

The Public

Fourth Year.

CHICAGO, SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1901.

Number 161.

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 column of last page.

David B. Hill is wise in announcing that he is not a presidential candidate. He will be patriotic also, if he sticks to his resolution.

Talking about presidential candidates, why not nominate Mr. McKinley for a third term? His election would doubtless perpetuate the "extraordinary prosperity" of which he boasts, and be no more defiant of American traditions and polity than his Philippine policy. Besides, if we should get into the habit of reelecting presidents during good behavior, business would be freed from the quadrennial election disturbances that now afflict it, and greater stability of government would be assured.

It was not a very high compliment to the prosperity of Tennessee that President McKinley paid in his Memphis speech. He said that even now the Tennessee "enlistments in the new army, according to population, exceed any other state in the union." As a rule men do not enlist in times of peace, if they can find anything else to do.

Soon after Mr. Bryan began the publication of the Commoner, we predicted that although the paper had disappointed some of its friends for lack of aggressiveness, it would come up to the full measure of their expectations when he had "found himself" as an editor, that is, when he had become accustomed to handling public questions from the point of view of the independent editor instead of that of the responsible candidate and leader of a national party.

As a candidate Mr. Bryan was refreshingly candid. But the candor of a candidate is timidity itself in comparison with what that of a man in his present situation should be. This prediction of ours now proves to have been well founded. Mr. Bryan's editorial, "A Bit Personal," in the Commoner of the 26th, has a ring to it that will encourage the democratic democrats from ocean to ocean.

Mr. Bryan is not planning for another nomination, he says; if he were he would not be editing a paper. Should he become a candidate again it will be because it seems necessary for the advancement of the principles to which he adheres, "and that does not now seem probable." But he does intend to take an interest in politics for a long time yet, and in that connection will "support those who as candidates advocate democratic principles and who can be trusted to enforce them if elected." There are no enemies to punish, adds Mr. Bryan. "No matter what a man may have said or done against the ticket in 1896 or in 1900, that man becomes my friend the moment he accepts democratic principles." Finally, he promises to say whatever he thinks ought to be said, and to write whatever he thinks ought to be written. This is a candid, aggressive, inspiring declaration. It is one of many things Mr. Bryan has said and done which prove him to be a man who neither thrusts himself selfishly into the first place nor retires with mock modesty into the last place. He stands for principle regardless of persons.

Evidently the municipal ownership idea is catching on in politics. So astute a politician as Congressman Dick, of Ohio, has made a speech in which he declares that "sooner or

later the telegraph and telephone lines of the country will be owned and operated by the government, and it is proper they should be." When it is remembered that Mr. Dick is not only a congressman and a politician, but an Ohio political manager, the significance of this remark with reference to the future policy of the republican party is apparent. Unless the democratic party "gets a move on it," the republicans will come in ahead on this vital question.

In Iowa some democrats are trying to get their party into line on the public ownership question. At Des Moines on the 26th 52 democratic leaders agreed to a party policy involving the taxation of franchises and ultimate public ownership. But this move is opposed by the Chicago Chronicle, that sterling democratic organ for revenue only, as socialistic. The epithet "socialistic" is used, of course, without the slightest regard for its meaning. Says the Chronicle—

Municipal ownership is now the plea of every demagogue in either of the old parties who lacks the intelligence to address himself to the real evils from which the people suffer. After municipal ownership we shall have state ownership, and after state ownership national ownership will follow inevitably. Twenty or 30 years more of tariffs, subsidies and privileges will make every owner of a public utility, from a rural gas plant to the steel trust, anxious to unload on the public. When government, which is mischievously engaged already in many enterprises which it ought to let alone, concerns itself with all of the industries of the people there will be no room in this country for even a pretended democratic party. The 52 Iowa democrats who embrace this socialistic proposition so lightly are better qualified to give advice to republicans, monarchists and populists than they are to counsel the democracy.

