

senger railway and extending this system as rapidly as the existing term grants expire and are released from the restraining order of the Federal court."

4. Relates to plans for unification of service in case one company settles and the other does not.

"5. If the City railway is restrained by timidity or contract from entering into Union Traction territory or is to be controlled by Union Traction interests, an independent system should at once be started with the expiring lines of the Chicago Passenger railway, this system to be owned and operated from the beginning by the municipality or by a company obliged to turn it over to the city upon the return of its investment with reasonable interest thereon."

6. Immediate organization of a city department of local transportation.

The last of Mr. Fisher's suggestions is excellent. But some explanation of the others is desirable. As to the second, how can good service be assured—not contracted for, but assured? And how can the 99-year claims be terminated without creating other equally effective grounds for dilatory litigation? As to the third and fifth, this question arises: If an independent municipal system can be organized and financed in case the proposed settlement is refused by the companies, why can it not be organized and financed in case the proposed settlement is refused by the city?

Senator Spooner's reply to Lincoln Steffens's article in McClure's (p. 403) on political corruption, betrays either a great desire to evade and great skill thereat, or else extraordinary innocence. Because Mr. Spooner is unconscious of corruption directly in his own behalf he assumes that he was involved in none. Unless the bribed can be separated from the unbribed legislators who voted for him, he assumes that there could have been no bribery in the matter. It does not occur to him, apparently, that the worst bribery of legislatures is not direct, but by bribery of "bosses." And he seems entirely oblivious to what every intelligent reader of Mr. Steffens's articles knows, the fact that the gravamen of Mr. Steffens's charges is not direct and unskillful bribery of public officials by "business"

men, but control of the System by "business" men through influencing its managers. All that Mr. Steffens says of Senator Spooner may be at once true and consistent with Spooner's denials. Steffens says that certain rich "business" men spent thousands of dollars to elect Spooner to the Senate. Spooner denies all knowledge of these expenditures and asks the public to infer that therefore no money was spent for him. It does not follow. If the rich "business" men had sized up Spooner as the kind of man they needed in the Senate—able, agile, popular, and so constructed morally as readily to see and spontaneously to magnify the mote of justice in their plans and to ignore or minimize their enormous injustices—those "business" men would readily have placed their "campaign contributions" where Spooner could get the benefit of them. All the better if he knew nothing of the "deal." Dooley's alderman is not the only character in history who has been bought without knowing it.

The thing to which Mr. Steffens's exposure of "the enemies of the Republic" constantly refers, and in the luxurious meshes of which Senator Spooner has evidently been caught,—the "System," as Mr. Steffens names it,—is tersely described by Carl Schurz in his letter this week on the Presidential campaign, wherein he says that "the Republican party is more and more becoming a party owned by rich men, who want to become, through it, still richer." This is the System at work. When those rich men to whom Mr. Schurz refers contribute campaign funds lavishly, they expect, as Mr. Schurz implies, to get their lavish gifts back again with lavish profits to boot. How can they expect to do this? Through just such men as Senator Spooner, whom they select for office as best adapted by nature and training for their purposes, and whose election they therefore buy, not of individual legislators of the party in power, but of the System itself,

which controls the legislative caucus.

When Mr. Schurz names the Republican party in this connection his thought is upon national politics. In that field it is true of the Republican party distinctly. But in State politics the System owns the more popular party, whichever it may be. In Wisconsin it is Senator Spooner's party, but in Missouri it is the Democratic party. This non-partisan tendency of the spirit of the System, is recognized by Mr. Schurz; for, while he is strong in opposition to Roosevelt, he holds out little encouragement to those who agree with him in that respect to follow his lead in supporting Parker. All he can say is illustrated by these words: "Do I expect the Democratic party, if successful, promptly to repress the evils of the present protective policy? I see at present no other instrumentality by which that work can be put into practical motion." If there were a single pledge by which the Democratic party might be held, if the leading candidate had not neutralized his platform by his cautious reservations, there might be hope in this direction, of which Mr. Schurz himself speaks with so little confidence. But as matters stand, one could only expect that if the Democratic party came into power nationally the System would at once make love to it, as it has in Missouri, and that in time it also would become "a party owned by rich men, who" would "want to become, through it, still richer."

