

quarrel, and no grown person would harm a child."

"But," said the American lady, "the child might get lost."

"That would make no trouble," was the smiling reply; and then she showed how, in little children's apparel there were inserted cards containing their name and address, and explaining that should they stray, any person finding them will first give them a good meal and then bring them home.—Christian Guardian.

#### "ALL HUMAN TOGETHER."

We badly need the doctrine of democracy, which we too easily profess with our lips. The sublime doctrine is, that "God hath made of one blood all the inhabitants of the world." Then we hold that Divine life is also, though slumbering, in Negroes and Chinamen and Filipinos.

Then a law follows this fact, namely, that we treat men with reference to the Divine life which is in them, that we treat them not as pawns, or toys, or machines, but as men; that we look for the best in them, and hope for the best, not the worst. Do we like to be treated with deference by others? Do we like to have men salute us? Do we care to have them listen when we speak? Do we ask their respect when we make requests of them? Then we must keep our own law. We will take off our hats to their manhood. We will listen respectfully when they speak, we will count their votes, as we wish our votes to be counted. We will never forget that we are all human together.—Rev. Chas. F. Dole.

#### HENRY GEORGE, JR., ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION. AN OPEN LETTER TO THE TREASURER OF THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE.

Hon. George Foster Peabody, Treasurer National Democratic Committee, New York:

Dear Sir—It appears to me of utmost general and party importance that Edward M. Shepard should be nominated for the Governorship by the Democratic convention at Saratoga on the 20th instant.

His strong moral qualities, high, clear principles, splendid attainments and long training in public and legal affairs fit him peculiarly to fill with profit and honor to the State of New York and with distinction to himself an office which for years has been degraded to the lowest standards. His nomination would signify not only

that the party had taken high, moral, progressive ground, but that it intended to be aggressive, for Mr. Shepard, as a candidate, would "carry the war into Africa." My judgment is that such a nomination would assure Democratic victory in this State in November.

Confidence of this result prevailing here would over the country quicken confidence of general Democratic success, for all eyes look to New York for indications.

To men thinking as I do there is not only no good result to be obtained by voting for Mr. Watson, the People's Party candidate for the Presidency; there is a negative evil. While, despite his opposing action, he is a good Jeffersonian Democrat and while there is much progressive democracy in his platform, he has little chance even of making a good showing at the polls, not to speak of being elected. The election lies between President Roosevelt and Judge Parker, and what one or the other stands for must govern the administrative branch of the United States Government for the next four years.

In my judgment the election of Judge Parker is needed to save the Republic from imminent danger.

I never approved of Judge Parker's hiding his political views and I must condemn his timid opposition to the tariff and trust iniquities, believing that the true stand for a Democratic candidate to take, both for social justice and political success, is such as was taken by Thomas Jefferson in his famous phrase: "Equal rights for all; special privileges to none."

Yet even judged on this domestic question, more may reasonably be hoped for from a candidate who promise little, but whose actions on the bench have been consistent with the principle of equal rights, than from a candidate who, as President, repeatedly swearing eternal enmity to special privilege, had a special cabinet office created largely in order to investigate trust monopolies, and since, manifestly to insure reelection, has had that investigating cabinet officer placed in the chairmanship of his political party, with authority to solicit for the Republican campaign fund contributions from the special privileges and trust monopolies to which the President is supposed to be so hostile.

This might be a sufficient reason for supporting Judge Parker. But there is a still stronger one. The anti-special privilege fight should be made and made soon if the masses of the people are to

be rescued from a variety of huge, insidious and constant robberies that are reducing multitudes to an embruting poverty to which other multitudes have already been reduced. But before we can bring our full or any considerable part of our strength into that fight we must battle with an enemy most active and most potent—an enemy embodied in the military idea, in a great army and a great navy, in a "strong" foreign policy, in manipulated coup d'etats abroad, in the rule of other peoples and the performance of extra-Constitutional things, and in pursuit in many ways of methods that made Rome the ravisher of the world and which helped to reduce her people to the condition of a few masters and many slaves.

Against this foreign aggression, proclaimed and practiced by President Roosevelt—an aggression at once destructive of the liberties of other peoples and ruinous to those of our own—Judge Parker has taken clear, strong ground. For this reason I shall earnestly support him, feeling that this is the pre-eminent issue of the campaign.

And because it appears likely to be of material help in Judge Parker's election while certain to offer a proper chief magistrate to the State of New York, I think Mr. Shepard's nomination for the Governorship to be of pressing political necessity. Yours respectfully,

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

Merrilewood Park, Sullivan Co., N. Y.  
Sept. 3, 1904.

