

both parties be represented in counting votes; that commissions not only be bi-partisan, but that minority parties and not the majority party appoint the minority members. The other report on Bryan is from Washington, where he declared himself in favor of the Canadian reciprocity agreement and immediate revision of the tariff. He is reported from there to have taken direct issue with Senator Bailey by advocating Statehood for both New Mexico and Arizona. "He particularly commended the Constitution of Arizona," says the report, "but would admit New Mexico notwithstanding objectionable sections in its Constitution, holding that the approval of such a measure should rest entirely with the people who are to live under it."

+ +

The Chicago Mayoral Election.

With only two principal candidates for Mayor, the people of Chicago are driven to a choice of one or the other, or of adding their votes to the Prohibitionist or to one or another of two Socialist candidates, or of passing their vote altogether.

+

Partisan Prohibitionists will of course vote for the candidate of their party. So will partisan Socialists. These voters, therefore, are self-placed out of the range of discussion with reference to the particular results and possibilities of the approaching election. Whatever influence their voting may have upon social progress or reaction in general, it is unlikely to have any upon the government of Chicago for the next four years. The same remark applies to strict partisan voters of the Democratic and the Republican parties, except that these may immediately affect the city government. They place themselves out of the range of discussion. But those citizens of Chicago who are not absolutely party-bound, have it in their power to decide freely and intelligently which one of the only two candidates who can be elected Mayor of Chicago shall be elected.

+

The Democratic candidate, Mr. Harrison, was Mayor eight years. Elected in 1897 and re-elected in 1899, 1901, and 1903, with declining pluralities, his plurality in 1903 was so small that he dared not test his strength in 1905. His administrations were of the machine order. Not a single important step of a genuinely democratic kind can be attributed to any of them. He disclosed himself to John P. Altgeld as utterly unworthy of confidence—to John P. Altgeld, the best

democrat that the Democratic party of Illinois has ever had in its leadership, and, next to Abraham Lincoln, the best that any party of this State has had. While Mayor of Chicago, Mr. Harrison journeyed to New York for the express purpose of supporting the corrupt and corrupting Tammany Hall, against progressive Democrats with Henry George as their leader. Throughout his regime in the City Hall, Mayor Harrison was the "great and good friend" of the traction interests, a relationship which brought Altgeld to the front to expose and oppose him in 1899, and Judge Tuley and Judge Dunne in 1904 and 1905. When the Hearst papers in Chicago were making a fight for people's rights in Chicago, Harrison was against them and they against him; but when these papers subordinate every consideration to Hearst's appetite for Presidential delegates, Harrison is with them and they with Harrison. After Dunne's renomination in 1907 on the traction issue, Harrison, whom he defeated at the primaries, used his influence for Busse, one of the worst types of one of the worst groups of the worst elements of the Republican party in Chicago. At the recent Democratic primary he defeats Dunne by less than 1,500 plurality in a total of 150,000, and to do this he was dependent upon Senator Lorimer's Democratic friend, "Hinky Dink," who gave Harrison nearly 3,000 First Ward votes—2,000 more than enough to change the result.

+

The primary at which Harrison thus defeated Dunne was not a "lining up" of men of like political opinions who are choosing leaders; it was for the most part a "lining-up" of men diametrically opposed in political opinion but happening to wear the same party label at a time of party disintegration—something like the pro-slavery and the anti-slavery Democrats of the '50's. Dunne represented popular democracy; Harrison represented machine organization for personal purposes, with a record that ties him up to pretty much all that the supporters of Dunne oppose. To vote for Harrison at the election after voting for Dunne at the primary, would be stultifying. Democratic partisans who preferred Dunne only personally, may indeed vote now for Harrison; but democratic Democrats who therefore voted for Dunne might as well support Graham (the Roger Sullivan man), had he been nominated. It would be fine proof of their loyalty to a Democratic office-spoils machine to vote for Harrison, but rather poor proof of their fidelity to the progressive Democratic policies and principles that Dunne represented at the primaries. The voters who sup-

ported Dunne at the primaries can best attest their disinterested sincerity by voting against Harrison at the election in April.

