

at different periods from about 1860, and usually for 20 or 25 years. Beginning in the late '70's renewals were secured at different times, to expire at varying dates from September of this year to 1914. The "Big Consolidated" and the "Little Consolidated"—Mark Hanna having long been the controlling figure in the latter—were combined a year or two ago into the Cleveland Electric Railway company, which now operates all the mileage of the city and several suburban lines.

In 1897 a vigorous effort was made to secure a general renewal of existing street car franchises and, despite popular agitation, a renewal ordinance at one time passed its second reading in the council. It was finally halted, however, and matters rested. The advent of Tom Johnson as mayor in 1901 brought the question again to the front. He challenged the companies with his low fare demands. They were anxious for a renewal grant, but they declined it on his terms and chose to wait.

The mayor thereupon took the aggressive. He determined upon the Detroit plan, by which, under Mayor Pingree, a new company built a duplicate system, ever since operated with eight tickets for a quarter.

For years, however, the Ohio legislature, dominated by traction interests, had been hedging up the way against such a move. The statutes rendered it exceedingly easy to grant "extensions" of existing lines or renewals of existing rights to an existing company, but exceedingly difficult to confer a valid grant upon a new company. Mayor Johnson produced a three-cent company ready to enter the field, and a grant was made to it for an extensive new system. This grant was speedily invalidated in the courts on technical grounds.

A different line of tactics was then chosen: It was decided to confer a franchise upon a new company for a single short line, the technical requirements for which could more easily be met, and then to grant to this company, as fast as they should fall in, the lines of the old company, with due provision for paying the latter for the value of the plants. A grant was accordingly made nearly a year ago to a new company for a new line three miles long in the outskirts, on the basis of three-cent fares and a universal transfer for this and all other lines subsequently operated by the company, and with a provision for city purchase at any time. The old company, however, got an injunction

stopping construction when the line was half finished, and the matter is still in court.

A few months ago a grant was made to this three-cent company for two lines of the old company—one expiring September 20 of this year and the other in April of next year—equitable payment for the existing plant being required. But the execution of this grant was likewise promptly enjoined by a United States judge at the instance of the old company.

Moreover, this injunction was obtained on a basis wholly unforeseen by the public. It was secured on the absolutely novel claim that the existing grants of the operating company—expiring, according to their terms, at different periods from 1904 to 1914—are, through various implications, effectually extended until the latter date. The claim is a complete surprise to the people of Cleveland.

Looked at broadly, the obstructive tactics thus far successfully used by the Cleveland traction interests to defy and defeat the city, are a significant comment upon the general policy of intrenching great public service corporations in the municipal body politic, where, when once established they can pursue the plan of "tiring out the people."

The general admission, too, that in the case of Cleveland these interests are virtually backed by the State legislature—working through its discreditable code revisions—not to say by the State courts and the State board of elections, emphasizes again the dependence of municipal reform upon State reform.

It is impossible to suppose that the municipalities of Ohio will permanently submit to have charters thrust upon them without being consulted, to have "separate city elections" abolished by a high-handed political maneuver in the interest of local monopolies and to have their will effectually nullified by outside machinery as to the administration of these monopolies. Mayor Johnson's struggle for home rule in respect to the traction question is of far-reaching import. It is clearly the principal item in Cleveland's progressive movement.

"You say he has a visionary and impractical nature?"

"Yes," answered the girl who is employed in the post office; "he is one of those people who write 'Rush' on an envelope instead of putting on a special delivery stamp."—Washington Star.

THE PEOPLE ARE NOT FOOLS.

A portion of a speech delivered by Gov. L. F. C. Garvin in East Providence, R. I., Friday evening, October 28, 1904.

It has been long manifest that the active Republican leaders of Rhode Island have an utter contempt for the intelligence of the voters, both as a whole and in sections. They treat this constituency as non compos mentis.

Acting upon this low estimate of public intelligence, the State House machine has engaged in such petty tricks that to call them "peanut politics" is to magnify and ennoble them an hundred fold. It is needless to recall the numerous indignities thrust at the Governor as president of the Senate; but scarcely less foolish have been the continued attempts to throttle the minority. It must be borne in mind all the time that the majority, both in the Senate and House, who do those ridiculous things are merely the marionettes made to dance by the party managers who put them there.

Last year and this, although the Democrats have almost as many members of the House as the dominant party, the most important committees, against all precedent and public safety, have been made up of Republicans. Only by the most strenuous efforts have the Democrats of the House, both last year and this, been able to shame the Republican speaker into giving them any representation. In the Senate the committee on finance and the committee on corporations (often called the "boodle committee") are partisan in character. The cities of Providence, Newport and Central Falls, although ably represented in the Senate, have no place on any important committee, because, forsooth, those constituencies preferred to elect Democrats. This proscription of opponents is supposed by the machine to make votes for its party!

Analogous to their action in shutting Democrats off of leading committees is the scheme, in vogue now or three years, of refusing to report from committees the bills and resolutions introduced by Democrats. The object the Machine has in view apparently, is to prevent discussion, and thereby keep the public from knowing the merits of the measures, and at the same time prevent members of the majority from going on record directly upon such propositions, for instance, as the giving of the veto power to the Governor.

A like belittling of public opinion is shown in the buying up of all open days of Infantry and Music halls, not for the purpose of using them, but, as in the 1892 campaign, in order to prevent the presentation of Democratic issues by

distinguished national speakers. By a wise foresight the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee was enabled, long before the campaign began, to hire Music hall for the evenings of November 4 and 7; but for the open dates of the ablest Democratic orators no large auditorium in the city of Providence is available.