Grover Cleveland is lending a hand in the Parker campaign, but it is an awkward hand. He says he has "never been so interested in the welfare and success of the Democratic party" as now; that he is "thoroughly satisfied with the ticket," and that he believes "Judge Parker is an ideal candidate." Then he tells why. It is because the Democratic party "has returned to sanity and future progress along the right lines;" its welfare is close to his heart and "it is once more upon

the right road." This studied insult to Bryan, who is trying to avert the impending disaster to Parker in the Western States, and to every adherent of so-called "Bryanism," may make good reading in the purlieus of Wall street; but for every Wall street voter it brings over to Parker, or holds to him, it will keep away or drive away a dozen Bryan voters, not only in the West but in New York as well. Some of these are accepting Bryan's advice to support the candidate; but they are doing it very reluctantly, and only because they feel that the situation offers a Hobson's choice. If the Republicans were to scatter Cleveland's insulting interview through Illinois and Indiana, Bryan's campaign in those States couldn't make a vote for Parker.

Promptly upon the opening of the Presidential campaign, with the Philippine question as one of its issues, the paternalists cry out in great alarm, "Hush!" Here is an extract from a letter to President Roosevelt written from Manila, by Luke F. Wright, the governor of our crown colony in the Philippines, and published by the President:

The agitation in the United States for Filipino independence and the spoken and written utterances of prominent men there who are urging it, are all brought here and published in the native newspapers, and are being made the text for editorials insisting that the Filipino people are now ready to become an independent nation. The effect of all this is distinctly injurious. Its tendency is to restore the influence of the old insurrection leaders and to make them active in preaching the old propaganda. This in turn has the effect of demoralizing and weakening the more conservative and thoughtful Filipinos.

Which means, being reasonably interpreted, that the patriotism of the Filipinos is still alive, and that the talk we have heard from official sources about their great love for the American crown colony system is all sham. That interpretation is confirmed by the news from Manila, that at the Federal party banquet to the returning Filipino commissioners,

the independence sentiment was freely expressed and applauded.

Out of 812 replies to inquiries regarding their views on "tariff reform" made by the New York Reform Club of Democratic and independent editors (p. 355) the following results have been tabulated:

	Yes.	No.	Doubtful.
Tariff revision.....	726	41	45
Thorough revision.....	522	164	..
Free raw materials.....	529	38	59
Free raw materials conditionally.....	56
Free raw materials partially.....	66
Reduce tariff on trust products sold cheaper abroad than at home.....	713	28	33
Abolish tariff on trust products sold cheaper abroad than at home.....	98
Tariff reform issue in present campaign.....	591	77	79

Most of the negative answers came from editors whose papers while nominally independent are really Republican.

The recent arrest and punishment for a local offense in Massachusetts, of an attache of the British embassy, and his going scot free upon seeking protection in international usage, must have come as a surprise to many well-disposed persons, especially when they learned from the incident that members of an ambassador's household are absolutely beyond the jurisdiction of the nation to which he is accredited, no matter how atrocious the crime they may commit. This exemption has no rational support. It rests upon the fiction that an ambassador and all his belongings are not legally on the part of the earth which they physically occupy, but are all the time in his own country and under that country's flag. This fiction could advantageously be abolished. No international relations whatever justify its being carried to the absurd extent of shielding criminals. Ambassadors, and everybody in their suites should be subject to the laws of the country in which they live.

The pushing asunder of society, with a leisure class above the sundering wedge of legalized monopoly privilege and a working

class below it, has been pictured forth vividly this week by two incidents, each typical of the extreme of its own class. One of these incidents occurred at Newport on the 30th. It was the celebration of the third birthday of a pet dog of high degree. Seven other pet dogs of equal breeding were invited to join it at a course dinner. All occupied high chairs and were served in great state by their aristocratic mistresses assisted by five butlers—full grown and potentially useful men. After the dinner the canine aristocrats withdrew to the drawing-room where cats had been provided to afford them the exhilaration of the chase; and when they were exhausted they were taken to their several homes in carriages. It was all harmless enough, to be sure—leaving the cats out of consideration; and if any people like to lavish money and time and human brain power upon that sort of thing, there would be no reasonable objection provided they earned the necessary money and leisure in the sweat of their own faces, and did not extort it from its real owners by monopolistic laws. But think of the contrasts! One of these—an incident as far to the extreme of the working class life as is this dog banquet at the extreme of the leisure class life—is reported from New York under date of the 23d:

In front of the Dodge monument this morning a neatly dressed young man fell to the pavement groaning. The night prowlers who surrounded him quickly diagnosed his trouble. Several men hurried away to get food. One soon returned with a cup of coffee. The sick man was lifted up, and he gulped down the coffee, but his stomach would not retain it. An ambulance doctor said that he was dying of starvation.

Neither of these incidents is typical of its class. Both represent extremes. But the gradations between those extremes are all more or less in keeping with the extreme toward which they tend. From the wedge of monopoly privilege which makes a class of struggling workers below, and one of luxurious idlers above, there run in opposite directions two tenden-