

as a part of the public, consider questions relating to the appointment or election of the superintendent and Board of Education; when they lay out plans for self-improvement; when they seek to establish methods by which merit may be recognized and rewarded by either financial or professional advancement, or both. It is inevitable, too, that these interests should run over into civic affairs relating to the levying and collection of taxes, the establishment of salaries, tenure of office, and the granting of pensions. All right-minded people may be convinced easily of the fairness, the wisdom, and even the necessity of the teachers taking an influential stand on these questions.

#### CLEVELAND AND CHICAGO.

Speech of Louis F. Post at Cleveland, June 3, 1905, at the Democratic picnic at which James Dalrymple, of Glasgow, and Clarence S. Darrow and Adrian C. Anson, of Chicago, also spoke. Being introduced by Mayor Johnson, Mr. Post said:

I am always glad to come to Cleveland. Two of the happiest years of my life were spent in this city. Perhaps my satisfaction at having lived here is due in some part to the fact that I came nearer to getting into jail in Cleveland than anywhere else in the United States.

It is greatly to be regretted that Mayor Dunne could not have been with you today. But it was altogether impossible. At the last moment he was obliged to turn back because a committee meeting with the expectation of settling the strike had been suddenly called for this afternoon. It would not have been wise for him to leave at such a time. And let me tell you, my friends, that this strike was intended to embarrass Mayor Dunne. It was an instigated strike. The employers' organization expected to go upon a week's picnic, something like this picnic here to-day and put down trades unionism in Chicago. And then a great outcry was immediately made about rioting, so that people from outside thought Chicago an unsafe city to come into. In fact it has not been unsafe. But the effect of the outcry of the employers, thank God, has been to keep business away, and they have been losing money by thousands of dollars a day. How it will end no one knows, but no matter which side wins nominally, both sides will lose. One thing about this strike is the fact that Mayor Dunne has managed it better than any large strike has ever been managed before by the authorities. He has been impartial. He has protected the public, regardless of the interests of either side.

Now, we are here to discuss the question of municipal ownership. What Mr. Dalrymple has just said gives me a new light. I have often wondered why Great Britain is so far ahead of us in this movement, and something that Mr. Dalrymple has said gives me the answer. He tells us they have no politics in connection with traction service in British cities. That suggests one trouble in this country. Our cities are corrupted with politics in connection with our traction service, and it is the traction corporations that corrupt them. Let us get rid of the traction corporations and we shall be rid of most of our municipal corruption. That is what we are trying to do in Chicago.

And we realize there, as your Mayor has realized here, that this cannot be done by paying any attention to the protests of those who don't want municipal ownership. Mayor Dunne won the election for municipal ownership by fighting these influences, and he will get municipal ownership by continuing to fight them. Nearly all the newspapers were against him then and they are against him now. All the traction politicians were against him then, and they are against him now. He beat them then, and he will beat them now.

In that campaign we had two kinds of people against us. There were the individualists whose individualism has run to seed, and a very bad kind of seed, too. These are the kind of men who want government to keep the peace, even if it has to break it to keep it, and don't want government to do anything else.

The other kind of opposition came from that class of business men who want to keep the field open for financial investments in public franchises. They are what we call the successful business men. Do you know, I never hear of successful business men these days without being reminded of the rules that a politician once gave me for success in politics. He said to me that if I wanted to succeed in politics I must do three things. In the first place, I must keep my family in respectable surroundings; in the second place I must be true to my ring; and "in the third place," said he, and I quote him exactly, for this is a true story, "you must keep out of the penitentiary, and after that you can do anything you damn please." Now I guess those used to be pretty good rules for success in politics; but don't you know, it seems to me that the modern business man has copied them from old-time politicians? It was this kind of business men that opposed Mayor Dunne's election.

But he turned a Republican plurality

of 110,000 last fall into a Democratic plurality of 25,000 this spring. He did it by setting up a standard and being true to that, no matter who opposed. He refused to yield to corporations, to politicians to newspapers. They say he was elected by the Socialists. Well, you can judge for yourselves. The Socialists put up a ticket against him, and they polled for that ticket 23,000 votes. Those votes all counted against Dunne, not for him. To call his victory a Socialist victory is stretching language. But what they mean, I suppose, is that he stood for socialist principles. That isn't true, either. What he stood for was the principle that government should do public business and stop interfering with private business.

There are three ways of looking at this question of public and private business. The socialist looks at it in one way, the plutocrat in another, and men like Mayor Dunne in a third. The socialist believes that all business, private as well as public, should be done by public government; the plutocrat believes that all business, public as well as private, should be done by private enterprise; but the truth is that private business should be done by private enterprise and public business by public government.

The test of public and private business is easily applied. Whenever you have to get a franchise from government in order to do your business, you are getting a privilege to do public business. I don't mean that this is so when government first prohibits the doing of a business and then licenses it. Government might forbid your doing private business without a license, and, of course, it wouldn't be public business merely for that reason. But when a business is such inherently that it cannot be done without a government franchise or license, then it is a public business. Now our position is that the government itself should do that kind of business and not farm it out to private corporations. Let the government do public business, and let private concerns do private business. That is Mayor Dunne's position on this subject. That is the principle upon which he stands in his fight for municipal ownership of traction facilities.

