



Courtesy of The New York "American."

VIEW FROM THE ELEVATED STRUCTURE.



VIEW FROM THE STREET.

THE NEW YORK "ELEVATED" WRECK.

END OF OUR TARIFF WAR WITH RUSSIA.

THAT the Czar should end his tariff war with us, in recognition of President Roosevelt's services in ending his war with Japan, is considered a most fitting and graceful act by most of our press. Some, however, remark that, as in his other war, the Czar makes more by ending it than he would by keeping on. In 1901, it will be remembered, Russia imposed a "penal" duty on our machinery and other iron and steel products, by which our manufacturers had to pay tariff rates 30 to 50 per cent. higher than European manufacturers, because we interpreted certain governmental aid to the Russian sugar industry as a bounty and, as provided by the Dingley law, raised our tariff on Russian sugar. Our tariff remains, but the Russian penal tariff on our machinery is now lifted.

"Russia needs the American machinery," says the *Chicago News* (Ind.), in explanation of the Czar's act, and the *Philadelphia Record* (Dem.) takes the same view. The *New York Press* (Rep.) observes similarly:

"We hate to look a gift horse in the mouth, but this animal is fit for the boneyard. The retaliatory tariff just removed by the Czar was doing the Russian people more harm than good, and they are glad to get rid of it. It was imposed because of a differential duty on Russian sugar imported to this country, to countervail an imperial bounty paid the Russian sugar-makers. To maintain the duty that shut out of the Russian market all kinds of iron and steel manufactures, or at least limited American exportation of such wares to Russia, was cutting off the Muscovite nose to spite the Muscovite face. Russia will be better off with American goods of this class, which are the best in the world."

The Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor at Washington reports that our sales to Russia have gone right on increasing under the "penal" tariff. It says:

"An analysis of the figures showing the imports from the United States of the various articles affected by the discriminating tariff legislation shows that these imports have, on the whole, increased during the period in question. Thus, the imports of manufactures of cast iron increased from \$19,955 in value during the year 1900 (which, for purposes of this comparison, may be taken as a normal year) to \$45,722 in 1903. The imports of hand tools, which were \$15,315 in value in 1900, increased to \$64,532 in 1903. Those of machinery increased from \$223,529 in 1900 to \$338,694 in 1903, while the imports of the various articles under the general head of manufactures of iron and steel increased from \$45,373 in 1900 to \$363,555 in 1902, and fell off to \$67,555 during the following year. The same is true of bicycles, the imports of which, from \$10,836 in 1900, increased to \$43,087 in 1902, but fell to \$30,377 during the

following year. The imports of the articles under the general head of naval stores more than doubled—from \$186,552 in 1900 to \$404,226 in 1903. The combined figures of imports from the United States of the articles subject to discriminating duties show an increase from \$501,558 in 1900 to \$951,106 in 1903."

FIRST BIG WRECK ON THE NEW YORK "ELEVATED."

SELDOM has there been a railroad wreck in this country so notable for the after-suggestions of simple precautions that might have prevented it as the disaster of last week, when a car plunged from the New York elevated road to the street below, killing twelve passengers and injuring forty more. The newspapers are full of such reflections. If the fatal curve which the Ninth-avenue train took at full speed, by mistake, had been "banked," instead of flat, the train might have rounded it safely; if the Ninth-avenue trains had been ordered to approach the dangerous switch slowly, instead of at full tilt, this one would have gone round all right; if there had been an automatic stop-device, the train could not have taken the wrong track; if two men had been at the controller, instead of one, the other might have seen the switch signal and applied the brakes; if the ill-starred car had been of steel, like many of the subway cars, it would not have crumpled up; and lastly, if the Sixth-avenue branch track had been elevated still farther, and carried across the Ninth-avenue line on a "crossover," the displacement of the switch would have been apparent, and the train stopped before it went into the street. All this, of course, is aside from the apparent suggestion that if the switchman and motorman had done their duty, the train would never have taken the wrong track. Altho the elevated road carries some 500,000 passengers a day and has been in operation, with heavy traffic, for thirty-four years, it had been the proud boast of the management that it had never caused the death of a passenger by collision or derailment, and the *New York Herald* remarks that this was in reality a dangerous fact, for it was "calculated to lull the managers into a feeling of fancied security in the existing methods."

The *Washington Star* says of the human element in the disaster:

"There is some doubt as to which of the two human causes is most to blame. One theory of the disaster is that the towerman, whose duty it is to switch trains alternately to one and the other branches of the line, mistook the destination signals on the approaching train and sent it around the curve instead of straight ahead. The high speed of the train made it impossible for it to negotiate the curve safely and it buckled and one of the cars was

thrust over the edge of the structure. The other theory is that the train bore the wrong signals, thus warranting the towerman in turning the switch for the curve. In either case it is plain that the motorman, who disappeared immediately after the accident and has not yet been found, ran his train at a dangerous rate of speed when he saw, or should have seen, the signals set for the curve instead of the straight track. Whether the towerman was responsible or not, the motorman is blamable for his reckless running regardless of signals. Had he slowed down on seeing the curve signals he would merely have run around on the wrong track, being later forced to back up to obtain his proper line.

"Thus in any case the combination of a deficient human agent and a deficient construction is presented, for if the curve had been properly built no mistake of either motorman or towerman, or both, would have resulted in disaster. And in the adjustment of the case it is to be hoped that the courts of New York will find a way to hold to a full degree of responsibility those higher officials of the line whose duty to the public requires them to adopt every device known to engineering science which will safeguard human life."

