its limits, and he passes into unhonored retirement, amid the execration of his dupes. He administered a staggering blow to independence in politics, by showing that a man may advertise himself as the foe of political bosses and yet be susceptible to the same abhorrent influences which form the corner stone of their power.

JOHN J. MURPHY.

NEWS NARRATIVE

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 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 Tuesday, October 5, 1909.

The Cleveland Traction Question.

Last week's local papers of Cleveland indicate that the traction question there (p. 926) is virtually settled, with a substantial victory for Mayor Johnson. This extract from the leading editorial of the Plain Dealer for the 1st says of the pending settlement that while it "will not be wholly in accordance with Mr. Johnson's personal preferences, will not embody all he has contended for," yet that—

in yielding some points to the popular demand, in accepting terms that the majority of Clevelanders deem just and reasonable, the Mayor is none the less the victor in the long struggle. Patient in the face of the most tedious and discouraging difficulties and delays, persevering through innumerable setbacks and temporary defeats, Mayor Johnson has brought the city a sane and sensible street railway arrangement that will long be considered the best attainable. Neither his most ardent supporters nor his bitterest enemies can with justice deny him the honor of accomplishment and victory.

+

The circumstances of the pending settlement

differ but slightly from the last reported offer by Mayor Johnson to the traction company (p. 897), when the only remaining question in dispute was the maximum rate of fare to be allowed. On the 13th the company had replied to the Council's letter of the 8th (p. 898), but owing to Mayor Johnson's absence their letter was not officially received until the 27th. It offered to submit to Judge Tayler for final decision and together, the two questions (1) of valuation of the traction property and (2) of the maximum rate of fare to be allowed. At a caucus in the Mayor's office on the 29th, the supporters of the city administration decided by a divided vote to recommend acceptance of the company's proposal, the proposed franchise to go to referendum when adopted by the Council. A meeting of the committee of the whole was thereupon held and the acceptance agreed to with but one dissenting vote. The letter of the committee of the whole to the traction company, dated the 30th, accepted the company's proposal with the understanding that Judge Tayler's valuation shall be by items to the extent that the City Council or the company shall request. To this letter the company replied on the 1st, insisting that the questions of valuation and maximum rate of fare shall be arbitrated by Judge Tayler without restriction or limitation in ascertaining the value of their property, and saying that as there are some other provisions of the proposed ordinance upon which they were not agreed, they suggest that these also be submitted to Judge Tayler for arbitration. On the 2d the Council adopted its reply as follows to the foregoing letter of the company:

Replying to your letter of Oct. 1, we understand that you do not object to the itemization of the values of the property. We believe that it would be impossible for the people to vote intelligently at a referendum election upon a valuation not itemized. We have, therefore, modified the form of letter submitted to include the idea of itemization. In your letter you refer to other questions undisposed of. There are two, dealing with language only, the result to be achieved in both cases having been agreed to. One of these is language making the public safeguards as good as the grant. This is referred to Judge Tayler, Judge Lawrence, Mr. Tolles and the City Solicitor. The other is language to give the company a preference without destroying competition under the licensee provision. We suggest that this language be drafted by the same gentlemen. The Administration and the Council share the hope of the company that the completed ordinance will settle the controversy between the company and the city, and the Council and Administration have agreed to pass and present to the people at a referendum election the ordinance when completed. This is the second time that the Council has removed all obstacles to an immediate submission of a settlement by accepting conditions imposed by the company. We remain ready to proceed and trust that the company will not again delay progress by introducing new

questions. The enclosed letter has been signed by us, and when signed by you can be forwarded to Judge Tayler.

The enclosure in this letter, proposed by the Council for submission to Judge Tayler, was as follows:

The City Administration, the City Council and the Cleveland Railway Co. unite in inviting you to value the property of the Cleveland Railway Co. as of Jan. 1, 1908, except that portion acquired from the Forest City Railway Co., which is to be valued as of March 25, 1908; and also, after you have reached a conclusion as to the value of the property, to fix the maximum rate of fare to be incorporated into the ordinance.

