

out with sufficient clearness to indicate unmistakably that, taking the schedules as a whole and including the maximum and minimum clause as its probable effect, the Payne bill stands for an advance of from 15 to 20 per cent over the Dingley law." Doesn't President Taft's support, then, of this bill make him out an invert? He promised a reduction of the tariff; he is too honorable a man to break his promises, and too honest to pretend that up is down if he knows better; yet the tariff bill which his administration stands for, increases the tariff by from 15 to 20 per cent. There does seem to be only one explanation. Mr. Taft must think that increase is reduction; he must see things upside down; his mental vision must be inverted. Is President Taft an invert? Apparently, yes.

+ +

#### Another Honor for Bryan.

When John J. Fitzgerald (the "Democratic" Congressman from Brooklyn whom Speaker Cannon has adopted), assailed William J. Bryan on the floor of the House last week, it was Pat McCarran who had wound up the talking mechanism, and the Standard Oil "crowd" that furnished the graphophonic "record."

+ +

#### The Chicago Traction Graft.

When the City Council of Chicago rushed through the traction (p. 301) ordinances at an all night session two years ago, with the "grey wolves" and the "greyhounds" lined up together against Mayor Dunne, none but the unsophisticated doubted the corrupt character of the proceedings. Whether money changed hands or not, the proceedings were marvelously like unto infamous legislative proceedings, from Tweed's time down, in connection with which money had changed hands. The loot was rich, and the all-night session of the Council was unexplainable upon any hypothesis of strict honesty. Those circumstances excited suspicions which seem now close to verification. Through "inside" quarrels the facts are leaking out. It is with the utmost difficulty that their full exposure is prevented. Like soft mud in a little boy's hand, which squirms through his fingers—and the tighter he squeezes the more it squirms through—the evidence of corruption is forcing its way into the light.

+

Says the Chicago Tribune of the 4th, in its report of an investigation into an effort of one of the traction companies to saddle the city with a share of the "slush" fund as part of the "partnership"

expense: "The campaign that resulted in the people's approval of the street railway ordinances by an overwhelming majority in 1907, cost the City Railway and the Chicago Railways company more than \$350,000, according to information that came to light yesterday. This revelation resulted from the attempt of the Chicago Railways company to charge its share of the expense up to operating expenses under the existing partnership agreement with the city. Municipal officials compelled the company to relegate the item to its individual accounts. The City Railway had kept its corresponding item of election expense in its individual account and never had attempted to make the city stand part of the burden. So far as could be ascertained from unwilling testimony, the City Railway spent something over \$235,000 in the campaign for the adoption of the ordinances, and the Railways company more than \$115,000." Some of that unwilling testimony was from James B. Hogarth, former auditor of the Chicago City Railway company, who said: "I am sorry that I am not at liberty to discuss what disposition was made of the \$270,000 placed at the disposal of President Thomas E. Mitten by the Chicago City Railway company in connection with the work done to secure the passage of that company's settlement ordinance." Mayor Dunne adds his testimony by declaring that he has "reliable information that the slush fund expended in greasing the ways for the street railway ordinance, was not less than \$600,000, and that two prominent political leaders received \$50,000 each out of that fund." And the only reply to these and other suggestions of corruption, based as they are upon bookkeeping disclosures, is that at the time of the corporation campaign for the ordinances, some of the traction companies' bookkeeping was "confused"! Of course it was confused. Corporation bookkeeping at such times and in such connections always is "confused."

+

Never was a confiding people more grossly "buncoed" than were the over-confiding people of Chicago two years ago, when, in opposition to Mayor Dunne's sincere and wise counsel, they fell into the trap of approving those corruptly begotten traction ordinances.

+ +

#### The Traction Question in New York.

New York appears to be now at the turning point on the question of whether her subway streets shall for years to come be public thoroughfares or a private domain (vol. xi, pp. 201, 539,