

# The Outlook

A Family Paper

NEW SERIES OF THE CHRISTIAN UNION

Volume 49,

For Week ending 16 June, 1894

Number 24



## The Week



THE first important change in the coal-miners' strike last week was the decision of the men to attempt settlements by districts instead of awaiting a National settlement. This decision was presently followed by the convening of a conference at Columbus, Ohio, at which an agreement was reached for most of the mines of Ohio, Indiana, northern Illinois, and western Pennsylvania. The men gain an advance of fifteen cents a ton, but accept ten cents a ton less than the old rate. As is usual in such cases, the leaders of the Union were anxious to effect a settlement, but the less responsible rank and file kept up the cry of "no compromise." The amount of violence in different States was even greater last week than the week before. The stopping of coal trains and the maltreating of non-striking workmen were the most common offenses. In Maryland, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois the militia has been needed. Several men—all of them strikers—have been killed in the conflicts with the authorities. In another column the editor of the Colorado Springs "Gazette" gives an account of the alarming situation in that State. The miners, in their statement of the case, published in the Denver "News," make no attempt to deny their armed resistance of the Sheriff, whose six hundred deputies, recruited by the mine-owners from the large cities, they denounce as "Pinkertons." The chief contention of the miners is that the conflict began as a lockout when the richer companies extended the hours of work from eight to nine with no advance in wages. When Governor Waite called out the militia, he refused to place it under the control of the Sheriff who had enrolled the deputies, but ordered his Adjutant-General to keep the command. The deputies were not allowed to make arrests on the ground that the militia alone could settle the conflict without bloodshed. Order was promptly restored, and an agreement was reached by arbitration that the old rate of wages should again be paid for eight hours' work, and no discrimination be made between union and non-union men.



When the sugar schedules were voted upon in the Senate, the Democratic members voted for protection and the Republican members against it. When the McKinley Bill was passed, the Sugar Trust was as yet incomplete, and the Republican Congressmen excused the twenty per cent. protection they gave the sugar refiners on the ground that it was needed by the refineries which were "fighting" the Trust. After the passage of the bill all these outside refineries joined the Trust, and the Democratic majority in the House decided that no protection at all was needed. When the Democratic Senators—at the dictation of the protectionists among them—agreed to give the Trust five

per cent. protection, the Republican Senators promptly took the position of the House Democrats, and voted that the Trust should no longer be protected against foreign competition, but that the people should be protected by foreign competition against the Trust's extortion. The Populist Senators and Mr. Hill voted with the Republicans on this issue, and the Trust won by a majority of only three votes. This, however, was the Trust's less important triumph. One of the amendments included in the Gorman-Brice compromise deferred the new tariff on sugar from the first of next month to the first of next year. During this interim the sugar refineries can buy unlimited quantities of untaxed raw sugar, and thereafter can sell it to consumers, protected by the new tariff imposed. As this new tariff amounts to 40 per cent. on raw sugar (45 per cent. on refined sugar), and the price of sugar to the public is practically certain to advance the full amount of the duty, the gain of the Sugar Trust through this postponement is estimated as high as thirty million dollars. As Senator Teller showed, this postponement of the tax was made all the worse by reason of the fact that the Treasury is in need of revenue. The Sugar Trust seems to be the only gainer. Yet every Democratic Senator except Mr. Hill, and one of the Populist Senators, voted to give the Trust this indefensible extension of time, in which to "stock up" against an inevitable advance in prices. It is to be hoped that the Democrats in the House will stand out against the consummation of this iniquity.



Another plank in the Democratic platform was last week repudiated. By a vote of 172 to 102, the House rejected the proposition to repeal the ten per cent. tax on State bank notes. All of the votes in favor of repeal were, of course, cast by Democrats, but 75 Democrats voted against repeal, and 41 were absent when the vote was taken. Mr. Harter, of Ohio, who was mainly responsible for the insertion into the Chicago platform of the pledge to repeal this tax, called upon the anti-silver men of the East to vote for repeal in order to end the silver agitation, but his appeal was almost entirely fruitless. General Tracey, of New York, the Administration leader in the fight for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman Act, was the only prominent Eastern Democrat who voted to authorize the expansion of the currency through State bank issues. All but eight of the votes for this proposition came from the South. It was noticeable that nearly every Southern Democrat who last fall voted to suspend the limited issue of silver currency voted to authorize the unlimited issue of bank-note currency. Chairman Wilson, of West Virginia, the author of the Sherman Act Repeal Bill, was among this number. Some of the Southern Democrats are disposed to claim that they supported the suspension of the silver issues with the understanding that the platform pledge to repeal the tax on State bank notes was to be

redeemed. There is little evidence, however, that any one was duped in this way who was not willing to be. When the repeal of the State bank tax was before the last Congress, about one-half of the Democratic members opposed it, and the adoption of the remarkable plank at Chicago seems to have been mainly a campaign device to side-track the silver issue. What was most noticeable about last week's repudiation of the platform pledge was that it attracted so little notice.

