

# The Nebraska Independent.

VOL. XII.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, MARCH 7, 1901.

NO. 41.

## THERMOPYLAE OF LIBERTY

The Last Great Fight in the United States Senate to Preserve the Constitution and Declaration of Independence.

When the history of those times is written, February 28, 1901, will be a memorable day. It was on that day that the last great fight was made in the United States senate to preserve this republic, to defend the constitution and preserve government among men by the consent of the governed. It was a battle that lasted for thirteen hours—hopeless from the beginning—for the republicans having a majority were determined to set a precedent and enact a law that would announce to the world that the old ideas of government handed down to us by Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln had passed away and another system of government was to take its place. It is not a new system that they would substitute, but the one that was abolished in this country after seven years of flame and blood at Yorktown. It was a pathetic fight. Hopelessly in the minority, Teller and his confederates could only plead, for the ten million of people that were to be thrust under a despotism by the act of the republican leaders. From eleven o'clock in the morning until one o'clock the next morning the battle raged and then the awful deed was done, a deed that will mark the beginning of the decadence, unless reversed, of the greatest free republic that has ever existed in the world. This republic has become great because it has insisted that "all men were born free and equal, and that all just powers of government were derived from the consent of the governed. The congress of the United States has repudiated that doctrine. That will change the course of history. If all men are not by nature free, then those only will be free who can maintain their liberty by force. For "the consent of the governed" the republicans have substituted "force."

This is the last great fight for liberty in the United States senate. Before the next session closes the republicans will change the rules and the senate will be no more a deliberative body, but will be run as the house is run, except that it will have Teddy in the chair instead of Czar Reed or Henderson.

Populists are requested to examine closely the yes and may votes on this occasion.

Not since the enactment of the resolutions declaring a state of war to exist between the United States and Spain has there been such an avalanche of passionate oratory as the senate listened to last Thursday. Throughout the session the army appropriation bill was under discussion, the controverted questions being the Spooner Philippine amendment and the Platt Cuban amendment.

Mr. Bacon (Ga.) said: "This amendment is the most pernicious and objectionable form of legislation which has been proposed since I have had any connection with the American congress." Proceeding, he said he believed that it was the very worst legislation that ever had been attempted in the congress. He considered it as revolutionary, and said that under no circumstances would he vote for it or vote for a bill containing such a provision. He would indeed rather vote for ten subsidy bills than for this measure. He denounced as "coercion" the putting upon an appropriation measure in the closing hours of a session, a proposition which the Philippine and Cuban amendments. They were clearly in violation of the rules of the senate, and every senator, he said, who voted to place the Philippine amendment upon the bill knew that it was a "plain, distinct and undeniable violation of the rule."

Mr. Bacon pointed out that in the Philippines there were 68,000,000 acres of rich lands, on which were rich mines and valuable timber. It was from "the plunderers and speculators, who, like vultures, are hovering over that prostrate land," that the demand had come for Philippine legislation to which the majority was about to respond. He referred to a press telegram from Manila which stated that Dr. Kruger, the German consul there, had urged his government to request the German ambassador in Washington diplomatically to advance the passage of the Spooner bill because it would improve the interests of certain German mining companies in the Philippines.

Mr. Bacon, briefly discussing the Cuban amendment, declared he could not vote for it. The Teller resolution, he said, was not a matter of sentiment, but a solemn avowal of our duty made for our own safety. "The relations existing between this government and Cuba ought to be guarded against any irritation that might be created by any such amendment as that proposed, which was an ultimatum declaring that the Cuban people were subject to the United States."

Lumber and Development company, of which he said Representative J. H. Hull, chairman of the military affairs committee of the house, was president, and Representative Dovenor of West Virginia was the attorney. A son of Mr. Hill, he asserted, even now was in the Philippines looking after the interests of the company.

Mr. Pettigrew read from what he said were certified documents of correspondence which had passed between Major H. O. S. Heistand of the adjutant general's department of the army and Major E. W. Hawkes, until recently an officer in the volunteer service, relating to a company which had been organized for the development of the hemp industry in the Philippines. The letters indicated that this company was endeavoring to secure control of the hemp industry in the Philippines, and that Major Heistand was using his official position to advance the interests of the enterprise. Mr. Pettigrew contended that no legitimate office were being made to prepare the Philippines for civil government, and he declared that the barbaric practices in the Philippines by our forces had been equaled only by those of the "civilized" armies at Peking. He could not comprehend how any American senator could look upon our act as an act of right. He thought the Philippines should be given their liberty and allowed to establish their government under our guidance and direction. "I hope," he said, in conclusion, "that this administration will see the infamy of its course and turn its back upon a policy which has already covered it with shame and disgrace."

