



CONSIDER THIS?

MISTER
VOTER

A Friendly Talk to Mr.
John D. Spreckels

CONSIDER THIS MR. VOTER

A FRIENDLY TALK TO MR. JOHN D. SPRECKELS

When you came here, Mr. Spreckels, we met you with welcome and said, "You can have anything we can give if you play fair."

We wanted you to make money in San Diego, and helped you many times by hard work in your interests and asking no thanks.

When you wanted any aid in San Diego, we saw that you got it. We always worked with you and for you. Now you call us obstructionists.

Let us see!

When you wanted to build the San Diego & Arizona railroad, you sold us the water system because it was said you needed the money to put into the railroad. You asked us to pay you \$4,500,000, which was a big lot of money, and we knew it. We also knew that if you could buy another water system just like it, you would not pay \$1,000,000 for it—and neither would we.

We didn't have to buy the water system, because we had a contract with you to buy all the water you had for four cents per thousand gallons; and this contract had nearly five years more to run. But we wanted to help build the S. D. & A. railroad, so we voted you \$4,500,000 for the water business, and we still are paying every tax-time for those bonds.

When you wanted the right of way for the same railroad, we took our coats off and helped you get it. You wanted substantially every lot along that right of way, and we practically threatened to mob every man who would hold you up for the price.

When you wanted rights for electric lines on our streets, and you wanted many, we did not murmur. And when you abandoned Third Street, Fourth Street, Spruce Street, First Street and F Street lines, there was no serious objection.

The fact is, we never did deny you anything of importance to you, even when you wanted us to vote for your "Smokestack Mayor"—the one who held us up for \$17,000 for a right of way for our water creek in a canyon through the Jamul ranch, which was a part of the water system, although we did not get it in our bargain from you.

When you wanted \$6,000,000 from the government for North Island (which originally cost less than \$100,000) a San Diego jury gave you the full allowance lawfully, and we were glad.

When you wanted to buy Broadway property, did we jump in and boost the price for you? No, we helped you every time to get as good a bargain as you could.

When you wanted increased fares did we not vote for the Zone System, and in many cases increase the fares 100%.

The simple, important fact is that the men you now call obstructionists helped you on every occasion to more than triple the money you invested in San Diego; and they are glad of it, and ready to do it again for you or any one else.

The only time we have obstructed your plans was when you wanted to sacrifice business and property interests and values of the oldest and largest business district of the city by practical abandonment of the most important car service on Market Street and on Fifth Street south of Broadway, by running the cars over Sixteenth Street and down Broadway.

You cannot deny that a delegation of representative business men saw you several times and begged and implored you not to turn these cars from Market and Fifth Streets, which streets have been the principal arteries for more than thirty-five years. Nor can you deny that you refused to give them or anybody else any assurance that you would not route these cars any way that suited your own pleasure.

More than one-half the taxes of the city are paid by owners of property south of Broadway and west of Sixteenth Street, and the council is doing no more than its plain duty in continuing the keeping up of this section in the interest not only of the people who have their money invested there, but of the city at large.

They are not pulling down or depreciating Mr. Spreckels' Broadway interests. On the contrary, they also are helping Broadway by cleaning up the back yard so that we may have a clean, modern business section.

The nearest to valid excuse for this new policy of destruction of business by a street car service is offered in the claim of your manager that it would cost \$130,000 more to rebuild the Market Street line than to run the cars along Sixteenth Street and down Broadway (recent Fair Play circular distributed shows that it saves only \$25,000) and that he could save you \$10,000 a year in interest by avoiding this expenditure; and you listened to your "efficiency" man instead of your partners and friends in city building. And this is followed by your promise or threat to expend \$3,000,000 in street railway enterprise, contingent upon your securing by popular vote this long undiscovered vital necessity of a franchise to run cars for four blocks on Sixteenth Street—which franchise was refused by the **official representatives of the public** as unnecessary and in conflict with the public interest after due hearings, discussions and consideration. Speaking still as your friends, may we be pardoned in expression of the hope that you get your idea that this is a valid way to obtain a valid franchise from your legal counsel and not from your "efficiency" man.

There is no pretense that the Market Street line does not pay; because it pays better now than it ever did heretofore.

The only way we could stop you from doing this proposed injury to this important business section was to appeal to the City Council and Mayor. They are fair, honorable men and loyal San Diegans, and they denied your petition.

We know you appreciate good and faithful employes and reward them liberally. The Mayor and Council are the employes of the people of San Diego. They have shown themselves to be honest and fearless in loyalty to what they believe to be the public interest. They hazarded their reputations against ridicule and abuse from your newspapers by their fidelity, and see how they answered it in the Adams Street controversy, where again they fought you to

Sp. Coll.
Goodman
Folio

Fl.
869
1527
266

1910

defeat in defense of the public interests, and when you surrendered with offers of compromise consented to terms so generous that you were prompted to respond with concessions unasked by them or anybody.

You accused them of playing politics. Time was when Coronado, too, was part of San Diego, but it was segregated to save your Coronado Beach company from paying city taxes. If it had not been you might now have a right to interfere with San Diego politics, but doubtless you will agree with us in this, that our new City Hall should not be located in Coronado.

All that has been asked of you in any of these Street Railway matters is that you respect and fulfil franchise obligations of your own seeking and making, and in this only to the extent that your action is essential to public welfare and city growth.

We believe that the people of San Diego will defeat your petition for a Sixteenth Street franchise on its demerits alone, but they ought to vote it down if only to show that they believe in upholding faithful, capable and courageous official representatives. We cannot afford to permit you to disgrace and defeat loyal and competent public servants to no better end than that you may have your own employes elected to succeed them.

CONSIDER THIS ALSO MR. VOTER

DO YOU WANT TO MORTGAGE YOUR GRANDCHILDREN?

What do you suppose Mr. Spreckels and his "efficiency" men have in mind with that other proposition through petition to be determined by the special election to be held in their interest on October 10th?

Why do they want or ask for a change from a fifty-year franchise to one for a longer and indeterminate time? Not they, nor any of the voters of today can hope to have much interest in street car service or terms of franchise in that distant future.

In view of the changes in traffic means during the last quarter century, and still greater and more rapid

changes of the last decade, is it not somewhat presumptuous for Mr. Spreckels to ask, or for us to grant, perpetual or exclusive control for a longer or indeterminate time of this service in place of his fifty-year privilege?

There has been scant exploitation in Mr. Spreckel's newspapers and campaign documents of this "little concession" to his spirit of public enterprise and desire for a "Greater San Diego," but it is amply provided for on the ballot. You will find it in Amendment No. 1.

And, if you vote for it and it is adopted, you will have given to Mr. Spreckels, his heirs, executors, or assigns and "efficiency" men, a lien and control upon San Diego streets and San Diego People to the most remote generations of future time. Ask your lawyer.

Unless, of course, Mr. Spreckels or his heirs shall consent to sell this private control of public utility back to the public at a slight advance of a few hundred percent in valuation—as he did in the matter of the City Water System to the City, of North Island to the Federal Government—with liberal assurances of his distinguished consideration and regard for public needs and public welfare.

VOTE NO

on each and against each of these subtle schemes to tax the public anew for private gain of men who already have acquired millions of dollars from San Diego by similar projects and methods, and make San Diego a Greater and Freer City.

COMMITTEE OF 2700,

J. W. SNYDER, Secy.