The leaders of the Republican party, after making a solemn pledge to have no more law making after election by a defunct legislature, are now a third time since that promise was made, about to defy public sentiment by holding such a session one week after a new legislature shall have been elected.

The State Machine, after refusing to consider amendments to the constitution conferring the veto power and equal suffrage in cities, has proposed an amendment to be read at the polls on November 8, dividing the cities and large towns into voting districts for the election of members of the House. Instead of yielding to the public demand that the people of the State be protected by reforming the State Senate, the Machine insults the voters by offering an amendment which will so gerrymander the large municipalities as to put an end to an opposition party of any kind in the State.

The State Machine, not content with its assumption that the electors are such fools that they will not see through the silly tricks above enumerated, acts upon the premise that every class of citizens in the State is made up of the densely ignorant. Among other things it tries to obscure the real issues by appealing to religious prejudice of some kind. It is to be expected, therefore, that this year, as last, some attempt to delude and deceive the voters in that line will be sprung somewhere a few days before election.

Again, this year still more than last, police commissions and license commissions are to be made use of by the State Machine to intimidate liquor dealers into a combined support of Republican candidates. As a means to this end threats are made as to what will be done to them after election if the Democrats are not defeated.

And so it has been year in and year out, that the active Republican leaders have manifested their supreme contempt for those whose support and votes they seek, unaware of the ridicule and dislike they have won from the common people. No one enjoys being looked upon and treated as though he were a fool.

But it may be said the policy so long followed must have seemed to be suc-

cessful or it would not have been continued. Certainly success has followed, but for other causes. The lavish and unscrupulous expenditure of money for both legitimate and corrupt purposes; the assistance of nearly all the State and municipal office holders; the support of most of the newspapers, and finally the mere momentum of long possession of political power, these have been the efficient agencies of the Republican Machine.

Added to these has been the poverty of the Democratic party. Unable to secure funds to build up a State organization and carry on annual campaigns, its members have not succeeded in substituting individual work and enthusiasm for the ordinary pecuniary methods.

Finally, a corrupt machine has controlled the Republican party, because no considerable number of influential citizens have been sufficiently interested and independent to rebuke it in an effectual manner.

The Democratic party, with all its faults, has always shown a respect for public opinion. In all its attempts at legislation it has appealed to the intelligence of the voters of the State. It refuses to arouse prejudice; it invites discussion of its measures; it has no desire to intimidate. All that it needs, in order to effect great and lasting reforms in this State is the open and cordial support of the good citizens who are dissatisfied with boss rule and its base methods.

THE BARGAIN OF ESAU.

Government by the people
—next after home and religion—
is the most austere obligation
now resting on you.
First is to keep your family;
next—after God's dues are met,
and a part of those dues if you will—
is to keep up the state.
Not merely to vote,
but to know whom you're voting for,
and to have some reason why.

If it's worth giving one's whole life,
It's worth giving such small fraction
of life as this study requires.
It interferes with your business?
It your business—
in its due place
the most important you have.
What is there more important
than saving the country?

And saving the country consists—
not in dressing in hardware
and making yourself a target
for some one to take a pot shot at—
but in doing this simple duty
of taking your share in the government,
this government by the people.

Come, if they all
paid as little attention
as you who read these lines,
where would self-government end?
Brethren, the bargain of Esau
doomed him to age-long infamy,
selling his birthright
for a mess of miserable pottage.

But Esau at least was hungry,
and got his hunger appeasal.
You let your birthright rot.
—Goodhue Co. News, of Red Wing, Minn.

Congressman Robert Baker, the man who wouldn't take a pass from the B. & O., was on the official train [at the opening of the New York subway road]. A Republican fellow passenger regarded him for some time with a malevolent glare, and then, touching him on the shoulder, said in icy accents: "Mr. Baker, did you pay for this ride?"

Of course everybody on that train was riding free. Baker gave a melodramatic start and hissed:

"Detected!"—New York Times, of October 28.

BOOKS

THE BOOK OF LORDS.

Mr. Watson, in his story of France, speaking of the splendid enthusiasm with which the friends of liberty everywhere greeted the fall of the Bastille, breaks out with the exclamation: "Cold, cold are the ashes of all this noble enthusiasm now." One cannot but be reminded of this in reading Morrison Davidson's "Book of Lords," written with a noble enthusiasm some 15 years ago, at a time when there was a hopeful agitation in England against the upper chamber of parliament. A great meeting was held in St. James' hall, which unanimously adopted this resolution—that the "House of Peers in Parliament is useless and dangerous, and ought to be abolished." If Davidson were writing now of this meeting, he might exclaim: "Cold, cold are the ashes of all this noble enthusiasm now."

The fact is that reaction is on top today. Enthusiasm for the abolition of shams and the overthrow of oppression is smouldering in the background. We have criticism, and cynicism, and a half-despairing discontent—but there is nowhere a buoyant enthusiasm thrilling the hearts of all lovers of freedom with a common fire. Socialism shows more signs than anything else, but even socialism, with its rapidly-growing protest, seems to many thoughtful reformers rather a sure manifestation of the social unrest than a clear-cut ideal that needs no defense. One does not feel in the air a pervasive, buoyant, bracing atmosphere of enthusiasm for liberty, equality and fraternity. And yet there are perhaps indications that the reactionary spirit is pausing at the top, and may soon decline.

It is a good time to read again such books as this little work by Davidson, with its scathing denunciation of so manifest an absurdity as hereditary legislators. Its spirit is catching, and will help to engender gall against other manifest absurdities.

"The Book of Lords" is a sequel to the author's well-known arraignment of royalty in the "New Book of Kings."