Republican State Conventions were held last week in Maine, Ohio, and Kansas. The Kansas Convention significantly refused to indorse either prohibition or woman's suffrage. In each of these conventions, however, the most noteworthy thing was the disposition of the silver question. The Maine Convention pronounced against "monometallism, either of gold or silver," and declared in favor of "international bimetallism, to be secured by all suitable means and the most strenuous efforts of National power." Ohio went further yet in demanding the restoration of silver to the currency. The plank adopted read as follows: "We favor bimetallism. Silver as well as gold is one of the great products of the United States. Its coinage and use as a circulating medium should be steadily maintained and constantly encouraged by the National Government; and we advocate such a policy as will, by discriminating legislation or otherwise, most speedily restore silver to its rightful place as a money metal." The Kansas declaration, though confused in statement, seems to favor the free coinage of the American product. Its wording is: "The interests of the producers of the country, its farmers and its workingmen, demand that the mints be opened to the coinage of silver of the mines of the United States, and that Congress should enact a law levying a tax on importation of foreign silver sufficient to fully protect the products of our own mines."

These declarations in favor of a return to bimetallism—so remarkable as coming from the party whose representatives in Congress last fall voted 123 to 31 for the unconditional repeal of its own silver coinage law—are not the only recent indications of a disposition on the part of the Republicans to oppose the monometallist policy of the Democratic Administration. Several weeks ago Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, offered a resolution that discriminating duties be levied against the products of all nations which refuse to enter into an international agreement for the free coinage of silver. Last week Representative Blair, of New Hampshire (ex-Senator), introduced into the House a resolution in favor of another international conference, to be held with the understanding that if international action is not agreed upon, national action shall be taken to restore silver to the currency. But more important than either of these resolutions is the interview with ex-Speaker Reed published in London. Without question—one might almost say, without a second—Mr. Reed is the Republican leader in the House of Representatives. He is also something more than a Presidential possibility. In this interview he takes the position that silver and the tariff must be regarded "not as two issues, but as one." His reasoning is somewhat difficult to follow, but his main idea is that the cheapness of silver makes it easier for Europe to buy from silver-using countries, and so stimulates exports from Asia while retarding exports from our own country. To check this tendency he urges that protectionists should direct the tariff policy so as to injure those nations whose hostility to silver lessens its price, and so increases Indian exports while decreasing

American. The political economy of this statement may be foggy, but the politics of it is clear enough. The fall in the price of products since the establishment of international gold-monometallism has strengthened bimetallism all over the country.

The testimony before the Lexow Committee as to the corruption of the New York police is rapidly becoming overwhelming in quantity and in its substantial agreement with well-known facts. Witness after witness has sworn directly to paying money for "protection" to the captains and "ward-men," giving names and dates and identifying the men accused. Other witnesses have, when on the stand, refused to testify to what they had already privately told the Committee's counsel; the fear thus displayed and the reckless stultification they have been driven to are in themselves negative evidence of a forcible kind. It may now be regarded as established by a great body of proof that for years the captains of police districts have dealt with the owners of disreputable houses and unlicensed saloons through their familiar official agents, the ward-men, and sometimes even face to face with the blackmailed persons; that it has been a regular and understood thing that these criminals might secure immunity on payment of, usually, \$500 "initiation fee" and \$50 a month. The ward-men are permitted to accompany the captains when the latter are removed from one district to another, and while the captains have seemed to think they possessed a vested interest in crime—"vested," probably, because they have paid round sums to corrupt Commissioners to get their offices—the ward-men have been the farmers of the vile revenue and the universal go-betweens for official corruption and blackmailed vice. Some of the more ignorant victim-criminals testified that they considered it a regular and semi-legal thing to pay for a "permit," and the whole traffic has been so systematized, its channels so well known, that only almost incredible moral blindness or indifference on the part of the public can account for its long continuance.

Much of the evidence before the Committee is even more convincing by its side-lights and necessary implications than by its main facts. Nothing has been more striking, for instance, than the tacit admissions of State Senator and Civil Justice Roesch, who went on the stand to deny imputations on his conduct, and ended by unconsciously giving a typical picture of the Tammany district leader, office-holder, and lawyer, who deals with politics and crime combined. Thus, he indignantly denied that he took \$100 from a keeper of a disreputable house to procure immunity from the police, but admitted that he took the money as a "general retainer," that he never drew papers, or appeared in court, or had anything to do with any specific case for his client, but that he did give the client a card which would enable her, in case her inmates were arrested, to get them out on bail. And he stoutly maintained that he could always distinguish in his actions between his capacities as lawyer, Tammany district leader, Civil Justice, and so on. Perhaps his "clients," however, do not understand the Pooh-Bah theory, and paid the lawyer for the district leader's "influence." Dr. Parkhurst's manly appeal to the honest patrolmen to help bring to justice the "thieves and blackmailers" who disgrace the force ought to bear fruit in breaking the "vicious despotism" of the system. The talked-of investigation by the Police Commissioners has been postponed, at the request of the Lexow Committee. The Board of Commissioners, in the general public opinion, is too much tainted itself by these charges to be a proper judicial body to examine them. Mr. Croker's sudden departure for Europe in the