+

A vote for the Prohibition candidate, or for either of the Socialist candidates, hopeless as are the possibilities of their polling a large vote, would be better than voting for Harrison. It would be half a vote against him, and that is better than a whole one in his favor. But the most effective vote against Harrison would be one for his Republican adversary—Merriam.

+

Fortunately, a vote for Merriam is not a vote merely in the negative. Merriam is to the Republican party of Chicago what Dunne is to the Democratic party. As Dunne is a progressive Democrat, so Merriam is a progressive Republican. As the Harrisons and the "Hinky Dinks" are against Dunne and what he stands for, so the Lorimers and the Busses are against Merriam. In Chicago at the April election, a progressive Republican is pitted against a standpat machine-made Democrat. In such a conflict, democratic Democrats belong not with Harrison, the reactionary of their own party, but with Merriam, the progressive of the Republican party. Mr. Merriam is rightly described by Raymond Robins as "able, energetic, courageous," and a "quiet, wise man, patient, straightforward, and clean as a hound's tooth," who "stands for effective progress, for a larger opportunity and a better life for all the people." That is a description which every democratic Democrat should understand and appreciate. In voting for Merriam they will be voting not only against Harrison, but in favor of a competent man for Mayor, and of that democracy which vitalized the Democratic party under Jefferson and the Republican party under Lincoln—a species of democracy to which politicians like Harrison in both parties are instinctively opposed.

+ +

Harrison and Hearst.

What Chicago needs first of all, says Hearst's "Examiner" of the 13th, is "a Mayor with the courage and ability to fight off franchise thieves—one whose record and character have come out of the fire of experience unscathed." Yet Hearst's "Examiner" is a Harrison paper now, notwithstanding that its own files of the summer and fall of 1904 show its own opinion then, that Mayor Harrison was at that time making an indelible record as a friend of franchise interests.

It was the "Examiner" that stood valiantly in the way of Harrison's success in those days. But for its intervention, Mayor Harrison would have given the traction system to Mr. Morgan. No, it is not a Mayor with "courage and ability to fight off franchise thieves" that Mr. Hearst's papers want. If that were so, they would not be supporting Harrison now. They know his bad record on the franchise question. What they want is a Mayor who will give delegates to Mr. Hearst for the Presidency at the next Democratic convention.

+

Roger Sullivan gave Hearst the Illinois delegates in 1904, whereupon and wherefore the Hearst papers were Sullivanitic, and Harrison they regarded as a bad one. Mayor Dunne refused to use his office to prepare the way for making delegates for Hearst in 1908; whereupon and wherefore the Hearst papers drove knives between Dunne's political and official ribs whenever they got a chance to do so without throwing off their disguise. Harrison is now evidently pledged to make delegates for Hearst in 1912; whereupon and wherefore the Hearst papers are devoted to Harrison.

+

It is not Harrison's record for "courage and ability to fight off franchise thieves" that draws the Hearst papers to him. His record in that respect both in fact and by its own files, must be read backwards to read good. What really draws the Hearst papers to Harrison is his "courage and ability" to bargain with Mr. Lawrence, formerly of San Francisco and now the boss of Hearst's Chicago papers, for delivering Illinois delegates to Hearst.

+ +

Newspaper Prudence.

A brooding spirit of non-partisanship has hovered over the Republican newspapers of Chicago since the Republican nomination of Merriam for Mayor. It might be good to look upon, were it not suggestive of bi-partisan possibilities with reference to Big Business deals in politics.

+ +

Effect of the Tariff on Wheat.

It is claimed by the American Economist, a protection organ, that the price of American wheat in Minneapolis is every year about 12 cents higher than the price of Canadian wheat at Winnipeg, and that the difference is due to the American tariff on wheat. Whether there is this difference in price, or any difference in price,