

transportation committee do cease the further consideration of the ordinance submitted to said committee by the Chicago City Railway company, and the ordinance submitted, or about to be submitted, to the said committee by the Chicago Union Traction company, extending the franchises of these companies, and that it report to this Council at its next meeting the ordinance submitted by the Mayor and attached to his message of July 5, 1905, commonly known as the "contract plan."

A motion to refer this order to the transportation committee itself, was ruled out of order by the Mayor on the ground that "it would be manifestly inconsistent and contradictory to refer this to the committee at which it is directed." His ruling was reversed on appeal by a vote of 41 to 22. A motion by Alderman Werno followed to suspend the rules and adopt the order, and this was defeated by 45 yeas to 18 yeas as follows:

Nays—Republicans: Dixon, Pringle, Foreman, Young, Bennett, Jones, Moynihan, Smith, McCormick, Reese, Potter, Schmidt (23), Schmidt (24), Hahne, Williston, Dunn, Lipps, Butler, Stewart, Raymer, Larson, Wendling, Burns, Roberts, Badenoch, Eldmann, Hunt, Ruxton, Hunter, Race—30; (Harri-son) **Democrats:** Coughlin, Dalley, McCormick, Martin, Hurt, Scully, Cul-ler-ton, Maypole, Harkin, Conlon, Ryan, Powers, Dougherty, Sullivan, Carey—15. Total, 45.

Yeas—Republicans: Harding, Bell-fuss, Slits, Uhlir—4; **Democrats:** Rich-ert, Fick, Hoffman, Zimmer, Considine, Riley, Nowicki, Dever, Finn, Werno, Reinberg, Bradley, O'Connell, Kohout—14. Total 18.

After the Council meeting Mayor Dunne said of this vote:

It simply indicates that the majori-ty of the aldermen do not favor the contract plan. I hardly think there is any possibility of a change in their at-titude, but I intend to have another message for the Council next Monday night, and I shall put the matter to them in such a way that they will have to place themselves on record. I can-not say what that message will be, nor upon what lines; but I shall place the matter so that they will have to meet the question squarely and honestly.

No action on the referendum propositions (p. 426) was taken by the Council at this meeting, but two substitutes were proposed, one by Alderman Foreman and the other by Alderman Kohout. The Foreman substitute is as fol-lows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this

Council that the procedure in dealing with any ordinance or ordinances for the settlement of the Chicago street railway question shall be as follows: The ordinance or ordinances shall be framed up for passage and voted on in committee of the whole without final action by the City Council. Thereupon such ordinance or ordinances as shall receive a majority of votes taken by roll call in the committee of the whole shall be published and the City Council shall take steps to have the ques-tion whether it or they shall be passed by the City Council placed on the bal-lot to be voted on by the people. The form of the proposition or propositions to be placed on the ballot shall be for-mulated by the committee on local transportation and approved by the City Council. The City Council pledges itself not to pass any ordinance or or-dinances that shall not receive a ma-jority of the votes cast by the people upon the proposition or propositions.

Following is the Kohout substi-tute:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Council that in case any ordinance or ordinances granting a franchise to any street car company should be intro-duced in this Council the mode of pro-cedure by this Council shall be as fol-lows: The proposed ordinance shall be considered by the Council in com-mittee of the whole; the proposed or-dinance shall then be submitted to the people at the next city election, and no report of the committee of the whole shall be made to the Council or final action be taken by the Council on said ordinance until after the people of Chi-cago have voted on the same as sub-mitted to them and it is approved by a majority of all persons voting on the question.

Progress of the referendum idea.

The proposed referendums not-ed above, especially that of Alder-man Foreman, for he has hereto-fore opposed the referendum idea, are indicative of its growing pop-ularity. These instances are in harmony with what is known as the "Winnetka plan" (vol. iv, pp. 340, 342); and so is the recent ac-tion of the Central Labor Union of Lancaster, Pa., which has instructed its legislative committee to push the adoption by the local City Councils of a joint resolution that has been introduced proposing that before the final passage of any ordinance it shall lie on the ta-ble for 30 days and if within that period 5 per cent of the voters pe-tition that a referendum vote be taken, the ordinance shall be vot-ed upon by the whole body of vot-ers and shall not become law un-

less a majority of the voters favor it. The joint resolution also pro-vides for the advisory initiative, namely: "Every petition to the City Council proposing an instruc-tion to a public official, and signed by at least five per cent of the registered voters of the city, shall be received and referred to com-mittee, testimony shall be taken and the measure reported back, together with such amendments, substitute, or recommendation as is thought best; and a yeas and nays vote taken, after which the meas-ure as originally introduced, to-gether with the amended measure, substitute or recommendation, shall be submitted to an advisory vote of the registered voters of the city."

Another labor organization, "the Workingmen's Federation of the State of New York," which is the State branch of the American Federation of Labor, adopted at its recent annual convention at Ithaca, resolutions for the same non-partisan plan of securing the referendum and initiative through the advisory system. These res-olutions declare: "The initiative and referendum is one of the most vital reforms now being demand-ed by the working people in the interest of the masses, and indeed of the entire community," and they "appeal to the farmers of New York State and all well dis-posed people of all classes to aid in this movement for popular gov-ernment," and pledge "hearty co-operation and support to the Pennsylvania Federation of La-bor and other organizations which are now so earnestly engaged in the effort to establish the sov-ereignty of the people."

