

The Public

Seventh Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1904.

Number 352.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

Entered at the Chicago, Ill., Post Office as second-class matter.

For terms and all other particulars of publication, see last page.

Intelligent observers of the Chicago traction controversy (p. 521) must suspect, if they do not fully realize, that much of the battling between the Union Traction company and the other companies is a contest of two large financial interests, to both of which the public interests of the city are only a shuttlecock in the game.

On one side or the other are several of the local newspapers, a coterie of corporation lawyers, the large business grafters of the city, business grafters of the East, and some members of the local transportation committee of the city council.

The animus of the local "business" interests was pretty frankly disclosed by an editorial in the Chicago Tribune of the 23d, which openly and justly attacked the Union Traction Company, but covertly urged the cause of the grafting interests of the other side of this financial fight. The following quotation from that inspired editorial is significant:

The city . . . wants more compensation for franchise privileges. It wants to deal with a company which is able, etc., etc.

There is in fact no indication that the people of Chicago want compensation for the municipal treasury, which is what the Tribune means by "compensation for franchise privileges." Only the real estate tax dodgers have manifested any wish for treasury compensation from street franchises. On the other hand, every referendum expression of popular opin-

ion has indicated emphatically that the people are opposed to franchises, whether with or without compensation. Every such expression has indicated, moreover, that the people do not wish to deal any longer with any company. They are tired of farming out the public function of street car service. After experimenting with it for nearly half a century they have found it distressingly inadequate and extremely expensive. Its policy has been plunder for the stockholders and bad service for the people, and there is no reason for believing that this policy would be altered in the future.

The Tribune realizes it all. So do all the other agencies of the local devotees of frenzied finance who are trying to extend this discredited experiment through another term, ranging from 13 years to 20, or 40, or indefinitely. They prove they know it by their pretense of ignoring the several referendum votes which have been cast in protest against a continuance of the wretched experiment. In still another way do these local financial schemers prove their disingenuousness. They are quietly arranging in their clubs for such city nominations next Spring as will give the victory to them no matter which set of candidates may lose.

On the Republican side they are maneuvering for the nomination for Mayor of either Mr. Foreman or Mr. Harlan. The former is a pliant tool of the financial interests; the latter, though not a tool, holds opinions regarding public utilities which are a guarantee of his support of the business grafters' programme. That programme is therefore secure, no matter which Republican faction wins. On the Democratic side Mr. Wacker has been picked out by the finan-

cial interests. Mr. Wacker is a plutocratic Democrat,—the very kind of Democrat whom the Democratic voters of Chicago rebuked last Fall with an adverse plurality of 100,000. He would almost certainly be defeated. But if he were to win, the traction companies would win with him. With Wacker at the head of the Democratic ticket, and either Foreman or Harlan at the head of the Republican ticket, a settlement franchise, with all its possibilities of perpetuating corporation control of Chicago's streets, would be assured, no matter how the people might vote on the matter directly as a referendum issue at the same election. This is the plan upon which the traction interests rely for defeating the popular purpose.

And that plan will succeed unless the opponents of corporate control meet it with the same degree of vigor, unity and common sense with which it is being promoted. If labor organizations insist upon a distinctively labor candidate for mayor, as a class candidate, they will play into the hands of the corporation grafters. If any anti-corporation Democratic candidate whose merits must be proved to the people at large, is put forward against Wacker, that also will play into the hands of the corporations. There is one way and only one to meet this very serious situation. It is to bring all the anti-corporation strength of the Democratic party to bear at the Democratic primaries in support of a candidate whose very name is a guarantee of purpose to prevent corporate control and of ability to execute the purpose. He must be a man whose name will not only attract Democratic anti-corporationists at the primaries, but those of all parties, regardless of their class or personal sympathies, at the election. He must be a man whose election will mean

to the public mind the defeat of the corporations and their traction schemes.

