

The Outlook

. A Family Paper

Volume 53

Saturday, 13 June, 1896

Number 24



THE bill introduced by Senator Butler, of North Carolina, forbidding the further issue of bonds without the consent of Congress, was intended to compel the Administration to redeem legal-tender notes in gold or silver at the option of the Government instead of at the option of the holder. It was vigorously attacked by Senators Hill, of New York, Baker, of Kansas, Sherman, of Ohio, Burrows, of Michigan, and others, and as vigorously defended by its author, Senator Teller, of Colorado, and many other free-coinage Senators. Senator Baker, of Kansas, who was elected as a believer in the independent free coinage of the American product of silver, surprised his constituents by declaring that the passage of the Butler bill would foreshadow "panic" and possibly "revolution." Senator Baker virtually indorsed all of President Cleveland's bond issues. Senator Sherman took a similar position. Senator Sherman, and likewise Senator Burrows, of Michigan, urged that redemption in "coin," either gold or silver, might be impossible unless the President could issue more bonds without the consent of Congress. This argument was combated by Senator Teller, of Colorado, who called attention to the present condition of the Treasury, where there are \$512,000,000 worth of silver against \$347,000,000 of silver certificates. He and his associates vehemently denied that the judgment and public spirit of Congress were not as much to be trusted as the judgment and public spirit of the President. The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 32 to 27. Every opponent of free coinage, except Senator Mills, of Texas, voted against it. In the House the bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, and an adverse report ordered by a vote of 13 to 2.

We do not impugn the motives of any Senator in saying that, in our judgment, the Senate bill forbidding the President to issue further bonds without a previous vote of Congress is essentially a dishonest bill. The Nation has a personality. The executive and legislative are parts of the one government. If a man should promise to pay his creditors gold and should then put it out of his power to pay gold, he would be guilty of an immoral act. This is what the Nation would do if it left the President authority to say that the Nation will pay its coin notes in gold and then should deprive him of the power to pay the gold. As the law now stands, he has the option to pay such notes in gold or silver. He has declared explicitly that he proposes to exercise that option by paying them in gold so long as the creditor asks for gold. Congress might deprive him of the power to exercise that option, and require him to pay the coin notes in silver whenever the gold reserve was threatened. That might be very unwise, but it would not be dishonest. But to leave him with power to pledge the government to gold payments and without power to fulfill the promise is not honest. The House will save the credit

of the Nation from a dishonor which such legislation would put upon it.

The Democratic State Conventions held last week in Kansas, Kentucky, Virginia, North Dakota, and Utah, all adopted resolutions in favor of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and instructed their delegates to Chicago to vote accordingly. The Kansas Convention required each delegate before election to pledge his personal support to a free-coinage plank in the National platform, and rejected two candidates who simply promised to vote with the majority of their delegation. The Kentucky Convention was the scene of an almost continuous ovation to Senator Blackburn, and the delegation to Chicago was instructed to support his candidacy for President. The anti-silver element was permitted to retain control of the Congressional district in which Louisville is situated, and thus name two delegates to Chicago, but the entire delegation was instructed to vote as a unit. In Virginia the dominance of the free-coinage element was equally marked, and United States Senator Martin, who has hitherto voted with the Administration, pledged the Convention that in the future he would support free coinage. The free-coinage victory in North Dakota was as unexpected as the free-coinage defeat in South Dakota had been. A majority of the adult population of North Dakota is of foreign birth, and the anti-silver Democrats were almost as confident of carrying the State as they still are of carrying similarly peopled Minnesota and Wisconsin. Probably the free-silver majority was in part due to the astonishing strength shown by the silver faction in Kentucky and Virginia. The fact that this faction seems to have the ascendancy has led many wavering politicians to identify themselves with it. The primaries held last week in Georgia, Louisiana, and Indiana were a succession of silver victories. In Georgia the anti-silver Democrats carried but a single Congressional district. In Louisiana even the city of New Orleans gave a free-coinage majority, though the delegation from that city to the State Convention will probably oppose a radical free-coinage declaration. In Indiana a large number of counties have yet to vote, but a free-coinage majority in the State Conventions seems certain. In Ohio and Illinois the situation is similar, though in the latter State a contesting gold delegation may be seated, or at least prevent the Illinois silver delegation from voting upon the permanent organization of the National Convention. A free-coinage majority at Chicago now seems as probable as did an anti-silver majority a few weeks ago.

