tected by a speedy settlement of the present Chicago City Railway strike.

That His Honor the Mayor use his best endeavors, either in union with influential citizens or with members of this Council, to secure a submission to arbitration of the questions at issue between the Chicago City Railway Company and its striking employes.

That the Mayor is hereby requested to prepare a statement or proclamation setting forth the facts with reference to the amounts of money paid or to be paid by the City of Chicago for claims for destruction of property during strikes or riots in the past years and that the Chicago newspapers be requested to publish the same, with the opinion of the Corporation Counsel as provided for in the Johnson resolution.

Pursuant to the authority conferred by these resolutions Mayor Harrison has appointed a mediation committee of eight aldermen, as follows: Palmer, Finn, Jackson, Maypole, Eidmann, Scully, Bradley and Ruxton. The company was invited by the Mayor on the 17th to send representatives to meet this committee at his office. A meeting was accordingly held, and others have followed it; but no result is yet reported.

Greater impetus has been given by the street car strike to the movement in Chicago for immediate municipal ownership (p. 486) of the street car system. The chairman of the sub-committee on franchises of the transportation committee of the city council, Alderman Bennett, having announced that the sub-committee would report the "tentative" Chicago city railway ordinance (p. 486) to the full committee at the city hall on the 14th, and that all civic organizations would be invited to participate in a public discussion of its provisions, the Chicago Federation of Labor issued the following call:

In compliance with the request duly made by delegates to the Chicago Federation of Labor, there will be a special meeting of the Federation in the corridors of the council chamber of the Chicago city hall at two p. m., Saturday, November 14, for the purpose of conveying to the local transportation committee of the Chicago city council the repeatedly expressed demands of Chicago organized labor that no street railway franchise whatever shall be either granted or renewed by the Chicago city council; that the local transportation committee shall therefore confine its efforts to the devising of means for the bringing about of immediate municipal ownership and operation; and that, in the meantime, the street railway cars shall be operated under revocable license only. The legislative committee of the Federation will be on the floor to take special charge of the presenting of the above views and demands.

This call was responded to by a large number of people, but no public meeting of the transportation committee was held. The report of the sub-committee was made informally and an adjournment was taken without discussion. Arrangements have since been made by the committee for subjecting the proposed ordinance to public discussion during the coming two weeks. At the meeting of the council on the 16th a resolution of the Chicago Federation of Labor urging the council committee on local transportation to advertise at once for bidders to operate the lines of the Chicago City Railway company, a resolution that no franchise be granted which does not provide for a lower fare between 5 and 7 o'clock morning and evening and for a reduction of fare by tickets, and an ordinance for licensing each street car, were referred to the committee on local transportation.

While the Chicago Street Railway company is thus seeking an extension of franchise and struggling with a labor strike, the Union Traction company, controlling the northern and western lines, is planning for legal advantages under the 99-year franchise (p. 468), under which both the Chicago City Railway and the Union Traction companies claim extraordinary privileges not expiring until 1958. The Union Traction company is in the hands of receivers appointed by Judge Grosscup of the Federal court. The city having refused permits to the company to do work on the streets (p. 248), Judge Grosscup granted an injunction restraining it from interfering with the company, and the hearing on that injunction is set for the 30th. This raises the question of the validity and effect of the 99-year franchise, for the shorter franchise expired July 30th. Further in assertion of their claims under the 99-year franchise, Judge Grosscup's receivers applied to the commissioner of public works, as for a right, for permits to equip some of their lines with electric power, thus challenging the contention of the city that even if the 99-year franchise is valid it authorizes the use of horse power only. Their application was referred to Corporation Counsel Tolman for an opinion, and on the 16th he transmitted his opinion to the city council. Mr. Tolman holds that the 99-year act did not extend the companies' franchises in the city streets, but at most only extended the life of the companies, and that consequently the application of the receivers cannot be granted except as a favor from the city council. The commissioner of public works accordingly notified Judge Grosscup's receivers on the 17th that he could not grant their application. Following this refusal the receivers asked that the permits be granted pending a legal determination of the legal questions involved, the proposed new construction and equipment to come down if the courts decide against the receivers and their claims under the 99-year act. The corporation counsel repeated, in answer, his previous suggestion that the receivers go to the city council with the matter.

In Cleveland the traction reform which Mayor Johnson has been promoting in the face of many injunctions for nearly three years has been confronted with another injunction. The question there has taken the form of a franchise for a road to be operated for a 3-cent fare, the city having no legislative authority to adopt municipal ownership. When last we reported the progress of this low fare movement (p. 393) Mayor Johnson spoke of the possibility of further injunctions. None were applied for, however, while the election was pending. But within a fortnight afterward the threatened injunction came. More than half of the 3-cent fare road had been completed, and work was still going on, when it was stopped on the 12th of November by a restraining order from Judge Dissette, granted in the suit of a resident of Denison avenue. Hearing was set for the 16th. On that day the parties arranged to postpone the hearing to the 30th. an injunction to issue meanwhile, but with the reservation that 2,000

more feet of track might be laid in the interval. The company's answer in this law suit shows that the company has expended $30,000 on the Denison avenue 3-cent fare line, and is under a bond of $25,000 for completing it; that 7,240 feet of double track has been laid, and 2,000 more of single track; and that 3,700 linear feet of pavement has been laid to a width of sixteen feet.

