

SENATOR BOURNE'S DEFEAT.

Portland, Ore

Believing that Senator Bourne's retirement from the Senate will be a distinct loss to the Progressive cause, I wish to state the facts as I see them.



None of Senator Bourne's political friends, so far as I know, approved of his plan of campaign, announced some eight months ago. It was, as has been said, "unique;" but it wasn't good politics. It was a voluntary and unnecessary handicap upon Senator Bourne and his friends. For himself, personally, he had a right to handicap himself. As a candidate for renomination he had no right to handicap his friends; he had no right to give odds to desperate, implacable and unscrupulous opponents, especially when he knew that most of the newspaper press of Oregon is in the hands of his opponents.

This isn't saying that the people can't be trusted. The people can be trusted when they know and understand the facts.



Senator Bourne announced his plan of campaign, which was to make no campaign, against the protests of many of his friends and long before he knew what the other side intended to do; and he is a man who, having determined upon a certain line of action, can't be switched off that line. That gave his political enemies in the Republican party plenty of time to develop and carry out their plan of campaign—and it certainly was artistic.

Last fall a man came in from one of the back country districts and reported that the Machine was pretty busy against Bourne; that it was paying special attention to the country districts, to the farmers, and particularly to the first voters and new settlers; that outside the cities it was combing the country thoroughly and systematically. But Bourne's close friends said they didn't believe it would amount to anything because the country voters wouldn't be deceived by any man with a Machine taint.

Bourne's friends were expecting all along that the Machine would put up a well-known and branded Machine man, like former Senator Fulton, in the hope that the standpat vote would land him, with the Progressive vote divided between three or four candidates. But that is just what the Machine didn't do. The puzzle picture is clear now, though it was all mixed up until about six weeks ago.



It is quite evident now that the Machine was working all along for Selling, who won the nomination.

It poisoned the country against Bourne, and used some of Bourne's own poison—his vote with the Aldrich-Payne crowd on the tariff, particularly on the cotton and woolen goods schedule. That poison was carefully injected into voters all over the State. One doesn't have to work his imagination very hard to see what effect such poison is sure to have on voters who must pay more for the family clothing and other necessities of life.

Selling's first open move was to flood the State

with letters asking voters to advise him whether or not he should announce himself as a candidate. That was a violation of the spirit of the Corrupt Practices Act, for he has not included the cost of that ante-announcement campaign in his campaign expenses; and it was probably a violation of the letter of the law. Still, it did not occur to Bourne's friends that Selling was the Machine candidate until The Oregonian began to urge him to be a candidate.

Even then the picture was not clear.

It was believed that The Oregonian was urging Selling into the race so as to get as many Progressives into it as possible, and that Fulton would then announce himself as a candidate. Selling has been for several years president of the People's Power League, and thus is known as a Progressive. The idea that The Oregonian was seriously for Selling, while advertising him as a Progressive and proving it by repeatedly mentioning the fact that he is president of the People's Power League, didn't seem plausible.

It seemed all the less plausible because, while The Oregonian was boosting Selling as a Progressive, and calling attention to his position as president of the People's Power League, it was and has been for a long time damning the various measures proposed and initiated by that League, and throwing bricks at a Constitutional amendment that the League has had under consideration for three years and may initiate this year.

Altogether, the Machine campaign was one of the most skillful jobs of political chloroforming that I have seen since I began to attend the moving picture show of politics more than thirty years ago. Even when the nominations were closed, and no branded Machine man was in the race, Bourne's friends in Oregon thought he was absolutely safe—unsinkable and with no need of boats or life belts. The Machine's iceberg was painted to look like real water.



There were two other factors that contributed to Bourne's defeat. One was his neglect to have some friend edit his statements that the people of Oregon are more indebted to him than he is to them, and that in the campaign just closed they were on trial, not he. That's bad politics; so bad that a candidate's friends can't repair the damage. Senator Bourne had no right to hobble his friends with such a statement, which was sure to be used and *was* used with telling effect by the anti-Bourne papers and politicians.

Then, Senator Bourne had some labor union leaders fighting him after the campaign became warm. They were for Selling because he did everything the labor unions asked him to do when he erected the Selling Building last year; the contracts provided for union labor. They were against Bourne because the Bourne mills at Fall River, Mass., don't pay higher wages than the other mills, and because he voted against exempting labor unions from the operation of the Sherman anti-trust law.

Last fall, when I was in California, one of the big Progressives in the Senate expressed to me his fear that Bourne was taking too many chances on defeat in the kind of campaign he had decided on; and this Senator, while above trickery, knows the political

game and knows that for the present it must be played according to certain rules. "It's all right to trust the people," said this Senator, "but it's all wrong to trust your enemies and imagine they won't persuade some of the people to distrust you." And that's political common sense.

