The Outlook

A Family Paper

NEW SERIES OF THE CHRISTIAN UNION

Volume 50 For Week ending 18 August, 1894 Number 7

THE end of the tariff debate came suddenly. Until toward the close of last week it appeared that the Senate and House conferees were slowly approaching an agreement. They had agreed upon a new sugar schedule. They had also (as Mr. Wilson told the House caucus on Monday) agreed to either reciprocity on coal and iron ore after five years, or a gradual cutting down of the duties on these articles. They had commenced to discuss the high tariff on manufactured wool imposed by the Senate bill. But from time to time the Senate conferees had to consult with one doubtful Senator or another, and the result was generally increased doubt as to whether the Senate would ratify their agreements. Finally they astonished the House conferees by offering free sugar, both raw and refined. This concession would have been a great triumph for the uncompromising free-traders of the House, but hardly had it been offered before the conferees were convinced that a new coalition in the Senate had determined to defeat the entire tariff bill if free sugar without a bounty were adopted. At about this juncture, when the danger of the Senate's defeating all tariff legislation seemed most threatening, Senator Hill offered a resolution instructing the Senate conferees to report progress upon the bill and return it to the custody of the Senate. This resolution was supported by all the Republicans, the three Populists, and the two Senators from New York. The result was a tie, and the vote of Vice-President Stevenson was needed to save his party from defeat.

❀

This was on Saturday. The same day Speaker Crisp led in a call for another caucus of the Democrats of the House to be held on Monday. At this caucus he offered a resolution providing for the immediate acceptance of the House bill, with all the Senate amendments, and the immediate passage of separate bills placing sugar, iron ore, coal, and barbed wire on the free list. Chairman Wilson then reported upon the situation as revealed in the conference, saying that he personally would be glad to fight the Sugar Trust upon the present bill, but that the Senate conferees held out little hope of success. Speaker Crisp urged that the alternative was plainly the Senate bill or no bill, and that it was the duty of the House to secure for the people "half a loaf rather than no bread." Mr. Bourke Cockran opposed the resolution, declaring that the House abandoned its duty if it accepted the dictation of four unnamed Senators. The resolution, however, was carried by a vote of 130 to 21—two-thirds of the negative votes coming from the New York, Maryland, and Louisiana delegations. In the afternoon the fight was transferred to the House. The Committee on Rules reported a resolution restricting to two hours the debate upon the Senate bill, and to half an hour the debate upon each of the bills increasing the free list. Mr. Reed then made a vigorous speech taunting the Democrats with suppressing debate in order to carry through a dishonest measure. One-tenth of a second, he said, was the average time allowed each side for the discussion of the six hundred Senate amendments. The proposed supplementary measures he ridiculed as "pop-gun" bills. Later in the debate Mr. Wilson made a serious speech in defense of the action of the House. He did not attempt to disguise his disappointment. The country, he said, was witnessing another illustration of the truth stated by Cobden, that when the people have gained a victory at the polls they must have another stand-up and knock-down fight with their own representatives. Nevertheless, the present bill made "some break in the protective system." Even the coal and iron schedules were fifty per cent. lower than in the McKinley Act. He admitted that the Sugar Trust was reported to have laid in $109,000,000 worth of raw sugar, the price of which would be advanced by the passage of this bill; but the Trust preferred the McKinley Act to the proposed law, and tariff reformers would not stop the fight until the Trust's power to tax the people had been entirely removed. Mr. Bourke Cockran made an oratorical appeal to the House not to desert its principles by surrendering to the petty combination of protectionist Senators, and Speaker Crisp replied by charging that they were the deserters who were ready to vote with the Republicans to defeat any reduction whatever in the tariff. When the vote was taken, 174 Democrats and 7 Populists supported the Senate bill, while 92 Republicans and 13 Democrats voted against it. The bills placing coal, iron ore, barbed wire, and sugar on the free list were promptly passed—free sugar being supported by all but two Republicans, as well as by all but nine Democrats.

❀

Two years ago the Democratic party declared that "Republican protection is a fraud" and a "robbery," and asked power to enact a tariff framed "for the purposes of revenue only." The people gave it the power: what has it done? It has repudiated a bill which provided for free raw material, *ad valorem* duties, and a lower tariff generally. It has passed a bill which differs only in detail, not in principle, from that which it denounced. The Senate has yielded to an insignificant minority of personally if not pecuniarily interested Senators. The House has yielded to the Senate. The result is a Democratic protective tariff in place of a Republican protective tariff. Nor is that all. It is a tariff conceived in corruption and passed in dishonor. There are three fatal objections to the Senate bill. It violates the plighted word of the Democratic party. It does this to enhance the profits of wealthy corporations. And there is good reason to believe that this result has been purchased and paid for—if not directly, then indirectly. For the feeble pretense at investigation and the report of "not proven" have rather confirmed than dispelled the public suspicion of corruption. Such protection is both a "fraud" and a "robbery." The party dishonor is not lessened by the promise to pass in the House separate

bills making sugar, coal, and iron free—for the purpose of "putting the Senate in a hole." A triple dishonor is not so easily atoned; nor will public indignation be so easily appeased. Nor is it relieved by saying that this is "the best the party can do." In that fact lies the dishonor of the party. The issue to be met in the fall elections is not economical, but moral. The Outlook does not demand a "tariff for revenue only," nor denounce "Republican protection as a fraud;" but it demands the honorable fulfillment of party pledges, and denounce as fraudulent men who characterize protection as a fraud in 1892 and enact it in 1894.

