

**HERITAGE.****For The Public.**

A common card with a picture,  
And the name of my far-off boy;  
It seems but the merest trifle  
To have flooded my heart with joy.

A view of the grand old ocean  
With the line of its curving beach;  
A row of cottages, stretching  
Far southward as vision can reach.

The breezy name in the corner  
I chose, when he lay on my breast,  
Wrapt in the infantile sweetness  
That flows from the fountain of rest.

I proudly hoped it would mingle  
With the names of our good and great,—  
His life be free from the worries  
That hauntingly followed my fate.

In the tide of its fuller current  
The best of my being would flow,  
The hours of my restless longing  
No need for his nature to know.

We stood on that beach together  
When the years of his youth had flown;  
Each in its turn had been laden  
With burdens that hampered my own.

With eyes on an outbound vessel,  
And his froward feet in the spray,  
He stood, with a silent longing  
To be sailing away, away.

Alas, for my own born-rover,  
By circumstance chained to a spot;  
The hardship missed from my journey  
Had fallen to the strong man's lot.

His shapely hands had been hardened  
While his heart grew brave and soft,  
And my own poor best and highest  
In his grasp had been held aloft.

He had wronged no helpless brother,  
He had failed to grow worldly-wise;  
But wisdom past worldly scheming  
Looked afar from his deep-set eyes.

I felt how little it mattered  
That his name should be only heard  
As that of a humble helper,  
And a gladdening household word.

If much of his mental nature  
Had been left asleep and adream,  
'Twas a birthright never bartered,  
That a future might well redeem.

My heart had no room for grieving  
Over hopes that had come to naught,  
Since even out of their ruins,  
Not a slave, but a MAN was wrought.

D. H. INGHAM.

\* \* \*

**DEFECTS OF OUR ELECTORAL COLLEGE SYSTEM.****For The Public.**

The original purpose of the framers of the Constitution in adopting the electoral plan was to remove the election of the chief executive from the direct vote of the unintelligent masses. It was their intention that the electors should be free and unbiased men whose judgment as to the best qualified man for

President would be superior to that of the whole people. Needless to say, this purpose has failed completely. Under the present plan of pledged electors the people decide, as surely as if they voted directly, who the President shall be, unless their verdict be defeated, as has happened, by the cumbersome and unequal method of choosing electors. Only the first President was elected by other than party-pledged electors. This failure might have been expected, for the electoral plan is quite contrary to the democratic spirit of our institutions. If there be any argument against the will of the people deciding who shall execute the laws of the country, the same will apply with equal force against the people having a direct voice in choosing those who make our laws; and if it be dangerous for them to participate directly in national government, it is difficult to see wherein it is less dangerous for them to participate directly in State government. Nor does it seem that they would be any better able to choose competent electors than a competent President.

The provision of the Constitution leaving the method of choosing electors entirely to each State has given rise to some very different modes of procedure, and caused considerable inequality of power between the voters of one State and those of another. Four different methods have been tried, and three of these have been in use in different States at one and the same time. At first in a number of the States the legislature chose the electors. South Carolina continued this method down to 1868. Colorado, at the first election after her admission, not having time to provide for an election by the people, chose her electors by vote of the legislature. This method was sometimes by joint ballot, sometimes by concurrent vote of the two branches of the legislature. The district plan was followed in more than one-third of the States as late as 1828. Michigan adopted the same plan in 1891, but gave it up after one trial. At present in all the States the electors are chosen by the people of the State, voting by general ticket. In this way each voter votes for all the electors to which his State is entitled, and the electoral vote of the State goes as a whole to the candidate who carries the State even by ever so meager a plurality. Here arise two serious defects of the system.

First: The will of the majority of the people of the nation may be defeated by a very small plurality in one or a few of the States which control a large electoral vote. A very large majority in one State may be overcome by a very small majority in another. One example will make this plain. In the election of 1892 Cleveland received in New York and Pennsylvania 1,107,132 votes, and in the same States Harrison received 1,125,361 votes. This was a majority of 18,300 for Harrison. Yet Cleveland received four more electoral votes from the two States than Harrison. The election of Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888, demonstrate the possibility of the popular majority being for one candidate, and the electoral majority for the other. Cleveland in 1884 received the thirty-six electoral votes of New York by a majority of 1100 votes. This turned the election. Thus 1100 votes out of 10,000,000 determined an election and a change of less than 600 votes would have given the election to the other party.

