

any attention whatever to questions of Presidential patronage.



The two cases—Mr. Cleveland's and Mr. Wilson's—are almost identical up to the present. Pray heaven the parallel may not continue.



Mr. Cleveland was elected by a landslide against the iniquities of Protection. So has Mr. Wilson been. President Cleveland was strenuously advised to call a special session at once and secure an anti-Protection revision of the tariff. He was advised to do this by his *disinterested* supporters—by the late Edward M. Shepard, for instance. Mr. Shepard urged that policy upon him orally, and at Mr. Cleveland's request formulated the arguments in writing with care. (Were this document available now, it might be of much use to Mr. Wilson.) But Mr. Cleveland listened to friends who were *not disinterested*—to J. Pierpont Morgan, for instance, and his group. Consequently he ignored Mr. Shepard's plea. Following the advice of the Morgans, he put aside the question of a special session until a better season, and the better season never came. Before Congress assembled, the "gray wolves" of our national politics had got the upper hand. Having secured their patronage and put President Cleveland at their mercy, they trampled upon the pledges of his campaign. The result was a tariff bill the President could not sign, one against which the masses who elected him revolted.



At last President Cleveland did call a special session of Congress. It was too late even if he had called it on the tariff question, upon which his election turned. But he called it upon another question, the money question, a question which had not entered at all into the campaign. What followed is written big in political history. The Democratic President was discredited among his democratic supporters. The Democratic Party was split asunder. The next Congress was heavily reactionary. The next Presidential prospects were hopeless. Only Bryan's meteoric appearance as a tribune of the people saved the inevitable defeat of 1896 from the extreme of party annihilation. As for Mr. Cleveland himself, the best that can be said of him even at this day, when the heat of the controversy has cooled, is that he was a popular leader—in 1892.



The Aldrich Bill.

When the present Congress comes to consider its

announced substitute for the Aldrich currency bill, it will do well to consider so slowly as to leave the bill for the new Congress and the new President to dispose of finally.



Bryan in the Cabinet.

Let all Bryan's friends hope that this will not be. While the President-elect would be less than gracious to ignore Mr. Bryan in making up his cabinet, Mr. Bryan would be far from judicious to accept any place in it. We are going through a transition period in politics. Its heat has been felt in the campaign; the break up was shown at the election. But what has happened is a trifle, in the way of political caloric, to what in all probability will happen before new political crystalizations set in. President Wilson may find himself at the head of a "bolt" from the Democratic Party as tremendous as Roosevelt's from the Republican Party. Or he may turn up, as some fear but we do not, in a role analogous to Taft's. In either event, Bryan's leadership ought not to be minimized by any popular feeling that he has sunk from the high place he now holds in public confidence and affection. There should be no room for a plausible question from anybody as to whether or not he might be influenced by cabinet controversies of a personal or partisan sort, instead of being guided wholly by his loyalty to democratic Democracy.



Governor Dunne.

Congratulations are due the people of Illinois for their election of Edward F. Dunne to the Governorship. What might have been the result but for the Progressive Party, no one can tell. It is a fair inference, however, that he would have failed of election. The warning is as pointed to the Governor-elect of Illinois as to the President-elect of the United States, that he represents the newer ideals of politics and must be loyal to them whenever they conflict seriously with the older ones. Happily, the new legislature of Illinois has no commanding Democratic majority. There can therefore be no caucus rule by machines and for machines against Governor Dunne's wishes. Happily also its balance of power lies with the progressive elements of all the parties in its membership—Democratic, Republican, Progressive and Socialist. Co-operating with that power in the legislature, Governor Dunne can make himself more "inefficient" than ever in the eyes of grafters—both those who take their graft raw and those who like it daintily cooked and nicely drained of visible impurities,—but vastly more *efficient* in the eyes of

all honest citizens than he has seemed to some of them heretofore. There need be no corrupt combine in the legislature to baffle him, as there was in the Council when he was Mayor; or if there be, its exposure will be easy. With such co-operation as is now available to him, Governor Dunne can give to the people of Illinois progressive legislation as well as honest administration, and prove by his record the falsity of the imputations that crooked politicians and grafting newspapers have put upon him. First of all among his duties in this connection is to secure the submission of the twice-demanded and long delayed Initiative and Referendum amendment. This reform calls for his immediate and active promotion, and in his promotion of it, for the cordial support of all progressives in the legislature, of whatever party, and regardless of all patronage and of all Senatorial claims.



Progress in Chicago Traction Graft.

Indications of further grafting multiply in connection with the Chicago traction system. Having secured seven per cent on a heavily "watered" investment, which is at least 1 per cent more than any traction system ought to get even upon a real investment, the manipulators of this system are now trying to get a guarantee from the city that their profits shall not be less than seven per cent in the future. The pretense of consideration is that there shall be universal transfers. A fine sort of deal, isn't it? Think of the city of Chicago *guaranteeing seven per cent* to traction stockholders, over and above all salaries and "profits on the side," without securing any greater interest in or control over the traction system than it already has! Would any business man, having the rights of the city, make such a tomfool bargain? If the city is to guarantee any percentage of profit at all to the traction company, it should do so as *owner*. There might be some sense in taking over the whole system, by mutual arrangement, upon a guarantee of seven per cent to the companies, the companies being retained and supervised as operating agents. But there is no sense at all in making such a guarantee without ownership.



The Police Sweatbox.*

Professor Keedy's article in the current issue of the Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, in which he criticizes "the third degree" and "trial by newspapers" is welcome. No less so are his specific

proposals for ending this species of lawlessness. He proposes as to the police "sweatbox" that extorted confessions shall not be admitted as evidence in criminal cases, and as to the extortion of such confessions that police officers guilty of it shall be punished criminally. On the subject of "trial by newspapers" he proposes criminal punishment of editors and publishers for publishing statements or comments calculated to prejudice the case of any accused person. It is a curious fact that laws to this effect have existed until recent years. Judges could punish for contempt editors and publishers who obstructed the administration of justice; police officers could be punished for giving the "third degree," and extorted confessions could be ruled out at trials—all in accordance with well established law which police officers, newspaper editors and judges have repealed without any of the formalities of legislation. Such law should be re-enacted *with* the formalities of legislation; and Professor Keedy's suggestions would be better if adopted than the old laws which are now practically obsolete.



Publicity for Real Estate Ownership.

Not a bad proposal, that of requiring city real estate to be labeled with the true owner's name. It would "run to cover" the responsible promoters of a good many abuses, and all the more if vacant lots as well as buildings were required to bear the label.



THE SINGLETAX FORWARD MOVEMENT.

The vote of last week in Missouri and Oregon furnishes phenomenal testimony to the solid growth of the Singletax idea in American thought. It at the same time indicates the great probability of an early injection of a large dose of Singletax principle into the fiscal affairs of this country.



At no time since Henry George polled 68,000 votes for Mayor of New York in 1886, has the Singletax spoken with so much emphasis anywhere in the United States.

Its emphasis now is greater than then.

The New York vote for Henry George in 1886 had been swelled by enthusiasm for the man, by a general revolt against Tammany Hall, by the united support of organized Labor, by discord among George's adversaries, and by numerous other factors having no vital relation to the doctrines that are now known as the Singletax. Although

*See Public of August 11, 1911, page 831.