

a considerable extent we regard as archaic and, in the light of modern knowledge, untenable.



ARE THE INSURGENTS DISLOYAL?

Attorney-General Wickersham, in a notable address in Chicago on the anniversary of Appomattox Day, April 9, 1865, effectively defended, perhaps we should rather say eulogized, the administration of Mr. Taft. The degree of his eulogy is indicated by the question toward the close of his address: "What other Administration can point to the accomplishment of so much in so short a time?" The test which he applied converted the current criticism into a verdict of commendation: "That it has accomplished much is abundantly attested by the volume of criticism and by the increasing vehemence of attacks upon it." The responsibility for failure to redeem the party pledges, if failure there should be, he puts on Congress: "In a word, the President has placed before Congress for enactment into law all those measures which the Republican party in convention assembled in June, 1908, pledged itself to adopt; and if the second session of the Sixty-second Congress should adjourn without having made good those party pledges, upon the Republican majority in Congress should the responsibility rest for that breach of faith." And, finally, his hopefulness as to the action of the present Congress is indicated by the sentence: "I am firmly persuaded that . . . the Republican majority in Congress will make good the party pledges and give the country the benefit of that legislation which the party has promised and which the President has so clearly and forcefully outlined."

The Outlook, in its recent editorial entitled "A Political Balance Sheet," has anticipated the Attorney-General's report of what has been accomplished by the present Administration in the year of its existence. We agree with the Attorney-General that it is for Congress at this session to enact into law at least the more important of the policies urged upon it by the President and so fulfill the party pledges. We hope that the Attorney-

General's anticipation of this result is well founded. But we must, in all frankness, add that, by two unfortunate paragraphs in his speech, the Attorney-General has done something—how much we cannot tell—to lessen the probability both of party victory in the general election and party achievement in the present Congress. These paragraphs are the following:

Is it not time that all those who call themselves Republicans should stop coquetting with the Democratic party, should sink their individual preferences about details of legislation, and join with Republican workers in carrying to fruition under our great, patient, candid, wise Republican President the work of clinching the reforms of the last eight years on the lines so carefully and so wisely laid down in the platform of 1908?

I speak to an assembly of loyal Republicans. I am sure I voice your thought when I say the time of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds is over, and every one must choose whether or not he is for the President and the Republican party. He that "hath no stomach to the fight," let him depart. Treason has ever consisted in giving aid and comfort to the enemy. If any one wishes to join the Democratic party, let him do so. But let him not claim to be a Republican and in and out of season work to defeat Republican measures and to subvert the influence of the Republican President.

The Outlook holds no brief for the Insurgents. Some of them, irritated by the attack upon them by the President's Winona speech, and by his apparent identification of the party with one wing of the party, have been irritating in turn, perhaps deliberately so. Some of them are possibly in their spirit Democratic rather than Republican, Jeffersonian rather than Hamiltonian, disbelievers in the New Federalism while belonging to the party which stands for the New Federalism. But reading such men out of the party is not the way to party efficiency or party success. That can be won only by allowing, in Congress and out of it, free and untrammelled expression to "individual preferences about details of legislation." That is exactly what Representatives are elected to Congress for. It is only by a frank and free interchange of "individual preferences about details of legislation," by men who are agreed in the essential ends to be accomplished, that results can be achieved by a representative assembly of the people.

What is the test of party loyalty? Is Mr. Wickersham right? Must the loyal Republican be an unquestioning supporter of the Republican President and the Republican party? No! Mr. Wickersham is wrong. That is not the test. The test of loyalty is support of Republican principles.

It is not support of the leader, not even of the chosen leader. If it were, then the loyal Democrat must have supported the gold standard with Grover Cleveland and free silver with William J. Bryan.

It is not support of the party organization. If it were, then the loyal Republican would have to be at one and the same time a supporter of the corrupt Republican organization in Philadelphia and the reforming Republican organization in Washington.

It is not even loyalty to every plank in the party platform. For it often happens that, by some gust of emotion or some skillful trick in committee, the party convention commits the party to a specific principle which is not germane to the great issues involved, nor even consistent with other principles embodied in the party platform.

Loyalty does not require, and never can require, a man to stultify his conscience or sacrifice his self-respect. Moral virtue never demands intellectual dishonesty. Loyalty to a party is neither loyalty to a leader, to an organization, nor to a platform; it is loyalty to those fundamental political principles which the leader is selected to interpret, which the organization is created to promote, and which the platform is supposed to embody.

We do not pretend to give a complete and comprehensive statement of Republican principles as held by the reorganized Republican party—reorganized in the last eight years under Mr. Roosevelt's leadership. But they at least include the following:

Government regulation and control of the great corporations, especially of such as administer the National highways or deal in the necessities of life.

