

company, and the Federationist published the name of the Bucks Stove and Range company under the caption of 'We don't patronize.' The proceedings against the officers of the Federation were begun August 19, 1907, by the stove and range company. After a comprehensive hearing Justice Gould, of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, issued a temporary injunction restraining the defendants from prosecuting a boycott on the business and products of the Buck company. Later this injunction was made permanent. In the appeal of the case to the court of appeals of the District of Columbia, Alton B. Parker of New York, appeared as one of the counsel for the Federation of Labor. References to the Bucks Stove and Range company continuing to appear in the Federationist and in speeches and writings of the defendants, the company had Gompers, Mitchell and Morrison cited to appear and show cause why they should not be punished for contempt of court. Mr. Gompers had openly intimated that he would not be bound by the terms of the injunction. After the hearing in the contempt proceedings Justice Wright, of the supreme court of the district, found the defendants had been guilty of wilfully disobeying the injunction and sentenced them to imprisonment in the district jail. In announcing the decision Judge Wright declared that the defendants had 'intimidated, browbeaten and coerced' the patrons of the stove and range company until it had suffered severe loss. Pending an appeal the three defendants were allowed to give bail for their reappearance."

REFERRING TO President Taft's visit to Birmingham, Ala., the Associated Press says: "The president referred once during the course of his speech to the proposition to amend the state constitution by providing in it for an indefinite continuance of state-wide prohibition. He promptly was asked how he stood on the question. 'I am not an Alabaman,' he replied with laughter, 'and I am somewhat in the position of Brother Fox who, when he was called upon to decide a case between a lion and some other ferocious beast, protested that he had a bad cold and had entirely lost his sense of smell.'"

CONCERNING President Taft's attitude on the waterways proposition, the Chicago Record-Herald, a republican paper, says: "The federal government, through President Taft, and twenty-three states of the union, through their governors, are flatly aligned against one another on the proposition, 'Shall work be started on the lakes-to-the-gulf deep waterway?' The acute line of opposition, it might be termed hostility, between the national government and the states was drawn this afternoon at the fourth annual convention of the Lakes-to-the-Gulf Deep Waterway Association. President Taft, in the most notable utterance he has made on the question of deep waterways, went formally on record as being opposed to immediate action on the Mississippi improvement proposition. He indicated that only in the dim and hazy vistas of the future should work be begun. 'Do it later, some time in the future.' This is the position of President Taft. 'Do it now,' on the contrary, is the cry of the governors of the twenty-three states extending from Minnesota to Louisiana and from Maine to Washington. The president's speech was an intense disappointment to the delegates. The moment he had left the hall the governors of the twenty-three states became extremely busy on the platform he had just deserted, and proceeded to voice sentiments that were not at all in line with those of the president and which evoked a continuous roar of applause from those present."

P. P. O'CONNOR, member of parliament from Liverpool, is visiting in America and declares "Ireland has never had such a chance for home rule as now." In a newspaper interview Mr. O'Connor says: "The whole United Kingdom is in a ferment. Such revolutionary public utterances in responsible positions and such an answering temper in the people have not been known in three generations. The issue before the people has been put squarely by Lloyd George and the people understand it. I can not do better than to repeat his phrase: 'Shall the peers of the people rule?' King Edward has foreknowledge of the crisis that may confront him, and the measure of his recent

activity is a sign of his anxiety. The budget now goes before the house of lords. If they reject the government will go to the people for a vote of confidence, and in my opinion they will be returned. The present government would pass, by three hundred votes in the house, a home rule bill for Ireland were they not withheld by a conviction that the peers would promptly veto it. Therefore they will not waste time on a bill sure to be killed when there is so much other important legislation pending. But if the present government is sustained at the polls, they will demand of the peers a right of suspensory vote. That is, a bill passed by the house may still be rejected by the lords, but if the house again passes it in the face of this rejection the bill shall forthwith become a law. You ask me why the peers will grant this concession. Because if they refuse it, the premier, with the country behind him, would say with all respects to the king: 'Sire, you must give me a majority in the house of lords.' The king may do this by the creating of new peers. He has done it for his own ends in the past, and in this instance he would have to do it, because the sovereign under the constitution must follow the advice of his responsible minister. Suppose the lords pass the budget. The government in my opinion will still find a pretext to go before the people for support on the deeper issue formulated by Lloyd George, which I have already quoted. But suppose again, that the government going before the people for support, is defeated. Why, even then we shall have such a small tory majority that the national, the Irish vote, will command the situation. King Edward does not wish to face the crisis I have suggested. He is trying to compromise the situation, to bring the peers to a realization of their embarrassment. Whether he wins, or loses, Ireland can not lose. If she rises to her opportunity, home rule is hers within from three to four years."