#### THE TRACTION QUESTION IN CHICAGO.

Leading editorial in the Chicago Examiner of Sept. 7, 1904. Written for the Examiner by Louis F. Post.

Had the people of Chicago suspected that Carter H. Harrison, Democrat, and Graeme Stewart, Republican, were running for mayor on the same side of the traction issue a year and a half ago, Harrison's election would have been highly improbable. He was elected because, and only because, a large body of the voters, fearing that Stewart would settle with the traction interests without consulting the people, confidently trusted Harrison's pledges to prevent any and every traction settlement not specifically approved by referendum vote.

That they did not follow the example of the 10,000 who were so distrustful of Mr. Harrison's sincerity as to vote for Daniel L. Cruice (the third-party municipal ownership candidate) was due to the intervention of Clarence S. Darrow, made at the solicitation of Judge Edward F. Dunne. Mr. Darrow saved the day for Harrison. He did so by convinc-

ing most of the voters who were inclined to support Cruice that Stewart, whom they would thereby help to elect, would play into the hands of the traction interests by making an immediate settlement, whereas Harrison could be depended upon to prevent any settlement whatever without a referendum.

This is the true explanation of Harrison's election, as all well-informed citizens of Chicago know. Mayor Harrison himself has acknowledged it in the most pronounced manner.

Yet Mayor Harrison has the temerity now to excuse his part in promoting a traction settlement without a referendum by asserting that in the mayoral campaign both he and Stewart stood for settlement!

He has done this through an interview which appeared on the 28th of August in the friendly columns of the Record-Herald. "Graeme Stewart was a settlement man," says Mayor Harrison in that interview, "and he received 138,000 votes. I also was running on another settlement platform, and I was given 146,000. In other words, the candidates who favored a settlement of some sort or other received 284,000 votes, while the immediate control candidates (Mayor Harrison here alludes to Cruice and the Socialist party candidates) received 20,000 votes."

The Mayor then proceeds in this interview to compare the total of 284,000 votes received by himself and Stewart with the 120,000 "little ballot" votes, a majority of 70,000, cast a year later for immediate municipal ownership; and from the difference thus shown in favor of himself and Stewart, considered as one, he infers that the "little ballot" vote of 1904 was overridden by the Harrison-Stewart "settlement" vote of 1903.

According to Mr. Harrison's present views, consequently, he and Mr. Stewart were running with friendly rivalry in a combination against immediate municipal ownership and in favor of a committee-room and Council-chamber settlement of the traction question. They would appear to have differed only as to the details.

But that was by no means the policy on which Mr. Harrison made his campaign. The platform on which he then stood, and the personal pledges he then made, cannot possibly be reconciled with his present attitude.

Mr. Harrison's platform of that year expressly pledged him and his party to:

The reference of all proposed extension ordinances to a vote of the people for their sanction and indorsement.

Not only was Mr. Harrison thus pledged by his platform, but he pledged

himself to the same effect over and over again to the people whose votes he solicited. He himself has declared it. When asked by a civic committee during that campaign to sign their pledge regarding the traction question, he replied, over his own signature:

In every speech I am making in the present campaign I am calling attention to the necessity of the referendum on all proposed franchise extension ordinances, and am giving my pledge to the people direct to withhold my approval from any ordinance which does not give to the people a right they expect and demand, viz.: A referendum vote on all franchise extension ordinances passed by the City Council.

Has Mayor Harrison changed his mind since making those pledges? If so, what are his reasons? The public which elected him to serve them have a right to know whether or not his reasons are those of a statesman. If they are, they will bear publicity. Then why are they withheld? Why does he try to reconcile the irreconcilable, instead of frankly admitting a change of mind and giving his reasons for the change?

Unless he has changed his mind since his election there can be no defense for his present position. If it is possible for a candidate to bind himself by campaign pledges, if a political party is capable of obligating its nominees by platform declarations, then is Mayor Harrison bound to withhold his approval from the pending traction-extension ordinance until after a referendum vote upon it. Nor is this obligation redeemed by the Mayor's flippant challenge to its opponents to "get busy" with an adverse petition. He cannot evade his pledges honorably by assuming that the refusal of these citizens to "get busy" in the particular way which he cynically outlines for them will amount to a "silent referendum" in favor of reversing the audible referendum of last Spring and of releasing him from his pledges of the Spring before. He is pledged not merely to withhold his approval from ordinances of this kind if a popular protest is made; he is pledged to withhold it a popular indorsement has been recorded.