Government ownership and regulation, though not administration, of certain great properties now belonging to the people; specifically the great forest lands, mineral

deposits, and water power sites, so that they shall be developed and administered, not primarily for the benefit of individual owners, but for the benefit of all the people.

A protective tariff, so adjusted as to secure for American workingmen a wage sufficient to enable them to maintain the American standard of living for themselves and their families.

Power in the Federal Government adequate to enable it to accomplish these results.

He who is loyal to these principles is a loyal Republican. He may believe that the measures recommended to Congress by the Administration are inadequate to secure these ends. Believing this and saying this frankly does not make him disloyal. He may believe that the party organization which shapes legislation in Congress does not comprehend the principles of the reorganized Republican party, or, comprehending them, does not believe in them, and he may in consequence be critical and even suspicious of that organization; believing this and saying this, he may be more loyal than the controlling spirits in that organization. He may believe that the President has appointed men to protect the public interests who are themselves indifferent to the public interests, or who are prevented by traditional prejudices or by personal entanglements from adequately and efficiently safeguarding the public interests; thinking this and saying this does not make him disloyal to the party whose principles he fears will suffer from official inefficiency or apathy. He may believe that the President has greater Constitutional powers than the President thinks himself to possess, and he may criticize the President for not exercising these powers without being disloyal to him. He may believe in the President—in his integrity and ability—and in the policies which he recommends, and have "individual preferences about details of legislation" because he believes that by changes in details the legislation can be improved, without rendering himself justly amenable to the charge of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds.

That there are some Insurgents who are not ardent believers in the Roosevelt-

Taft policies is not improbable. That there are some Regulars who are not so is evident. What is wanted is a perfectly free and untrammelled discussion, in Congress and out of it, for the purpose of finding out, not who are loyal to the President and the Republican party, but who are loyal to Republican principles. If Mr. Wickersham's sanguine expectations are not realized at the next general election, it will not be because there are some Insurgents in Congress. It will be because the attempt to prevent the full discussion of legislative proposals and the free criticism of administrative methods has created a suspicion in the public mind that the Republican party is not standing sincerely and working efficiently for the three great principles avowed by the Republican party: National conservation of public wealth, National regulation of the great corporations, and National protection and promotion of American labor.



SAVE THE PEOPLE'S MONEY

One of the most important questions before the Administration at Washington is that of sufficiency of revenue. How may it be secured? By making the budget balance—that is, by making the revenue or income balance the expenditures or outlays.

As presented to European Parliaments, a budget is the annual statement of the financial policy of the existing government with reference to the probable income and outgo for the ensuing twelve months. The ministry submits the budget to Parliament, and Parliament refers it to a committee, which examines it, increasing or decreasing its appropriations.

Our Government has had nothing like this. Extravagance has followed its absence. Originally, doubtless, it was expected that a budget would be presented by the Secretary of the Treasury. Indeed, Hamilton began in that way. But, from Alexis de Tocqueville to James Bryce, and now to Franklin MacVeagh, the present Secretary of the Treasury, students of our institutions have pointed out that the rigid separation between the Government's executive and legislative branches has

prevented the elements of financial responsibility from getting together, and hence has prevented the framing of a budget. In the British Parliament, for instance, Cabinet members are necessarily members of Parliament and respond for the Government. But in the American Congress Cabinet members, as the direct representatives of the Administration, are regrettably excluded. Hence, in any desire to bring forth a budget, our Administration is deprived of both influence and responsibility in proposing and securing for each executive department adequate appropriations of money for a twelve-month to come. Indeed, we have often reached the point where not only has the Executive had little or nothing to say in the final determination of action, but where the Executive's estimates of expenditures have actually been made for trading purposes with the various appropriation committees in Congress!

A budget is still further from realization because Congress is compelled to meet its economic responsibilities in a partisan way, reflecting the particular political organization in power. Hence there arise both unintentional and intentional instances of waste. This is due largely to duplication, first, because each member of the Cabinet sends his own departmental estimates to Congress without any common consideration by the whole Cabinet of all the estimates of all the departments; second, because in Congress separate appropriation bills are referred to unrelated committees.

A prominent Senator recently said that if he could have the management of the Government, he could save two or three hundred million dollars a year simply by instituting efficient for inefficient budget methods. Two years ago Mr. Cortelyou, Secretary of the Treasury, said: "It is commended to the serious consideration of the Congress whether a careful study should not be made of the entire subject of the budget with a view not niggardly to economize, but to apply the money of the taxpayers in the most efficient and beneficial manner." In his recent report Mr. MacVeagh declares that "it is too early to say what final form the reorganization of our fiscal responsibilities will take, but it is fair to hope that there will be constant