

asking and the answering of the question was almost painful. A second later the mayor continued: "Where did you get the money and what were you doing so often during the holidays around the offices of the president of the Little Consolidated?" "None of your business," responded Goldsmith. Amidst the oppressive silence that followed this virtual confession, the mayor concluded:

I want to state that in what I am about to say, if it is not so, I deserve more than your contempt, and Mr. Goldsmith has right of action against me for personal damages. I charge that near the end of last July Mr. Goldsmith made a deposit in the Cleveland national bank of \$500 and that two days after the report of your low fare committee was made he made a deposit in the same bank of \$1,250. I believe myself that these deposits are in some way related to the report of the committee, although I am not attempting to cast reflections on the members of that committee. Now, gentlemen, you have my whole case.

When Mayor Johnson had finished, the central labor body hotly discussed the subject and ended with throwing out the report of their committee. They adopted as a substitute for it a resolution saying nothing of fares, but indorsing municipal ownership. Thus did Senator Hanna's effort to line up the labor vote of Cleveland in support of his expiring street car franchises come to grief.

The negotiations in Chicago between the city council and the street car interests (p. 695) have reached the stage of a deadlock. From all the circumstances it is now evident that the representatives of the street car interests have simply been trying to get an extension of franchises under agreements that would carry over to the next expiration the unsettled legal questions which they are using to force a compromise now. The 99-year act is their principal weapon. This infamous grant, purporting to extend franchises from 1865 to 1964, would probably give them sufficient standing in court to keep the question in litigation for years, and an offer to surrender all claims under that grant in consideration of an extension was consequently most favorably

received. But now they refuse to make the surrender. They ask that the question of the validity and value of the grant be postponed. This is the very trick they played 20 years ago. It is fast becoming evident that the best way, if not the only way, to fight these tricksters is to fight them; and the time may not be far off when aldermen and citizens alike, who urge a compromise, will fall under reasonable suspicion. With \$60,000,000 of watered stock of the traction companies upon the market and in the hands of "widows and orphans," worthless if the franchises are not extended but good for their face if they are extended, blind confidence in the integrity even of "our best citizens" is indicative of some kind of weakness.

The hearings before the anthracite arbitration committee were made memorable by the extraordinarily able closing speech of Clarence S. Darrow. Aided by Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Darrow had presented the case of the miners with consummate ability. All the elements of a great tragic drama, not founded on fact merely, but made up altogether of facts, were evolved from the daily lives of the coal miners of eastern Pennsylvania; and in his summing up Mr. Darrow marshaled and massed these facts so skillfully yet so simply that the drama seemed to unfold itself. It was the tragedy, rather than the speaker who described it, that for two days engrossed the attention of the commission and entranced the fortunate auditors.

Among the many striking things that Mr. Darrow said, one is especially worth remembering. It was in reply to the advice of the lawyers on the other side that trade unions ought to get themselves incorporated. We quote him:

I am not willing to admit for a single moment that anything can be gained for manhood, for righteousness, for the good of all by going into some petty legislature and asking to merge the individual flesh and blood man into a corporation created by the state.

Why, we were told in the argument that the State of New Jersey—of all the places on earth, the State of New Jersey!—had introduced a law to compel labor organizations to incorporate. New Jersey has been busy with the corporation business. New Jersey has issued its bogus charters and sent them broadcast over the United States, its charters which have been simply letters of marque and reprisal for every pirate that sails the high seas of commerce to capture what he can get, until New Jersey has become a stench and a byword in the minds of all people who believe in fair dealing and justice between man and man.

Senator Campbell, of Illinois, has won an unpleasant distinction by proposing in the State senate a peculiar bill for the nomination of judges. Had this bill become a law the judgeships of the State would have been appointive offices, and party bosses would have been invested with authority to make the appointments. For it provided that—

The central or managing committee or executive committee of any political party authorized to make nominations of, in or for any judicial district, judicial circuit, or county, may itself make any and all nominations for judge or judges of any court of record without holding any primary election or convention.

Senator Campbell heard a rumbling when the news about his bill got abroad, and he promptly moved to strike out the enacting clause. His motion was adopted. He explained, however—and his explanation was more unpleasantly significant than anything else about the whole matter—that he had offered the bill at the request of "a committee of the judges of Cook county, who claimed to represent all the judges." Would it not be fair to the people of Chicago to let them know the names of that committee of judges?

The magnificent Lincoln day banquet at Columbus, Ohio, of the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln league, was marred by the speech of ex-Gov. Budd, of California. Though the lawyer in California of William R. Hearst, proprietor of the New York, Chicago and San Francisco papers that go by his name, Mr. Budd had the bad taste to announce his client,

Mr. Hearst, as a candidate for the next Democratic nomination for President.

