

and pervert it from its function as a part and parcel of the municipal political machine. Then he vowed vengeance both against the professor and against the mayor.

"Where Johnson camps with his tent this spring, there will I be," exclaimed Wensink. "Where Johnson camps with his tent I will camp in the dooryards of every man of the ward. I will tell them my tale of ingratitude and unrequited benefits conferred. I will tell them of Johnson, who knows not his friends, and of Johnson's evil genius, the professor, who has turned the waterworks department from its proper function, so that it is now little more than a place where political services are counted as naught. No rest will I take until this professor is driven from the city, and until the proud head of Johnson is brought to the dust."

Prof. Bemis told of Wensink's bitter mood to Mayor Johnson.

"It may defeat us," said the mayor. "But," he added, "I would rather be defeated and stand for principle, than win by truckling to schemers."

"It was in this fashion," said Prof. Bemis, in explaining the removal of Wensink. "Since the establishment of so many water meters there has not been need for as many assessors as formerly. There was the necessity that one be discharged; so I ordered two employes to make an examination of the reports of all the assessors to find out which was the most incompetent. The balance of incompetency was largely in favor of Wensink. It was found that out of 11 assessments reported in three days, three were absolutely wrong. When I confronted Wensink with these facts he admitted that he had not examined the houses in question.

"They were the houses of poor women," he said, "and I shall not assess them up as high as others in better circumstances."

"Of course I admired Wensink's benevolent motives, but the waterworks department is not authorized by the city council to make any distinction in assessment on account of the material prosperity of the person to be assessed. If this were the case we could save assessors entirely by merely charging each consumer in accordance with his wealth. And if it were to be a matter of charity, we ought to turn it over to Director Cooley."—Cleveland Plain Dealer.

#### LET THE TUNNELS ALONE.

For The Public.

With something of the pertinacious insistence with which the elder Cato

declared that Carthage must be destroyed, and the almost forgotten Nasby used to "Pulverize the Rum Power," the newspapers of Chicago have long been demanding that we "lower the tunnels."

For years they have had an acute attack of this malady just before the opening of navigation. During the past year or two, however, the senseless clamor has become chronic or constant; and, what is worse, high-priced "experts" and grave scientific men have devoted columns to the serious discussion of the "tunnel problem." This shows how great a matter a little fire kindleth. While confined to the funny paragraphers of the daily press these frequent and latterly almost constant gibes might be lightly passed over, though it did jar one's sense of propriety that they should appear in staid and serious protection papers. However, the recent serious discussion and grave editorial advocacy of the lowering of the tunnels in these same protection papers, shows that all sense of the incongruity is lost, and is one of the enigmas of progress.

It would almost seem that the tunnels are without a single defender. Yet the very arguments that are used against the tunnels show that to them, in part at least, must be due Chicago's marvelous growth.

The progress of lake shipping and ship building has made these much abused tunnels better than a custom house to prevent Chicago from becoming a "dumping ground" for goods produced elsewhere. Even under the Dingley tariff law, though most of its schedules are intentionally prohibitory, there is some importation; and in proportion as goods are "dumped" here, domestic enterprise is discouraged and the development of home industry retarded.

That such must be the result is at once apparent to any mind capable of logical processes. But we are not driven to abstract reasoning to support this view. Many concrete examples establish it. Two of Chicago's Michigan suburbs furnish a perfect illustration. Fifteen years ago Grand Haven, with its magnificent harbor at the mouth of the Grand river (as its very name indicates), had about twice the population of its neighboring city of Holland (also a significant name). Moreover, Holland was at a disadvantage in that a much larger proportion of its people were foreigners, and, though of most worthy and sturdy character, were withal weighted down by European

conservatism. But Holland had one tremendous advantage over its sister city of Grand Haven, 20 miles to the north; it did enjoy the protection of a shallow harbor—Black lake—more recently called Macatawa bay. Even the comparatively shallow-draught boats of that day dared not attempt to "dump" goods into Holland. The result has been that local industry has developed until Holland has become a thriving manufacturing city, with twice the population of Grand Haven, which has barely held its own in population, and has actually gone backward so far as business enterprise is concerned.

Do we Chicagoans need any plainer lesson—any further warning—not to disturb the tunnels under our noble river, which has in the past furnished such efficient and beneficent "protection," and made us one of the greatest commercial and manufacturing centers in the world? What is it to us if a few rat harboring elevators have been built along the Calumet? And even if we cared a rap, let us be candid enough to admit that the real reason is because the land to build them on is cheaper, and that it is not at all due to the presence of the beneficent tunnels in our noble river.

In conclusion, candor requires me to say that I am not a protectionist. To me, even revenue tariffs are an abomination, and custom houses a curse. But if I were a protectionist, I should have to run in debt for the hardihood to seriously propose the lowering of the tunnels which have so long and effectually served to keep Chicago from becoming a "dumping ground for the pauper-made goods of Europe."

WILEY WRIGHT MILLS

Chicago, Feb. 8, 1903.

#### THE OPPORTUNITY OF DEMOCRACY.

For The Public.

I believe it is true of parties as of individuals, that if they decline the burden that seems naturally offered to them, they lose the opportunity of the service, and have to give place to others who are willing to take up the burden.

This is the history of the birth of new parties. To go no farther back than the fifties, we find an example in the anti-slavery problem. Neither of the old parties would assume the task. Fortune pointed especially to the Whig party as the one to which the burden should fall—not so much because of its inherent principles as because the Democrats were hopelessly hampered. The opportunity was

declined. Compromise could not go on forever, and we know the result.