President Cleveland's veto of the River and Harbor Bill was overridden in both Houses by overwhelming majorities. In the Senate only five members voted to sustain the veto, though five others were paired in its favor. Senators Kyle, of South Dakota, and Allen, of Nebraska, who

voted against the passage of the River and Harbor Bill, failed to vote at all when it became a question of sustaining the President. Senator Sherman made a very remarkable attack upon the propriety of the President vetoing an appropriation bill. To most thinkers such bills seem to furnish an appropriate field for the exercise of the veto power, as the representative of the entire Nation is comparatively removed from the local influences responsible for so many objectionable items. The President's veto of the General Deficiency Bill, which was returned to the House on Saturday, met with a better reception. The vote was 170 to 39 in favor of sustaining his position. He especially criticised the appropriation of over \$1,000,000 toward the payment of French spoliation claims. He reviewed the history of these claims since the destruction of some of our vessels during the French wars at the close of the last century. He showed that the amount of these claims had increased from \$5,000,000 to \$25,000,000. "This," he said, "indicates either that the actual sufferers or those nearer to them in time and blood than the present claimants underestimated their losses, or that there has been a great development in the manner of their presentation." He quoted with approval a message of President Pierce declaring that our Government was under no obligation to pay these claims "unless it be the assumption that the United States are to be considered the insurer or the guarantor of all claims of whatever nature that any individual citizen may have against a foreign nation."—The most important bills recently passed by either House were those restoring the tax on the alcohol used in manufacturing processes, and placing a tax on "filled" cheeses. A filled cheese bears the same relation to a genuine cheese that oleomargarine does to butter, and the taxing bill is intended both to insure the buyer of the genuineness of the article bought, and to protect the dairymen against this new form of competition. The bill came very near obtaining a first-class importance. Senator Dubois, of Idaho, met Senator Sherman's declaration that the silver Republicans were responsible for the current deficit by offering an amendment to the filled cheese bill increasing the tax on beer seventy-five cents a barrel. Such a tax would have covered the present deficit and defeated the chief argument for an increase of the tariff. Nearly all the free-coinage Senators supported it, and Senator Sherman with difficulty secured a majority in favor of protection and cheap beer. During the debate Senator Dubois renewed in the most specific form the pledge that the five silver Republicans who voted against the Dingley bill would vote with Democrats and Populists against any increase of the tariff until the mints are opened to the coinage of silver. The longer Congress remains in session the more complete becomes the erasure of old party lines.

The latest returns from Oregon indicate that a recount will be necessary in each of the Congressional districts to determine whether a Republican or Populist has been elected. In one of the districts the Republican plurality last year was 7,000, and in the other it was 10,000. The gains made by the Populist party have astonished every one; even the city of Portland virtually gave its support to the Populist ticket by electing ex-Governor Pennoyer by an overwhelming majority. The vote against him was divided between a free-silver Republican candidate and the regular Republican candidate—the former receiving the larger vote. Old party lines were effaced in an extraordinary degree. In some counties the Republicans who favored the re-election of Senator Mitchell (free coinage) made their campaign in open conjunction with the Populists and Democrats, and

in other counties where the Republican candidate for the Legislature declined to take the Mitchell pledge there was a general fusion of all the elements of opposition to anti-silver or compromise Republicanism. The effect of this election, combined with the growing probability that the Democratic Convention will declare for free coinage, has been to check the movement within the Republican party against the nomination of Major McKinley and in favor of an explicit "gold" plank.