Along the same general lines were the following resolutions adopted by the Ohio Federation of Labor on the 4th:

Resolved, that the Ohio Federation of Labor co-operate with other nonpartisan organizations to secure from the next General Assembly a resolution submitting to a vote of the people a constitutional amendment embodying the principle of the initiative and referendum. Resolved, that the executive committee of the Federation be in-structed to send a communication, to the legislative candidates of all parties asking them to pledge their sup-port to such a resolution. Resolved, that the committee be instructed to so

word its address to the candidates that they shall be asked, irrespective of their personal opinion concerning the initiative and referendum, whether or not, if elected, they will vote to submit a constitutional amendment, and thereby give the people of the State a chance to express their opinions. Be it further resolved, that whenever any legislative candidate ignores the communication of the committee or declares himself opposed to permitting the people to vote on such an amendment, it shall be the duty of the committee to so inform all labor organizations within the district of said candidate, to the end that the members of organized labor may not be betrayed, by their negligence, into the support of their enemies.

People's campaign in Toledo.

The successor of the late Mayor Jones, as non-partisan leader, is Brand Whitlock, one of Mayor Jones's closest personal and political friends. Having been selected as the independent candidate for mayor, he accepted on the 6th, and in publicly defining his position he said:

This campaign has become a critical one, and the cause of non-partisanship to which Mayor Jones devoted his life is menaced as never before. The real issue is whether the government of our city is to be administered by representatives of the people or by representatives of some boss, some coterie or some corporation. We must not surrender the fruits of Mayor Jones's great work; that work must not now be allowed to fall; the people must carry this work on to completion, and when it is finished we shall have a republican government, a government of all the people, and this means good government.

The Cleveland contest.

A debate between Mayor Johnson and his Republican adversary, William H. Boyd (p. 406) began the municipal campaign in Cleveland. Over 4,000 were in attendance at Gray's armory, this large auditorium being literally filled. The two candidates and their immediate friends met at Mayor Johnson's house and went together to the hall. C. W. Collister, a supporter of Mr. Boyd, presided. The second debate took place at the Coliseum Theater on the 6th, with Judge Babcock, a supporter of Mayor Johnson, presiding. There were from 3,000 to 3,500 people present. The debate turned altogether upon questions of local administration and local interest.

New York city politics.

Aside from nominations by minor parties, three sets of municipal nominations have been made—(Tammany) Democratic, Republican, and Municipal Ownership—in the city of New York.

That Mayor George B. McClellan would be the Tammany candidate for reelection has all along been expected. He was nominated on the 5th at a Tammany convention which praised President Roosevelt for bringing about peace between Japan and Russia, and with reference to municipal ownership declared:

Municipal ownership of important public utilities has long been accepted Democratic doctrine and has been repeatedly recommended in Democratic State and local platforms. The most serious obstacle to its realization has been the reckless and corrupt granting by State legislatures of perpetual franchises without compensation to our city and in disregard of its interests and charter rights. The present and previous Democratic administrations, in the face of such difficulties and restricted by the constitutional debt limit, have municipalized many public utilities with a just regard for private rights involved. Public ownership is no longer a campaign watchword, but a principle applied and in operation in this, the greatest of American cities. The ferry to Staten Island has been bought, and with the equipment and dock accommodations for which provision has been made, its further extension is already guaranteed. One electric plant for lighting the Williamsburg bridge and its approaches is about completed. For another, illuminating all our present streets, parks and public buildings, \$600,000 has been appropriated for the purchase of a site, in accordance with accepted plans involving a total expenditure of \$7,500,000. An intelligent, conservative and responsible Democratic administration may be intrusted with the continued application and the ultimate triumph upon safe lines of the principle of municipal control of public utilities.

Efforts to make a fusion of all anti-Tammany elements were under way during the Summer and early Fall (p. 117). The principal organized bodies concerned were the regular Republican organization, the Citizens' Union, which has participated in previous fusions, and the Municipal Ownership League (p. 22). The Citizens' Union had selected District Attorney Jerome as its choice for mayor. This choice was accepta-

ble neither to the Republicans nor to the Municipal Ownership League, and under the circumstances Mr. Jerome forbade the use of his name. In his place the names of Judge Gaynor and Judge Seabury, both Democrats, and ex-Senator John Ford, a municipal ownership Republican, were suggested, but to these the supporters of Mr. Jerome in the Citizens' Union objected. The controversies culminated on the 14th of September in the withdrawal of the Citizens' Union from further fusion negotiations. A fusion conference was held, however, on the 18th; and on the 25th, at the request of this conference, the Citizens' Union resumed negotiations. But harmony was not established. On the 30th the Municipal Ownership League, in a conference with municipal ownership members of the Citizens' Union, and with the German-American League, decided to take steps to nominate a municipal ownership ticket; and action was precipitated on the 4th by the nomination (p. 427) at a municipal ownership mass meeting, of William Randolph Hearst for mayor. Mr. Hearst accepted on the 10th, in a letter to Judge Seabury, chairman of the committee of notification, in which he said:

I have felt absolutely unable and unwilling to accept the nomination you have offered me, but I have at length decided to defer to your wishes and not to shirk a task that presents itself to me as a public duty. . . . The machinery of government in this city is in the control of a boss whose fortune is based on contracts awarded by corporations in return for special favors and illegal privileges. The subway, which was owned and built by the city, has been given away. . . . An organization for plunder has planned to secure and exploit all new subways and all other remaining franchises, and has arranged a political combination to make it impossible for the people to protect themselves. And, bad as the situation is to-day, it is as nothing to the four years' riot of corruption that would follow an apparent indorsement of such dishonesty at the polls. . . . Under these circumstances a man asked by his fellow citizens to represent their interests and the honor of the city has no right to refuse.

Ex-Senator John Ford, whom the Republicans have favored for Mayor, but whose municipal ownership views make him objectionable to the plutocratic elements of his party, goes on the Municipal