

# What Republican Editors Are Saying

## "THE STREET'S" CHOICE

Bryan is practically certain to be the democratic nominee. He is not being supported by the "interests." There is not even a suspicion of any deal or understanding between him and them. He is not being boomed by the plain people of the west on the one hand, and by Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Schiff, the Harriman influence, the Standard Oil representatives, and the Aldrich crowd on the other. He is as much opposed to and as strongly opposed by the steel trust as he is opposed to or by any other trust. Judging the two men by the character of their support, are not the people likely to believe that even the policies of the president would be safer in the hands of Mr. Bryan, his antagonist, than in the hands of Mr. Taft, his candidate? At least there is that chance. Much is said of the question of the platform, and people are wondering who will write it, and what it will contain. The matter is important, of course, but far less important than the question of the candidate. Wall Street cares little about the platform; it cares everything about the candidate. If it can get its man it will let anyone write the platform. Its very deep interest in the fortunes of Mr. Taft proves at least one thing, and that is that it believes it can trust him to give the country the sort of administration that "the interests" want.

As between the people and "the street" we should say that it is much more likely that the people will be fooled than that "the street" will be. \* \* \* Wall Street is fighting Hughes because he would not make a "deal" with it. Is it supporting Taft because either he or his managers have made a "deal" with it?—Indianapolis News.

## "ENTIRELY SATISFACTORY"

Mr. Bryan's assertion that the trusts have been fighting him in Pennsylvania and Alabama will nowhere excite so much mirth as among those predatory corporations. In Alabama, Mr. Bryan says, his friends "had the steel trust to fight, and in Pennsylvania they had not only the steel trust, but several other trusts." The truth is that the trusts are praying for the nomination of Mr. Bryan. In 1896 the silver mining interests, it is asserted, contributed \$288,000 to bring about the election of Mr. Bryan. The trusts today do not want Mr. Bryan elected, but they want him nominated. Because they are entirely satisfied with Mr. Taft, and they know Bryan is the weakest candidate the democrats can name. After seven years of the volubility and turmoil of a Roosevelt administration a Taft administration will come like a poultice of silence that heals the blows of sound. The trusts and corporations know that Mr. Taft is a just man, a man of balance and sanity, violent neither in speech nor in act. He will not betray the interests of the people, they know very well. On the other hand, he will not devote his days and nights to devising engines of assault upon corporate property. His nomination being now practically assured, and his candidacy being entirely satisfactory to them, nothing would suit them better than a campaign by the democrats under the perfectly hopeless leadership of the doomed Nebraskan.—New York Times.

## AN UNFORTUNATE COMPARISON

How empty by comparison is Mr. Bryan's title to the leadership of his party today, and how slender his claim to be its candidate for president for a third time! In public office his experience is limited to two forgotten terms in the house of representatives. His personal canvass for the United States senate, after a second defeat for the presidency, was a dismal failure, one of the most humiliating that ever befell any man. For public affairs he has had no training worth mentioning, and his executive ability is an unknown quantity.—New York Sun.

The point which the Sun makes against Mr. Bryan might have been made with equal force against Abraham Lincoln in 1860. Lincoln's political career up to that time had been a career of failure. He had served but one term in the house of representatives without any special distinction. He had been defeated in a popular contest for United States senator in Illinois. He had been an unsuccessful candidate for the vice presidential nomination in the republican convention of 1856. For public affairs he had had no training worth mention-

ing, and his executive ability was an unknown quantity. Yet he made, in the most stupendous crisis of the nation, the best president the country ever had. Now it by no means follows that because Mr. Bryan's experience in public office has been limited and that his political career has been one of defeat, he would not make a competent president. Nor does it follow that because this comparison can be made between his career and that of Abraham Lincoln prior to his election to the presidency, Mr. Bryan would make a second Lincoln. There are so many valid and strong points to be made against Mr. Bryan as a candidate for president, that it is unfortunate that the Sun should have instituted such a comparison as this.—Wall Street Journal.

## THE CURRENCY FARCE

The following editorial is taken from the Philadelphia North American (rep.):

This discredited congress has done what we trust will be its farewell piece of clowning.

The party whip cracked loud enough in the house to force the passage of the maimed and scarred Vreeland currency bill. The Cannon crowd felt confident that the senate would be brave enough to cast it aside, allowing the congressmen to tell the disgusted business men at home that they had done their best, but that the wicked senators would not let them do anything.

The senate leaders played their part by killing the abortive thing which the house had created and substituting the iniquitous Aldrich bill.

The result has been the throwing of the entire matter into a conference conducted, in the main, by creatures of Aldrich and Cannon. The outcome, in all likelihood, will be absolutely nothing. Adjournment next Saturday is likely. The house will accept nothing worse than the patched-up Vreeland bill. The senate will not dare insist upon the Aldrich bill, denounced by every honest business interest in America. But it will not be likely to concede even so small an amount of legislative decency as the feeble house bill contains.