Does he intend to redeem this pledge? If not, why not? He makes no upright and downright explanation. He juggles with the question. And while he juggles with it, his supporters are either also evasive or they are silent. The public, therefore, are left to their own inferences.

Are the public blamable, then, if, under all the circumstances, they become increasingly suspicious of this settlement ordinance, and seriously doubtful of the integrity even of high-minded men who urge its speedy acceptance by

the authorities without referendum approval? These natural and fast spreading doubts and suspicions cannot be allayed so long as Judge Tuley's condemnation of the extension ordinance is ignored by all but one of its promoters besides the Mayor, and evokes from him only the arrogant exclamation that the warnings of this foremost citizen and most noted Jurist of Illinois are "ail wind."

Judge Tuley has enumerated in the columns of this newspaper no less than nineteen reasons against enacting the ordinance in question. Every reason is important. There is not one which does not call at least for amendatory clauses; many go to the heart of the ordinance, calling for its rejection as an unnecessary, if not corrupt, surrender of valuable public rights to the traction companies. Among the latter are such reasons as these: That the ordinance increases the privileges of the corporations while restricting the rights of the public and lessening the powers of the city; that it falsely professes to destroy the possibilities of long and vexatious litigation by the companies; that it falsely professes to rid the city of the companies' ninety-nine-year claims; and that it makes municipal ownership of the city's traction facilities practically impossible.

Under such an indictment, from such a source, the advocates of this ordinance cannot resort to evasion or take refuge in silence, yet hope to retain public confidence.

If Judge Tuley is in error, it is incumbent on them to expose his errors, and to do so with dignity and candor. If they are unable to do this, they must either throw their influence against the ordinance, or be prepared to bear the odium of a most reasonable, even if mistaken, suspicion.

The public will be slow to believe, and ought to be slow to believe, that a traction settlement which Judge Tuley condemns as hostile to municipal ownership while pretending to promote it, as lessening the city's powers while pretending to increase them, as increasing the companies' privileges while pretending to diminish them, as preserving the possibilities of vexatious litigation while pretending to remove them, as conserving the ninety-nine-year claims while pretending to foreclose them; a settlement which flies in the face of the referendum vote on the same general subject less than six months ago; which is to be approved by the Mayor without referendum indorsement, in spite of his campaign pledges to approve no such settlement until thus indorsed by the people; and a settlement which will

withal be of great value to certain financial interests not noted for being over-scrupulous—the public will be justly slow to believe that the sponsors of such a settlement, so condemned yet so consummated, are altogether innocent. Some of them may perhaps deserve to be so considered, and all of them doubtless desire to be; but none can escape the odium of responsibility for pledges broken, an electorate betrayed, and the rights of a city bartered for the favor of conscienceless corporations.

From this reasonable suspicion, only one among the promoters of the ordinance in question has thus far entitled himself to exemption. Edwin Burritt Smith's reply to Judge Tuley is dignified and has all the indicia of candor. It does not satisfactorily answer Judge Tuley's criticism, however, and it wholly fails to justify, to excuse, or even to explain the Mayor's proposed violation of his campaign pledges to approve no franchise-extension ordinance until it has been indorsed by popular referendum.

#### EDWARD M. SHEPARD ON THE ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN.

Portions of a speech delivered by Edward M. Shepard at Bennington, Vt., Aug. 31.

#### THE "PROSPERITY" ARGUMENT HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

Is it true that our increase in wealth and prosperity since the rise of the Republican party has been its work, its glory? Was it an appeal to truth for Mr. Hay to treat as result of "Fifty Years of the Republican Party" our increase in population between 1850 and 1900, our fourfold increase in farming acreage, our fivefold increase in corn crop and sixfold increase in wheat crop, our increase in manufacturing capital from \$500,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000? Does any argument deserve less respect from one who has mastered that first rule of reasoning which bids him not infer that event A is the effective and sole cause of event B merely because in order of time event B comes with or after event A? Were there not in the United States fertile soil and moderate suns and rains, the brains and hands and inventive genius of American men and women, liberty, law and order—all these before there was a Republican party; and were not they the prime cause of our prosperity? The growth of American population and wealth between the peace of 1783 and the inauguration of John Adams in 1797 was but a small fraction of the like growth under McKinley and Roosevelt. And in those fourteen years—the years when Franklin and Jefferson and Hamilton and Mad-

