

platform addresses and debates of perhaps the greatest living exponent of Direct Legislation through the Initiative and Referendum in this country today. Arrangements have been made through the co-operative direct legislation leagues of the country to have Mr. White come personally to New Mexico for three weeks for the purpose of aiding in the effort to secure the Initiative and Referendum in the Constitution of the new State. Mr. White has already arrived in Raton and he will appear successively in Las Vegas, Santa Fe and Albuquerque, speaking on "The Initiative and Referendum" in this city Thursday night of this week. The interest in this subject and the prominence of the speaker insure him one of the largest houses ever gathered in this city. From here he will go southeast, covering every important town in New Mexico. . . . Mr. White is a debater of national reputation and he will meet any opponents of the Initiative and Referendum who may desire to discuss the issue.

+ +

Judge Gilbert's Candidacy.

The candidacy of so distinguished a jurist as Hiram T. Gilbert for nomination as Democratic candidate for the lower house of the Illinois legislature from the Fifth Senatorial district (embracing all of the Sixth ward of Chicago south of Forty-third street and all of the Seventh ward except the part south of Sixty-third street and east of Cottage Grove avenue), is inspired, as will be at once inferred, by larger considerations than desire for office. Such official service he can give only at a sacrifice. His primary purpose is the furtherance of legislation for improving judicial conditions, particularly in Cook county; but he is also interested in securing Constitutional amendments establishing home rule for this Chicago county without prejudicing the interests of the rest of the State. The plan he favors in this matter would make no law applicable to the entire State unless—

It shall have received either a majority of the votes of the Senators and Representatives from Cook County, as well as a majority of the votes of the Senators and Representatives from the outside territory, or the approval of a majority of the voters of Cook County and of a majority of the electors of the outside territory.

And it would require that—

special legislation for Cook County be adopted whenever the same is demanded by a majority of her Senators and Representatives and approved by a majority of her voters; . . . a like privilege of special legislation, under like conditions, to be accorded the people of that portion of the State outside of Cook County.

Judge Gilbert's views on taxation are in harmony with his attitude toward home rule in general, and in all other respects he is the kind of citizen we

could well wish to see active no less in legislative than in judicial service.

+ +

Public School Politics.

Two candidates for superintendent of the public schools of Cook County (excluding the Chicago schools but including Chicago voters) are men we gladly commend, one of them to democratic Democrats and the other to democratic Republicans.

+

For the Democratic nomination, the candidate we allude to is G. Charles Griffiths, a long time principal of one of the Chicago schools. For the Republican nomination we allude to Archibald O. Coddington. Both are competent educational executives, and both have democratic ideals in education. The election of either would be in the line of democratic progress; the election of one or the other is greatly to be desired, and to that end it is important that each be nominated by his own party at the primaries.

+ +

Samuel Gompers on Republican Insurgency.

Samuel Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, has taken another courageous step which should stand to his credit, along with that of himself and his associates in the Presidential campaign (vol. xi, pp. 82, 133, 418, 492, 578, 586, 781, 819) of 1908. In speaking in Wisconsin a few days ago he took an unequivocal position in support of the great political fight—we should call it a splendid fight, if that adjective were not belittling to devotion so profound and tenacious—that Senator La Follette is making in Wisconsin.

+

Let no one suppose that a man in Mr. Gompers' position can do such things lightly. It would evidently be easier for him to follow the even tenor of his way as a straight out trade unionist, leaving politics alone. This was the right course when his career as leader of the Federation began. It is no longer the right course, because politics, plutocratic politics, won't let trade unionism alone. But changing circumstances are not quickly realized by all, and he who does realize them risks his reputation when he tells it to the rest. Easier, then, though it would evidently be for Mr. Gompers and such as he to continue silent and inactive politically, he is not insensible to his duty in that regard, and for this he should have the loyal support of those who agree with him and the respect of those who do not.

To do as he has done with reference to La Follette and Republican insurgency, is, we repeat, no light matter. It calls out naturally the criticism of strict trade unionists whose eyes are not yet open to "the changing order." It challenges the criticism, not always fair, of trade unionists whose political sympathies lie in other directions, either because they do not see the rising dangers he discerns or because they are guilty of what they mistakenly charge against him—of putting their politics before their trade unionism. When a man who has every temptation, as Mr. Gompers has, toward the close of a career upon the laurels of which he might rest, to keep out of political cyclones and hurricanes, yet resists those temptations, and not from any personal interest in politics but because he realizes ahead of the mass of his followers, what is the truth, that the cause of his life's devotion is at stake, is not a man to be weighed and measured by unfriendly standards.

* * *

THE DEMOCRATIC OPPORTUNITY.

Nothing has done more, and justly, to accentuate distrust of the Democratic party than the spirit and attitude of its managers towards the present political situation. They seem to see in Republican Insurgency, nothing but a lucky chance to "get in," to which end they are urging one another and all the rest of us to "get together."

+

And what a "getting together" it is!

Take Chicago for illustration. All the Democratic factions are "getting together" as cozily as the traditional inmates of a prairie dog's burrow.

Here is Roger Sullivan, who threw Dunne in favor of Busse at the last mayoral election; and Dunne (a man of unimpeachable honesty and sturdily conscientious at all costs under temptations in the Mayor's office of a kind that few men resist), whom Sullivan threw because he had administered the mayor's office to his best ability in the public interest instead of Sullivan's interest; and Harrison, who ran away from Dunne in the election campaign after contesting the primaries against him and losing; and Hearst, who did as little as possible to prevent Busse's election because Dunne as Mayor couldn't "stand for" Hearst's unalterable nominee for chief of police, and who, for personal revenge upon Bryan for not trying to nominate him for President at St. Louis in 1904, managed a flank movement for Taft at the Presidential election of 1908; and O'Connell, whose official service under Dunne had the signal merit of winning him the contrapositive enmity of Hearst

and of Sullivan; and Alderman Dever, one of the very few noted public servants of Chicago in either party whose political purposes rise above the level of office holding, and whose courage of his convictions armored and weaponed with tenacity and intelligence, has on occasion and in trying circumstances gone far to prove his fitness for trusted leadership.

They are all trying to "get together."

+

As with those elements in Chicago, so with similar elements in the Democratic party all over the United States. They, too, are trying to "get together."

For what?

Because they have, after all, found one another worthy of personal and political confidence? No. As in Chicago Hearst would still denounce Sullivan (or Bryan for shaking hands with him), and undermine Dunne and trample on O'Connell, and excoriate Harrison, and also find their respective candidates for office quite unfit, but for their "get together" concordat; and Sullivan and Harrison would be of like mind toward all but themselves respectively and their own individual choice of candidates—as this would be so in Chicago but for the "get together," so also but for that, would it be everywhere.

Is the "get together" movement, then, because incongruous elements in the management of the Democratic party have finally found common ground on some vital political principle or policy? Evidently not: at any rate they are not mentioning it.

Is it in order to co-operate with the Insurgent Republicans, who, having come to a realization, belated but not too late, of what some Democrats have proclaimed from the housetops since 1888, that the Republican party is the private property of plutocratic combines which put "the man below the dollar," are lining up with democratic Democrats for the common good? No; for none of that is the "get together" movement in the Democratic party.

Put it to the test wherever you find it, and you will learn, if you are astute enough to learn anything about it, that the sole object of those Democrats who shout loudest and coax softest for the "get together,"—like the object of their prototypes in Lowell's day—is only "to git some on 'em office an' some on 'em votes."

+

We are not criticizing political combinations, even such as make a motley showing of bed fellows,