The fact that Senator Bourne has remained in Washington, attending to public business, was used against him. He was pictured as a non-resident who pays no taxes in Oregon, remaining away from the State and spending his time playing golf in Washington. Loud shouts were made over the State that he pays no taxes in Oregon except \$2.44 on some office furniture in Portland; no mention was made of other taxes paid by him outside of Portland. Equally loud shouts were made that Selling is a "large taxpayer," and he wisely refrained from explaining that as a merchant and building owner he passes those taxes on to his customers and tenants.

Doubtless it will be said, especially in the East, that Oregon voters have "repudiated the Progressive hysteria." There is no reason for that claim. Oregon voters repudiated Taft in the primaries, and Selling's campaign was based on the statement that he is one of the original Progressives; that a large part of the credit for establishing the "Oregon system" belongs to him. There was never a hint that he has been or is opposed to any plank, prop or nail in the Progressive platform. Whether or not he will shed his Progressive feathers when he gets into the Senate is a conundrum for the future to answer.

There is one thin thread of silver on the edge of the cloud. No other Progressive is going to try the Bourne plan of campaignless campaign at a very early date; not until the public service corporations are out of politics, which they won't be until they are out of private hands and in the hands of the people. Private ownership of public utilities means selfish control of the press to defend and uphold taxation for private profit.

W. G. EGGLESTON.

AUSTRALIA.*

Corowa, N. S. W., Australia, March 21, 1912.

The fifth Commonwealth Political Labor Conference was held at Hobart, Tasmania, in January, when the following platform was adopted:

(1) Maintenance of a white Australia. (2) Maintenance of the land tax. (3) Effective federation for the inclusion of the referendum proposals in the constitution. (4) New protection. (5) Nationalization of monopolies. (6) Arbitration act amendment. (7) Navigation. (8) Commonwealth freight and passenger steamers. (9) Restriction of public borrowing. (10) General insurance. (11) Establishment of sugar refineries.

A proposal was made that no exemptions be allowed in the existing Federal land-value tax, but it was defeated.

Clause 3 refers to the referendum taken in April, 1911, on the question of extending the powers of the Commonwealth.

*See Publics of February 16, page 150; and March 29, page 301.

By "new protection" is meant legislation to provide for higher wages in protected industries, so that the manufacturers shall be compelled to give their employees a share of the benefit derived from the tariff.

General State elections were held in South Australia in February, the Verran (Labor) ministry having resigned owing to a disagreement with the Legislative Council (upper house), over the budget.

The ministry proposed to reduce railway freights for the carriage of wheat and firewood; to raise the exemption under the Income Tax Act from £200 to £300; to abolish the stamp duty on receipts; and to make up the deficiency in the revenue by increasing the land-values tax by a half-penny in the pound. It also proposed to establish state brick works, and timber and firewood yards. As far as can be judged from the reports, the Council would have passed the Appropriation Bill but for the last items, which it held were improperly included in the bill.

The Ministry then appealed to the country, but was defeated. The new House is composed of 24 Liberals and 16 Laborites.

The electoral machinery in South Australia is very bad; the voting was nearly even, yet the Liberals secured a majority of eight members.

The Verran government appears to have lost the opportunity to pass some useful reforms, owing to disputes over some socialistic experiments of doubtful value.

ERNEST BRAY.

PROGRESSIVE EFFORTS IN MARYLAND

Baltimore, Md.

Advocates of direct legislation and tax reform have had a busy time here this year. The legislature favorably reported an Initiative and Referendum bill out of committee and a canvass showed a majority of supporters in the House; but the sentiment was not strong enough to withstand opposition of floor leaders, and the measure lost by 6 votes on its second reading. A Constitutional amendment permitting classification of property for taxation was put through the House but was unfortunately held up in committee in the Senate. Joseph Fels recently stimulated Singletax interest here by addressing the City Council, the Real Estate Exchange and several other public bodies; and Charles Frederick Adams of the Henry George Lecture Association has spent several days here in effective work. Mr. Adams addressed the political economy class at the Johns Hopkins University, where Dr. J. H. Hollander came out most surprisingly for the Singletax. Mr. Adams also spoke before the Advertising Club and the Real Estate Exchange on "Commission Form of Government;" and before the Builders' Exchange, the Baltimore Chapter of the American Banking Institute, and the Federation of Labor, on "Rational Tax Reform." Everywhere he met with responsive audiences, and excited an eager demand for literature.

CHAS. J. OGLE.