

riot; to deny it in fact has been referred to as waving the flag of anarchy."

Mr. Harrison says that there is little if any excuse to even consider the claim that the theory under discussion is a species of anarchy, but he points out that the experience of Glasgow shows the absurdity of such contention. In Glasgow public ownership has advanced to the stage where the city owns not only the waterworks, but the street cars, the gas plant, and the telephone system and all these are operated to the entire satisfaction of the user as well as to the profit of the municipality. The rates charged are low, the profits to the public are so great that taxes have reached low water mark.

Replying to the claim that municipal ownership would result in the creation of gigantic political machines formed of the army of city employes, Mr. Harrison says that this argument vanishes before the fact that every advocate of public ownership strongly favors a rigid civil service provision for the conduct of public utilities, and that a well established merit system would come nearer divorcing any public utility from politics than it is separated now.

Mr. Harrison says that those who object to municipal ownership solely on the ground of the fear that it would result in the creation of a political machine might at least be inclined to look favorably upon ownership without operation which plan he maintains is both possible and practicable. He uses the street car system as an example and says that a city may reserve to itself the ownership of the right-of-way and lay rails along it and then let to the highest bidder the right to operate cars upon these rails subject to certain conditions. He points out that this system has been successfully tried at Toronto.

Referring to the immense political power wielded to the disadvantage of the people and to the advantage of the corporations under private ownership, Mr. Harrison contends that, properly administered, public ownership would reach further to purification of politics than any advanced step toward the conduct of municipal affairs that has yet been suggested.

Replying to the argument that private companies can operate with greater economy than would be possible under a system of public ownership, Mr. Harrison denies the claim and says that even though there be truth in the claim, the public obtains no benefit as a result of that economy. He maintains that under public ownership it would be possible to devote profits to improvement of service, reduction of rates and increase of wages, while under private ownership, profits go mainly to the increase of dividends.

While Mr. Harrison admits that public ownership would prove a hard blow to the speculative world, he maintains that it would result in permanent benefit to a legitimate business venture. Under public ownership the reason for watering of stocks would disappear and there would be no great bulk of securities saddled upon an unsuspecting public, wages would reach a fair point and the surplus earnings would apply to lowering the general taxes, not to swelling the bank account of the already over-rich stockholders. And among the various benefits to be obtained from public ownership, Mr. Harrison counts as not the least important the promise that it would "tend to free any city from gang politics with its attendant evils of boss rule, boodle legislation and public spoilation."

It is a good sign when vigorous and enterprising men like Carter H. Harrison take the lead in practical reforms. Doubtless the time will come in this country when under the beneficent results of municipal ownership men will wonder how it was ever possible for individuals to control municipal franchises and grow rich on the profits therefrom.

Government by Injunction.

The democratic platform of 1896 declared: "We specially object to government by injunction as a new and highly dangerous form of oppression by which federal judges in contempt of the laws

of states and the rights of citizens, become at once legislators, judges and executioners."

This plank was bitterly denounced by republican newspapers and was frequently referred to as an assault upon the courts.

Interest in this protest against government by injunction has recently been awakened because of the writ issued by Judge Adams in the United States circuit court at St. Louis. Upon application by the officers of the Wabash Railroad company, Judge Adams granted an injunction restraining representatives of the labor unions from "ordering, coercing, persuading, inducing or otherwise causing" the employes of the railroad to strike or quit the service of the company. Representatives of the labor union were also enjoined from "ordering, advising, or influencing employes on connecting lines to refuse to interchange traffic."

It is somewhat interesting to observe that even republican papers are finding it necessary to protest against this "highly dangerous form of oppression by which federal judges in contempt of the laws of states and the rights of citizens become at once legislators, judges and executioners."

The Chicago Record-Herald, a republican paper, referring to Judge Adams' injunction, says that it "is such an extraordinary exercise of the power of injunction that it may well invite public apprehension regarding the extent to which this arbitrary instrument of the court may be used in the future."

The Record-Herald further says that "if this injunction stands and is finally written into the laws of our country, it is difficult to conceive of the possibility of fixing any limit to government by injunction."

The Des Moines Register and Leader, also a republican paper, says that heretofore it has been assumed that the right of labor involved the corresponding right to refuse to labor and that the exercise of this latter right means men acting as individuals or collectively. The Register and Leader points out that if Judge Adams' injunction is sustained, "it will revolutionize the relations of organized labor to its employers and will practically eliminate the strike as a weapon of defense."

