

But what is most surprising of all is the general wave of satisfaction that swept over the land following the successive announcements that the aforesaid captains of industry and others of their kind were at the helm of our war organization. We have yet to hear a single protest against the clothing of these men with extraordinary authority, and the people as a whole are manifesting implicit confidence, not only in their ability, but in their integrity as well. This, in view of some of our silly notions in times past, is the most notable development of the war to date, and the facility with which we seem to forget our past differences and all join hands in the common cause not only constitutes our chief source of strength now but will redound to our everlasting glory in the years to come.

* * * *

A SUGGESTION.

A CERTAIN sarcastic citizen from way down East wants to know of what use is Congress during the war. He seems to think that it has outlived its usefulness, for the time being at least, and that in divers ways it has managed to resolve itself into "one of those unnecessary expenses everyone is being urged to cut off in war-times." He therefore proposes, to the editor of the North American Review, to abolish Congress in the following fashion. It will be noted, also, that the reasons advanced are not wholly without merit:

"Why then should not Congress pass a single act—under cloture with debate limited to an hour in each house—abolishing itself for the period of the war and for eighteen months thereafter; delegating to the President authority to issue bonds, levy taxes and make disbursements, and to do whatever is, in his judgment, for the best interest of the country; empowering him to fill all offices he may see fit to create, at such compensation as he may deem wise, with his son-in-law? Would it not be infinitely simpler for the business men of the country to have to deal only with Messrs. Wilson and McAdoo, instead of with numerous and divers councils and commissions on national defense, imports, lingerie, exports, morals, publicity, fuel, shipping, food, and so on, ad lib? Would it not be far more economical to permit these two statesmen to take such compensation as they see fit and dispense with several hundred members of Congress, drawing salaries aggregating \$4,000,000, to say nothing of mileage, for doing nothing?"

"Then all these M. Cs., with their invertebrate protestations, their long winded quibbling, their sycophantic twaddle, could go home and swell the ranks of farm labor, where, God knows, they are needed.

"These are war times, times when everyone is being adjured to cut red-tape, abandon precedent and practice thrift. They are days when innovations, total abstinence, woman suffrage, popular election of unpopular Senators, and personal purity are being accomplished by Constitutional amendment. Why then, in God's name, should we not boldly strike at our greatest extravagance and abolish Congress—by Constitutional amendment if need be—but abolish it anyway?"

* * * *

THE LAST STRAW.

COLONEL HARVEY of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW seems to be fearful of the possible consequences of a partisan campaign this year and so he is vigorously advocating that the two old-line political parties reach an agreement to re-elect practically all of the present members of Congress. His idea is that neither party has anything to gain by winning the fall elections but that the country and the cause of the war has much to lose. As the colonel views the situation, were the Democrats to win, they could not possibly hope to strengthen their present position and the probabilities are that they would be disposed to misconstrue their success at the polls as a ringing endorsement of their Administration. On the other hand, should the Republicans win, the only thing they could possibly gain would be to share in the responsibility for the future conduct of the war.

We quite agree with Colonel Harvey that it would be dangerous business to give the Democrats any occasion to feel more chesty and cock-sure than they do at present, but we doubt that a victory at the polls this fall would have such effect. It is to be assumed that a wide-open and free-for-all campaign would invite an honest and uncensored

discussion of the burning questions of the day, and to fear the result of such a contest is to lose faith in one's fellow countrymen. Moreover, it is quite likely that there would be some Democrats who would have their eyes opened to the fact that the people are not altogether pleased with certain policies. They would learn, to their surprise, no doubt, that the citizens are doing some serious thinking themselves and that there is an awful day of reckoning ahead. Certainly, if the campaign results in nothing more than to bring our national legislators in close contact with their constituents once more and remind them of the pay-day that will come at the close of the war, it will prove well worth while.

Then there is this contingency to consider: Suppose the war should end, as we all hope it will, before the next Congress should expire, what a mess of "me too" statesmen we would have on hand to undertake the gigantic legislative task that the reconstruction period will immediately impose upon Congress. A bigger and better type of lawmaker will be demanded then than we happen to have on hand now, and the country should bear this in mind. For the time being all bets are off and we are all content to follow the lead of the President, but when peace comes the stage will be reset, the old lines will be redrawn and the old policies and prejudices will reassert themselves in unmistakable manner. Stirring times will follow and we should see to it that only Congressmen of the biggest calibre obtainable are on the job. And to make certain of this, we ought to make the start at the fall elections.

Were it not for the fact that we hold Coloney Harvey above such things, we would be inclined to the belief that he was trying to work a hoax on the American people. But he seems to be in dead earnest. That is what perplexes us most. Were he in cahoot with the Administration, instead of being its most caustic and consistent critic, one might comprehend his position. But we know that there is no love lost between President Wilson and the man who "discovered" him. Also, since the colonel is a patriot of the first rank, and in no sense a politician, it would hardly be fair to accuse him of seeming to sluff politics this year in order to set the stage in better order for the showdown fight in 1920. Like everybody else, he simply wants to win the war in the quickest and surest possible fashion, and to smother politics he would pull the teeth out of the elections. Who would have thought that this doughty old editor could ever be stampeded by a shadow?

* * * *

WORN-OUT SLOGANS.

THE Philadelphia PRESS in commenting on President Wilson's recent declaration to the New Jersey Democrats that "The old party slogans have lost their significance," observes that this is especially true of the party of which he himself happens to be the head. Whether or not the time-honored slogans of the Democratic party have all passed into the discard, our esteemed contemporary does not venture to state, but he does risk the observation that "their usefulness is impaired for some time to come."

Among the famous slogans that have gone to the scrap-heap are cited the following: "The high cost of living is caused by the robber tariff," "The tariff is the mother of trusts," "Imperialism," "Economy, retrenchment and Jeffersonian simplicity," "The sacred rights of sovereign states," "The perils of centralization," and the old Democratic favorite, "The crime of '73." And then in conclusion, it is even suggested that perhaps the more recent but most efficient slogan of all, "He kept us out of war," has also served its purpose and has altogether lost its value as a party slogan.

That the PRESS failed to include those other old reliables such as "16 to 1," "watchful waiting," and "pitiless publicity" in the list mentioned, was simply to an oversight, we suppose. A hasty survey of the situation shows that the President was dead right in his observation, insofar at least at the above-named slogans are concerned. They have indeed lost their significance; they will no longer make a serious appeal to the American voter, and the President realizes this full well, even if his party doesn't. The new Democratic campaign text-book will call for considerable censoring—and camouflage, perhaps—to make it appear consistent with the context of those of the past.