

ing system he looked upon as a devilish device for corruption; and the whole Federalist program he viewed as a scheme to assimilate the United States to the "rotten parts" of the British constitution. The United States Senate, which was the political stronghold of these capitalistic interests, he described as "an Augean herd."

The battle which Jefferson waged in 1800 he frankly announced to be a war of the agrarian and petty trading interests against the larger capitalistic interests. As early as April 24, 1796, he declared that on his side was "the whole landed interest," and that on the other side were "British merchants and Americans trading on British capitals, speculators and holders in the bank and public funds." And a year later he said that the issue depended upon the election of "farmers whose interests are entirely agricultural. Such men are the true representatives of the great American interest." Even his antipathy toward the British was largely based upon their affiliations with American capitalistic interests. On this line the battle of 1780 was fought, and when it was won, Jefferson directed his first message through Congress to the "agricultural part of our citizens," not overlooking the capitalistic interests yet too strong to be ignored.

The conflict of classes which Jefferson distinctly recognized came out clearly in the alignments of the campaign of 1800. From the commercial and financial centers came the plaintive plea of the holders of bank stock, public securities, and industrials, for the "widows and orphans" whose invested savings were endangered by the Virginia planter. In the upstate agrarian regions of New York, the Republicans accepted Jefferson's analysis of the conflict, and avowed themselves to be the party of the farmer battling to wrest the government from those who made money without labor. New Jersey Republicans, to be sure that no capitalistic sympathizer could slip into Congress by their route, named farmers for the House of Representatives. The rural regions of Pennsylvania did likewise, and represented their nominees to the voters to be endorsed by Jefferson as of the class which Providence had made the peculiar deposit of Republican virtue. In Virginia, the Republican Dawson found only "pestilential air" in the towns, while the spirit of '76 and Republican liberty reigned among the farmers. The upland regions of South Carolina swamped the "corrupt squadron of stock jobbers" in Charleston. The Wall Street ward of New York City went Federalist; the "clodhoppers" up the Hudson valley voted for Jefferson.

But in spite of the "glorious revolution," the tide of capitalism and industrialism swept resistlessly onward. To-day nearly half of us belong to the "mobs of the great cities"—sores on the body politic. What message has the sage of Monticello for us? What message have the statesmen and their followers whose political science is derived from Jefferson for a society founded upon "the casualties and caprices" of trade?

Our Undemocratic National Budget

REPRESENTATIVE Fitzgerald had a mortifying experience when as chairman of the Appropriations Committee he delivered the customary annual statement of the appropriations. For years the Democratic party had been contending that the appropriations were excessive and that extravagance pervaded the government service. The facts abundantly supported that contention. While Mr. Cortelyou was Secretary of the Treasury under President Roosevelt, he pointed out that in the period 1878-1908 the net disbursements of the government had increased 400 per cent. while the population had increased less than 84 per cent. In a speech on April 10, 1909, Senator Aldrich, chairman of the Committee on Finance, made the admission, "I am myself satisfied that the appropriations made last year could have been reduced at least \$5,000,000 without impairing the efficiency of the public service."

On March 4, 1909, Mr. Tawney, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, made an equally frank speech upon "the necessity of checking this growing tendency towards excess." Thus Republican party leaders admitted that the accusation of their budget management by the Democratic party was well-founded. Since then the Democratic party has succeeded to the management, but apparently the only practical result has been a fresh set of players at the same old game. Mr. Fitzgerald, while claiming that some economies had been accomplished, had to admit general failure.

The hopeful feature of his statement is the candor with which he admits that improvement may be expected only through a change of system. The evil cannot be reached and cured merely by change of party control. In that case the result will exemplify the French proverb, "The more it changes the more it remains the same thing." To the mass of the people it does not really matter whether the Treasury raiders are Republicans or Democrats. The evil results of the system—extravagance, waste and inefficiency—go on just the same. It is impossible to shame the mass of the membership, as their subserviency to their local political interests destroys their sense of public obligation and weakens their sense of party responsibility. At one time Mr. Fitzgerald tried to strike down one particularly shady practice—the sending of private telegrams at the expense of the government. There is no law authorizing that practice, and Mr. Fitzgerald characterized it as graft. But, law or no law, members consider it one of their perquisites, and when they send a telegram, charge it to the contingent fund of Congress as a matter of course. Mr. Fitzgerald mentioned one case wherein a member sent his sweetheart a telegraphic letter that cost the government sixty dollars. Such opportunities of Congressional graft still exist for the House voted down by

members from charging private telegrams to the account of the government.

