

might so easily bring to their cause. He is understood to favor the establishment of powers of direct legislation as a check upon the disloyalty of representatives to their constituents; but he has not distinguished himself as an advocate of this reform, which has come to be a veritable touchstone of democracy.

So much reserve on the live issues of democracy, though easily accounted for as the temperamental qualities of a modest statesman of transcendent abilities and profound democratic sentiments, discourage every hope of Mr. Shepard's being accepted generally as a democratic leader.

+

In conjunction with that reserve on the issues of democracy, Mr. Shepard's place on the legal staff of the Pennsylvania Railroad appears to have made him impossible as a leader on the democratic fighting line. We are not stating our wishes, but the fact.

So far as he is known outside the circle of his friends, Mr. Shepard is distrusted by the Interests because they know something of his democracy, and by the masses because they know something of his corporate connections. Consequently, as a candidate for office, he has been the easiest kind of target for crooked agents of the Interests, those who are what the uninformed suppose Mr. Shepard to be. Corporation tools themselves, shameless ones, they point in scorn at him as "a corporation lawyer," knowing that this cannot hurt them with the corporations, for the corporations can see them wink; but that it will hurt him with the people. And it does. He and his friends cannot deny; they can only explain.

+

We have said that a miracle alone can restore the possibility of Mr. Shepard's leadership in democracy, and this we repeat while regretting the fact.

The miracle might take either of two forms. One form would be a public enlightenment so far reaching and intense that Mr. Shepard's democratic enthusiasms would be manifest in spite of his reserve and of his corporate connections; the other, Mr. Shepard's abandonment of his democratic reserve, and his substitution, without waiting for election to office, of the people in place of a public utility corporation as his principal client.

The miracle is not at all likely to take the first form. In the second, an example, not necessarily for imitation but by way of suggestion, may be found in the career of Louis D. Brandeis.

## "CALGARY MUNICIPAL."\*

San Francisco will soon have a street railway line owned by the people and operated by the people, which is, as you have read, a "dangerous innovation."

No other American city is rushing into that brand of what American street railway monopolists call "socialism." But Calgary, the largest city of Alberta, and Edmonton, the capital of Alberta, have already "rushed" into it—and the people like it.

Yet they are not Socialists. Even the most conservative business men of Calgary and Edmonton see nothing alarming in municipal ownership of street railways, water and electric light and power plants. It seems natural to them, for those cities have never known the thrilling joy of being taxed by private owners of public municipal functions.

+

The American monopolists fire rockets, put torpedoes on the track, and swing red lanterns to warn us against the "dangers" of public ownership of public utilities. But in Calgary and Edmonton the street railways, water plants and electric light and power plants, unlike our public utility corporations, own no mayors, no members of city councils, employ no political bosses, play no tricks in politics, hire no lawyers to pollute the public service, have no secret ownership of newspapers. On the other hand the people of the two cities thrive and are happy. They get good service at reasonable rates, and the employes of those publicly owned utilities are not compelled to work more than nine hours a day—and are otherwise treated like real human beings.

But of course the Calgary cars are rickety and the track out of repair, aren't they? No, the cars are just as good as the best I have recently seen in New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit, St. Louis, Louisville, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul or Minneapolis; and compared with the four-wheel agitators used in Cincinnati they are as a morris chair to a bucking mule. The track is in New York Central shape. There are plenty of cars, and the motormen and conductors are careful and courteous.

It is a maxim of street railway monopolists that "public ownership of street railways doesn't pay," which means, when the sentence is completed, that "public ownership of street railways doesn't pay private monopolists."

\*The two words one sees on the publicly owned street cars in the Alberta city, Calgary.

That's one reason the people of Edmonton and Calgary own their street car lines. They seem to have some prejudice against private monopoly; and their experience with public ownership shows that it does pay, not only in money, but in morals. Their public utilities have never spent a dollar to corrupt municipal politics.

You may not believe it, but Calgary and Edmonton don't know what it means to have a street car company delegate in a municipal convention or meeting of any kind—which shows how easily people can get along without the actual necessities of life if they have never had them.

+

Calgary has 40,000 people. Its first street car was run July 1, 1909, and at the end of the first six months the system showed a surplus of \$6,944.08; not only showed it, but had it.

In the next twelve months, which ended December 31, 1910, the net surplus was \$33,315.28, after the municipal government had put away out of the earnings a reserve of \$9,370.55, paid to the general fund \$22,500, and put into a contingent fund to cover depreciation of plant, etc., \$10,634.07. So you see how the people of Calgary are squandering money on a "fad."

Yet when I asked a conservative business man in Calgary if there were any sentiment in favor of private ownership of the street car system—of selling it to a private corporation—he replied: "Why, no one here would suggest such a thing. We are being gouged by private ownership of the Canadian Pacific, and that's enough."

+

For its 18 miles of double track, 18 cars and all other things the city of Calgary invested \$516,000 in its street railway plant, and the total earnings to December 31, 1910, were \$214,778.44; that for the first eighteen months, and the earnings went right back to the people. That's the reason public ownership doesn't pay the would-be private monopolist.

"But see how the people are bonded!" a street car monopolist would exclaim. "They are loaded down with a debt of almost \$13 per capita for their 'fad.'" But are not the stocks and bonds of a private monopoly a load upon the people? Do the private monopolists pay the principal and dividends and interest out of their own pockets? And would "private capital"—which in this case means private monopoly—have been content to stock and bond the street car system of Calgary at only \$516,000? Ever hear of street car monopolists capitalizing a first-class system at only \$28,-

667 a mile? Wouldn't they add \$71,333 a mile just to make it "even" and look more business-like, thus "capitalizing" the permit given by the people for the use of the streets? And then wouldn't they say that they shouldn't be taxed on the franchise "because it isn't worth anything"?

+

The people of Edmonton and Calgary have in operation a plan by which they avoid the payment of something for nothing to private monopolists, and at the same time avoid incessant meddling in municipal politics by professional corruptionists.

W. G. EGGLESTON.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### CONGRESSMAN GEORGE IN IDAHO.

Boise, Idaho, Feb. 22.

Another step toward the realization of the single tax may be credited to the State of Idaho. The Senate wing of the legislature now in session yesterday unanimously passed a bill to exempt \$200 of improvements from taxation, and the House wing is expected to act similarly. Hon. Dow Dunning, member of the House from Owyhee county, the father of the bill, looks for much single tax progress in the State during the next few years. He counts four out-and-out single taxers in the Republican legislature, and a majority of the members of both branches ready to make advances of some kind. The Democratic Governor, James E. Hawley, is by his own statement to me, "more than ninety per cent a single taxer."

+

I came to the capital city of Idaho under the lecture management of F. H. Monroe of the Henry George Lecture Association, and have made six addresses. The most important was in the Pinney Theater, and the subject "The Single Tax." The next in importance was in the House chamber at the capitol, before a joint meeting of the two wings of the legislature, the subject there being "Direct Legislation." A large part of the members of House and Senate attended the single tax lecture and, judging from the applause, were not frightened by the most radical sentiment. Mr. Floed, the Governor's secretary, presided, and spoke as one fully in the faith.

The address before the legislature was in support of measures for the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, introduced by House Member Dunning. They are with him only means to single tax ends. He calls himself a farmer, and he does work a little Idaho irrigated farm. Among other things, he raises some of the finest apples I ever saw.

When he first went to the legislature two years ago he was regarded as a "fool farmer" and a "crank." He had had little or no public-speaking experience and had stage fright for almost half the session. But at last, driven to desperation by the heresies uttered and the things done on the legislative