

judge to set forth in the order his reasons for granting it. These were provisions in the Clayton bill.

The new rule on injunctions provides:

"No preliminary injunction shall be granted without notice to the opposite party, nor shall any temporary restraining order be granted without notice to the opposite party, unless it shall clearly appear from specific facts shown by affidavit or by the verified bill that immediate and irreparable loss or damage will result to the applicant before the matter can be heard on notice.

"In case a temporary restraining order shall be granted without notice in the contingency specified, the matter shall be made returnable at the earliest possible time, and in no event later than ten days from the date of the order, and shall take precedence of all matters, except older matters of the same character. When the matter comes up for hearing the party who obtained the temporary restraining order shall proceed with his application for a preliminary injunction and if he does not do so the court shall dissolve his temporary restraining order.

"Upon two days' notice to the party obtaining such temporary restraining order, the opposite party may appear and move the dissolution and modification of the order, and in that event the court or judge shall proceed to hear and determine the motion as expeditiously as the ends of justice may require. Every temporary restraining order shall be forthwith filed in the clerk's office."

The new rule follows in a general way the rules of the federal court in the Ninth circuit, which comprises the Pacific coast states.

Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, had this to say about the anti-injunction rule:

"It is a step in the right direction and one of the things labor has long been fighting for."

During the campaign of 1908 James W. Van Cleave, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, issued a statement denouncing Mr. Bryan's platform, particularly with reference to the plank relating to injunctions. Mr. Bryan issued a statement in reply in which he said: "This plank declares that parties to all judicial proceedings should be treated with rigid impartiality and that an injunction should not issue in any case in which an injunction would not lie if no industrial dispute were involved. Do the business men insist upon partiality in judicial proceedings? Do they insist that the mere fact that there is an industrial dispute should justify an injunction? That plank does not attempt to interfere with the issue of an injunction where other conditions justify it, but it does oppose the issue of an injunction merely for the purpose of bringing the court into the discussion of an industrial dispute. What proportion of the real business men of the country find a menace in this part or any other part of the labor plank of the democratic platform?"

"Mr. Van Cleave asserts that this plank arouses a 'class spirit,' and constitutes a demand for 'class favors.' But this is not true. It is a declaration that the writ of injunction should not be used for the purpose of creating a class or favoring a class. The laboring men resent an attempt to discriminate against them in favor of any other class.

"Mr. Van Cleave is entirely too narrow in his definition of the business man, and he does the business man an injustice in assuming that his waking hours are filled with fears of the wage earners and that his night's rest is broken by imaginary disputes with those who toil. The business man is an important factor in society—more than that, he is a necessary factor, and the democratic party has not overlooked him. The democratic platform is broad enough for all to stand upon. It breathes the spirit of reconciliation between labor and capital; it pleads for harmony between all elements of society and urges co-operation in the work of advancing civilization. The business man is one of the common people; his interests are interwoven with the interests of the masses, and Mr. Van Cleave will fail in his appeal to class spirit and in his effort to array the business men against the reasonable and necessary reforms to which the democratic party is pledged."

IN COMPLETE POWER

The democrats will control a safe majority in the senate as well as in the house. With Wilson in the White House this puts our party in complete control of the government. Now let the democratic party vindicate its claims as the genuine champion of popular government.

STATEMENTS BY WILSON AND MARSHALL

On the day following the election, Governor Wilson issued the following statement:

"The result fills me with the hope that the thoughtful progressive forces of the nation may now at last unite to give the country freedom and enterprise, and a government released from all corporate and private influences, devoted to justice and progress.

"There is absolutely nothing for the honest and enlightened business men of the country to fear.

"No man whose business is conducted without violations of the rights of free competition, and without such private understanding and secret alliances as violate the principle of our law and the policy of all wholesome commerce and enterprise, need fear either interference or embarrassment from the administration.

"Our hope and purpose is now to bring all the free forces of the nation into active and intelligent co-operation, and to give to our prosperity a freshness and spirit and a confidence such as it has not had in our time.

"The responsibilities of the tax are tremendous, but they are common responsibilities which all leaders of action and opinion must share. And with the confidence of the people behind us, everything that is right is possible. My own ambition will be more than satisfied if I may be permitted to be the frank spokesman of the nation's thoughtful purposes in these great matters."

Governor Marshall issued this statement:

"The democratic victory of today will result in a restoration of representative government in America if democratic officials, both state and national, shall constantly remember that executive duty consists in the enforcement of the law and in the insistence upon legislative compliance with democratic platform and principles; if legislative representatives will remember that they are to represent the people and not any interest whatever, and will be zealous to formulate in legislation the principles either enunciated in democratic platforms or growing out of the basic principles of Jeffersonian democracy, and if judicial representatives will give us the perfection of reason in the light of today and not in the light of two centuries ago, and shall be content to construe and not make statutory law.