Judge Tuley, an Illinois state judge at Chicago, makes interesting comment upon the Adams injunction. Judge Tuley says that he is not surprised at any injunction of any kind being issued, and he adds:

"I regret it very much because I believe that the issuing of such writs of injunction brings the administration of justice into contempt. It breeds discontent and will reap a whirlwind some day from the seeds so sown.

"The day may come in the not distant future when the working classes will have political control and will appoint judges who will also issue writs of injunction—in their favor. I see no reason why a writ of injunction should not as well issue against a railroad enjoining it from discharging any employes or from failing to pay such employes a certain fixed rate of wages. It would be no greater departure from the true principles that ought to govern when issuing such writs.

"We judges are getting to be the whole thing in government. We are approaching a condition that will be without precedent in the history of the world, in which the governing power will be exercised by the judges, with the executives and legislators as mere figureheads in carrying on the government. It is time to call a halt."

Will any intelligent man undertake to say that Judge Tuley is desirous of bringing the courts into disrepute? Is it not true, on the contrary, that men who protest against this "highly dangerous form of oppression" as Judge Tuley does show a much deeper anxiety for the maintenance of the dignity of the courts than do those who, either directly or indirectly, are responsible for the effort to establish government by injunction?

Judge Tuley well says, "It is time to call a

halt." That is what the democrats said in 1896; and it is significant that while the government by injunction plank of the Chicago platform was bitterly denounced and many claimed that that plank had considerable to do with the defeat of the democratic ticket, since then injunction writs issued by federal judges have become, by reason of their radical terms, more and more oppressive, and this form of oppression has come to be so "highly dangerous" that even republican newspapers are moved to enter vigorous protest.

"Harmony" Among Harmonizers

There are some indications that even among the divinely appointed champions of "harmony" there is not entire harmony.

In a fearfully and wonderfully made editorial entitled "Hill Hard at Work," the Brooklyn Eagle, recognized as one of the organs of Alton B. Parker, congratulates the sage of Wolferts Roost upon some of his efforts.

The Eagle congratulates Mr. Hill because he is making an organized effort to drive the Kansas City platform democrats out of power in the party. It expresses satisfaction over the report that Mr. Hill has received promises from "those who dominate the democracy of Indiana" that Indiana will stand by him in his desperate undertaking. It congratulates Mr. Hill because "the war against Bryanism is to be carried into Africa—he is to go to the convention handicapped by defeat at home." It entirely agrees with Mr. Hill that "nothing is more essential to democratic welfare than that the party shall rid itself of anything and everything suggestive of Bryan manias. The divorce should be absolute." And it sends to Wolferts Roost the message, "By all means let the war on Bryan proceed. It cannot go on too merrily for the Eagle."

But right there Mr. Parker's organ draws the line.

The Eagle says that "in other respects," than those mentioned, "the Hill program is far from acceptable." The Eagle seems to have conceived the notion that Mr. Hill has ambitions of his own and that he is anxious to become the nominee for president. In the contemplation of this prospect, the Eagle is not at all pleased, although it enthusiastically applauds the sage of Wolferts Roost so far as concerns his war upon Kansas City platform democrats. The Eagle likens Hill to Judas Iscariot and even goes so far as to say, "As Hill passes through the door, respect goes up the chimney."

Now this is, indeed, too bad! If these gentlemen hope to win in their effort to republicanize the democratic party, they will do well to undertake, in the first place, to establish harmony among themselves.

It is instructive to observe that so long as Mr. Hill is engaged in an effort to drive the Kansas City platform democrats out of the party, so long as he devotes his attention to the task of destroying democratic principles, Mr. Hill is, in the estimation of Mr. Parker's organ, a gentleman, a scholar, and a benefactor of his race. But when Mr. Hill undertakes, in the building of his foundation, to provide a basis for the Hill presidential boom, the gentleman, the scholar and the benefactor takes on a resemblance of Judas Iscariot and Mr. Parker's organ is moved to say that "As Hill passes through the door, respect goes up the chimney!"

The Detroit Free Press, which bolted in 1896, wants a big democratic party—one big enough to hold Kansas City platform democrats and Cleveland democrats. Well, we tried that once and the Cleveland democrats went over and enlarged the republican party. They did not demand concessions from the republicans when they went over, and they ought not to demand concessions from the democrats if they return.