

CURRENT TOPICS

IT has been said of President Wilson's revival of Washington's and Adams' practice of addressing congress in person that President Jefferson abandoned it as an "imitation of royalty's progress." Referring to this claim, the New York World says: No evidence whatever exists to support any such assertion. Jefferson, as an indifferent public speaker, doubtless preferred the written message to the spoken address. What he objected to, however, was not the spoken address but the practice which had grown up of a congressional reply to the address that had become the subject of prolonged wrangling to no other effect than delay in the real work of congress. Thus he said in a letter of December, 1801, to the president of the senate: "The circumstances under which we find ourselves placed rendering inconvenient the mode heretofore practiced of making by personal address the first communications between the legislative and executive branches, I have adopted that by message, as used (heretofore) on all subsequent occasions through the session. In doing this I have had principal regard to the convenience of the legislature, to the economy of their time, to their relief from the embarrassment of immediate answers and to the benefits thence resulting to the public affairs." Soon after this he wrote to Dr. Benjamin Rush: "By sending a message instead of making a speech, I have prevented the bloody conflict to which the making an answer would have committed them (the two branches of congress.) They consequently were able to set into real business at once without losing ten or twelve days in combating an answer." That was all. He evidently never dreamed that in the difference between a spoken and a written communication to congress there lurked the difference between royalty and democracy. He wanted from congress an answer in deeds, not words, and sought to help congress in getting it. So President Wilson says the only answer he wants to his spoken address is a "legislative" one.

ONE of the changes brought about by the adoption of the amendment providing for the direct election of United States senators is that it deprives governors of states of the power to appoint senators in case of vacancy when the legislature is not in session. The Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch says: Unless the legislature expressly empowers the governor to appoint, he can do nothing in such a contingency. The Columbia State, in making this very interesting point, cites the following clause of the amendment: "When vacancies happen in the representation of any state in the senate, the executive authority of such state shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies, provided that the legislature of any state may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct." Under the constitution, before it was amended, the governor had the power to fill a vacancy in the senate by appointment until the legislature met. Hereafter it is made mandatory upon the governor to order a popular election unless he is authorized by legislative act to make temporary appointments. For instance, if one of the Virginia senators were to resign at this time, Governor Mann would have to order an election unless he convened the general assembly in special session so that it could pass an act enabling him to appoint. Without such legislation, the governor can in no case appoint.

IN a statement outlining the reasons for the recall of Henry Janes as an arbitrator in an Ecuadorean dispute, Secretary of State Bryan said that this action was taken because the state department thought Mr. Janes' previous dealing with Ecuadorean affairs while a state department official disqualified him to act as a member of the arbitral tribunal. Up to the time of Mr. Janes' appointment last December as a member of the tribunal which was to adjust the claims pending between the Ecuadorean government and the Guayaquil and Quito railway he had, as assistant chief of the division of Latin-

American affairs of the state department, been familiar with the controversy, which had come before him in one way and another from the time of its origin. Later, discussing the Janes incident with the newspaper men, President Wilson made it clear that whenever the present administration was requested by a foreign government to mediate a dispute, every effort would be made to secure persons who would be detached from any business or other affiliations with the case in point. One feature of the arrangement under which Mr. Janes went to Ecuador was that the railroad was to pay his expenses. This met with the disapproval of the administration, and it was the arrangement, rather than the person involved, which impelled the government to withdraw Mr. Janes and approach a mediation of the dispute under a different basis.

REFERRING to the Bryan-Clark dinner, a news report in the Washington (D. C.) Post said: Secretary Bryan's statement gives the impression that he had talked with Speaker Clark about their differences. In saying "I have tried to make it clear to Mr. Clark that I have always regarded, and do now regard, him as a good, clean, progressive democrat" Col. Bryan did not mean to convey that he and the speaker had discussed the causes of the quarrel. His reference was to things he had said to other people to be conveyed to Mr. Clark. But the speaker had refused to accept these olive branches. There were no speeches at the luncheon, no reference was made during its progress by any one pointing to the making up of Bryan and Clark. Nearly the whole time was spent in story telling. Vice President Marshall, Senator Kern, Senator O'Gorman, and Secretary Tumulty spun most of the yarns, and those told by Mr. Kern brought the greatest laughter. It was 3:30 o'clock in the afternoon before the company disbanded. The party had sat around the table for two hours. To both Col. Bryan and Mr. Clark it was explained that a luncheon should be given to which the secretary of state and the speaker would be invited, and that the object was to bring them together on a friendly footing again. Great tact was necessary to obtain the consent of both parties to the suggestion put forward, but it had been arranged that explanatory statements should be exchanged between Col. Bryan and Mr. Clark, and the invitations to the luncheon were issued. Vice President Marshall, who attended the luncheon, said: "It is needless for me to say that I am personally delighted that the two leaders in the democratic party have come together. They are both my friends. Their reconciliation will lead to more harmonious party action, and will be a good thing, not only for the party, but for the country. If I may use the language of the boys out in Indiana, I will say that when I was invited to that luncheon, and knew that Mr. Bryan and Mr. Clark would be there together, I was 'tickled to death.'" Senator Kern, party leader in the senate, said: "I take great gratification in seeing these two big men in the democratic party getting together. I am personally very glad indeed that they are to be on good terms again. It is a good thing for the members of the party, and it is a good thing politically."

