

date this year. At the primaries the nomination was captured by a Tory, Timothy Hogan, present attorney general of the State. The Republican nominee, while about equal to Hogan in most things, exceeds him in one respect. He makes no false pretense of democracy. The candidate of the Progressive party, Arthur L. Garford, is not so well known, but seems by far the best entitled to democratic support of the three. s. D.



#### Advantage of Direct Primaries.

Direct primaries this year give voters a chance to quiz candidates for nomination as well as election. Quizzing, however, should not be confined to promises for the future. In the case of present members seeking to be returned, questions regarding the past offer better opportunities. This especially applies to the action of members, claiming to be democratic and progressive, on measures that should have had the support of every congressman opposed to privilege.



Among these measures may be mentioned the amendment to the Alaska government railway bill proposed by Congressman Bailey of Pennsylvania. Had that been adopted the money spent for building the road would have been returned to the people through a tax on land values in Alaska. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 126 to 27. The vote on this measure affords an excellent test of a candidate's democracy. Let those seeking renomination be asked how they voted, if they did not dodge, and why. Another good test is afforded by the vote on the George bill reforming the assessment system of the District of Columbia. As introduced it would have abolished gross favoritism in assessments in the District. The bill was first loaded down with hostile amendments, which were finally eliminated and then the original bill was rejected. Candidates should be allowed a chance to explain. Then, again, there is the Crosser bill to municipalize the street railway system of Washington. Although favorably reported on by the District Committee it has not been allowed to come to a vote. Here is another chance. A bill providing for retention by the federal government of title to radium bearing lands was amended into an unrecognizable shape and made useless. These are but samples of a number of tests offered to congressmen to prove their democracy. Since they relate to matters not mentioned in party platforms they better enable a voter to gauge the

ability of a member to pass on the merits of a measure without help of a party declaration.



Among others whose position on the measures mentioned might be ascertained is Congressman Stringer of Illinois. As the principal candidate for the Democratic senatorial nomination against reactionary Roger Sullivan, it is important that progressive Democrats know to what extent he represents them. Was he one of the 27 who voted for the Bailey amendment? Did he vote for the passage of the George bill in its original form? What has he done to help the Crosser bill? Did he oppose amendment of the radium conservation bill? Mr. Stringer should make these matters clear, not only that voters at the primaries may know to what extent he differs fundamentally from Sullivan, but also that they may judge how he measures up to the democracy of Raymond Robins, who will be his opponent at the general election, should Sullivan be defeated. s. D.

s. D.



#### Mexico Still in Danger.

The Constitutionlists of Mexico have now such an opportunity as comes too rarely to leaders in a great cause. A revolution to free the land has met with sufficient success to put in control those who have led it. But that is only half the battle. The revolutionists have won against physical force. They have yet to win against cunning. It is inspiring to hear that in Northern Mexico the workers on the farms are this year for the first time getting the entire product of their labor. This is what one year of freedom from landlordism has done. It is now the task of the government to keep the land free. It can not do so by dividing it into small holdings. It can only do so by making it unprofitable to hold land for any other purpose than to put it to its most productive use. There is only one sure way of doing this under modern civilized conditions. Holders of land should pay to the state its full annual rental value, exclusive of the value of improvements. This ground rent should pay all public expenses. There should be no taxes whatever on industry or its products. Under this system there will be no holding of large tracts of land in an unused or partially used condition. Yet, to prevent the new government from adopting this system there will be no lack of cunning efforts. Plutocracy will work on well meaning but poorly informed officials to secure substitution of futile devices. Herein lies the greatest danger to the new government and to the