THE SENATE CONSIDERS THE SHIP BILL
—Chicago Herald.

Stone Raps Bolters on Ship Purchase Bill

The Chicago Herald gives the following report of Senator Stone's speech on the administration ship bill:

Washington, Feb. 3. — In one of the most dramatic scenes witnessed in the senate in years, Senator Stone of Missouri, leading President Wilson's "team," read out of the democratic party today the seven democratic senators who refused last Monday to support the administration government ship purchase bill.

His denunciation came after he had learned he could not win back the bolting democrats and that the bill was defeated unless by delay until tomorrow some way of compromise could be found. He won the delay, the bill going over without action in the senate.

All the pent-up biterness of the administration leaders in their defeat because of the democratic bolt was voiced by Senator Stone in invective and denunciation.

Senator Stone named the men he branded as recalcitrants. They are Senators O'Gorman of New York, Vardaman of Mississippi, Hitchcock of Nebraska, Camden of Kentucky, Hardwick of Georgia, Bankhead of Alabama, and Clarke of Arkansas.

After lashing the democrats who disagreed with him, Senator Stone turned to them with a plea that they return to the party ranks and cease their opposition which has led to the embarrasment, discomfiture and disruption of the administration plans.

"For two years I saw the republican members of this body sit without a smile on their faces," he said bitterly. "Now I notice they sit with a broad grin of grim satisfaction as they witness the struggles of the democrats. I confess that we are in a hole. I confess the coup of the republicans with the democratic allies took us by surprise. I do not see the way out of the difficulty.

"Some time ago Senator Williams said he had been told by a friend the democrats could not govern the country because they could not govern themselves. I resented the statement then, but I think the republicans may have some excuse for making such a charge.

"We have been clothed with the authority, the responsibility for legislation by the majority of voters of the country," he continued. "We must make good and we can do it only through teamwork.

"I do not know where you recalcitrant democrats wish to go, but for me I would rather follow Woodrow Wilson than Elihu Root or Henry Cabot Lodge or Reed Smoot or Gallinger of New Hampshire."

"OLD HICKORY" AND NEW

In President Wilson's speech at Indianapolis on "Jackson day" he stood to his guns as stanchly as the old democratic leader ever did. There was neither excuse, apology nor evasion. Everything that had been done in his administration had been well done.

Not more set in his resolution to have those historical and ungracious references expunged from the senate record was "Old Hickory" than is President Wilson in his opinion that the "new charter of freedom" is everything it pretends to be.

Not more fixed in his views on the eternal wickedness of the United States bank was "Old Hickory" than is President Wilson in his views on the proper way to deal with the Mexican situation.

Not more fully did old Andrew commit himself to the idea that all good and all democracy dwelt in the democratic party than did President Wilson to the opinion that all hope for the country at present lies in the same organization.

It was a typically Jacksonesque speech, infused with the true Jacksonian spirit; with that mixture of unhesitating conviction and straightforward aggressiveness—that willingness to make and meet an issue—that even an opponent must respect.

There are essential points of difference between the college president in politics and the old lawyer and warrior who played such a part in the same great arena. Each is the product of his age.

But "Old Hickory" and President Wilson are akin in their aggressiveness, their apparently absolute confidence in the saving virtue and the saving wisdom of democracy. "New Hickory" is a good name for the president.—Chicago Herald.

WILSON TO THE INDEPENDENTS

Mr. Wilson is the smartest campaign speaker the country has listened to since Abraham Lincoln. We defy any man to read his Indianapolis speech without recognizing in the president one of the shrewdest and most forceful political leaders this country has ever known. He is very generally right, but the persons who think him wrong will not deny the extraordinary persuasive manner in which he presents his case. He has something to say, and he knows how to say it in the way most likely to disarm criticism and to make a lasting impression upon the hearer or reader.