REFERRING to the affair, the Washington (D. C.) Post says, editorially: The historian of the Baltimore convention will not have done justice to a dramatic turn in the heart-breaking race for the nomination unless he gives prominence to the sequel—the event which found Champ Clark and William J. Bryan closing the breach between them. The estrangement between these leaders had its inception in the unforeseen workings of a titanic struggle, during which speeches were made by Mr. Bryan which were interpreted by the country as reflecting seriously upon Mr. Clark's political integrity. Mr. Clark had received a majority vote of the convention, and Mr. Bryan's speeches were instrumental in defeating him. He was deeply aggrieved, and it seemed that the breach between the two men would never be closed. The disavowal by Mr. Bryan that he had ever intended to reflect upon the personal or political integrity of Speaker Clark—that he regarded

him and now regards him as a "good, clean, progressive democrat"—was met with fine spirit by Speaker Clark, although he was free to say that he still felt a sense of loss that could not be effaced. The restoration of good relations between the two men followed naturally upon the reaching of a mutual understanding. The country loves a good loser, as was shown in the case of President Taft. It will applaud the magnanimity of Champ Clark, and will welcome the beginning of harmonious relations between the speaker and the secretary of state, upon which so much depends in advancing the success of the administration. The democratic party is the gainer by the effacement of bitterness between Messrs. Clark and Bryan, and their determination to submerge personal differences not only marks them as truly great leaders, but brings out in most favorable colors the attractive personal qualities of both men.

A WRITER in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch says: Preparations are now being made in Europe for the next international Peace conference at The Hague, which takes place two years hence—that is to say, in the summer of 1915. Preliminary meetings have already been held in Paris, Rome and St. Petersburg, as well as in London, for the purpose of formulating proposals for consideration at the conference through the respective governments taking part therein. Those in London have been presided over by Lord Loreburn, who was lord high chancellor until a year ago, and attended by Lord Avebury, the banker, formerly known as Sir John Lubbock; Sir Earnest Satow, for so many years British envoy at Peking and Tokio, and Sir John Macdonald, master of the supreme court for Great Britain for the last quarter of a century, and one of the leading authorities in England on international and mercantile law. Lord Loreburn's conference appointed two sub-committees—one to deal with all matters relating to naval warfare, including the abolition of the right of private capture at sea, blockade and contraband, while the other committee will consider all questions outside those affecting naval warfare.

AT the memorial meeting held in New Haven, former President Taft paid the following tribute to the late Major Archibald W. Butt, one of the heroes of the Titanic disaster: "He was incapable of intrigue. He had a clear sense of humor, and it lightened his life and the lives of those about him. He was single-minded and loyal, and never had any doubt about what he ought to say. Life was not for him a troubled problem. He was a soldier. I very much doubt whether I have ever known a man who had as much self-abnegation, as much self-sacrifice, as much ability to put himself in the place of another and suffer and enjoy with that other as Archie Butt had. Occasions for tests like that of the going down of the Titanic frequently develop unforeseen and unexpected traits in men and make them heroes, but with Archie, what he did was nothing but conformity to a rule of his life. He was on the deck of the Titanic exactly what he was everywhere else, and if he could have selected a time to die he would have taken the one that God gave him. He would have taken it because he would have felt that there before the world he was exemplifying the ideal of self-sacrifice. He left with us the sweet flavor of his unselfish life, and while we mourn for him we felicitate him on the way he went. His heroism will stand as an example for future generations."

WILLIAM GORHAM, of Albany, N. Y., has written to the New York World the following interesting letter: I have had occasion recently to read again some of the letters and speeches of Samuel J. Tilden, and it is of interest to see how the basic problem of today was present in his mind. He said, in a speech at Albany, March 11, 1868: "These taxes, when laid on imports in the manner in which they were laid in the congressional carnival of manufacturers which framed our present tariff, cause a misapplication of industry that charges