Mr. Turner (Wash.), criticized the Spooner amendment as a departure from the American system—the first departure in the history of the country. It vested, he contended, in the president of the United States all the powers that belong to and are exercised by the czar of Russia.

It is an extraordinary proposition," he declared. "To my mind, it is a monstrous proposition, which ought to be repudiated for a moment. We may well tremble for this country if the proposition of the senator from Wisconsin be adopted; for we will not only have a czar in the Philippines islands, but a czar in the United States itself. It shall pass out of existence. If I were a Filipino," Mr. Turner continued, vehemently, "I should never cease to resist the attempt to impose the rule of the United States government upon myself and upon my people, in the face of so tyrannical a proposition as that involved in this amendment."

Mr. Bacon (Ga.) said: "This amendment is the most pernicious and objectionable form of legislation which has been proposed since I have had any connection with the American congress." Proceeding, he said he believed that it was the very worst legislation that ever had been attempted in the congress. He considered it as revolutionary, and said that under no circumstances would he vote for it or vote for a bill containing such a provision. He would indeed rather vote for ten subsidy bills than for this measure. He denounced as "coercion" the putting upon an appropriation measure in the closing hours of a session, a proposition which the Philippine and Cuban amendments. They were clearly in violation of the rules of the senate, and every senator, he said, who voted to place the Philippine amendment upon the bill knew that it was a "plain, distinct and undeniable violation of the rule."

Mr. Bacon pointed out that in the Philippines there were 68,000,000 acres of rich lands, on which were rich mines and valuable timber. It was from "the plunderers and speculators, who, like vultures, are hovering over that prostrate land," that the demand had come for Philippine legislation to which the majority was about to respond. He referred to a press telegram from Manila which stated that Dr. Kruger, the German consul there, had urged his government to request the German ambassador in Washington diplomatically to advance the passage of the Spooner bill because it would improve the interests of certain German mining companies in the Philippines.

Mr. Bacon, briefly discussing the Cuban amendment, declared he could not vote for it. The Teller resolution, he said, was not a matter of sentiment, but a solemn avowal of our duty made for our own safety. "The relations existing between this government and Cuba ought to be guarded against any irritation that might be created by any such amendment as that proposed, which was an ultimatum declaring that the Cuban people were subject to the United States."

Mr. Jones (Ark.) said he would vote against the Cuban amendment because it seemed to reserve the right of the United States to intervene in Cuban affairs wherever the government does not suit the purposes of the people of Cuba. He also criticized the right claimed to interfere in regulating the sanitation of Cuban cities. He was "willing to say that the amendment was far better than he had expected, for he had for months been apprehensive that the party in power would desire to maintain a real protectorate over Cuba. He therefore considered the Philippine amendment contained a more serious question than that involved in the Cuban amendment. He contradicted all reports that there had been any agreement to vote upon the army bill, but he for one was not willing to filibuster and thus force an extra session when he knew that in case of an extra session measures more objectionable than those pending would be forced through congress."

trate into a position their children cannot hold," he said, and he was satisfied when the light should come they would be found adhering to the great declaration of our independence. In view of this change of sentiment he considered it better to postpone further discussion in order that the change might go on. "Although," he said, "I am opposed to the proposition contained in this amendment, to commit to five men despotic power over 12,000,000 of men, yet I bear in mind that that power is now, and will be for some time in the future, exercised by one man. I do not, therefore, think it wise to bring on an extra session of congress by what would in the end be an unavailing opposition."

Mr. Hoar presented documents signed by native Filipinos, which, he said, were convincing evidence that those people were not savages. Mr. Hoar predicted that the proposed legislation would "wipe out the last hope that the example that the United States is to continue to work out its great result in the ideas of the downtrodden people of the rest of the world."

"You may," he declared, in conclusion, "talk about benevolent assimilation and use other honeyed phrases, but your act is pure, simple, undiluted, unchecked despotism."

Mr. Tillman (S. C.) declared congress was about to abandon its prerogatives and turn them over to an oligarchy—a new despotism of five men to be appointed by the president. He declared by the Hoar amendment "the teeth of the hyena which was about to tear out the vitals of the Filipinos had been pulled." He protested that the president ought to be left with his present power—the war power—which he thought was ample, and he urged that the committee amendment be voted down.

Mr. Lindsay (Ky.) made a brief argument against the Spooner Philippine amendment. His principal objection to the proposition was that it added nothing to the security of the Philippine people and opened the door to serious abuses.

Mr. Cuberson (Tex.) urged that the Philippine amendment was unconstitutional, and made an argument in support of his opinion.

Mr. Money (Miss.) did not want to leave Cuba in the hands of United States forces until next December. The time had come, he thought, for action. He said that he was violating no great secret in saying he had consulted with some of his democratic colleagues about the amendment before it was reported, and every one of them had approved it. They had changed their minds now, but why he did not know. In conclusion he stated briefly his objections to the Philippine amendment and his reasons for not supporting it.

