

The Outlook

A Family Paper

Volume 53

Saturday, 15 February, 1896

Number 7



THE Government loan of one hundred millions was subscribed for more than five times over, at an average rate of interest of $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Inasmuch as the syndicate's rejected offer was to take the bonds at about $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., the Government saves in interest \$375,000 each year, or \$11,250,000 in the thirty years for which the bonds are to run, by making the loan open to competition. The sale of the bonds, therefore, on the open market has been highly advantageous to the Government, and in this respect the "popular" loan was a success. It does not, however, sustain Secretary Carlisle's theory that multitudes of comparatively poor people were hoarding without interest nearly three hundred millions of gold. The total number of bids for \$1,000 or less was only 358. It should be added that the two loans of \$50,000,000 each, sold in the open market in February and November, 1894, though not subscribed for nearly so widely, were subscribed for at much better prices. Both sales were made upon a three per cent. basis. Had the present issue been sold upon the same basis, the price brought would have been 119 instead of 111. Just before the new bond issue was announced—even the week following the Venezuela war scare—119 was the lowest recorded price for the similar bonds issued to the syndicate a year ago. That the price of such bonds should, in less than two months, fall to 111 is a serious disappointment to those who hoped that the Government would receive a higher price for the new issue.

In Congress the most striking event last week was the action of the Senate Finance Committee in reporting a free-coinage bill as a substitute for the House tariff bill. This action was taken through the concurrence of Senator Jones, of Nevada, with the Democratic members of the Committee, all of whom are avowed advocates of free coinage. The significance of the event—so far as it has any—seems to lie in Senator Jones's apparent determination that no protective tariff bill shall be passed unless the silver industry also is protected. Most of the silver Republicans, however, declare that they will in this matter refuse to follow Senator Jones's leadership. The free-silver substitute, therefore, can pass the Senate only through the votes of anti-silver Democrats who wish to kill the tariff bill. Thus far the only effect of the measure is to add to the general confusion. The most important action taken by the Senate was the election of Mr. Frye as President pro tempore. This was accomplished through the unanimous consent of the Democrats. In the House a short squall blew up through the remarks of a member from South Carolina to the effect that he believed he was right when he went into the war of the rebellion, and under the same circumstances would again follow the same course. Mr. Barrett, of Massachusetts, denounced the utterance as treasonable, and was calling for the member's expulsion when Speaker Reed sustained the Democrats who insisted that the offender

should be given an opportunity to explain his expressions. The explanation was that the constitutional right of secession no longer existed, that the circumstances of 1861 never could recur, and that he and his State were to-day absolutely loyal to the Union. It was a kind of explanation that ought to have preceded his remarks instead of following them. Mr. Barrett remained still unsatisfied, but the majority of Republicans sensibly decided to let the matter rest. The important discussion in the House was the debate over the Senate's free-coinage amendment to the House Bond Bill. Among the free-coinage Republicans joining in the debate were Mr. Towne, of Minnesota, and Mr. Milnes, of Michigan. To what extent the Republicans of the Central States will follow their leadership cannot yet be determined. The anti-silver forces received an important recruit in Mr. Boatner, of Louisiana, familiar to our readers as the most influential opponent of the anti-lottery movement in that State.

The most significant political events during the past few weeks have not taken place in Congress or in political conventions. First came the declarations of the Chicago Board of Trade, the National Board of Trade, and the Boston Merchants' Association in favor of the retirement of the legal-tender paper money. All of these organizations are largely Republican as regards the party affiliations of their members, yet all of them in the most explicit way indorsed the policy advocated by President Cleveland. The Boston Association went even further than the President in the direction of currency contraction and the establishment of logical gold monometallism. It demanded that the silver currency as well as the legal-tender notes should be made redeemable in gold on the demand of the holder, and retired from circulation, unless holders of gold should thereafter present it for redemption in silver or paper. The possibilities of contraction contained in this recommendation are apparent when we consider the present composition of the currency. In round numbers this is as follows:

Gold, at most.....	\$400,000,000
Legal-tender notes.....	400,000,000
Silver.....	500,000,000
Bank notes (not legal tender).....	200,000,000
Total.....	\$1,500,000,000

In other words, three-fifths of our present currency consists of silver and Government paper. Yet all of this would be retired if its holders cared to ask its redemption in gold in order to force new issues of bonds and get rid of all currency not "sound" from the monometallist standpoint. This revolutionary proposition of the Boston Merchants' Association has the indorsement of such monometallist authorities as the "Evening Post," of this city, and Professor Laughlin, of Chicago, and indicates how long and hard a road the Nation has yet to travel if it is to follow monometallist leadership. The danger of the depreciation of

our legal-tender notes has never been greater than the danger of the depreciation of our silver currency, and if we ought to issue bonds to buy gold to retire the notes, we ought also to issue bonds to buy gold to retire the silver. We cannot have logical monometallism so long as we have \$500,000,000 of silver money worth as bullion only fifty cents on the dollar, and remaining at par only by reason of the bimetallic principle that the value of money depends upon the supply of and demand for money, and not upon the material of which it is made. The fact that the monometallist leaders realize the logic of the situation and are ready to follow it enforces the conviction that the day for compromises is past.