Evidently the country is now being confronted with a problem even more vital and far reaching than the abolition of negro slavery. It is more vital and far reaching, because it involves a wider emancipation. This is the social problem of modern times, involving the various phases of the concentration of wealth, and of the growth and power of monopoly and privilege.

Now again the party at present dominant is hopelessly hampered by its connections. And so fortune points this time to the Democrats, as it once pointed to the Whigs, as the party to take up the new burden of the real abolition of privilege and of the equalizing of opportunity.

This time it happens that the new burden is but the fuller and clearer recognition and acknowledgment of the long-professed principles of the party to which fortune points. Equal rights to all, and special privilege to none, has been the professed principle of the party from its noble beginning. The supreme question now is, will it translate this principle into honest action? Will it make the applications which the times demand? Too long has it been giving a half-hearted meaning to its profession of faith.

The above remarks are introductory to a comment I wish to make upon the leading article in the North American Review for February, entitled "The Political Opportunity of the South." I cannot here outline the article, but will only say that it is an appeal to Southern Democrats to bring the party back, as the author says, to the principles which it held during the long period of its ascendancy. Now upon these principles, as proclaimed by the best leaders of the party in that period—including its strong stand for local self-government and States' rights—democratic Democrats of to-day are of course ready to stand. But the tone of the article shows that the writer intends that we shall go no farther in the application of these principles than our fathers did.

The statement of a principle may be eternal; its application grows with the times. This I take to be the essential meaning of Lowell's thought about keeping abreast of Truth:

New occasions teach new duties; time makes ancient good uncouth;  
They must upward still, and onward, who would keep abreast of truth.  
This is the thought which some

really earnest Democrats, like the writer of the article in question, seem to fail altogether to appreciate. They seem to lose sight of the evident fact that the America of today is not the America of 50 years ago.

I have recently seen the statement, that whereas ten per cent. of the people then owned only about 35 per cent. of the wealth of the country, now ten per cent. own about 90 per cent. I know that such definite estimates are difficult and may be somewhat erroneous; but that such a statement could be seriously made is an indication of the tremendous change that has come over the nation. Where then were the multi-millionaires on the one hand, and on the other the terrible indications of poverty that may be seen in every city? Poverty there certainly was, but not in such hordes as city slums now hold. Where then were the numberless strikes, and the unions of laborers bent upon ever increasing concessions—an evidence, in the last analysis, of the growth as well as of the need of true democracy? Where then was there any thought in America of an open and aggressive propaganda of socialism? Add to such evidences as these the increase in the power of production and the decrease in the opportunities of self-employment, and it would seem that no one could fail to see the tremendous change of conditions within the half century.

Here therefore, to repeat, is the mistake of writers like Mr. Ryan in the North American. They do not take account of modern conditions. They ignore the modern social problem, which is annually becoming less easy of peaceful solution, and will not be much longer postponed.

If the Democratic party declines the task of attempting this solution, and has only mild-tempered conservatism to offer, according to Mr. Ryan's advice, it will quite surely go the way of the Whig party and give place to a worthier heir. The time and the opportunity call for positiveness, and an aggressive application of economic principles truly democratic. No special privilege must mean no special privilege; equal opportunity must mean equal opportunity.

J. H. DILLARD.

Why not seek our taxes (public revenue) where the speculator gathers his riches—namely, from land values?—City and State, of Philadelphia.

## A TRUST THAT WAS NOT SOLD TO THE TRUSTFUL.

For The Public.

The following dialogue is reported by the man from nowhere.

Smith—I hear, Brown, that you're forming a trust in spite of the dreadful threats of the administration.

Brown—Yes; it's the spirit of the age, and it seemed to me that all the other trusts sort o' made this necessary.

Smith—Indeed?

Brown—Yes; you see all the other trusts are children of the Republican party, and all "chips o' the old block," at that. This party, you know, has a main tent, and a side show called the "Reorganized Democracy;" and a single pass from any trust admits you to both shows. Now, I propose to form a trust that is not merely Democratic for publication only, but genuinely democratic—"all wool and a yard wide," you know.

Smith—But aren't you afraid the sentiment against trusts may get you into trouble? Now if Knox should—he might, you know, the thing is thinkable—isn't it well to consider what might happen if—

Brown—If a mouse should run in here with a cat in its mouth?

Smith—Don't you think the attorney general can be trusted to—

Brown—Leave off the "to."

Smith—I accept the amendment. But what are you to monopolize?

Brown—I'm going to corner misery—

Smith—Man, you're crazy! The coal trust, oil trust, beef trust and a score of other leeches are ahead of you.

Brown—Stop a bit. You're missing a distinction. They are spreading misery broadcast, not cornering it. That is the one thing they don't produce a scarcity of. I'm going to form it into a trust—incorporate it, by hokey, under the laws of New Jersey with a regular partnership name.

Smith—What name?

Brown—Grinn & Barrett. Won't that be great on an embossed letter-head, with a coat-of-arms showing a full dinner pail rampant and an empty coalhod couchant on a field of expansion?

Smith—Won't it be a bit too realistic for good art? You know art is for art's sake, and mustn't have either use or motif. But never mind that now. Tell me, is the corporation to be limited?

Brown—Not under the present expansive administration. If the people