

nounced that it would arbitrate all questions but seniority, and sent the following report to the State Board of Arbitration:

To the State board of Arbitration: By a vote of 129 for and 1,076 against, the motormen and conductors now employed by The Municipal declined to submit their rights to seniority position to arbitration. This question, therefore, cannot be arbitrated. The men now at work will maintain their seniority. The company is willing to take back as many of the striking employes as possible. It prefers experienced men to new ones. Motormen and conductors reporting for duty before 6 p. m., Tuesday, May 26, will receive the same rate of pay as if they had not left the company's service. No men guilty of violence during the strike will be either employed or continued in employment.

The Plain Dealer of the 26th states editorially that "the company, in the face of grave difficulties, has restored service to practically its former standard."

* *

The Traction Question in New York.

Governor Hughes has vetoed the Robinson rapid transit bill (p. 149), the salient feature of which, as the Governor describes it in his veto memorandum of the 24th, "is the provision for the sale of the privilege or franchise to construct, maintain and operate rapid transit railways in the city of New York, with the reservation to the city of the right to purchase and take the privilege or franchise and the plant and property of the grantee at the expiration of a fixed period, which is not to exceed fifty years." In giving his reasons for the veto, Governor Hughes says:

These railways, except in the case of certain extensions of existing lines, cannot now be constructed, save by the use of public moneys. The purpose of the bill is to authorize construction also by private capital and thus to provide additional transportation facilities, which are greatly needed. I am convinced, after careful consideration of the matter, that the plan proposed by this bill is illusory and injurious. This bill, in its main features, means that to have additional rapid transit in New York we should give fifty year grants. I do not believe in that policy. The city should not lose its control over its highways for rapid transit purposes for such a period. Anyone who reflects upon what the city was fifty years ago and upon what it is likely to become in the course of the next fifty years must realize this. . . . Proper control over the highways and public improvements of the city must be reserved and we must not allow temporary exigencies to force grants contrary to sound judgment and wise policy. The present bill, with what amounts, as I read it, to a practical provision for fifty year franchises, is thoroughly objectionable. There are some other features of the bill which have been criticised, but I do not think it necessary to discuss them as I cannot in any event approve it.

+

A hearing on the question had taken place on

the 15th, at which it was noted that almost without exception the speakers who urged Governor Hughes to approve the measure, avowedly represented private interests in vacant land. The principal argument in favor of the bill was made by Allan Robinson, president of the Allied Real Estate interests. The Manhattan Single Tax Club, in opposition, was represented by Frederic C. Leubuscher and J. P. Kohler. Other speakers in opposition were Ex-Sheriff Flaherty for the Central Federated Union, of Brooklyn; Thomas Ryan, for the Brotherhood of Carpenters, and Charles Sprague Smith, for the People's Institute. Mr. Smith presented an argument by Calvin Tomkins, president of the Reform Club, and another by William M. Ivins, the Republican candidate for Mayor three years ago.

+

In a review of the situation, Frederic C. Leubuscher, President of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, who appeared before the Governor in opposition to the bill, writes that the Governor has refrained "from mentioning the principal objections to the bill, namely, that it was opposed to the letter and to the spirit of the referendum vote of 1894." Mr. Leubuscher adds that the Governor "wishes to leave the way clear for future legislation providing for the employment of private capital with the objectionable features of the Robinson bill eliminated." Continuing, Mr. Leubuscher says:

Without wishing to derogate from the effects of the good work of others, I contend that were it not for the agitation set on foot by the Manhattan Single Tax Club, there would probably have been little or no opposition to the passage of the bill. On July 1, 1907, the very day the Public Service Commission came into being, the Manhattan Single Tax Club held a mass meeting at Cooper Union (vol. x, pp. 301, 344) in order to stiffen the backbones of the commissioners to uphold the referendum of 1894 and make no concessions whatsoever to the Interests. Following this, the Club was represented at a number of hearings before the Commission. In January, immediately after the Governor sent his annual message to the legislature, in which he gave credence to the "debt limit" cry, and hinted at the employment of private capital, the Club sent a protest to him. The following month the Public Service Commission gave a hearing on the propositions to allow the use of private capital and to extend the leasing term with an indeterminate franchise. Arguments were heard pro and con and the radical utterances of the representative of the Manhattan Single Tax Club were the most heartily applauded. Although this meeting was held on a Friday afternoon and lasted about five hours, all of the speeches being reported stenographically with the ostensible intention of having a full report made for the deliberate consideration of the Commissioners, the following morning the Commission sent a printed report of its recommendations to the legislature, thus showing that its action had been predetermined and that the