Other significant events enforce the same conclusion. At last week's Convention of the National Farmers' Alliance in Washington, where nearly every State was represented, there was an unprecedented sentiment in favor of putting aside old party ties and bringing the Alliance into politics in support of the proposed free-coinage party. In the Republican press, West and East, the desire for harmony and victory has in a marked degree disappeared. Papers in the far West, and even in Kansas, are insisting that Western Republicans cannot again accept Eastern leadership; while Eastern party organs, such as the New York "Tribune" and the Cincinnati "Commercial Gazette," are declaring that the East cannot again attempt to conciliate the Western free-coinage faction. The "Tribune" proves to its own satisfaction that the Republican party does not need to conciliate the States west of the Missouri, but can secure victory without them. Mr. Wharton Barker, of Philadelphia, however, does not take so hopeful a view. In an open letter to the manufacturers of the East he publishes a badly drawn platform in favor of free coinage and protection, signed by sixteen Republican United States Senators, and tells the manufacturers that unless they force the adoption of such a platform on the Republican party "there will be no Republican party." "The responsibility," he says, "rests with you, the manufacturers of the East. You can force the Republican party to adopt the above platform. By doing so you can save the protective system. If you do not do so, you will lose the sympathy and you will alienate the support of those who put bimetalism before protection, and without whose support the passage of any protective measure is impossible." Inasmuch as Western Republicans have for years been indifferent to the protection of Eastern manufacturers, it looks as though the unity of the Republican party is now as seriously threatened as the unity of the Democratic party. Relatively fewer Republicans, indeed, support the free-coinage principle, but the section in which the free-coinage sentiment is the strongest has hitherto been a Republican section, if to a solid South against it is added a solid West. Senator Brice's widely quoted declaration that both parties are "drifting" seems to fail of truth only in that it does not bring out the rapidity of the present movement toward disruption.



On Tuesday of last week Mr. Edwin F. Uhl, Assistant Secretary of State, announced that he had accepted the position of United States Ambassador to Germany, made vacant by the death of General Runyon. Mr. Uhl is of German descent, is a lawyer by profession, and has long occupied a high position at the Michigan bar. Three years ago he was made Assistant Secretary of State, and has done nothing in the Department which has not been remarkably well done. Perhaps his best-known pub-

lic act was in connection with the Alliança incident. In the absence of his chief, Secretary Gresham, he conducted the correspondence with the Spanish authorities which brought the affair to a satisfactory conclusion both to the Alliança's owners and to the United States. We are glad, therefore, that the appointment has come to one who has already given good guarantees of future service. In truth, however, the appointment's significance is not so much personal as it is departmental and political. It is the first instance in a long time where the idea of promotion has been so signally emphasized. We have no higher diplomatic position than that of Ambassador, but with any position, consular or diplomatic, it is high time that we were following the lead of other nations and making our foreign service one of promotion, not of spoils. True, we have had some admirable representatives, but they have been natural, not trained, diplomats. It has been said that we have less need than other countries for a foreign service, and this is true; our need is increasing, however, and the fact that we have any need at all should be sufficient to insure us proper representation abroad. Because some pothouse politician in a remote district has been of use to an incoming administration, therefore the President must needs appoint him to an office; and if the man prefer a foreign appointment, it frequently is his. At least half of our representatives have been men of little education, culture, and refinement. In Great Britain, if a young man wishes to enter the diplomatic service, he must pass an examination in geography, history, languages, and international law. He is then appointed to some subordinate position in the Foreign Office, and gradually rises through the different grades at home and abroad, for which service he is well paid, and at the end of his career is retired with a pension. There is no reason why our service also should not be competitive and the profession of an American diplomat be made both paying and permanent.



A school bill has been presented to the Legislature at Albany in opposition to the Strauss Bill, upon which we commented in our issue of February 1. The retention of the trustee system by the Strauss Bill makes it worthless in the minds of those actively interested in the public schools of New York. The new bill, the Pavey Bill, preserves all the best features of the Strauss Bill, but has this clause:

"After the 30th day of June, 1896, the term of office of the present trustees of common schools in and for the several wards of the city of New York shall end, and their official functions cease, and said office be abolished, and all powers, authority, duties, and jurisdiction then vested in said trustees shall devolve upon the Commissioners of Common Schools then constituting the Board of Education in said city and their successors in office."

This bill is practically the work of a few educators and a committee of gentlemen who drafted and presented the bill known as "the bill of the Committee of Seventy" last year. It embodies the best intelligence of a number of citizens who worked for months to meet the wishes of practical educators in drafting the bill. The Strauss Bill went to the Legislature as a bill approved by the Commissioners of Education New York. This is not really so. There are twenty-one Commissioners on the Board. Fifteen were present at the time the bill was passed. Six of those present voted against the bill. It is well known that more than half of the number absent would have voted against it had they been present to vote. The amount of actual work and special knowledge demanded by the duties of the office of trustee is but imperfectly understood. A trustee must appoint teachers, though he has no pedagogical training. This