

labor in Chicago from the career in which Harrison politics supported it.

+ +

A Questioned Voting Right.

An inquirer in the Chicago Tribune of the 21st wanted to know whether he will be entitled to vote at the municipal election on the 4th of April, explaining that he will not be 21 years old until the 5th; and the Tribune, on the authority of the election officials, informs him that he can not vote on that day. But the answer to his question turns upon the date of his birth, which he does not give. His statement that he will not be 21 years of age until April 5, is what the lawyers call "a conclusion of law" and not "a statement of fact." From a casual remark in his letter of inquiry, however, this young man was probably born on the 5th of April, 1890; for he says he will be 21 at midnight of the 4th. If this guess of ours is right, the young man is certainly entitled to vote at the Chicago election on the 4th. All persons born on the 5th day of April, 1890, began their first year on that day; they therefore began their second year on the 5th day of April, 1891; therefore they will begin their 22d year on the 5th day of April, 1911; therefore they complete their 21st year on the 4th day of April, 1911. By the clock, they would not complete it until midnight; but as the law takes no notice in such matters of fractions of a day, they complete it with the beginning of that day. Wherefore, an American male citizen, born April 5, 1890, is entitled to vote at any moment he pleases while the polls are open on the 4th day of April, 1911. And the courts have so decided.

+ +

Mayor Whitlock and "Tainted News."

The systematic promulgation of "tainted news" in the interest of the Interests, a subject to which we have had occasion heretofore to refer (vol. xiii, pp. 1058, 1227), seems to have about it an odor that trails off in the direction of Columbus, Ohio, whence comes one of the latest specimens. In this instance the squirt was aimed at Brand Whitlock, Mayor of Toledo.

+

A State board of examiners which had been at work for three years on the administration of Toledo, reported late on the night of March 3rd, filing its report in Columbus. It was a voluminous affair, this report, comprising eight large volumes of close typewriting; but in less, very much less, than 24 hours, what parported to be a fair condensation had been published broadcast as coming from Columbus. This condensation made it

appear that the official report charged much wickedness to Mayor Whitlock's administration. But in fact the wickedness did not exist, and the official report did not say that it had existed. That news from Columbus was *tainted news*.

+

Well may Mayor Whitlock ask:

Must a city, if it would not be slandered and libeled throughout the land, turn over its streets to franchise corporations and provide an administration that with one hand will crush the organizations of labor, and with the other deliver to an already privileged few, those communal values that are the result of labor's toil? It is not less than this that Privilege demands, it is not less than this that partyism is ready to perform in its service. That is the way of Privilege. It will traduce where it can not debauch, it will seize the legal means devised to protect the people and use them to despoil the people. It will commit every crime except those requiring courage. And that is not all Privilege does. It demands most of all of its own servitors; it deprives them of the power of spiritual appreciation, so that they are deprived of the ability to recognize and understand how despicable are the deeds they have to do.

The Ohio cities thus attacked have been Toledo under Whitlock's administration, and Cleveland under Tom L. Johnson's. The motive is plain, but where does all this tainted news come from? Who are the agents of the Interests in sending it on its travels? Is it a mystery that must remain a mystery? Or will some competent investigator run the rascals down?

+ +

An Appeal from Mexican Patriots.

In our news columns this week is an appeal to Samuel Gompers, as president of the American Federation of labor, from an American organization of the Liberal party of Mexico. Essentially it is a strong appeal. It would be a stronger one had it been differently addressed. It assumes that Mr. Gompers has in his official capacity the right and the power to speak out on the subject raised, promptly and decisively. This weakens the appeal, just as any appeal is weakened when addressed to persons officially who are without official authority to respond to it. Such appeals are weak because the common sense of mankind interprets them as less likely to secure the results appealed for than to put the person addressed in the position of either seeming to be unsympathetic or of actually overstepping the official authority reposed in him. As an address to American workmen, however,—and, for the matter of that, to the American people—this address in behalf of the Liberals of Mexico should command the widest and deepest sympathy.