ison, under the auspices of the noble, unboastful character of the Father of his Country, established our Republic,—our material growth in absolute figures was small indeed—our railroad mileage nought. Were those earlier statesmen dwarfs, therefore, in comparison with the latter-day Titans, who have dwelt in the White house since March, 1897? What years, O American men and women, have done more, material and moral, than those early ones for their own generation, what years more for this very Twentieth Century prosperity of ours? Is it the Lincoln doctrine—or was it ever—that the merit of moral and political causes is measurable by the wealth and luxury accumulated at the very time of their operation? Is it not the doctrine of prophets and apostles and the lesson of all practical history, that self-denial, simplicity, economy, righteousness, sobriety, lead on—not instantly but after patient years—to power and wealth? Would not Republican orators give better promise for future fruits of present day Republican administration—if they could rather and truly claim for their party under President Roosevelt an enforcement of equal rights, a rigorous economy, a punctilious regard for law?

But if this doctrine of "Present wealth, therefore present virtue in present ruling politics," be not a shallow sophistry, still see with what absurd unfairness it is applied. Do Republican apologists say—dare they say—what alone would be relevant to the political problem, that during the forty-four years since their party came into power, the progress of our country has been as great, from year to year, as during the sixty years of general Democratic supremacy before the civil war? If the Republican party may justly ask another lease of power because from 1860 to 1900 our population increased from 31,000,000 to 76,000,000, or 36 per cent. per decade, why may not the Democrats with greater justice ask their return to power because from 1800 to 1860 the increase was from 5,300,000 to 31,443,000, or 82 per cent. in each decade? Was not the increase in the decade, 1850-1860—and in spite of slavery,—from 23,000,000 to 31,000,000, or at the same rate as in the decades, 1860-1900? If the increase in total wealth between 1860 and 1900 was from \$16,000,000,000 to \$90,500,000,000, or 116 per cent. per decade, and in wealth per capita of

\* All my statistics are taken from the Summary of Commerce and Finance for May, 1904, issued by the bureau of statistics, department of commerce and labor. For total wealth and other data before 1850, there are no official figures. In each case the percentages are computed upon the earlier figure given.

population from \$513.92 to \$1,235.86, or 35 per cent. per decade—was not the Democratic increase in total wealth between 1850 and 1860 from \$7,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000, or 128 per cent. for the decade, being still larger than the Republican, and in wealth per capita from \$307.69 to \$513.93, or at the rate of 67 per cent. for the decade—nearly double the Republican rate? Although the value of farms and farm property increased from \$7,980,000,000 in 1860 to \$20,514,000,000 in 1900, or at the rate of 39 per cent. in each decade, was not the increase from \$3,967,000,000 in 1850 to \$7,980,000,000 in 1860, or at the rate of 100 per cent. per decade; and were not, therefore, Democratic auspices far more favorable to prosperity than Republican? Although the corn crop increased from 838 millions bushels in 1860 to 2,105 millions in 1900, or at the rate of 37 per cent. in each decade, was not the increase from 377 millions in 1840 to 838 millions in 1860, or at the rate of 61 per cent. in each decade; and if therefore, we wish large increase in the next four years, ought we not to prefer a Democratic president? Even if the wheat crop increased from 173 millions of bushels in 1860 to 552 millions in 1900, or at the rate of 50 per cent. in each decade, did it not increase from 84,000,000 in 1840 to 173,000,000 in 1860, or at the larger rate of 53 per cent. per decade? If this kind of argument be fit, what shall be said of the increases in wealth under Democratic auspices from \$7,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000 in 1850-1860, or at the decade rate of 128 per cent., as against the increase under Republican auspices during the decade 1890-1900 from \$65,000,000,000 to \$94,000,000,000, or at the rate of only 44.6 per cent.? Or what shall be said of the increases in wealth per person throughout the United States in the decade 1850-1860 from \$307.69 to \$513.93, or at the decade rate of 67 per cent., as against the corresponding increase under Republican auspices in 1890-1900 from 1,038.57 to \$1,235.86, or at the decade rate of only 19 per cent.? Or what shall be said of the increase in export of American manufactures of iron and steel from \$52,144 in 1800 to \$5,870,114 in 1860, or an average rate of 1859 per cent. per decade, as against the Republican increase from \$5,870,114 in 1860 to \$121,913,548 (at the abnormally high figures of 1900), or an average increase per decade of only 494 per cent.? Or what shall be said, and perhaps more reasonably, of the increase under Democratic rule in our export of agricultural products from \$25,000,000 in 1800 to \$256,000,000 in 1860, an average of 150 per cent. per decade, as against the increase under Republican rule from \$256,000,000 in