"The principles of democracy, finding their expression in representative government, are now upon trial. This is the last chance that will be given the officeholder to prove himself the servant and not the master of the people, unless he really serves. Failing to guarantee honest individual opportunity to every man, unhindered and unhelped by law, the people will pronounce representative government a failure and will seek expression of democratic doctrines under some other system.

"The party appreciates the gravity of the situation and the sacred burden which it bears. It enters not carelessly but reverently upon the discharge of its duties; it has faith in the people, hope for the future and charity for the wrongs and errors of the past. It enters confidently upon its great mission with malice toward none and charity for all. It seeks peace, not war, but it knows that peace can only come when accompanied by her handmaidens, justice and mercy."

HISTORY REPEATS ON MINORITY VOTE

Following is an editorial printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch: President-elect Wilson is not alone among his predecessors in failing of a majority in the popular vote while commanding an enormous plurality and winning more than three-fourths of the electoral college.

Within the time when electors have been chosen directly by the people, John Quincy Adams in 1824 gained the presidency without a majority either of the popular or the electoral vote. James K. Polk in 1844 had nearly two-thirds of the electoral college, but a minority of the popular vote. Zachary Taylor in 1848 was out-voted by the democrats and free soilers.

Franklin Pierce had nearly three-fourths of the college in the great democratic sweep in 1852, but a popular majority of only 63,000. James Buchanan in 1856 was in a popular minority.

Abraham Lincoln in 1860 was heavily in a popular minority. Hayes in 1876 lacked both a popular plurality and majority. Garfield in 1880 had a plurality of about 7,000 and was in a minority of over 300,000. Cleveland in 1884 was in a small minority, though barely elected, and in 1892 was in a minority of nearly 1,000,000 when the democrats swept the country. Harri-

son in 1888 was elected by a minority of the total popular vote.

The present situation is more exactly comparable with that of 1852, when the whig party went to pieces, and that of 1860 when the democratic party went to pieces. It is the republican party which now breaks up and it is largely for the democracy again in power to determine how long the republican party is to remain a divided majority or a united minority under that or another name.

INCOME TAX

A Washington dispatch to the New York World, says: Formal notice of the ratification by the state of Louisiana of the income tax constitutional amendment reached the state department recently. Thirty-three states have given notice of their approval of this amendment and the department is daily expecting notice from the state of Ohio, whose legislature has already acted favorably.

The affirmative votes of only two states are now necessary to make the three-fourths required by the constitution for the adoption of the amendment. It is not doubted here that the necessary votes will be forthcoming during the coming winter sessions of the legislatures of the following ten states which have not yet acted upon the amendment: Delaware, Florida, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia and Wyoming.

Only two states—Minnesota and Massachusetts—have so far acted upon the amendments submitted to them by congress providing for the election of United States senators by popular vote.

So favorable is public sentiment to the income tax that the vote of the necessary states will unquestionably be forthcoming. One by one democratic reforms are winning their way.

SURELY BLIND

The New York Herald points out that Mr. Wilson received a minority vote and that the Roosevelt and Taft vote combined would have elected the man who received it. The Herald says:

"It is our opinion that if Mr. Roosevelt had acquiesced there would have been a square fight between Mr. Wilson and Mr. Taft, with the tariff as the paramount issue, and that the election would have been very close, and perhaps might have resulted in the re-election of Mr. Taft."

The editor of the Herald is surely blind. Nothing could have saved Mr. Taft. If Mr. Roosevelt had not been a candidate Mr. Wilson would have received the largest majority ever given to any candidate.

UNPRECEDENTED

The Sioux City (Iowa) Journal says: It was a famous victory. The electoral vote this year numbers 531, against 483 in 1908 and 447 in 1900. Mr. Cleveland in 1884 won 219 electoral votes and in 1892 he carried 277. In 1896 Mr. McKinley gained 271 electoral votes against 176 for Mr. Bryan. In 1904 Mr. Roosevelt won 336 electoral votes to Judge Parker's 140; and in 1908 Mr. Taft gained 321 electoral votes to Mr. Bryan's 162. The victory for Mr. Wilson is unprecedented in the history of the electoral college.

THE COLORADO SENATORS

In the selection of John F. Shafroth and Charles S. Thomas to be United States senators, the people of Colorado have acted wisely. It would be difficult for a state to pick a better team than Shafroth and Thomas. They have spent their lives in the fight for good government and in the United States senate they will be of powerful assistance to President Wilson.

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNORS

The democrats won many governors at the 1912 election. Here they are: William Sulzer, New York; James Cox, Ohio; Samuel M. Ralston, Indiana; John H. Moorehead, Nebraska; Elias M. Ammons, Colorado; Edward F. Dunne, Illinois; Earnest Lister, Washington; S. V. Stewart, Montana; Eugene Foss, Massachusetts; O. B. Colquitt, Texas; George H. Hodges, Kansas.

WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE

The woman's suffrage amendment was defeated in Wisconsin but it carried in Kansas, Arizona, Michigan and Oregon.