Second: Another serious injustice which results

from the right of each voter to vote for all the electors to which his State is entitled is the unequal power which exists between the individual voter in the larger States and the individual voter in the smaller States. Thus each voter in New York has a voice in determining who thirty-nine of the Presidential electors shall be, while each voter in Wyoming can vote for only three, in this way giving a vote in New York thirteen times the power of a vote in any one of the seven smaller States. In 1834, when a change of 600 votes in New York would have taken thirty-six electoral votes from one party and given them to the other, a similar change in Montana would have transferred only three electoral votes. It is manifestly unfair that six hundred men in New York should have so enormously much more power than six hundred men in the smaller State.

\*

But there is still another inequality of electoral power between the citizens of the small States and those of the larger States; and contrary enough, it operates in favor of the people of the smaller States.

While the voter of the larger State possesses greater power than the voter of the smaller State by being able to vote for a greater number of electors, yet each voter of the smaller State has a greater proportional representation in the Electoral College than has the voter in the larger State. This fact arises from the method of apportionment which allows two senatorial electors in addition to those to which the State is entitled on the basis of population. In one of the small States whose population entitles it to but one Representative in Congress, the addition will be in the ratio of two to one, while in New York it will be in the ratio of two to thirty-seven; or, to state the matter in another way, the two senatorial electors will increase the representation of the people of the smaller State in the Electoral College two hundred per cent., while the representation of the people of the larger State will be increased less than six per cent. As a State stands lower in order of population, its proportional representation in the Electoral College is greater and the power of each voter is increased. For it must be remembered that the senatorial electors do not represent the State as a State, any more than do the other electors, being chosen not by the legislature as are the Senators, but by direct vote of the people. The point may be illustrated as follows: The State of Nevada with a population of 42,335 (census of 1900 according to which Representatives were last apportioned), has three electors, being one for each 14,111 of population. New York with a population of 7,268,012, has thirty-nine electors, being one for each 186,359 of population. It will thus be seen that one person in Nevada has the same representation in the Electoral College that thirteen persons in New York have. In the same way it may be shown that the six smaller States that have only one Representative each in Congress have the same representation for 55,636 persons in the body which chooses our President that the six larger States have for 180,531 persons, a ratio of over one to three.

While we have discussed what are perhaps the greatest errors of our Electoral System, there are still several minor defects which space permits us only to mention.

It has been urged that the long period of four months between the vote of the people and the inauguration of a new President is a source of grave danger. It is true that an outgoing administration might do much contrary to the expressed will of the people; and at a critical period of affairs, national or international, a vigorous opposition to the sanctioned policy of the incoming administration might beget for it a much more embarrassing situation than did the inaction of the last four slow-dragging months of Buchanan's administration. There is also good ground for the objection that a majority should not be required to elect. If there be a multiplicity of electoral tickets there will be more or less chance of the election going to the House of Representatives—a contingency that should be reduced to the minimum for reasons hereinafter given. Besides this, there seems more justice in allowing the greater number of people to have the choice of President than that he should be chosen by one of the lesser factions, through an indirect system. A popular plurality requirement would accomplish this result, but as it now is, not even a popular majority is an assurance of election. As a matter of history, nine out of nineteen Presidents elected since the beginning, in 1824, of the present system of popular election of electors, have been elected by less than a majority of the popular vote. Still another objection to the electoral plan is that the voter has no choice between the candidates for Vice-President, or else no choice between the candidates for President, since the same body of electors choose both.

Practically, however, this is of little moment. A more serious objection to the system is the method of counting the electoral votes. Notwithstanding the act of 1887, Congress is still the judge of the returns finally sent in. Trouble over the returns began with Massachusetts in 1805, and the returns have nine times since been the cause of more or less friction between the branches of Congress, finally culminating in the memorable Hayes-Tilden contest of 1877. The electors of Wisconsin in 1857 assembled and voted on a day different from that provided by law. The question as to whether a certain State belonged to the Union at the time of election came up with regard to Indiana in 1817, Missouri in 1821, and Georgia in 1869. If a partisan Congress must decide these and similar questions there is certain to be dissatisfaction and bitterness of feeling. Of course it will be answered that there must be a court with authority for final decision, but the force of the argument lies in the fact that the danger might be minimized if the system could be so changed that the entire vote of the State would not be involved. If the election of President goes to the House of Representatives he will be chosen by a strictly party vote. This may result in the choice of a President representing a policy opposed to that of the popular plurality, as in the case of J. Q. Adams in 1824. It may also give us a President and Vice-President of different parties as were Adams and Calhoun.