The "New England Homestead" has taken a straw vote among its subscribers which furnishes a most significant indication of the drift of sentiment among American farmers. All the subscribers of that journal were asked to express their preferences for the Presidential nominee of their party, and also their views regarding the economic policy of the Government. Nearly 8,000 replied to at least a part of the questions submitted. As regards candidates the preferences ran as follows: McKinley, 3,090; Reed, 1,172; Allison, 1,098; Tillman, 473; St. John, 409; Boies, 316; Hill, 295; Carlisle, 236, and others scattering. This vote indicated that the great majority of those voting were Republicans, so that the views expressed upon the financial policy are, in the main, the views of a Republican constituency. The question "Should the protective policy of the McKinley Bill be indorsed?" was answered "yes" by 3,868 subscribers, and "no" by 1,672 subscribers. The question "Do you favor a Federal bounty on agricultural exports?" was answered "yes" by 1,460 subscribers and "no" by 3,425 subscribers. The principal questions regarding the currency were answered by sections as follows:

	Gold Standard.		Free Coinage.	
New England.....	86 yes.	239 no.	13 yes.	158 no.
Middle States.....	155 "	766 "	172 "	161 "
Central ".....	261 "	2,531 "	643 "	1,046 "
Western ".....	48 "	335 "	111 "	21 "
Southern ".....	48 "	213 "	41 "	35 "

The vote indicates that most farmers—or at least most Republican farmers—still occupy middle ground on the financial question. A majority of those voting, however (2,588 to 2,168), favored the free coinage of the American product.

The second annual Peace Conference was held at Lake Mohonk last week. About eighty invited guests were present. The Conference was presided over by ex-Senator Edmunds, whose encyclopædic knowledge of American history and international law rendered the Conference an invaluable service. The clergy were represented by such men as Bishop Foss (Methodist), Dr. Charles L. Thompson (Presbyterian), Drs. Herrick and Reuen Thomas (Congregational), Edward Everett Hale and Mr. Dole (Unitarian), the religious press by two members of the staff of The Outlook, and by Mr. Hallock and Mr. Bright, of the "Christian Work." Among the notable educators present were President Warfield, of Lafayette College, and Professor John B. Clark, of Columbia College; and the bar by such jurists as ex-Chief Justice Earl, of the Court of Appeals, William Allen Butler and Walter S. Logan, of the New York bar, and George S. Hale, of the Boston bar. Robert Treat Payne, Mr. George B. Capen, Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, Mr. Robert Garrett, Vice-President of the Lehigh Railroad, Judge Steiniss, of Rhode Island, Mr. Robert U. Johnson, of the "Century Magazine," and Lyman Abbott, of The Outlook, constituted the business committee and gave shape to the platform finally adopted. That platform we publish in another part of this issue, and to it we desire to call the especial attention of our readers. The absence of military men from the Conference was sincerely regretted. A number of them were invited, but

there were no responses. Even in America the idea that free discussion, involving the clash of the most contradictory opinions, can be carried on in a most friendly spirit, and the result, the elucidation of truth, be welcomed by all, is apprehended only by an elect few.