Rather the most important part of his address in Indianapolis was his statement that it is the independent voters who hold the balance of power. Neither great party has enough of the old hide-bound, dyed-in-the-wool, thick-and-thin partisan followers to give it a chance of carrying the country. Each party must appeal to the men who are not severely partisan, who are not much imposed on by party names, but who have political ideas and ideals, and will support whichever party at the time gives the greater promise of realizing these. And the president is entirely right in saying that much the greater part of the independents are now acting with the democratic party. Roughly speaking, two-thirds of the independents are in the democratic party and one-third in the republican. Two years ago the democratic party had the support of the greater part of the independent voters and won; there is every prospect that two years hence it will have the greater part of the independent voters and will win again.

For the progressives are an independent variety of republicans, and as the president points out, every progressive must admit that all of his program which is practicable has been undertaken, or is about to be undertaken, by the democrats. There is a lot in the Roosevelt literature of 1912 that no practical statesman would try to put on the statute book; of the part that is practicable, much has in less than two years been enacted by the democratic party, and the rest of it is on its program for immediate action, or action at the earliest possible moment.

In the sense in which the phrase is commonly used there is no such thing as a scientific tariff, but so far as a phrase has any practicable meaning, the Underwood tariff comes within the classification, and no republican tariff since the Civil war does. The tedly of immense value to the business world. Yet for many years the republican party in congress resolutely opposed any rectification of the tariff and any modernization of the national bank system. As the president says, for 30 years the republicans have shown no capacity except to sit on the lid.

But the steam is forming all the time in the national boiler, and the democratic party has applied this power to useful ends. The republicans aimed only at suppressing it.—Philadelphia Record.

BRYAN AND THE SULLIVAN "MESS"

In all the San Domingo mess, and the added fuel it has lent to the assaults on Secretary Bryan, but one witness has been heard to connect Mr. Bryan's name with the alleged grafting designs of Minister Sullivan.

It is illuminating of real public opinion in the country concerning the "Commoner," that while there has been much testimony as to what Sullivan is said to have declared himself ready to do, as to what the men who "put him over" had in mind to get out of the job, there has not been the suggestion from a source responsible or irresponsible that Mr. Bryan himself had not been imposed upon.

It is characteristic of the form of direct attack on the secretary of state that when one witness came to mention his name as a sharer in the proposed spoils, he mentioned it as having been mentioned to him in a proposal to share the graft by way of inducement to join a nefarious scheme because of the high company he would be keeping.

"Buncombe" was the way the witness described this more or less veiled intimation, and it is at once all and less than that. Mr Bryan serves the cartoonist admirably. He is the shining mark for a certain easily manipulation ridicule. He is and has been for years a sort of terrible example to thos who wish to be terrified. Through it all he has been under the microscope, the page of his life spread out before the multitude of those who would destroy him. It is magnificent that even those most ready with smut dare not essay the task of placing the smallest smudge upon an unspotted personal record. — The State, Columbia, S. C.

COUNTRY'S DEBT TO PRESIDENT

What might have happened during these months of trial, what might yet happen during the terrible months still before the nation, if the head of the nation were a man of inferior intellect, or of a character or temperament less representative of the best ideals and the soberest thought of the country, is a consideration that may well give us pause when we are again confronted with the task of choosing a man for the chief magistracy of the republic. It is a trite and commonplace saying that the American presidency is the greatest office in the world. Whether this be literally true or not, there is no act of election performed by any people in the world, or by any representative body, that compares, in point of incalculable possibilities involved in it, with the election of a president of the United States. He is chosen for a fixed term of four years, and, no matter what strange turns of fate may occur within that period, it is upon him that the guidance of the nation's policy will depend, in a degree far transcending any formal definition of his constitutional powers. In times of crisis the difference between a weak or rash or wrong-headed man and a strong, prudent, right-minded man in the presidency may mean all the difference between welfare and disaster, between glory and dishonor, for the nation. And no man can foresee when that crisis is to come, nor what may be its nature. —New York Evening Post.