\*

Last but not least in the evils of our

electoral system is the opportunity it offers for political corruption. If, as has been shown, a vote in New York is thirteen times as powerful as a vote in Montana, then a vote in New York is worth thirteen times as much as a vote in Montana to the purchaser of votes. A change of a few hundred votes in the "pivotal States" would give the election to the other party, since the entire electoral vote of a State is carried by even the smallest popular plurality. It was pointed out that a change of 600 votes in New York in 1884 would have elected Blaine President; then how immensely more valuable to either party were the 600 votes in New York than 600 votes in any of the smaller States. The course of a Presidential campaign shows how each party throws all its force, legitimate or otherwise, into the larger doubtful States.

+

Since, as a great British writer says, "the presidential electors have become a mere cog-wheel in the machine, a mere contrivance for giving effect to the decision of the people," is it not time to get rid of the useless cog-wheel, and avoid the friction and jumping of cogs? Is it not time to dispense with the "mere contrivance," and escape its attendant evils?

C. E. PATTISON.

+ + +

## WHAT CLEVELAND IS DOING FOR THE MAN WHO IS DOWN.

Rev. Harris R. Cooley, Member of the Board of Public Service for the City of Cleveland, in the Cleveland Press of Oct. 23, 1906.

During the year another cottage and a school house have been added to the boys' home at Hudson. We will have accommodations for 120 boys. The gymnasium is being furnished. When all the building construction is completed a manual training department will be started.

During the coming year, if funds can be secured, we hope to establish a home for girls.

Two additional farms have been purchased, giving us now 1,700 acres at Warrensville. As the fundamental principle of our movement is to return to the natural life of the country, it is essential that as large an area as possible be provided for the thousands who will in the future become residents of the colony. About 40 of our old men from the infirmary are living at the colony, and our experience with them has given us great confidence in the plan.

The plans of our new infirmary village at the farm colony consist of a quadrangle built about a service court. Facing upon this court are to be a boiler house, laundry, bakery, bathrooms and kitchen. The cottages are to radiate from each corner of this quadrangle, giving the effect of a country village. This is to be situated on a high ridge 600 feet above the city and looking out upon the lake 10 miles distant. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars are in hand for this work. A start on the buildings will be made at the earliest moment in the Spring.

Next year all of the inmates of the infirmary can become residents of the farm colony. This will provide for the unfortunate ones happier surroundings

in which to spend the declining years of their lives. It will also prove a great benefit to all the people of Cleveland, by giving to them the consciousness of dealing more fairly and generously with the aged poor and the crippled who are in our midst.

The temporary tuberculosis sanitarium at the farm colony has been completed with accommodations for over 100 patients. The sanitarium was constructed with reference to the outdoor treatment, which has proved so successful. Three lean-tos have been provided for the accommodation of 60 of the patients, who spend their days and nights practically out of doors. A new building is now being constructed which will provide a sun room, to be used also as a recreation room and an auditorium for the residents of this group.

During the coming year it is hoped to start the building of a permanent tuberculosis sanitarium on the summit of a high ridge which overlooks miles of the surrounding country.

From 50 to 70 of our trusties from the house of correction have been kept at the farm of correction, which is a part of our farm colony. Two large buildings have been erected, the first of the permanent group of the house of correction buildings at the farm. These buildings, known as the trusties' lodge, will accommodate 160 men. This group of correction buildings will be located on an ideal site a mile from the other villages.

During the Winter we hope to relieve the congested condition of the city house of correction by removing a part of the population to the trusties' lodge. Our experience with the prisoners at the farm gives us greater confidence in the successful working out of the plan to use many prisoners in road making and farming and at other outdoor employment.

The plan for the coming year is to build a permanent, modern house of correction on the farm, so that the old workhouse in the city can be abandoned. We hope to see prisoners sentenced directly to the farm of correction.

The night school at the house of correction has been continued under the direction of our parole officer. A parole matron has been appointed to give to the women, if possible, the opportunities which have worked successfully with the men.

The Brotherhood is an organization of former prisoners at the house of correction, whose purpose it is to help men when they are released. It finds them employment and then provides them with food and shelter until their pay day. It furnishes to these men an opportunity to work, to live and to help some other fellow who is down.

During the year the Brotherhood moved into a temporary home and purchased on credit equipment for a kitchen, dining room and dormitory. These have been paid for and are now the property of the Brotherhood. Aside from the use of the building rent free, the home is self-sustaining.

Over 200 men have been helped, and these men have paid into the home for their support more than \$4,000, which they have earned by honest labor in the shops and factories of our city. It is hoped to establish this home in some permanent quarters.

The plan for the coming year is to establish a contagious disease hospital. The growth of the city and