A vote there was taken upon the amendment of Mr. Vest, providing that the action of this government or its officials in the Philippines shall be subject to the constitution and laws of the United States so far as they are applicable. The amendment was rejected, 25 to 45, as follows:

Yeas—Bate, Berry, Butler, Caffery, Chilton, Clay, Cockerell, Cuberson, Harris, Heitfeld, Hoar, Jones (Ark.), Kenney, McEmery, McLaurin, Mallory, Martin, Pettigrew, Pettus, Rawlins, Telfer, Tillman, Turley, Turner—25.

Nays—Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Beveridge, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Clark, Cullom, Deboe, Dillingham, Dooliver, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gallinger, Hanna, Hansborough, Hawley, Kean, Kearns, Kyle, Lindsay (Ky.), Lodge, McComas, McCumber, McMillan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Platt (Conn.), Platt (N. Y.), Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Sewell, Shoup, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wolcott—45.

Mr. Rawlins offered an amendment declaring it not to be the purpose of the United States to hold permanent sovereignty over the Philippines, but only to the extent necessary to secure their pacification and to establish a stable government. Rejected—yeas, 24; nays, 45.

Mr. Bacon offered an amendment to limit the grant of power to March 4, 1904. Rejected—yeas, 46.

Mr. Pettus (Ark.) offered an amendment providing that every person in whom authority is vested under this grant of power shall take an oath to support the constitution of the United States. Rejected—25 to 41.

Mr. Teller then offered his amendment providing that the civil government established in the Philippines should be so exercised as to secure for the inhabitants thereof the fullest participation consistent with the safety of the government. Rejected—23 to 39.

that he had never expected to live—indeed, he regretted that he had lived to see the day when the ordinary rights of citizens were denied people living under the American flag.

It looked as if the vote was about to be taken, when the venerable Massachusetts senator, Mr. Hoar, arose: "There is one principle of constitutional liberty not yet slain," said he, "and I will give it a chance tonight. He then offered an amendment providing that no official of the Philippines vested with legislative power should exercise judicial or executive power and vice versa. "To the end that the government might be one of laws, not men."

The amendment was rejected—yeas, 26; nays, 43.

At last the decisive moment had arrived. It was now 10:30 p. m. The senate had been in session continuously since 11 o'clock in the morning. The vote was taken upon the amended Spooner resolution, which was adopted—yeas, 45; nays, 27—as follows:

Yeas—Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Beveridge, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Clark, Cullom, Deboe, Dewey, Dillingham, Dooliver, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansborough, Hawley, Kean, Kearns, Kyle, Lodge, McComas, McCumber, McLaurin, McMillan, Nelson, Perkins, Platt (Conn.), Pritchard, Proctor, Quarles, Scott, Sewell, Shoup, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wetmore—45.

Nays—Allen, Bacon, Bate, Berry, Butler, Caffery, Chilton, Clay, Cockerell, Cuberson, Harris, Hoar, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenney, Lindsay, McEmery, Mallory, Martin, Pettigrew, Pettus, Rawlins, Telfer, Tillman, Turley, Turner—27.

Mr. Platt (Conn.) then offered the amendment prepared by the committee on relations with Cuba. Mr. Jones (Ark.) moved to strike out the third condition providing that Cuba shall agree that the United States shall exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence. Mr. Hoar (Mass.) said he considered the entire Cuban amendment wise. He was not able to share in the apprehensions indulged in on the other side. It was designed to enforce the Monroe doctrine.

Mr. Jones replied that the Monroe doctrine was not involved in the third condition. The right of the United States to intervene in the internal affairs of the island would be, he thought, tantamount to assuming the right to overturn the government of Cuba whenever we saw fit on one pretext or another.

He moved his amendment so as to strike out only that portion of the condition or section providing that the United States could intervene "for the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty."

Mr. Morgan declared the Cuban proposition was a piece of arrant hypocrisy. The position we were to assume toward Cuba would justify England in slaying the Boer people in South Africa under the claim of suzerainty. The amendment in effect proposed an American suzerainty over Cuba.

Mr. Pettus (Ark.) declared that the honor of the country was at stake. Congress and the president had pledged their word that the Cuban people "were, and of right ought to be free and independent." This proposition violated the pledge. It was to be the old law of "let him take who has the power, and let him keep who can." It was a disgrace upon the American people.

Mr. Jones' motion to amend the amendment was defeated—yeas, 21; nays, 43.

