

many. "Under our eyes and within our reach," he says, "children are being reared from infancy amid surroundings containing every conceivable element of degradation, depravity and vice." It is from this source, as we have often had occasion to note, and as the uniform testimony of police magistrates and police officers on both sides of the ocean affirms, that "the great and ever-growing army of professional criminals receives its most promising recruits." "Is it not high time that society demanded protection against this appalling peril?" The plan proposed by Prof. Wayland is in substance the same that has often been approved in these columns, and that is the officers of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and other philanthropic bodies in this city. The general principles would be these:

1. Paid investigating agents, or officers whose sole duty it should be to seek out and bring to light all cases of parental neglect or direct demoralization or abandonment.
2. The hearing of such cases before a magistrate, all persons concerned being duly notified.
3. A Board of Guardians intrusted with the care of such children as may have been declared by the magistrate to be wards of the State; this Board to have discretionary power to use any methods which may have been found serviceable in such cases.

We are well aware that every such proposal is sure to be promptly met with a chorus of objections. Influential men and newspapers protest vigorously against the injustice of laying upon society the burdens which belong properly to parents and other relatives, and against the unwisdom of fostering the idea in the minds of the lazy and vicious that they have only to neglect or abuse their little ones to insure their being relieved of the care of them by the State, and thus left free to indulge their own low and selfish, possibly criminal propensities. We have not Dr. Wayland's complete article before us and do not know whether he recommends any special line of treatment for the able-bodied parents who would be thus relieved of the children whom they had proved themselves unworthy to rear, but it seems clear to us that the necessity for thus removing the children would be ample justification for bringing compulsion to bear upon the parents, to the extent, at least, of forced contributions, in either money or labour, towards the expenses incurred in the proper care and training of children. But those who object on the grounds indicated seem to forget that it is in the interests of society, not of the unworthy parents, that the proposition is made. It is, unfortunately, the community, and not the parents, who are the chief sufferers from the evil which it is sought to remedy. This being the case, if it can be shewn that the remedy proposed, or some one based on similar principles, would prove effective and is the only feasible one, it would surely be

childish to object to its use because in so doing an undeserved favour would result to the parents whose criminal neglect made it necessary.

### THE COURTS AND THE RAILROADS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Several novel decisions which have within the last few weeks been pronounced by different courts in the United States bid fair, if sustained, to place the relations between railroad companies and their employees on an entirely new footing in certain important respects. The first case occurred in Ohio. A strike was in progress on the Toledo, Ann Arbor and Northern Michigan road. In obedience to orders issued by Chief Arthur, of the Brotherhood of Engineers, and Grand Master Sargent, of the Brotherhood of Firemen, five engineers and three firemen on the Lake Shore Road left their posts because the trains they were expected to take out contained cars of the Ann Arbor Road. Thereupon the General Manager and the Attorney of that road summoned from Cleveland Judge Ricks, of the United States District Court. He came by special train, was driven at once to the Federal Court building, and there, in conjunction with Judge Taft, of the Circuit Court, issued what have been said to be "the most remarkable orders that have appeared from any court since railroads were organized." The first and most important of these orders was most sweeping in its terms, and temporarily restrained Mr. Arthur and Mr. Sargent from "issuing, promulgating, or continuing in force any rule or order of any kind, under the rules and regulations of either order, which shall require or command any employees of any of the defendant railroad companies herein to refuse to receive, handle or deliver any cars of freight in course of transportation from one State to another, from and to the Ann Arbor." They were also prohibited "from in any way, directly or indirectly, endeavoring to persuade or induce any employees of the railroad companies whose lines connect with the Ann Arbor not to extend to said company the same facilities for interchange of interstate traffic as are extended by said companies to other railways," and they were required to recall and rescind any orders issued by them prior to the service of the injunction.

Another order was directed against the eight Lake Shore employees who had left their posts rather than handle Ann Arbor cars. These men were taken into custody by United States' marshals and arraigned for contempt of court in refusing to obey a restraining order which had, it appears, been previously issued by Judge Taft, requiring the labor chiefs to raise the boycott against Ann Arbor cars and freight. Judge Ricks held the men under bonds to appear for a hearing, after having lectured them on their duties to the public. The following was the most pertinent part of his remarks:

"The court does not assume the power to compel you to continue your service to your employers against your will, but it does undertake to compel you to perform your whole duty while such relations continue, and does further claim, for the purpose of ascertaining whether its orders have been violated, the right to determine when your relation to your employer legally terminated, and when your obligations to observe this order cease." A supplementary order was issued commanding Chief Arthur to rescind the boycott against the Ann Arbor, and also to produce before the court a copy of the rule or regulation of his organization under which the boycott was imposed. Chief Arthur declared his entire readiness to obey the court, and he at once issued an order raising the boycott. After hearing argument the court has since confirmed these orders and injunctions.

The other cases to which we refer involve to some extent the same principle of public control of employees. In Georgia, Judge Speer, of the District Court, has ordered the receiver he appointed to take charge of the Georgia Central Railroad, to appear before him and answer why he refuses to renew the contract between the road and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. It appears that the receiver has sustained his superintendent in the position that the corporation representing all the owners of the road shall deal with each workman separately and refuse to treat with the "corporation" representing the workmen. Judge Speer is reported to have told the committee of engineers who applied for the order to the receiver, that if they asked the aid of the court they "must now and ever be subordinate to the law and the finding of the court, and that the court's decision would in future control their actions after a full hearing had been given to both sides."

A still more noteworthy decision, because rendered by a Federal and not a State court, was that given a few days ago by Judge Billings of the Federal District Court of Louisiana. The decision was in pursuance of the prosecution instituted in this court against the labor unions in connection with the great strike in New Orleans, last November. This prosecution, which is said to have crippled if not crushed the strike, was taken under the provisions of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law—a law supposed to be directed against combinations of capitalists. Upon this case Judge Billings has now rendered a decision, the most remarkable part of which is its affirmation that the United States has already jurisdiction over all labour unions engaged in work affecting inter State commerce. This is substantially the same ground on which the orders issued by Judges Taft and Ricks, in Ohio, were based.

At first view all these decisions seem to bear hardly upon the employees. Very great benefits have unquestionably been won