The ordinance into which the valuation and maximum rate of fare fixed by you are to be written, is to be passed by the Council and submitted to referendum vote. To the end that an intelligent judgment may be exercised, and full information given to those entrusted by law with the final ratification of the settlement, we concur in requesting that the valuation reached by you shall be by items to the extent that either the company or the representatives of the city shall request. Representatives of the company and the city will meet your convenience as to hearings upon the valuation and rate of fare, and will present as promptly as possible all data and information in their possession.

No response from the company is reported in the latest Cleveland papers at hand; but on the 4th Judge Tayler made a voluntary statement in which he imposed as conditions of accepting the arbitration that—

there must not be anything left to debate about or agree upon. Before I am called upon to leave, for an indefinite and considerable time, my public duties as judge, the ordinance ought to be completed in every line except the questions of valuation and maximum fare. As to itemizing the valuation of the property, I cannot consent to be required to itemize upon any and every part of the property values which either of the parties may request, but I am not unwilling to value the physical property in one item, franchise value in another item, and, if an allowance is made at all for good will or going value, to separately itemize that.

Judge Tayler adds:

As to the maximum rate of fare my position is well known and the parties to these negotiations ought to understand now that my conviction is that the maximum rate of fare ought to be seven tickets for 25 cents and 1 cent for a transfer. I see no objection to making the single rate of fare 4 cents.

+

Under this settlement the Council would grant a franchise for twenty-five years, with such maximum rate of fare as Judge Tayler fixes (probably 4 cents cash with free transfers, and 7 tickets for a quarter with one cent for transfers); the initial rate of fare would be 3 cents, with 1 cent for transfers, subject to reduction or increase according to earnings, the maximum earnings to be 6 per cent

net on actual investment; and the valuation fixed by Judge Tayler to be accounted as part of such investment; the city would have complete supervisory control of operation, and the right to name a purchaser after eight years.

+

Regarding the proposed settlement Mayor Johnson was quoted in the Cleveland Press of the 30th as reserving the right to oppose certain features in the proposed ordinance if he thinks they are not for the best interests of the city, and as saying:

We have tried for weeks to settle with the traction company in our way, but we have failed. Now we have decided to give the people a chance to vote on the Tayler plan. We propose to give the people a hand in the settlement, instead of trying to fight it out in our own way. When the questions of valuation come up before Judge Tayler, I expect to go before him as an advocate, and try to make him see some things as I do. If I am overruled, the Judge's idea will prevail in the ordinance, and the people will act as the jury. It is too early to say whether or not I shall take a stand for or against the ordinance during a referendum campaign. I hope to be able to support it. If there are some things in it that I don't think are right, I shall probably point them out.

+

The value of the company's stock had risen on September 30, in anticipation of the settlement, to 80. It fell to offers of 79 on the 1st, but with no takers.

+ +

Municipal Politics in New York.

As generally expected (p. 948), Judge Gaynor of Brooklyn was nominated on the 30th by Tammany Hall (the regular Democracy) for Mayor of New York to succeed Mayor McClellan. Edward M. Shepard made the nominating speech. The platform declares for a tariff for revenue only, supports the income tax amendment, demands adequate school accommodation, and commits the candidates to municipal ownership and control of public utilities. The other candidates are Robert R. Moore for controller and John F. Galvin for president of the Board of Aldermen. Both are of Manhattan.

+ +

Free Speech in Philadelphia.

Supported by the Free Speech Committee, which does not commit itself to any particular set of opinions, but demands and undertakes to enforce the American right of free speech, Emma Goldman (p. 899) has thrown down the gauntlet to the police of Philadelphia, and they have taken it up. Her agent, Dr. Reitman, applied to Mr. Clay, the Director of Public Safety, on the 24th, to know if there would be any interference with her meeting. The Police Director decided that