If there is such a man, no class prejudices, nor personal friendships or ambitions on the part of believers in municipal ownership, should stand in the way of calling him into service; and no considerations of personal comfort or advantage of any kind should deter him from accepting the call. That there is just such a man—perhaps the only man who at this particular juncture fully meets the necessities of the case—every intelligent voter in Chicago knows. Those who oppose the schemes of the traction corporations know it; those who favor those schemes know it equally well. As the latter do not hesitate to name him, neither should the former. Against the possibility of the candidacy of Edward F. Dunne the traction interests are already erecting defenses. They object, for instance, to his making himself a candidate for mayor while a member of the judiciary. But whether that objection is good need not be discussed. There is no reason why Judge Dunne should make himself a candidate for mayor. The question is not whether he wants to be mayor, but whether he is wanted for mayor.

If Judge Dunne is willing to allow the people to vote for him in case the Democrats nominate him, and to perform the functions of the office if chosen, that is enough. Whoever objects to such a candidacy objects to the wholesome doctrine that the office should seek the man and not the man the office. It would be much better if in our politics men were commonly called into the public service in this way, whether from private life or from one office to another. The present fashion of electing only office seekers is a bad one.

There is an opportunity in Chicago now to set a good example in that respect at the primaries. Let the Democrats at their primaries invite Judge Dunne to be

their candidate for mayor; let the people at the election invite him to be their mayor; and let him, upon his election, leave the office to which they have called him heretofore and take the office to which they call him now. This would be distinctly in the line of civic duty. The candidacy would not be an office-seeking matter. It would therefore be raised above all sincere or well-founded objections to judges becoming candidates.

This would be a case in which the office seeks the man. It would be in the public interest. It would be a most desirable innovation. And no one would object but the traction pirates, whom, as everybody knows and none better than they, Judge Dunne, if mayor, would drive away from their expected plunder.

Wholly apart from all other considerations, good street car service in Chicago depends upon some such course. Should traction interests win at this election, we should have extended franchises and renewed promises of good service; but we should not get good service. Let the experience of the past be our witness. And by some such course as this, and only so, can the Democrats hope to gain the municipal election. By this course they can gain it. After nearly 50 years of bad service by corporations which perennially promise better things but never perform them, the majority of the people of Chicago are not fools enough to vote for another corporation promise if they have an opportunity to vote against it. They are pretty well convinced by this time that good and economical service can be got only through municipal ownership and operation. Convince them that the candidate of either party stands for that reform, and stands for its immediate adoption, and they are numerous enough to give the election easily to that party.

There is something startling about the unanimity with which railroad magnates approve

President Roosevelt's elaborate scheme for regulating railroad traffic and legalizing pooling. Can it be that Paul Morton's place in the cabinet has anything to do with it all? He has "consented," it will be remembered, to remain in this body of Presidential advisers for the purpose of assisting in the good work of shackling railroad cunning. A most excellent thing, for this is a species of cunning with which Mr. Morton is thoroughly familiar. He has been a business and political protegee of Mr. E. P. Ripley, president of the Santa Fe, and in that association he doubtless learned much.

But how does Mr. Morton happen to have got into the President's cabinet at such a critical juncture for railroad interests? He is a son of the late J. Sterling Morton, who was one of President Cleveland's official household and a Democrat by political profession. Through the elder Morton's connection with railroad interests, his son Paul secured opportunity for utilizing his talents as traffic manager of the Santa Fe. Like his father, Paul was a lifelong Democrat by political profession. He remained a Democrat, nominally at any rate, until a short time prior to the late election, when his change of political allegiance to the Republican party was ostentatiously announced. Just why this announcement was made, was not immediately clear; for Mr. Morton had never been conspicuous in politics. He had no political prestige whatever nor any political following, and his change of party was utterly without public interest. But hardly had the announcement been well circulated, when the reason for it transpired. President Roosevelt needed him in a Republican cabinet as a Republican secretary of the navy. The reason for his particular appointment, like the reason for announcing his change of politics, was not clear at the time. Mr. Morton had no knowledge of naval affairs. Since the election, however, this mystery also has been

explained. Mr. Morton is in the cabinet as secretary of the navy not so much for naval purposes as for the purpose of establishing a cordial understanding between the President and the railway magnates.