It is inconceivable, almost, that Mr. Hearst should have authorized such an impertinence. Doubtless he would like to be President, or even a presidential candidate, as who would not; but unless he is without all sense of the eternal fitness of things Mr. Hearst must know that no one who leads the life that he notoriously does, can go before the people of this country as a presidential candidate without meeting overwhelming defeat and bringing humiliation and shame upon his party.

Even if that insuperable objection to so much as the mere consideration of Mr. Hearst as a candidate did not exist, his journalistic record in politics would be a bar to his nomination. Thousands of Democratic voters all over the country will not easily forget how, after his New York paper had "boomed" Henry George for first mayor of Greater New York, he suddenly turned it about face and supported Tammany hall with the evident purpose of swinging the George vote over into the Tammany lines. This action so closely resembled treachery to a principle and a candidate that Willis J. Abbot and Arthur McEwen resigned from the staff of the paper, and all George's supporters who knew the facts put Hearst's name upon a black list from which it cannot be without good reason erased.

That act, however, might be pleaded as proof of fidelity to party organization. But not so with Hearst's political performance in the California election last Fall. He used his San Francisco paper then to defeat Franklin K. Lane before the Democratic convention. To this there is no objection except that he opposed Lane for no other reason than that Lane could not be bossed either by Hearst or by the Pacific railroad interests with which

Hearst's paper in California is in collusion. But after Lane had been nominated by the convention, defeating Hearst's candidate overwhelmingly, Hearst's paper joined hands with the Republicans and the railroad ring to defeat him at the polls. That is one of the unforgivable things in party politics. They succeeded, but the vote showed that the man whom they thus conspired against possessed the confidence of the community. He carried San Francisco, where he had served as city solicitor and was well known, by 9,600—an extraordinary result. He carried the Republican city of Sacramento by 2,300. And though he lost in the State, it was by only 2,500. The rest of the ticket, supported by Hearst's paper, was defeated by majorities ranging from 20,000 to 65,000. After the election Mr. Hearst still pursued Lane, endeavoring even to deprive him of the complimentary vote of his party in the legislature for United States Senator. Here again Hearst was disappointed. Lane received the vote of nearly every Democratic member of the two Houses. While it is almost inconceivable that Mr. Hearst should hope to get even a complimentary vote from even one State in the Democratic national convention, the fact that he has thus opposed one of the best and strongest men of the party in California, does raise a fair suspicion that ex-Gov. Budd's impertinence in nominating his client at the Jefferson-Jackson-Lincoln banquet may have been committed under orders from Hearst himself.

It is not pleasant to write in this way of a man whose newspapers have published much that is good, even if along with a great deal that is bad. But if Mr. Hearst is simply grinding an axe of his own, it is better that the radicals of the country should know it, and the amazing act of his lawyer at Columbus calls for plain speaking. It is not so very difficult for a rich and selfish man owning newspapers, to hire good and honest editorial writers, and, while giving them full freedom to write in harmony with

their convictions, be ready at a moment's notice to utilize the popularity which they secure for him, to serve his own personal and indefensible ends. It may be that Mr. Hearst is not that kind of man. But evidence to the contrary accumulates.

The appointment by the Michigan governor of Thomas J. Navin as a member of the prison board of the State, may not commend itself to those righteous people who abhor criminals only after they have got into the penitentiary, but religiously despise them then and thenceforth. For Mr. Navin, once mayor of Adrian, has served a five-years' term in the Michigan State prison for forgery. But what better selection could be made for membership upon a prison board than a man of good character who has endured the prison life? Gov. Bliss is to be heartily commended for this appointment; provided, of course, that it has been made in good faith, and not to reward a copartisan regardless of his character.

THE ISSUE AT WATERBURY.

The facts are generally known: eighty strikers; twelve hundred militiamen called out. Why the need of so much force? Because eight thousand union men in the town, as is commonly reported, were joined with the strikers to prevent non-union men from taking their places. It is further said that thirty thousand people, out of a population of thirty-five thousand, were in sympathy with the strikers. Now it may well be that some of this sympathy "has been due to intimidation, or selfish and cowardly interest, as has been alleged; but no one denies that a large part of the people, in spite of the inconvenience to which they have been subjected, have been in sympathy with the strikers and with the attempt to prevent non-union men from stepping into the strikers' jobs.

We should like to ask the New York Commercial Advertiser to state what it thinks may be the cause of this queer state of affairs. Let us see again clearly what the queer state