⊗

This is, however, the distinguishing characteristic of the Conferences which have been held at Lake Mohonk. They are in the strictest sense of the term deliberative. For three days the eighty guests of Mr. Smiley discussed with one another in public and in private the problem, Is it desirable and is it practicable to secure the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations, as we now secure the peaceful settlement of such controversies between individuals? and if this is desirable and practicable, how can it be accomplished? Some objections to the plan proposed for this purpose were suggested, but for the most part they were second-hand objections, suggested for the purpose of furnishing an answer. The result of the deliberation was a unanimous judgment that it is both practicable and desirable to secure a permanent international tribunal for the adjustment of differences between nations, somewhat as the Supreme Court of the United States determines issues between the several States of the Union. Whether this tribunal should be permanent in its personnel or not, how it should be constituted, and how its decisions should be enforced, if at all, were questions upon which the Conference reached no definite conclusion. Edward Everett Hale apparently desired a court with power to enforce its decrees; George S. Hale, a court of conciliation, the enforcement of whose decrees would be left to the moral obligation and good will of the nation which had invoked the offices of the court; and this was as far as the Lake Mohonk Conference went. It did, however, go thus far, urging vigorously the establishment of some permanent tribunal, whose very existence would tend to prevent the resort to arms, and whose decisions would constitute a morally authoritative interpretation of international law. One of the most useful contributions to the discussion was furnished by Professor Clark, of Columbia College, who pointed out with singular clearness the significant fact that the antagonism between labor and capital had led to the organization of both; that these organizations were sympathetically international in their character; and that they were both strenuously opposed to war—capital because war destroys it, labor because war paralyzes industry; and he prophesied, and gave good reasons for his prophecy, that were some other method than resort to arms provided for the settlement of international controversies, labor and capital would be found combining in the demand that this method should be adopted, and the resort to arms abandoned. It was doubted by some whether all questions could be submitted to an International Tribunal for its consideration, but we think the trend of opinion was that eventually, if not at first, its jurisdiction would extend to all subject matters, especially if the enforcement of its decisions was left, as the enforcement of the decisions of international arbitrations has been left, to the nations themselves concerned. The very significant fact was brought out in the course of the session that during the past year England and the United States have entered into negotiations for the establishment of a permanent International Tribunal, the French Legislature has with substantial unanimity proposed a permanent treaty of arbitration with the United States, and the International Parliamentary Union, containing Parliamentary representatives from fourteen European nations, has not only agreed in recommending an

International Tribunal, but in proposing a definite plan for its constitution. It should be added that perhaps the most interesting figure in the Conference was Mr. Hodgson Pratt, the President of the International Peace and Arbitration Society of Great Britain, who had come from his summer home in Switzerland for the express purpose of attending this Conference, and whose life for the last fifteen years has been devoted to the promotion of the ends which this Conference had in view.

⊗

The clemency shown to the leaders of the revolt in South Africa has tended to disarm English criticism and to soften English feeling, coming as it did on the heels of the publication of the compromising letters and dispatches. Both the Boers and the English are waiting upon events, but it grows more clear that the question of the autonomy of the Transvaal is only an incident in the larger question of the eventual control of South Africa. It is clear that German arms and German officers have not been introduced into the Transvaal in such quantities and numbers without a purpose; it is equally clear that the outspoken friendship of the Emperor William, at the time of the disturbance, was not an accident. The Transvaal has apparently definitely committed itself to some kind of German alliance. It is very likely that it had been led to reverse its former policy of friendliness with England under the pressure of its fears of the aggressiveness of the chartered companies or of the Cape Government. The Boers are naturally slow, but they have a good deal of clearness of sight, as well as decision in action and skill in diplomacy. It was probably the perception that the tide of English energy could not be permanently kept within bounds which led President Kruger to say, months ago, that the time had come to knit ties of the closest friendship between Germany and the South African Republic. It is clear that the Transvaal will be held to its agreement with England, and that England does not intend to give in an inch in the struggle for supremacy in South Africa. That great undeveloped country, with its magnificent resources, will fall eventually into either English or German hands, and at this moment there seems no reason to question the final supremacy of the English. They have, in many respects, the advantage of the position, and although the Germans are pressing them at many points and are developing an astonishing capacity for colonization and trade—astonishing as compared with their activity in these matters a quarter of a century ago—the English genius for getting hold of new territory and civilizing it is not likely to be eclipsed. Moreover, English pride is aroused, and the English Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of English authority. Whatever may happen, therefore, in connection with the trouble in the Transvaal will be only incidental to the larger struggle that is going on between Germany and England for the possession of the southern part of Africa.

⊗

An element of picturesqueness is introduced into French politics from time to time by pronunciamientos from the pretenders to the throne. There are now two of these gentlemen, the heir of the Napoleonic traditions and the young Duc d'Orléans, in whose person are combined the claims of the younger and older branches of the Bourbon family. The Duc d'Orléans, who has shown an adventurous spirit on more than one occasion, has recently brought himself to the front and apparently snubbed the Royalist managing committee by the publication of a letter in which he makes a broad distinction of policy between himself and the committee. The latter believe that the true policy of