But Mr. Morton's official life is still enveloped in mystery. Although his change of party was cynically explained by his appointment to office, and his naval rank somewhat incongruously by his abilities as manager of railway traffic, there is as yet no explanation of his personal sacrifice in the matter. For Mr. Morton has given up a railway salary of \$25,000 to take a government salary of \$8,000. Is this difference the price of gratifying an unwonted political ambition? Or is the sacrifice an act of patriotic devotion, analogous in the walks of peace to the sacrifices of battlefield heroes? If Mr. Morton is too modest to confess such extraordinary devotion, some of his admirers should do a little virtuous boasting for him. But what if this relinquishment of the difference between a large salary and a small one is neither a patriotic sacrifice nor the price of a political bauble? What if the financial loss is in some way financially covered? Should that be so, who is to be reimbursed and how? Mr. Morton possesses the confidence of the railroad magnates; have they thought it well to have such a representative near the wielder of the big stick—that unswerving wielder who sometimes swerves? These are only questions, to be sure. But as the facts suggest such questions, the people will do well to watch, with a very great watchfulness, Mr. Roosevelt's overtures to the railroads for regulating railroad traffic and authorizing pools.

Almost frantic in their efforts to throw upon democratic Democrats the burden of responsibility for the overwhelming defeat of the Democratic party under plutocratic control and with plutocratic candidates for President

and Vice-President, plutocratic Democrats are attributing this defeat in part to what the New York World describes as a "mass of clotted nonsense" in the platform, the clotted nonsense being the platform declaration that "protection is robbery." On that point the World fairly represented the whole brood of Democratic protectionists, when it said, in its issue of the 1st, that the majority of Democrats do not believe it and never believed it, and that in its opinion no Democratic Congress would pass a strictly free trade revenue measure. As the tariff question—involving as it does the essential principle of freedom of contract, untrammelled commerce, unobstructed manufacturing, unmonopolized transportation, unrestricted employment, and business freedom generally,—is the really vital question in our national politics, this attitude of plutocratic Democrats is an important consideration with reference to the Democratic party's future.

The assumption that no earnest purpose stood behind those brave words in the St. Louis platform doubtless accounts for the refusal of many free traders to vote for Judge Parker. If no principles were involved and the difference between the parties was only one of percentages, no wonder that apathy chilled the Presidential canvass. On a question of right and wrong, human pulses may be stirred; but whether a man shall be privileged by government to take a smaller or a larger part of the people's earnings from them in the form of a tariff tax, is an issue which affords little scope for enthusiasm. Under the circumstances, therefore, it was not strange that the nation preferred a candidate with definite avowals, to the estimable but indefinite Judge who was warmed into life only at the campaign's end.

If protection is not robbery, to what species of appropriation does it belong? If it is wrong for tariff to shelter a monopoly or trust, as tariff tinkers concede,

why is it right for tariff to shelter single individuals, engaged in occupations which enforce tribute from their fellow citizens? Is morality a question of numbers? If not, why is it immoral for the trust to pillage helpless consumers? If the kind of democracy which is cherished by those who condemn the candid anti-protection declaration of the St. Louis platform is the kind that was represented by the Democratic party in the recent campaign, then the overwhelming defeat of the party was richly merited. It was in that case a plutocratic combination with an alias,—its most urgent need the grave-digger.

True democrats who are enrolled in the Democratic party, the democratic Democrats, will decline to accept the dictum of those for whom the World speaks in this matter. They will rather subscribe to the vigorous statement of Henry Watterson, that "next after the institution of African slavery, for which the South was no more responsible than the North, the protective tariff is the most monstrous instrument of classism and greed, of legalized robbery, jobbery and corruption, which the rapacity of man and the malice of Satan have ever devised to degrade and torture humankind." The assumption that no Democratic Congress would pass a strictly free trade revenue measure is a matter upon which men may reasonably differ. Popular opinion determines what a Congress in power will do, and free trade popular opinion is fast making. Such editorials as that in the World are reminiscent of the Tory editorials of England when Cobden and Bright sought to emancipate their countrymen from protection robbery. Yet a Tory prime minister eventually executed the commands of the unpopular "fanatics." So in this country popular feeling is beginning to revolt at protection, and to demand the total extermination of this scheme of spoliation which wears the mask of a benevolent name.