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 McCarren 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,

Digitized by Google

746). In one respect at least the movement there for public thoroughfares has exceptional elements of strength. A large private interest—the outlying real estate interest—is awaking to the fact that private control of subway rights is bound to react against them. Private control threatens to divert communal growth from the unsettled New York to the unsettled New Jersey side of the port of New York, by withholding accommodations from the less congested places.

+

The immediate issue upon which the traction question hinges, is a Constitutional amendment which, if adopted, would have the effect of enlarging the Constitutional limit that restricts the power of the City to incur indebtedness. It would exclude from consideration as part of the City debt, all self-sustaining bonds, such as those on docks and subways, and utilize for subway extension the resulting addition to the City's credit. Unless this is done, the new subways are in danger of falling into private control as the original ones did. For, as the Committee on Municipal Affairs of the Reform Club explains, it is beginning to be apparent that private interests have planned, first to delay provision for additional subways as long as possible in order to maintain the more intensive and profitable traffic; and, second, to secure long term leases of municipal subways,—leases that "in reality are not leases at all, but constitute contracts more valuable than actual ownership, since they avoid the responsibilities of ownership, including taxation, and carry with them the inevitable franchise value which accompanies all long-term municipal grants." This is the character of the present Belmont lease.

+

In defense of the proceedings which resulted in that one-sided Belmont transaction, it has been urged that subway construction and subway operation were then in the experimental stage. This explanation may well be accepted as indicative of the good faith of all that class of business men who were responsible for building the original subway upon the credit of the city and leasing it for 75 years to the Belmont "crowd" at a trifling rental. But the subway method of city transit is no longer in the experimental stage. Its feasibility, usefulness and profitableness are demonstrated. Yet the leading business men of that class are not notably in evidence against the plutocratic schemes that are hatching to duplicate, in subway extensions, the vicious principle of the original Belmont arrangement. The Chamber of Commerce, for instance, seems indeed to be giving encouragement if not aid to the interests that are hatching the schemes.

+

Why does the Chamber of Commerce hold aloof from the Reform Club's program? In doing so is it acting in the public interest, or is it giving tone to plutocratic exploitation? What public spirited citizen or body of citizens who are genuine could oppose, either directly by condemnation or indirectly by silence, this program which the Reform Club puts forth: "The subways are the 'subway streets' of the city, and should be continuously made subject to the same degree of public control as the surface streets; they should be built by the city and should not be alienated under franchise grants; operating leases should be for short terms only, subject to the right of re-entry at the option of the City on a prearranged basis—of indemnity if necessary. The exploitation of the needs of the City is the curse of the City, and advances in municipal civilization depend primarily upon preventing the unfair use of the many by the few."

+ +

International Responsibility.

Seldom has any principle of international ethics been more forcibly expressed or better applied than by Professor Frederick Starr, of the University of Chicago, in defining our duty as a republic toward the little African republic of Liberia. "What should we do?" he asks in Unity; and replying, says: "First—we should notify Great Britain, France and Germany that encroachment upon Liberian sovereignty will be considered an unfriendly act by us; that coercion ought not to be used in the collection of debts, even though Liberia did not take part in The Hague Conference of 1907. Second—we should use our good offices to bring about definite arrangements between Liberia and the European nations for arbitration of all points at issue between them. Third—we should under no circumstances attempt to make a model government for her, nor should we insist upon reforms along our lines, but we should appoint an *advisory* commission of thoughtful and well-balanced men, to thoroughly investigate conditions and stand ready to give asked advice when needful upon points of importance. This commission should be retained for several years and should be non-partisan. So much we can and should do."

+ +

Federal Jurisdiction Over Libels.

The attempt to indict the New York World for libel in the Federal court at New York does not

Digitized by Google