hearing was a mere farce. Those recommendations favored the employment of private capital with an indeterminate franchise, upon which the Robinson bill was based. We considered this so outrageous that we called another mass meeting in Cooper Union (vol. x, p. 1042) to denounce the action of the Commission. After this there were a number of mass meetings called by the People's Institute and by citizens' organizations in favor of the bill; but we attended the meetings and they indorsed our position. At the meeting of the People's Institute held the night before the day appointed for the Mayor's hearing, the vote was about 1,500 to 6 against the Robinson bill. Before the Mayor, owing to a confusion as to the hour of hearing, I was the only one heard in opposition. As was expected from his previous actions in similar matters and from his friendship for the Interests, Mayor McClellan approved the bill. It was then "up to" the Governor. Until the Mayor's hearing not a single organization or person, other than the Manhattan Single Tax Club and its representatives, had, so far as I can find out, opposed this steal of the people's rights. Immediately after the Mayor's hearing, I called on William M. Ivins, and urged him to join in the opposition, with the result that he wrote an unanswerable argument against the proposed law. About the same time Calvin Tomkins wrote a strong brief. At the hearing before Governor Hughes the argument of the Manhattan Single Tax Club was seconded by Charles Sprague Smith. In giving credit for this fight against the Interests, L. S. Bedford, an old-time single taxer, must not be overlooked. For more than ten years he has been fighting the traction trust, and while his methods have not always commended themselves to his associates, he has been the most persistent foe of franchise grabbers. It was he who induced the Manhattan Single Tax Club to start the war and to keep it up. Through Edward Polak he aroused the Bronx, and through the Central Federated Union of Brooklyn he aroused that Borough. He attended a number of rapid transit meetings, going so far in his opposition in some of them as to lead to his being put out by the managers of the meetings and once even to his being arrested. But he carried his point every time. He is a poor man, earning his daily bread by typesetting; and the time he devoted to the fight made serious inroads upon his income.

+

Writing on this subject, with reference to ex-Congressman Baker's letter in *Editorial Correspondence of the 8th* (p. 130), Mr. Charles Sprague Smith, managing director of The People's Institute, which holds its public meetings regularly in Cooper Union, explains that neither of the two Cooper Union meetings mentioned in Mr. Baker's letter were held for the purpose of endorsing the rapid transit bills to which Mr. Baker objects. Of these two meetings Mr. Smith writes:

The first was planned by the legislative committee of The People's Institute purely in order to instruct the audience as to the rapid transit situation and the bills pending. A resolution introduced at the close of the meeting by one of the speakers was

made entirely on his own motion. It was not, as interpreted by those who denounced it, a resolution in favor of the bills, but in opposition to them unless amended in important particulars. Whatever its character it was not an Institute motion but a personal one. The second meeting, two weeks later, was held for the distinct purpose of discussing the transit bills which had in the interim reached their final form, passed the legislature, and were to come before the Mayor and the Governor. As representative of the Institute, I invited Mr. Fred C. Leubuscher, president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, and Mr. John Martin of the Reform Club, to represent the opposition to the bills, and Mr. Allan Robinson, representative of the United Real Estate Interests and Mr. J. Aspirwall Hodge, to defend them; Mr. Julius Henry Cohen being asked to give, subject to corrections made by any person on the platform, an impartial statement as to the whole rapid transit situation, the law as it stood originally, as modified by the new legislation. The confusion and disorder that occurred at both meetings, notably at the last, were occasioned, in the first place, by the denunciation in print and from the floor made by one individual; on the second occasion, by lack of self-control manifested not merely by this individual, but also by others. It would seem a sufficient reply to the verbal and written denunciations of these persons to point out that Mr. Ivins, who was the first object of attack and proclaimed to be "a tool of the traction thieves," has presented to the Governor an exhaustive brief attacking these bills, which brief will have furnished the convincing argument against them in case they are rejected. As to the Institute itself, its managing director had charge of the opposition at the hearing, and on the Institute's behalf there was presented first the brief of Mr. William M. Ivins, second the argument of Mr. Calvin Tomkins, who spoke not merely in behalf of the Reform Club but also the Institute, and third, a brief statement by the managing director.

