

It would be hard to support a position that would put the interests of the state banks above the interests of the depositors.

But the answer to this argument is that the state ought to provide similar protection for depositors in such banks and until this can be done the state banks ought to be permitted to avail themselves of the national guarantee if they are willing to place themselves on the same basis in regard to inspection and security.

To sum up the situation, the depositors need security and this must either be given by the postal savings banks, which will grow until it has absorbed the deposit banking of the country, or it must be furnished through the guarantee of existing banks.

We believe it is better to give it as far as possible through existing banks than to have the government embark in the banking business on so large a scale, as it would have to do if the postal savings banks were the only ones in which depositors would feel safe.

It is sometimes argued that the system of guaranteed banks would relieve bank officials of responsibility and make them careless in regard to the bank, but there is no truth in this, because the officials are chosen by the stockholders and the stockholders will lose everything before the associated banks will have to pay anything to depositors, and this loss to stockholders will in itself be sufficient to compel carefulness. When banks become liable for each other's losses it will make it easier to enact stringent laws for the regulation of banks—laws for instance which will prevent directors from exploiting with the depositors' money, and laws that will prevent the officials and directors from gambling. These are the two sources through which defalcation generally comes, and it will be much easier to improve the management of banks when each bank feels an interest in the solvency of the other banks which are joined to it under the plan.

It is sometimes declared that the government has no more right to guarantee a bank than it has to guarantee the price of corn or cotton, but the fact is we have always recognized the distinction between money and other forms of property. We have usury laws regulating the rate of interest, but no law regulating rent; we have laws for the inspection of banks, but no law for the inspection of stores; we have laws limiting the amount of money that can be loaned by a bank to one borrower, but no law limiting the amount a merchant can buy or sell. Money is the life-blood of commerce and the present stringency shows how easy an unreasonable fear on the part of depositors may paralyze business.

We do not know what the senators and congressmen may think of the plan, but we believe it is the duty of every citizen to propose what he thinks is best and give his reasons and then leave the people and their representatives to sit in judgment upon the plan. Some plan must be adopted and we know of no other that is so effective, or which can be put into operation as quickly. The government is not going beyond its legitimate bounds under the strictest construction of the constitution when without cost or risk to the treasury it restores confidence throughout the country, putting the expense upon the banks which will get the benefit of the increased deposits.



CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Roosevelt's suggestion that the government appropriate money for the legitimate expenses of political parties is original and is entitled to serious consideration. The appropriation might be justified on the same ground that we defend the printing of ballots in payment of primary expenses by the government. A few years ago we had to raise money by subscription to print our ballots, now they are printed at the expense of the public.

In some places the cost of the primaries is still borne by the candidates, while in other places it is paid by the county, city or state. The public is interested in having a campaign so conducted that the issues shall be presented clearly and voters fully informed. There is no doubt that the republican party has been able to secure enormous campaign funds by selling legislation in advance to special interests. If the government should appropriate a reasonable amount for campaign expenses and then appropriation that appropriation between the parties according to the vote cast at the last general election, it would enable all parties to present their policies and thus insure more intelligent action on the part of voters.

The president's recommendation ought to

be taken up and discussed in all sections of the country. It ought to be, as we have no doubt it will be, ultimately enacted into law. If to this is added a provision forbidding private contributions, the law will go far toward the elimination of corruption in politics, for when the government furnishes the necessary funds it will require a strict accounting of the money spent.

In an article printed several months ago in the Reader Magazine Mr. Bryan said:

"It is not sufficient to prevent contributions from corporations, for where there is a great temptation to aid in campaigns, the officers will find ways of contributing that will not bring the corporation within the letter of the law. It is necessary that the contributions of individuals shall be made public where those contributions are to any considerable amount, and it is also necessary that the publication shall be made in advance of the election in order that the voter may know what influences are at work in the campaign. One of the Washington correspondents has reported the president as considering a law which will provide all the parties with necessary campaign funds to be paid out of the public treasury. I do not know whether this statement is authoritative, but it is a suggestion worthy of consideration. If each party was furnished with a moderate campaign fund in proportion to the votes which it cast at the preceding election, and then all other contributions were prohibited by law, corruption in politics might be reduced to a minimum. And why should not the reasonable and necessary expenses of a campaign be paid by the public, if the campaign is carried on in the interest of the public? At present, in any controversy between predatory wealth and the masses of the people, the corporations which are seeking special privileges and favors are able to furnish enormous campaign funds to the party subservient to them, and no one can doubt that these campaign funds are furnished upon an understanding, expressed or implied, that they shall be allowed to reimburse themselves out of the pockets of the people."