Moreover, Congress actually forces unnecessary expenditure upon the executive departments. Mr. Fitzgerald in his budget reviews gave a remarkable instance. He pointed out that the appropriations were \$6,411,550 in excess of the estimates submitted by the Post Office Department, and he went on to say that "a system which permits the grants from the Treasury for the support of any service to be 2 per cent. in excess of the sum requested or desired by those administering the service cannot be defended." It is obvious that such a system is destructive of administrative responsibility.

It is the opinion of those with opportunities of investigation that our postal service is much inferior to that of other civilized countries both in extent and in quality of service, but the men administering cannot be held responsible, for not they but Congressmen run the service. The Post Office Department is charged with the cost and maintenance of numerous buildings for which Congress makes appropriations, but the department is not even consulted about the matter. Postmaster-General Meyer, in a statement made on February 26, 1909, said that "at the last session of Congress more than twenty millions of dollars were appropriated for the construction of public buildings, for the exclusive use of post offices in the smaller cities and towns, where the department had made no recommendation for new buildings." He also said that the cost of the accommodations thus provided was much in excess of the needs of the department.

Congressional extravagance still goes on unchecked. What is to be the remedy? It is at least a great step in advance that it is now admitted that the disease is constitutional and can be reached only by constitutional treatment. The old political claptrap of "turn the rascals out" will serve no longer. It is now admitted by party leaders on both sides that conditions must be changed.

Mr. Fitzgerald's own plan of reform is in the main the same as that of his predecessors in the Chairmanship of Appropriations Committee—the concentration of appropriations in the hands of one committee. At present there are eight committees framing and reporting the regular appropriation bills. This arrangement is comparatively new in our history. Previous to the year 1865 all revenue and appropriation bills were in charge of the Ways and Means Committee. All the great revenue measures and all the vast appropriations required by the Civil War were prepared and reported by that one committee. The Committee on Appropriations was first established in 1865. The work of that committee was split up and distributed among a number of committees in 1885 as an incident of the faction war in the Democratic party.

But institutions once brought into being have a way of perpetuating themselves, even when their inconvenience is generally admitted. The proposi-

tioned influence of the membership of those committees, and, although often mooted, has never taken practical shape. Even if it were feasible it would only palliate the situation; it would not introduce true constitutional order, or establish democratic government in the full integrity of its functions. That can be accomplished only by regarding Congress as altogether disinterested in the expenditures. The proper function of the representative body is to confine the government to actual requirements and to hold the administration responsible for results. No appropriation should be made unless the administration applies for it, and no more should be granted than is asked. This is the fundamental budget rule of every English commonwealth, and is one explanation of the democratic character of English government. This was our own practice in Washington's time, and the framers of the constitution of the Confederate States revived and safeguarded that practice when they adopted a provision prohibiting Congress from making any appropriation "unless it be asked by the head of a department and submitted by the President."

Nothing less than a budget rule of this character will suffice and nothing more is necessary. Simple as such a reform would be, its influence upon the character of Congress would be profound, rescuing it from its debased condition as a scuffle of local agency, and transforming it into a dignified and efficient system of control in behalf of the people.

Two Impressions

Thoughts on the Sea

THE boat makes her way between the islands; the sea is so calm that it scarcely seems to exist. Eleven o'clock in the morning, and it is hard to tell whether or not it is raining.

The thoughts of the voyager turn to the past year. He sees again his trip across the ocean in the stormy night, the ports, the stations, the arrival on Shrove Sunday, the trip to the house when, with a cold eye, he scanned the sordid festivities of the crowd through the mud-spattered windows of his carriage. His thoughts show him again his parents, his friends, old scenes, and then the new departure. Unhappy retrospect! As if it were possible for anyone to retrieve his past.

It is this that makes the return sadder than the departure. The voyager re-enters his home as a guest. He is a stranger to all, and all is strange to him. (Servant, hang up the traveling cloak and do not carry it away! Soon it will be necessary to depart once more.) Seated at the family table he is a suspected guest, ill at ease. No, parents, it is never the same! This is a passer-by whom you have received, his ears filled with the fracas of trains and the clamor of the sea, like a man who imagines that he still feels beneath his feet the pro-