A further step in the process of transforming Panama into an independent nation (p. 501) has been taken. On the 13th President Roosevelt formally received Philippe Bunau-Varilla as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary from Panama to the United States. Bunau-Varilla was likewise received by the French ambassador at Washington on the 17th. On the same day two special commissioners from Panama—Dr. Manuel E. Amador and Frederico Boyd—arrived at New York. J. Pierpont Morgan & Co. have been appointed fiscal agents in the United States for the Republic of Panama.

—

The Colombian government has addressed the following protest to the United States Senate:

The government and people of Colombia have been painfully surprised at the notification by the minister of the United States that the government at Washington had hastened to recognize the government consequent upon a barracks coup in the department of Panama. The bonds of sincere and uninterrupted friendship which unite the two governments and the two peoples; the solemn obligation undertaken by the American Union in a public treaty to guarantee the sovereignty and property of Colombia in the Isthmus of Panama; the protection which the citizens of that country enjoy and will continue to enjoy among us; the traditional principles of the American government in opposition to secession movements; the good faith which has characterized that great people in its international relations; the manner in which the revolution was brought about and the precipitancy of its recognition, make the government and people of Colombia hope that the senate of the United States will admit its obligation to assist us in maintaining the integrity of our territory and in repressing that insurrection which is not even the result of a popular feeling. In thus demanding justice, Colombia appeals to the dignity and honor of the American Senate and people. It is to be hoped the petition for justice which Colombia makes to the American people will be favorably received by a sound public opinion among the sons of that country.

—

On the 16th an address upon the same subject was cabled by the Colombian government to Great Britain. As cabled back to this country from London on the same day, the gist of this address is as follows:

"The main responsibility for the secession of Panama lies on the United States government, in the first place by fomenting the separatist spirit of which there seems to be clear evidence, then again by hastily acknowledging the independence of the revolted province, and finally by preventing the Colombian government from using proper means to repress the rebellion." The address goes on to say that President Marroquin has energetically protested to the United States and wishes that his protest should be known throughout the civilized world. Colombia contends that the United States has infringed article 35 of the treaty of 1846, which it is asserted implies the duty on the part of the United States to help Colombia in maintaining her sovereignty over the Isthmus, and adds that the "Colombian government repudiate the assumption that they have barred the way to carrying out the canal." It is asserted that since 1835 Colombia has granted canal privileges to different people no less than nine times. After giving the previously stated reasons for the Colombian senate's failure to approve the Hay-Herran treaty, and asserting that the delay in the negotiations had not affected the ultimate issue of the canal project, the protest concluded: "The hastiness in recognizing the new government is under these circumstances all the more surprising to the Colombian government, as they recollect the energetic opposition of Washington to the acknowledgment of the belligerency of the Confederates by the Powers during the civil war."

—

This diplomatic action of Colombia appears to have been preliminary to action more energetic. At any rate it now transpires that the Colombian government had already communicated with the American minister at Bogota in hostile terms. Following is the tenor of this notice:

By the recognition of Panama and the warning that the United States will not allow Colombia to put down the rebellion, the heretofore friendly relations between the two governments have arrived at such a critical state that it is absolutely impossible to continue diplomatic relations unless the Washington government immediately gives notice that it has no intention of preventing Colombia retaking the Isthmus or of extending recognition to the belligerents. A prompt reply is awaited from Washington, as the Colombian army is ready to march on Panama at once.

—

But the Washington government treats this warning lightly, regarding the threat of war as (we quote from Walter Wellman) "almost too fantastical to be deemed worthy of serious consideration by the Administration or its naval or military advisers." No delay has intervened, therefore, with reference to the acquisition of canal privileges. A treaty in that regard was signed on the 18th at 6 o'clock in the evening, at Secretary Hay's house in Washington, by Mr. Hay and the Panama minister, Bunau-Varilla. As Panama had no seal, Mr. Hay improvised one for Mr. Bunau-Varilla's use. This treaty—

grants to the American government a lease in perpetuity of a canal zone ten miles in width, over which the United States is to exercise complete control for all purposes, save that within the cities of Panama and Colon the authority of the United States is limited to the necessary operations of the canal construction and maintenance. Within these cities the Panama police are to maintain order, and local courts are to administer justice, but if at any time the United States deems the administration of the police and the judiciary unsatisfactory it may enter with its own authority, preserve order and try offenders against the peace. Within and near the canal zone the United States is empowered to exercise the right of eminent domain, through judicial process, for the necessary works of the canal, and for sanitation, drainage, water supply and so on.

Four islands lying in or near the Bay of Panama are included in the canal zone and leased in perpetuity to the United States. In addition the Republic of Panama grants the United States the right to take possession of other islands lying within the jurisdictional waters of the Republic. Panama transfers to the United States all its rights in the Panama railroad and authorizes the new Panama Canal company to sell to the United States all its shares in that corporation, amounting to more than 79,000 shares out of a total of 80,000 issued. The United States stipulates to pay the Republic of Panama the sum of $10,000,000 in gold on ratification of the treaty and an annuity of $250,000 a year after the expiration of nine years.