

# The Outlook

A Family Paper

Volume 53

Saturday, 16 May, 1896

Number 20

**M**R. MCKINLEY'S lead was still further increased last week. The Republican State Conventions held in Indiana, Michigan, and California all instructed their delegates to support him, and his only defeat in the local elections was in the State of Delaware, where Mr. Addicks secured the selection of uninstructed delegates who are likely to give their votes to Senator Quay. If every delegate to St. Louis were certain to vote in accordance with his expressed preferences at the time of his election, Mr. McKinley's choice upon the first ballot would be assured. His opponents, however, have not given up the hope of defeating him. The fact that he once voted for the free coinage of silver, and supported both the Bland-Allison Bill and the Sherman Act, has arrayed against him nearly all the anti-silver leaders. It is a noteworthy fact that the same men generally oppose his attitude on the tariff question. Until this year it has always been the agricultural districts that have stood for a moderate tariff, and the manufacturing centers that have supported extreme protection. This year, however, it is the agricultural districts, from Vermont to California, which support Mr. McKinley—the champion of extreme protection—while the manufacturing centers, including nearly all of the large cities, demand a more moderate protectionist. At first glance the present situation seems anomalous, but the anomaly is explained the moment we consider the character of the Wilson Law, after the elimination of the income-tax provision. Its fundamental principle is, not free trade, but free trade in raw materials. By making raw wool free and by reducing the tariff or bounties upon other products of the farms, the present law discriminates in favor of the manufacturing centers more than did the McKinley Act. Hence the conservatism of these manufacturing centers concerning the revision of this measure, and the radicalism of the hitherto conservative farming districts. In last week's conventions the McKinley element seems to have been easily victorious in each State. The only important struggles were over the currency planks. In Indiana a platform was adopted favoring the use of silver, but explicitly opposing the free coinage of silver at the old ratio. To conciliate the Republican farmers, whose defection was feared in case the Democrats adopted a free-coinage platform, a popular farmer was nominated for Governor. In Michigan both the gold and silver planks reported from the committee on resolutions were retired in favor of a compromise upon the National platform of 1892. In California a free-coinage platform was adopted.

The Democratic State Conventions held simultaneously in New Jersey and Tennessee were each entirely harmonious, but together were as discordant as conventions within the same party could possibly be. The New Jersey Convention, without audible protest from any quarter, not only de-

nounced the free coinage of silver at any ratio, but condemned the further purchase of silver bullion, and demanded the retirement of the greenbacks. The Tennessee Convention, with a barely audible protest, demanded the free coinage of silver at the old ratio, and instructed its delegates to Chicago to vote as a unit on this question. Except in the city of Memphis, the primaries throughout the State had been a succession of free-coinage victories. In the South Carolina Democratic primaries the anti-silver men are apparently making no fight, except to elect delegates who will not "bolt" from the party in case the Chicago Convention fails to adopt a free-coinage platform. Even on this issue the conservatives seem to be losing in nearly all the counties. The most exciting contests, however, now going on in the Democratic party are those in Iowa and Illinois. If the silver men lose these two States, they cannot possibly control a majority at Chicago. In Iowa, under the leadership of ex-Governor Boies, they have carried several counties which a year ago went against them, and would seem sure to control the Convention were it not for the recollection of the outcome in Michigan. In Illinois the gold men are not making a fight in the agricultural counties in the southern part of the State, but are bending every effort to secure a solid delegation from the city of Chicago. They endeavored to conciliate Governor Altgeld by urging his renomination in most flattering terms. The Governor, however, refused their support, and is leading the fight against them. The contest is an increasingly bitter one, and party unity seems almost out of the question, whichever faction triumphs.

Enough delegates to the National Conventions have been elected to afford some indication of a probable result, though not enough to afford any sure ground of prophecy. On the tariff issue Mr. McKinley has unmistakably the lead in the Republican party. The fight against him is made mainly on the ground that he is not sound on the financial question. His opponents insist that the currency question is the most important one, and that no man can be elected who is not a "sound money" man. The welfare of the country may, and in our judgment does, depend more upon the settlement of the currency question than upon a revision of the tariff; but, from the party point of view, the former is less important than the latter. On the tariff issue men are pretty sharply divided into two parties, one in favor of a tariff for protection, the other of a tariff for revenue only. The issue is a simple one; it is fairly well comprehended; and protectionists, however they may differ in detail, will not desert their party because it nominates a protectionist who is either too extreme or too moderate to suit their inclinations. On the financial question the country is divided into four parties: one in favor of a gold standard; one in favor of free silver; one which believes that it is both practicable and desirable to circulate gold and silver side by side as legal

tender at a parity; and one which does not understand the currency question, does not pretend to, and cares very little about it. This last is much larger than the other three combined. A platform which pronounces unmistakably for protection, and ambiguously for bimetallism, will get all the protectionists except a few men of strong convictions in favor respectively of the gold standard and free silver. This is the policy of the advocates of Mr. McKinley, if not of Mr. McKinley himself, and it is the policy which is likely to control in the Republican Convention, unless we misread the signs of the times. Nor will this policy be likely to lead to an organized bolt. The signs are not equally clear in the Democratic party, in which both the gold monometallists and the free-coinage men are more positive and more earnest in their convictions, while the convictions in favor of a tariff for revenue only are neither as strong nor as harmonious. There is more to split the Democratic party and less to bind it together—a fact the results of which will probably be seen in the election, even if they do not appear in a division in the Convention.