We approach this experiment with a great deal of satisfaction, for we are not without experience in municipal ownership and operation. We have an electric lighting system for public purposes. Some of our public lights come from this. But we haven't enough, and so we have to rent some of our public lighting from the private company. This enables us to make a comparison, and what do we find? The cost for public operation is less than three cents per

unit of candle power, while the cost for rentals is more than five cents—a difference of two cents in favor of public operation for every unit of candle power. And that isn't all. Not only do we save money right along, but we have built up a plant with three million dollars or more, as private companies would capitalize it. If we had rented all our lights, we would have paid nearly double for the service and instead of having a three million plant we should have nothing to show but a bundle of old receipts.

We have another successful experiment in municipal ownership and operation in our water system. May be you wouldn't think me a good witness when I have to confess that I don't drink the water. But I guess that is because I formed the habit of not drinking lake water when I lived in Cleveland. Anyhow, they tell me that Chicago lake water has been good since the opening of the drainage canal; and even if it wasn't, the fault wouldn't be with the water system, it would rest upon those who were responsible for fouling the source of supply. Our water system is a successful experiment of long duration in municipal ownership. It was established in 1854. It serves a territory 190 square miles in extent. It supplies average houses for \$10 a year, and reduces that for prompt payment. It is far better in every respect and cheaper than any private system you can mention. And yet it turned over into the public treasury last year \$1,800,000 on a gross collection of only \$4,000,000.

Compare that with our traction service. They have cost for the plants, about the same—something like \$38,000,000 for the water system and \$35,000,000 for the traction system. The plants are worth about the same now—about \$25,000,000 each without including some valuable land which the water system has acquired. Now observe, while the water system supplies water at low rates, it turned \$1,800,000 into the treasury last year; but the traction system, charging high rates, turned comparatively nothing into the public treasury, but turned between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 into the pockets of its "widows and orphans."

They say that politicians would steal the income if we had municipal ownership and operation. Well, if they did, will you tell me how much worse off the public would be, in the light of that comparison. If politicians stole the whole \$1,800,000 that the water system earned last year, the public wouldn't be any worse off than they would be if corporations had taken it for widows and orphans before it got into the public treas-

ury. They would be better off, for they would have got their water cheaper.

Mayor Dunne's work in connection with the municipal ownership of our traction system will be described by Mr. Darrow, who more directly represents him, but as his junior representative on this occasion, I shall say a word on that subject. The work is progressing. Already some ten miles of traction line are available for municipal ownership, and within two years' time there will be enough to make a large system, extending north and south about 20 miles and westward from the center of the city in various directions about ten miles. This is entirely aside from the other system which is in controversy in the courts.

In establishing municipal ownership Mayor Dunne will be opposed in all manner of ways, but he will succeed. We are going to have municipal ownership in spite of all the opposition that met Mayor Dunne in the campaign, and in spite of the same opposition that confronts him now. As he stood in the campaign, so he stands now, and so he will continue to stand.

But we all realize that municipal ownership and operation of traction facilities is not the end of our work. Our task is continuous. The only people with whom we have personal relations whose work is done are Egyptian mummies. Some of our dead-and-alive contemporaries are of the mummy order; it is true their work is done. But the work of living men is never done. The heart of the municipal ownership movement is its democracy, and it cannot stop until democracy triumphs.

In this movement Mayor Dunne is steadfast. He stands with your own mayor for municipal ownership and operation of the public service, and he will be true to this policy in the future as he has been in the past. He stands for the principle of public ownership and operation of public functions and private ownership and operation of private business. If this appeals to you Mayor Dunne should have the credit. I have heard him say the same thing, and so it is his speech, not mine.

"I never gamble," said the good man, "and speculation is gambling."

"Of course," returned the man who was not so good; and then he added, casually: "What did you do with that property out on the West side?"

"Oh, I've got it yet," was the reply. "It looked like a good investment when I bought it, and I am hopeful that it will yet be worth enough to give me a good profit; just now it shows a loss."

The man who was not so good looked thoughtful.

"It's a mighty lucky thing for your conscience," he said at last, "that it was land, and not wheat you bought."  
—Chicago Evening Post.

Briggs: It's too bad about Winkle and the girl he is engaged to. Neither of them is good enough for the other.

Griggs: What makes you think that?  
"Well, I've been talking the matter over with both families."—Life.

Farmington—Ah! there's that old poem about husking bees. I always did like that.

Dumley—Husking bees? What do you mean?

Farmington—Why, were you never in the country during the season of husking bees?

Dumley—No. How in the world do you husk a bee?—Philadelphia Press.

## BOOKS

### PEOPLE OF THE WHIRLPOOL.

In Prof. Dill's history of Roman society, from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, he makes the following remark: "The truth is that society in every age presents the most startling moral contrasts, and no single comprehensive description of its moral condition can ever be true. This has been too often forgotten by those who have passed judgment on the moral state of Roman society, both in the first age of the Empire and in the last. That there was stupendous corruption and abnormal depravity under princes like Caligula, Nero and Domitian, we hardly need the testimony of the satirists to induce us to believe. That there were large classes among whom virtuous instinct and all the sober strength and gravity of the old Roman character, were still vigorous and untainted, is equally attested and equally certain. . . . There were homes in which boys and girls were reared in a refined and severe simplicity, which even improved upon the tradition of the golden age of Rome. . . . Many a brief stone record remains which shows that, even in the world of slaves and freedmen, there were always in the darkest days crowds of humble people, with honest, homely ideals, and virtuous family affection, proud of their industries, and sustaining one another by help and kindness."

This thought comes to one after reading *People of the Whirlpool* (Macmillan)—a novel of modern life in and about Manhattan. The author's name is not given, though it must be an open secret to many. She appears here