+

From ex-Congressman Baker we have the following comments upon the veto:

That continued agitation sometimes brings results is again shown in the action of Governor Hughes on the Robinson bill to permit the construction of subways by private capital. In the face of what seemed insurmountable obstacles, unceasing agitation to arouse the needed opposition to the bill has had its legitimate effect. The veto gives us a year's respite. But it does even more. Those who would turn much needed and loudly demanded subways over to private exploitation, must now change their tactics. Their chief cry has been, "As the city is without the funds, let us build by private capital;" and the real estate interests, anxious to reap the unearned increment of added land values, helped in the demand. But this avenue being closed for at least another year, we may now expect real estate boomers to change their tune and insist that "the most urgent need is more subways, and other and less pressing public improvements must wait; that the funds available on July 1st must be kept for subways, as their building will increase the real estate

assessment to be paid for out of the increased borrowing capacity." Our success in defeating the Robinson bill should give a new stimulus to intelligently directed agitation on matters of immediate public interest where vital democratic principles are involved.

* *

The Lake Mohonk Conference Sees Blood.

The 14th of the conferences held annually at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., to consider international arbitration and other humanitarian subjects, held its sessions last week, closing on the 22nd. Speaking on the 21st, General Horatio C. King, of Brooklyn, said that, if only because of internal conditions, it would be utterly impossible to disarm or reduce the army or navy of the United States today. At the closing session on the 22nd Rear Admiral French E. Chadwick startled his audience by asserting that "There is no use in crying 'Peace' when there is no peace. The world moves from plane to plane chiefly by convulsions. We are now rapidly approaching another convulsive period. There is certain before long to be a new readjustment. Shall this be bloody or peaceful? The army and navy are the great arms of conservatism. When you can arrange revolutions by academic discussion, you may perhaps do without them, but as yet I can see no signs of such an outcome." And Baron Kogoro Takahira, Japanese Ambassador to the United States, declared that a careful study of international disputes shows that they arise almost as much, if not more, from the internal conditions of the country affected as they do from the conflict of outside interests.

* *

Liberia Appeals to the United States.

Liberia, the little state created on the southwest corner of equatorial Africa by Negroes who had been released from slavery in America, is suffering from inability to cope with the growing spheres of influence exerted in its neighborhood and over its borders by England and France. A series of boundary disputes with both of them has been settled by yielding in every case to the strong nations. Worse yet, the difficulty of maintaining order among the native tribes of the country is coupled with responsibility for the disorder as it reaches out of bounds, and now England has delivered an ultimatum to the effect that Liberia must either maintain better government or submit to intervention. A Liberian delegation is now in this country, bearing an appeal to the United States to give advice, and, if possible, still more substantial aid to the black Republic in its distress.

* *

Woman Suffrage in the English Liberal Program.

To a delegation of radical members of the House of Commons, the new Prime Minister, Mr.

Asquith (p. 157), declared on the 20th, that the government intended, before the close of the present Parliament, to introduce a comprehensive measure of electoral reform. He said he was not himself an advocate of woman suffrage, not having yet been convinced of its desirability, but he had an open mind on the subject, and if an amendment was introduced to the projected reform bill favoring woman suffrage on democratic lines, the government would not oppose it. He said also that he recognized that the woman's suffrage movement had gained a great impetus of late years, but no change of the kind proposed could be carried through with effect unless it had the women of the country as well as the electors behind it. A later dispatch, to the Chicago Tribune, asserts that—

A definite deal has been made between the Liberal leaders and the moderate suffragists whereby the government will endeavor to make votes for women the principal issue of the next general election. This move, which is intensely repugnant to Premier Asquith personally, has been forced on him by the political exigencies of the situation. The by-elections demonstrated pretty clearly that the Liberals cannot hope to carry the country on the free trade issue alone or even principally. The suffragist movement has gained such strength among the Liberal masses that the radical party is doomed to defeat unless it can gain the co-operation of the women who, even without votes, are a greater political force in England than in any country of the world. The reform bill which the government will introduce at the close of the session will be designed solely for electioneering purposes. There is not the slightest doubt that a sweeping woman suffrage provision will be inserted by a big majority. The attitude of the Unionists on the question is not yet defined. There are many woman suffragists in that party. Also they may seek to embarrass the government by proposing to grant suffrage to single women and those in possession of property qualifications in their own right. The effect of this undoubtedly would be to increase the strength of the Unionists among the new electorate. It was in anticipation of this that Asquith insisted that suffrage for women, if granted, must be along democratic lines. One thing now certain is that the great question of universal adult suffrage for both sexes will be brought to an issue in this country in the near future.

* *

The by-election to Parliament (p. 158) in the Sterling district in Scotland, to replace the membership of the late Premier, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (p. 109), resulted in the election of Sir Henry's secretary, Arthur Ponsonby, by the greatly increased majority of 1,361.

* *

Teacher: "Wait a moment, Johnny. What do you understand by that word 'deficit'?"

"It's what you've got when you haven't got as much as if you just hadn't nothin'."—The Methodist Recorder.