The Senate last week, by a vote of 51 to 6, passed the resolution introduced by Senator Peffer providing for an investigation of the bond issues made under the present Administration. The investigation is to be conducted by the Senate Finance Committee. The subjects covered include the amount of money in the Treasury at the times the several issues were made, the manner in which the gold reserve was depleted just prior to them, the market price of outstanding bonds at the time the new bonds were sold, and the effect of the bond sales upon the credit and business of the country. The only Senators who finally voted against the investigation were Hill, of New York, Gray, of Delaware, Caffrey, of Louisiana, Faulkner, of West Virginia, Palmer, of Illinois, and Mitchell, of Wisconsin.—It has been decided that the Pacific Funding Bill will not be pressed to a vote at the present session of Congress.—While the River and Harbor Bill was under discussion in the Senate, Senator White, of California, called attention to the fact that a \$3,000,000 appropriation had been inserted for his State, which neither its Senators nor the Representative of the district most immediately concerned had asked for. The appropriation was for a harbor at Santa Monica—a proposition condemned by the Government engineers on the ground of excessive cost, condemned by the people of the district because of excessive inconvenience, and favored only by the Southern Pacific road, which controls a branch to that point.—The House of Representatives voted to increase the salaries of its members by allowing them \$100 a month each for clerk hire during the interval between the sessions. The proceedings of Congressmen that have recently attracted the most attention, however, have not had reference to pending bills, but to the approaching National Convention. Week before last Senator Wolcott's letter to the Republican State Committee in Colorado, declaring that he would support his party no matter if it declared against his free-coinage convictions, was followed by a declaration of Senator Teller that he would support his convictions no matter into what party they led him. Last week Senator Vest, who previously had declared that his devotion to the Democratic party equaled Senator Wolcott's to the Republican, qualified his declaration with the announcement that he would "bolt" from the Chicago Convention if an anti-silver majority were obtained by the activity of Federal office-holders. He held in his hand communications from Michigan stating that some counties were represented at the State Convention exclusively by Federal office-holders,

and that over one hundred delegates violated their instructions on the money question.

The danger that the Competitor incident might lead to serious complications between this country and Spain has been averted by the prompt action of the Spanish Government in accepting Secretary Olney's request for postponement of the execution of the death sentences until the two countries can consider in a friendly way the questions involved. Briefly stated, the facts are that the Spanish authorities in Cuba seized the schooner *Competitor*, laden with arms and ammunition for the Cuban insurgents. Among the men on board were three who claimed to be American citizens—one was certainly so, the others probably. These men, with the others, were tried by court martial and sentenced to death. It is claimed here that thereby rights were violated which are secured to American citizens by the treaty of 1795, and what is known as the Cushing protocol of 1877. The latter provides that United States citizens residing in Spain, charged with sedition, treason, and the like, shall be tried only by the civil courts, unless taken in arms, and then shall be tried before a council of war. While the men now under sentence were not residents of Spain, it is held that the reciprocal rights granted to Spain in the protocol show that the intention was to include such cases as this. Under the treaty of 1795 and the law of 1821, it is said privileges of defense were insured in such cases which have not been accorded. It must be remembered that Spain has not admitted that war exists in Cuba, and it is held here that the mere carrying of arms to sell or give the insurgents is not an offense punishable by death under the law of nations, and that while the intention of these men may have been to take arms against Spain, they were not, when captured, technically "in arms." It will be seen that several nice points in treaty construction and international law are involved. The Spanish Government, as we have said, has promptly shown a friendly disposition to consider whatever our Government may advance. The Queen Regent of Spain, in her address from the throne, read on Monday, says in effect that plans for political reform in Cuba have been thwarted by the insurrection, the leaders of which feared that the people would be contented under the proposed reforms; that those reforms are now necessarily postponed, but will be carried out when the rebellion is suppressed; that the rebel chiefs, "principally foreigners and negroes," are violating all the laws of war and of humanity; that the insurrection is decreasing; and that the United States has not departed from loyal friendship and "correct and friendly conduct."

The demagogues who have taken advantage of the public sympathy and respect for the old soldier to promote their own selfish schemes have just met with a severe setback at the hands of the full bench of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, which has decided to be unconstitutional the veteran-preference act passed by the Legislature last year over the veto of the late Governor Greenhalge. The case was brought by Frederick W. Brown, an applicant for appointment to the detective force of the District Police of Boston. Although he passed an examination that placed him the highest on the list of candidates eligible for appointment, the Civil Service Commission, under the preference act, appointed E. D. Bean, a veteran who had not taken the examination. Chief Justice Field, who wrote the opinion of the Court, laid down a principle that exposes every fallacy of the argument used in defense of the legislation to favor veterans in appointment to public office.