The country wants neither. Both are unsound in principle, and even the less vicious is nothing but a mischievous makeshift.

There is no sign of trouble in the financial skies to call for any such measure for so-called emergency currency. The Wall Street manufactured panic has done its intended work. Commerce and industry have been crippled sufficiently to make money idle and send it pouring into the gambling center.

The New York banks hold half a billion cash, call loans are at the nominal rate of two per cent and the stock market is bulling merrily along. The ultimate unloading on the public will not come until long after another congress will have a chance to frame any number of such unsound "emergency" measures, which, until then, will not have an excuse.

## "THE MOST EXTRAVAGANT"

The following is taken from the New York Globe, a republican paper:

"We have set up the most extravagant government the world has ever known, and year by year we are making it more extravagant. It is unpopular to talk economy—it is held to indicate smallness of mind. Is not this the richest country in the world? Can't we afford to have what we want when we want it? The older generation thought that one of the prime objects of administration was to keep expenditures down. Parties and public men boasted of what is now sneered at as cheese-paring. Now the man who opposes appropriations, instead of gaining popular applause, is likely to find himself considered a narrow-minded old fog who is out of place in a generous age.

"The administration of President Roosevelt is the most expensive this country has ever known during a time of peace. In every department of the government there has been an increase of distribution—in most cases an increase relatively larger than our increase in wealth and population. The president has been an industrious writer of state papers. He has bombarded congress with messages general and messages special. He has touched on almost every subject of mundane concern. Yet one looks in vain through the volumes of his writing to discover any more than perfunctory advice to keep expenditures down. He has been an

adviser of new appropriations all along the line. No president in our history has shown a smaller development of the economy sense. He has many times shown extreme impatience when it was suggested that while a particular thing might be good, perhaps the government could not afford it. He has enlarged on how mean it was for an opulent country to tighten its purse-strings. \* \* \*

"Explaining by those responsible will do no good. No one will notice the defense that the money went for good objects. The Taft administration may find itself embarrassed as was the second Cleveland administration when the supreme court invalidated the income tax. Moreover, the country expects a revision of the tariff next year, and by revision it means smaller duties, with, in all probability, a smaller revenue. This congress is doing what it can to block tariff revision, not merely directly by refusing to act, but indirectly by doing what it can to create a financial condition that will make revision next year extremely difficult. Nor can one ignore the possible injury to business if next year the government is out of funds and is compelled to borrow to meet running expenses. From whatever aspect the matter is viewed the contempt for the budget shown by the present congress is calculated to arouse apprehension."

## THE GREAT TREASURY DEFICIT

The Literary Digest presents some of the comments made by republican newspapers concerning republican administration. Following is an extract:

"The republican party is warned to the of its own leading organs, the Standard and I will Democrat, that the present 'deal' is a case I will ginning of a presidential canvass is if you pay me thing," although it believes "se you pay me for a steady improvement." "teen years Gandy lieve a still higher repu" "re railroads, and espe- ever, Chairman Tawney, of the "house appropri- tions committee, the signs are for a steady deterioration. At the end of April the treasury showed a deficit of over \$50,000,000, as compared with a surplus of over \$55,000,000 a year before, making a difference of \$105,000,000. By the end of June, when the fiscal year ends, Mr. Tawney predicts that the deficit will reach \$60,000,000 or \$65,000,000, as contrasted with a surplus of \$87,000,000 on June 30, 1907, a difference of \$150,000,000. And as if this were not enough, Mr. Tawney declares there will be an "almost certain deficit of not less than \$150,000,000 at the end of the next fiscal year."

This big balance on the wrong side of the ledger is attributed partly to the falling off in revenues, caused by the hard times, and partly to the increased government expenditures. The government expenses for April, 1908, for example, were nearly \$12,000,000 in excess of its expenses for the same month of 1907. Not a few papers regard this increase as extravagance.

## "IT IS AN OUTRAGE"

The following editorial is taken from the Ohio State Journal (rep.):

"It is charged that Governor Folk trans- cended the bounds of courtesy in proposing a conference, he deela "good way to protect our forests was to repeal the duty on lumber. The criticism of Governor Folk is based on the idea that politics was to be tabooed in the conference. But where is the politics in merely saying the duty on lumber "should be removed? Why, nearly every "led by Mayor of that. It is certainly no "devoted question, for no party would dare say specifically it favored the retention of the duty on lumber.

"In discussing the question how to preserve our forests, the suggestion to take off the tariff that encourages their destruction is very pertinent. Putting an impost duty on lumber means the protection of trees in other lands and the chopping down of our own. It is a good thing to suggest this. It is as pertinent as the reservation of vast areas of mountain forests.

"If the governor has been guilty of a little impropriety, it will prove of service, for it will call attention of the people to an impost that is not only destroying our forests, but is increasing the cost of every home a man builds. We hear much of the question, is a tariff a tax? That doesn't apply to the tariff on lumber, for it is an outrage."