There is much less socialism in what the Chronicle condemns in that

article, than in its own confusion of truth and error. The essential difference between public ownership of monopolies, on one hand, and public ownership of competitive business, on the other, it utterly ignores. Yet the difference is plain. The two things are quite inconsistent. When a business cannot in its nature be done without a public franchise, it would seem to be in its nature a public business. Water supplies for cities, street transportation, and all other highway business are of that kind. They cannot be carried on without a grant of sovereign power. Therefore they ought to be carried on by the public. For the public has no right to parcel out its sovereign power. Is it not, then, suggestive of just a little weakness in the intellect to assume, as the *Chronicle* does, that public ownership of such businesses logically involves public ownership also of businesses of a private nature, which anybody can carry on if government will only keep its hands off? We take the liberty of thinking so. It would be no more absurd to argue that the contention that John Doe should own his own property logically involves the idea that he should also own Richard Roe's. The public as a whole has business and functions, and individuals as individuals have different and distinct business and functions. It is the task of good government to keep these two things separate; not to confuse them, as socialists and the *Chicago Chronicle* do.

If the people of Nebraska were half as jealous of their rights, the last buttress of which is trial by jury, as a free people must be to preserve its freedom, they would demand that the judge who presided at the trial of the alleged kidnaper of Cudahy's boy be impeached. Whether the prisoner was guilty or not, the general public does not know except as it accepts the verdict of its agent for ascertaining that fact—the jury. Neither is it of great importance in comparison with the question of whether men charged with crime in

Nebraska shall hereafter be tried by intimidated juries.

The fact that the judge did not prefer legal charges against the jury for corruption indicates that he had no evidence against its members. The fact that he did not reverse their verdict is enough in itself to show that he had no legal authority over the jury. It follows, when he lectured them and condemned them for not finding a verdict in harmony with his conclusions instead of their own, that he went beyond his authority and trespassed upon their freedom, a freedom which cannot be trifled with without undermining the protective influences which trial by jury is designed to throw around men charged with crime. The only effect of acts like that of this perniciously obtrusive Nebraska judge is to intimidate juries in future so that they will take the hints and act upon the innuendoes of judges in making up their verdicts.

This judge appears to have committed a crime—a crime more dangerous to the community than the Cudahy kidnaper's, infamous as that is. Unless he is punished for it, other arbitrary judges will be emboldened to follow his example, and other juries will be afraid to render verdicts upon their own judgment and conscience when they suspect the judge of disagreeing with them. In this way judges will become the thirteenth juror, and as the evolution goes on the other twelve jurors will be reduced to desuetude and finally dropped. The liberties of no country can last when that tendency sets in. There is quite as much truth as florid rhetoric in the old aphorism that the jury is the palladium of Anglo-Saxon liberty.

Railroad officials furnish an example, in their ticket system, of the influence of habit. All their moves to reduce fares are hedged about by conditions that cannot benefit the companies nor any of their employes out-

side the auditing department; that tend to annoy and exasperate the traveling public; and that promote discriminations, generally against the poor and ignorant.

For instance, they sell mileage tickets, 2,000 miles in a bunch, for \$50, giving the purchaser back \$10 when the tickets are exhausted, provided he goes through a process of personal identification. Why not sell all tickets without discrimination for two cents a mile? The object of the prevailing system is to compel retail buyers of transportation to pay more than wholesale buyers. Yet there is no wholesale principle in the matter. The company does not economize by selling tickets in bulk. As much work per mile is required, for a given journey, to serve a 2,000-mile ticket patron as to serve one who buys only for the journey; and more work is necessary to keep the run of the wholesale purchaser's ticket and to head off "scalpers." The possibility of profit in the wholesale case rests upon the chance that the 2,000-mile ticket holder will lose some of his tickets. But dependence upon that possibility is suggestive of dishonesty.

Another instance. The Illinois Central railroad sells return tickets from October 1 to May 31, from Chicago to New Orleans, for \$35; and from June 1 to September 30, from New Orleans to Chicago, for the same price. Chicago is a northern, New Orleans a southern resort. Yet the regular fare is \$21 each way. Why not make the regular fare \$17.50 each way, and sell no return tickets? The passenger who goes only one way between Chicago and New Orleans costs the company no more for that journey than the passenger who goes both ways. There might, of course, be involved here that principle known to vessels of going out loaded and coming back "in ballast." That is, if the railroad sold each way for \$17.50 it might carry many passengers down and bring none back,