IT WAS SUPPOSED that when James H. Eckels, formerly comptroller of the currency, died that he was worth in the neighborhood of half a million dollars. It seems now that the liabilities of the Eckels estate are double the assets. Claims against the estate have been presented as follows: Hanover National Bank, \$178,016.73; National City Bank, New York, \$94,202.50; John P. Hopkins, \$39,365; Roger C. Sullivan, \$28,205.12; People's State Bank of Detroit, \$25,900.06; William Capesius, \$25,900; Harry Benedict, \$13,824; First National Bank, Chicago, \$8,607.71; Thomas A. Marlow, \$5,331.33; LaSalle State Bank, \$5,306.66; Farmers' National Bank, \$5,291.67; National City Bank, Ottawa, Ill., \$4,215.33; A. B. Leach & Co., \$64,489.67; William Salomon & Co., \$56,804; Pittsburg Trust Company, \$50,000; Farson, Son & Co., \$30,820.56; Morton Trust Company, \$264,737.55; A. G. Becker, \$119,841.67.

A SIDELIGHT on Judge Gaynor, New York's mayor-elect, is shown by the Kansas City Times in this way: "William J. Gaynor chose the occasion of a dinner given by the Knife and Fork club in Kansas City, May 23, 1907, for expressing himself pointedly concerning transportation. The subject of his address was 'Our Railroads Are Public Highways, Not Private Roads.' The applause which welcomed every strong statement showed that there was practically unanimous agreement with him among the 200 members of the club present. The speech caused considerable comment in the country and his plain speaking was subsequently indorsed by J. S. Harlan of Chicago, a member of the interstate commerce commission. 'No man has measured the importance of the railroad problem more accurately,' an editorial in the Star said the following day. 'Justice Gaynor's address comes from a man of the highest integrity, a man of judicial insight, a fearless advocate of the square deal, a democrat who is standing shoulder to shoulder with President Roosevelt in the fight for equitable railway regulation.' Railroads are government roads, was Justice Gaynor's argument, because they can not be constructed without the resort to the government's grant of eminent domain. 'But land can not be taken by government for any private use. Fasten that in your mind—that only the government can take private property away from the owner and that it can take it only for a public use, such as for a public highway and the like—and you have the key to why our iron

roads, just like our dirt and water roads, had to be, and were built, not as private roads but as public highways. You, therefore, perceive that our iron roads are not private roads, but public highways. Some have come to the conclusion that the government should take the railroads and run them in order to end the abuse (of discriminatory freight rates). My own view is that it is necessary for the government to appoint the general freight agent of every railroad, for he could stop all rate favoritism at once.' Referring to the Roosevelt policies, Judge Gaynor expressed a hope that 'President Roosevelt's successor will be the kind of a man who will continue his policies to the end. This may sound strange,' he continued, 'coming from a New York democrat, but I believe the man in public office who is carrying on such a work as President Roosevelt is doing should receive support and encouragement from every honest man.'"

THE "CHICAGO plan" is an organized effort on the part of Mayor Busse and other Chicagoans to boost Chicago as a business city. As one member of a committee of 325, whose duty it would be to push the "Chicago plan," Mayor Busse appointed John Fitzpatrick, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor. Mr. Fitzpatrick wrote the mayor a letter, refusing to serve. In his letter Fitzpatrick said he was seriously concerned in any plan that would make a better Chicago, but was not in sympathy with any plan to boost the commercial interests, so long as those interests are concerned only in the accumulation of dollars. He said if the mayor would appoint a committee to wipe out the white slave traffic and punish the gambling trust, it would do more for the city than a committee to plan greater industrial and commercial enterprises. The letter to the mayor is, in part, as follows: "Why not consider the cause of the white slave trade and find out whose interests profit by its existence? Why not look into the affairs of the gambling trust and instead of allowing a notorious police official to divert attention by attempting to fasten the bomb outrages upon organized labor, appoint a committee of 325 citizens to find out what estates receive rents from gambling and other resorts, and who among our good citizens exert their influence to protect the landlords from publicity, thereby preventing the possibility of curbing the keepers? What we need in Chicago is a better citizenship and an understanding of the responsibility we have, to protect and promote the welfare of the human family. We present a sorry spectacle when we close our eyes to home conditions and the very limited opportunity of our people to live anything like the way an American citizen should live, while our better inclinations are shrouded with an all-consuming desire for more dollars. It is time we of Chicago should be seriously concerned with a 'Chicago plan,' but one having as its object a better life, a better home, a better future for human beings. It may appear to some that the promotion of industrial and commercial interests is all, but I have found that they are fully able to care for themselves, and am somewhat confounded as to the need of a committee of 325 citizens to help them. Long ago I reached the conclusion that one decent home, with a bread winner full of hope and courage, a contented wife and happy children, mean more in the eyes of our Creator than any industrial or commercial enterprise in our midst. I appreciate the honor you have conferred and most respectfully request that for the reasons herein set out you accept my declination to act as a member of said commission."

HERE IS A refreshing story of political courtesy as told by the New York World: "Cyrus C. Miller, the fusion candidate for president of the borough of the Bronx, doesn't believe in campaign mud slinging, and he proved it yesterday when he refused to take advantage of certain material offered to him out of which such mud could be made. Mr. Miller received in his mail a letter attacking his rival candidate on the Tammany ticket, Arthur H. Murphy, in the bitterest terms and giving alleged facts regarding Murphy which could be used with telling effect to divert votes from him. Mr. Miller read the letter and then enclosed it in an envelope and sent it to Murphy with this note: My Dear Mr. Murphy—I enclose herewith a letter which I have received today. I send it to you so that it will go no further. Yours very truly, Cyrus C. Miller."