As regards punishment, the opinion is freely expressed that claims for damages to the amount of \$500,000 or more will probably be filed against the company. Several papers, however, think that somebody should wear stripes for this affair. So thinks the *Providence Journal*; and the *Boston Transcript* says:

"The *Railway Gazette* recently tabulated twenty-five derailments and twenty-three collisions on railroads in this country in the month of July last. There was an average of one death a day, which was considered 'a good showing' in comparison with reports of other months. Yet it does not appear that our courts have been overworked with the trial of cases to determine who was responsible for these accidents, or for the punishment of those so responsible. In England, when anybody is killed in a railroad accident, somebody is very likely to go to jail. In this country such a result is the exception. We find too many excuses for the human carelessness which is the prime cause of our railway accidents.

"The New York case affords an opportunity to test the sufficiency of our laws relating to accidents; if the laws are not tested, it will be the fault of the authorities of that city, and to let a person responsible for such a disaster as that of this morning go unpunished is merely to put a premium on carelessness in railroad management."

SOUTH CAROLINA'S DISPENSARY SCANDAL.

AN investigation of the workings of the State Dispensary in South Carolina has uncovered a system of graft, corruption, and bribery at which the local papers stand appalled. "The dispensary," declares the *Columbia State*, "stands alone, unrivaled; the world's matchless grafting-machine"; and the *Charlotte Observer* remarks that it is "one of the most elaborate systems of grafting in modern times." South Carolina for over twelve years has been trying the dispensary method of dealing with the liquor traffic, in which the State controls and conducts liquor-selling, the profits going to the public treasury. Senator Benjamin R. Tillman, the father and chief defender of the system, and other promoters held that this scheme would drive liquor selling out of politics, reduce drunkenness, and free the traffic generally of political scandal and social demoralization. Nevertheless, almost from the day that the system went into operation, we are told by the *Charleston News and Courier*, "charges of corruption have been laid against it," but the people were "not allowed to suspect that dishonesty could enter the dispensary."

For nearly a month a committee has been investigating the workings of the dispensary. It is shown that positions with the dispensary were bartered and sold for money. Mr. Toland, a former dispenser at Spartanburg, told of his actual payment of \$275 and a gold watch to secure a dispensary job. Even the \$50 clerkships were bought or sold. At Spartanburg the committee uncovered a scheme to buy the support of the *Spartanburg Journal* in the fight against prohibition. A fund of \$400 was to be raised for the purpose. The testimony shows also how the liquor concern boomed their own candidates for dispensary positions,

and in many cases furnished the campaign funds. There was sharp competition to gain the patronage of the State Dispensary Board, whose duty it was to distribute the stock to the dispensaries. In brief, dispensers accepted presents from whisky-dealers as pay for favoritism; received bonuses and bribes for pushing certain brands of whisky, by selling to the agents of such whisky the empty cases for three or four times their value. Sometimes the empty bottles were sold to the agents for from 20 to 35 cents a dozen.

In South Carolina there is now a strong movement to close up the dispensaries, and Senator Tillman proposes to leave the question to the Democratic primary. The prohibitionists are confident that their cause will win if presented to the people. Probably the best that South Carolina has to say on the subject is found in the debate that has been going on between George B. Cromer, a prominent prohibitionist of that State, and Senator Tillman, both men using the *Charleston News and Courier* as their mouthpiece. Mr. Cromer writes, in part, to Senator Tillman:

"Our Supreme Court, in its famous decision upholding the constitutionality of the dispensary law, laid down the following as a fundamental proposition, and said that if this proposition is not true the law is unconstitutional: 'That liquor, in its nature, is dangerous to the morals, good order, health, and safety of the people, and is not to be placed on the same footing with the ordinary commodities of life, such as corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, potatoes, etc.' Kansas says to her children, 'The liquor traffic is dangerous and ought to be prohibited.' South Carolina says to her thousands of school-children: 'The liquor traffic is dangerous to the morals, good order, health, and safety of the people, and therefore we will sell liquor and get all the money we can for the schools.'

"The business of the saloon-keeper was becoming disreputable in this State, and saloon-keepers were beginning to find it difficult to justify the business in the eyes of their children. The dispensary system attempts to make the traffic respectable and reputable. How can the children in our schools answer the sophistry of the argument that whatever contributes to the support of the school is good and wise? I lay it down as little short of an axiom that any restrictive scheme that takes control of a traffic that is dangerous to the morals of the people, and controls it in such a way as to make it reputable, is a vicious and dangerous scheme."

A portion of Senator Tillman's reply follows:

"The dispensary law properly administered does reduce drunkenness. It does conduce to temperance and good morals, and teaches men the uses of liquor rather than the abuses of it. That the State board of control is now under suspicion of corruption, with many things pointing to the belief that the suspicion is well grounded, and that the local dispensers have been debauched because of the lax administration or maladministration of the law, proves nothing.

"Everybody recognizes the evil of drunkenness, and how to minimize or to prevent it is the whole question. You say prohibit the sale. I say sell by bonded officers, under stringent regulations, in the daytime only, and have the law enforced; the profit, which is an incident and not a purpose in this sale, to go where it is most needed; that is, into the school fund of the State. It would make no difference if it went into the fund of the general treasury, and the school fund increased from other sources. But that is a subterfuge. No one drinks any more or patronizes the dispensary because the profits go to the school fund. I can not see any harm or sin in obtaining revenue from a traffic that is irrepressible. The United States Supreme Court protects each citizen in the right to import for his own use, and no law of the State can prevent it. The poorer and more ignorant classes, who can not thus obtain liquor, have been, and always will be, supplied through some local agency, no matter what the law against selling liquor may be. . . . The dispensary system does not rest for its support upon the money that it brings in. It rests on the claim of its defenders backed by experience of our people and statistics, as affording more protection against the vice of drunkenness than any other system, prohibition or license either.

"If it has done this in spite of maladministration and mismanagement, what would it not do if such men as Dr. Cromer and his friends would give to the enforcement of the law their great moral support?"