

## ONE MAN'S OPINIONS

BY N. D. COCHRAN

**The Senatorial Scrap.**—I have the following letter concerning the Democratic scrap for U. S. senator:

"I see in your Comment that the daily papers failed to print all of Carter Harrison's speech on Roger Sullivan's record. What is the matter with The Day Book? Has Roger got The Day Book buffaloed as well as the daily papers? If not, tell us something about Roger. I think that the majority of Day Book readers would like to see something in The Day Book about Roger's past record. If you are not with him show us that you are against him and why.—  
**Day Book Reader.**

I am not bothering my head about that senatorial scrap one way or another, and have no desire to influence any reader of The Day Book as to how he should vote.

It doesn't make the slightest difference to me whom the Democrats nominate.

I don't know much about the details of Sullivan's record or of Springer's. I have seen nothing to indicate that either of them would tear his shirt in a frenzy to serve the people. Personally I would prefer Barratt O'Hara, by far, to either of them.

I couldn't be a supporter of Roger Sullivan because my impression of him is that he is a representative of Special Privilege rather than a representative of the people, a political boss rather than a leader. I don't believe in the party system that Sullivan stands for, and haven't seen anything in his public utterances to indicate that he is really progressive. I have no doubt he stands by his friends, keeps his word and plays the game on the level with his political pals. Every political boss has to do that or go under.

I think Carter Harrison stands more for real democracy, with the

small d, than Sullivan does. But he also stands for Hearst and Andy Lawrence; and I have more faith in Roger Sullivan's candidacy than in that of Hearst and Lawrence; for they pretend to stand for the rule of the people, yet all the time play the game of plutocracy. They are hypocrites and Sullivan isn't. As I understand it, Sullivan is quite frank in his bossism. If I had to have a boss I would prefer Sullivan to either Hearst or Lawrence. But I don't have to have a boss; so I am for none of them.

Before Mayor Harrison got hitched up with Lawrence, he was the strongest man in town with the people. They had faith in him. But Hearst is too big a load for any man to carry in Chicago. And I can't quite reconcile Hearst's alliance with Dunne, Harrison and Lewis with his vicious hostility toward President Wilson and Secretary Bryan.

If I were a party Democrat and an earnest supporter of Wilson I would be afraid to turn the election machinery of Chicago over to Hearst, because I think Hearst will be found fighting Wilson in 1916. I regard Judge Owens as more of a Hearst-Lawrence man than a Harrison man. If I were a Democrat I would vote for Dan Cruice for the nomination for county judge, not only because of his record as an advocate of popular government, but also because if he should be nominated and elected he would be under no obligation to any party boss and could serve the public.

But as to the senatorial scrap, I don't want to be tied up to either of the party factions. I can't see much in it for the people no matter who wins in the primaries, and it doesn't make a particle of difference to me how any voter votes. It is none of my business.

I am merely sitting in the bleachers watching the game. And I begin to have doubts as to whether Springer is really opposing Sullivan. Th...