WRITE TO WASHINGTON

President Roosevelt is quoted as having said that while he heartily favors the guaranteed deposit plan he doubts whether the people are quite ready for that reform. The president ought to be informed on this subject. Let every one who believes that this important measure should be adopted drop a line to his United States senators and representative in congress. Write, also, to the president, thus encouraging him to lend the weight of his great influence to a plan that, in the opinion of many well informed men, is necessary for the resumption of commercial order.



CAN NOT?

Henry Clews, the New York broker, being asked "would it benefit the country if the buying of stocks on margins were to be prohibited by law," answered, "No; and it can't be done."

That's what the owners of the powerful Louisiana lottery said a few years ago; but they soon realized their mistake. The lottery is a thing of the past and the way the lottery went stock gambling will go, once the American people are thoroughly awakened to the damage it does to the real business interests of the country.



A TARIFF OBJECT LESSON

Mr. Bryan is in receipt of a practical demonstration of the iniquities of the present protective tariff law in the shape of a handsome hunting case gold watch, Elgin movement. The watch was presented to him by Mr. Charles A. Keene, president of the Independent Watch Dealers' Association. On the front of the case is engraved words to the effect that the watch was presented to Mr. Bryan by Mr. Keene, and on the back is engraved the following:

"As a demonstration of the methods of the American watch trust, this watch was bought in England for \$7.98. The same grade cost the dealer in this country \$10.58, a difference of nearly fifty per cent."

Attached to the watch is a card bearing an explanation of the way in which American watch buyers are "held up" by the watch trust through the power conferred upon it by the Dingley tariff law:

"This watch was purchased in England by Charles A. Keene, a dealer in watches at 180 Broadway, New York. It is an Elgin movement with a twenty-year gold filled case. It was sold

by the American watch trust in England for \$7.98—in America the dealer must pay \$10.58. Here is the number of the case, 7,485,367, and movement, 12,212,215. This statement can be verified by the books of the makers."

In brief the Elgin Watch company made this watch, shipped it to England and sold it for \$7.98 after paying carriage and insurance. But the American dealer must pay \$10.58 for the same watch because the Elgin Watch company is protected to such an extent that it can levy a toll of \$2.60 on each watch sold to an American watch buyer. This protection is granted on the plea of "protecting American labor" and "fostering infant industries." The Elgin Watch company is one of those "infants" that long since doffed its swaddling clothes and now wields a club secured through special legislation which enables it to force American buyers to pay it tribute and at the same time compel its employees to accept any wage terms the company offers. No one believes that the mechanics who make these watches get any part of the \$2.60 exacted as tribute from the American buyers—that is no one who does not yearn to be deceived and who really likes to be forced to pay tribute to arrogant trusts which are allowed to exact tribute through special legislation.

Mr. Bryan appreciates Mr. Keene's gift because of the kindly sentiments of the giver, and because it affords a convenient and practical object lesson to those who still believe that "the foreigner pays the tax."



A MILD REBUKE

In an editorial entitled "Presidential Popularity" the Wall Street Journal says: "Now it is said that Roosevelt must bear the blame of the financial disturbance and that the closing of factories, the discharge of workmen, and the decline in trade will all be attributed to him. His enemies are becoming more aggressive. They declare that his star is descending, that his day is passing. Never before in all his political career has Roosevelt been subjected to the same degree of denunciation as he is at the present time. Even an associate justice of the supreme court of the United States publicly charges him with 'playing hide and seek with the American people.' The ex-senator who is commonly esteemed as the best constitutional lawyer in the country, practically accuses him of violating or twisting the constitution. Countless business men are charging him with having destroyed confidence and producing trade depression. Newspapers teem with criticism and accusing cartoons, and one persistent editorial enemy goes so far as to speak of the illustrious occupant of the White House as 'an imperial dead-beat.' The columns of American journalism during the past century may be searched in vain for the equal of this degrading epithet hurled at a president of the United States."

Very mildly, indeed, does the Journal rebuke these bitter criticisms. Indeed, the Journal is so tame on this subject that one is tempted to suspect that among the one time worshippers at the Roosevelt shrine the Wall Street Journal has grown cold—along with others too numerous to mention.



OF COURSE

In an over-heated editorial the New York World says: "Our conscience is clear." Of course it is. Did not the readers of the World know, through display headlines printed in the World itself, that the London Telegraph had given to Joseph Pulitzer's organ this certificate of character: "The New York World . . . holds an unassailable position in America as an independent newspaper, unbought and unbuyable."



THE SMILER

Be a smiler—up the hill,
Rough or smooth, keep smiling still!
Be a smiler—let the throng
Hear your laughter and your song;
Let the echoes of your cheer
Calm the sobbing, stay the tear,
On the lips and in the eye
Of a brother passing by!
Be a smiler—with the ring
Of the heart of youth and spring
In your "Howdy-do, today!"
To the neighbor on your way.

—Baltimore Sun.