

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