❀

In Alabama the Kolb committees last week issued a manifesto calling upon their supporters throughout the State to hold mass-meetings on August 15 to protest against the alleged frauds at the election and determine what action should be taken to prevent the seating of the Democratic candidates. The committees assert that even according to the contested returns they have this year carried forty-one counties out of sixty-seven, and that the majority of 25,000 claimed for the Democratic candidate was obtained by counting a 35,000 majority in fifteen counties in the Black Belt. It will probably be some time before authoritative returns are received, but the fact that similar conditions certainly prevailed two years ago gives to the charge a great deal of likelihood. A part of the manifesto has a belligerent ring, but the committees expressly disclaim a desire to call for any resistance to the laws. There are likely to be for a time two Governors and two Legislatures; but as the Courts are in the hands of the regular Democrats, there is apparently no chance for the contestants to get possession of the State Government. Fortunately, it is now the white people of the State (though, unfortunately, the poorer whites) who claim to be suffering from these election outrages, and we may hope that the public conscience may be aroused to demand a law which shall prevent their repetition. Some effort in this direction was made by the last Legislature in the passage of the Sayre Law, but this enactment was itself greeted by the opposition as a plan to perpetuate fraud, and has certainly failed to restore confidence in the honesty of elections. Senator Chandler has proposed a Federal investigation of the charges, on the ground that rival Legislatures in Alabama mean contesting Senators from that State. The Senate, he urges, must know the facts before determining which faction is entitled to elect a United States Senator. This question may be answered when it arises; and meanwhile we may hope that the alleged frauds may not lead to a lawless uprising. One disgrace would not wipe out another.

❀

The sessions of the New York Constitutional Convention were mainly occupied last week with discussion on the report from the Committee on Cities with regard to "home rule" in the large cities. The Chairman, Mr. Jesse Johnson, defended the proposed article against active attacks, based partly on the argument that the change would give the cities too much power over themselves and partly on the charge that the bill did not go far enough in the direction of home rule. The bill would separate city from State elections (the first to come on odd, the second on even, years). This provision is receiving strong support by all who favor municipal reform, and was adopted unanimously by the Committee. Another provision is for a State election commission, and to secure equal majority and minority representation in all election boards of the cities. This was opposed by the minority of the Committee, nominally because the system is confined to the cities alone, but really (it is probable) for partisan reasons. Still another article of the proposed amendment—said by the minority to be aimed specifically at the city of Buffalo—provides that the Chief of Police shall be appointed by the Mayor or the Mayor and Common Council. It is directed, however, that the Governor may remove the Chief of Police after charges have been proved against him, if the Mayor decline to do so; this, of course, is one of the guards against a corrupt home rule which, at present at least, seem reasonable and necessary; the problem has been correctly stated by President Low as being to give to municipalities a right in some respects to govern themselves, and yet not dismember the State by taking from the Legislature all right to govern. This statement clearly shows the difficulty of adjusting these relations in an absolutely satisfactory way. It seems to us that the proposed new article, while perhaps susceptible of improvement in detail, is based on the right principles. Final action has not yet been reached by the Convention.

❀

The Convention has accepted the report of its committee against incorporating the principle of woman suffrage in the new Constitution. This decision seems to us a wise one, for, apart from the merits of the question, it would be fatal to the consideration of any other part of the revised Constitution to make this fundamental change an integral part of the revision. Nearly every sensible citizen would manifestly be forced to vote for or against all other propositions according as he favored or opposed this one. The suffrage questions still before the Convention are whether municipal suffrage shall be given to women, and whether the question of their general suffrage shall be separately submitted to the voters. As to the first, we recognize that there are thinkers who favor municipal suffrage for women, and oppose general suffrage for them, on the ground that women ought first to be intrusted with the franchise in those elections in which their knowledge is most adequate and their interests most vital. But the majority of voters do not refine in this way. If they oppose laying on women the duty to vote at one election, they oppose it at all elections. The members of the Convention, acting as representatives, ought therefore to reject the municipal suffrage proposition by the same vote that they reject the general suffrage proposition. But the question whether the people themselves shall have an opportunity to decide the fate of woman suffrage stands upon an entirely different footing. The petitions in favor of woman suffrage have been signed by 360,000 individuals, and indorsed by farm and labor organizations with a membership of 260,000 more. So formidable a body of petitioners have certainly a right to demand that the people shall be permitted to pass upon the constitutional change they favor. The constitutions have long been recognized as the people's law. The members of constitutional conventions are elected to submit plans, not to accept or reject them. It will not do to urge that if this question is submitted separately every question must be. The number of questions to be submitted separately must be governed by the possibility of obtaining for each intelligent consideration. Common sense must determine how many. In California last year half a dozen constitutional amendments were intelligently voted upon, and this year still more are to be submitted.

❀

There are two moral questions of importance raised by the report of the expert accountant upon the finances of the Atchison railroad system. In brief, he finds that the resources of that system have been overstated by its