The Cuban amendment to the army bill was adopted. The vote was 43 to 20, as follows:

Yeas—Aldrich, Allison, Bard, Beveridge, Burrows, Carter, Chandler, Cullom, Deboe, Dewey, Dillingham, Dooliver, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Gallinger, Hale, Hanna, Hansborough, Hawley, Hoar, Kean, Kearns, Kyle, Lodge, McComas, McCumber, McMillan, Nelson, Penrose, Perkins, Platt (Conn.), Proctor, Pritchard, Quarles, Sewell, Shoup, Simon, Spooner, Stewart, Thurston, Warren, Wetmore—43.

Nays—Bacon, Bate, Berry, Butler, Caffery, Clay, Cockerell, Cuberson, Jones (Ark.), Kenney, Lindsay, Mallory, Martin, Pettigrew, Pettus, Rawlins, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Turner—20.

Several amendments were voted down and the bill was passed—yeas, 43; nays, 18—and the senate at 1 a. m. adjourned.

## "SHALT NOT" GROWS FAINTER

To Appeal to the Moral Sense of the Imperialist is Worse Than a Waste of Breath and Time.

In its original edition, Mohammed's Koran laid down the law of "one man one wife." But when Mohammed became an "expansionist" and was propagating the blessings of peace and true benevolence by the sword, he met a young woman whose charms convinced him that a revised edition of his moral code was necessary.

And down from heaven came a new revelation, giving the faithful large latitude in the matter of wives.

So it is with the moral code of our holy band of imperialists. In the original edition of the revelations of the mandates of the Almighty to its sanctified leader, "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet" appeared in the paraphrase, "Forcible annexation would be criminal aggression." In the revised editions that are constantly appearing, the "not" in these commandments grows fainter and fainter, and stealing and coveting and pledge-breaking and false swearing and even murder are gradually being erased into resplendent virtues.

Of the many ways of wasting breath the most foolish is in appeals to the moral sense of imperialists. Their moral code changes with their appetites and their appetites grow so rapidly that there is no keeping up with them.

The only hope of preventing the Cuban perfidy, and for that matter the only hope of stopping war and rapine and desolation in the Philippines, is in the arguments of the coldest expediency.

Therefore, we say to Mr. McKinley: No doubt you can adjust your conscience to any situation which the demands of imperialism may create. No doubt you can make yourself take a "holy joy" in the breaking of pledges, in the outraging of the moral code of ordinary mortals, in the renewal of the scenes and the sounds of anguish in Cuba.

But, will it pay, dear Mr. McKinley? Wouldn't it be wiser and cheaper to let Cuba go for the present and take advantage of an internal disturbance created by judicious agents to return? Couldn't you steal more in that way with less bloodshed and less expense and less damage to the property you covet?

And, if you are right in thinking that you will follow countrymen such as wish you to do the "dirty work" of violating the Cuban pledge, will they not be better pleased, be less likely to make a scapegoat of you, if you do the "dirty work" in a nice, smooth, oily, hypocritical way?

If we must steal and swindle, let us steal and swindle artistically, not vulgarly, not bunglingly. And, above all, as cheaply as possible.—N. Y. World.

## A BEAST OF PREY

The Nation That Washington Founded and Which Lincoln Saved Attacks the Weak and Helpless.

In my early childhood I read an inscription on an old revolutionary copper coin, namely, "Not one cent for tribute, but millions for defense." After my uncle explained the word "tribute," we both decided that the great Boston tea party was justifiable. And you may hold the sentiment for the inscription together with the influence of my reading the lives of Jesus the Christ, of Washington, Franklin, Marion of Bolivar, and of the noble, generous patriot Lafayette—responsive, to a great extent, for my having since enlisted twice in the union army of the war of the rebellion, and for my now writing this, in hope that the sentiments herein expressed, through the powerful influence of the republican, may awaken a deeper interest in the cause of justice, liberty and humanity. I pray these words may be wise, immediate and decisive action by all who love justice, who love liberty, who love humanity, to use individually and in concert all just and lawful means to stop the unjust and inhumanly cruel wars now being waged by the British on the Boers in South Africa, and by the United States government in the Philippines, evidently for no other motive than that which prompts the most powerful rapacious bird and beast of prey to seize and kill their struggling victims. And they always attack the weak and helpless—all of which is certainly inhuman.

In speaking of people controlled by this "beast-of-prey" quality of mind, the apostle Paul says: "Whose God is their belly; and their end is destruction," and "The universal eternal law of the terminal transmutation of opposites, insures the destruction of the beast of prey spirit in all individuals and governments now controlled by it, and its being supplanted by its opposite. But this change will come only through strict obedience to law and the exercise of good sense and kindness, by both individuals and nations."

From my viewpoint what is known as republicanism in the United States today is no more like that of Mr. Lincoln's time than what is now recognized as Christianity is like the Christianity taught and lived by the Lord Christ and His apostles 1900 years ago. Both are antitheses of the originals. And the inhuman cruelties now being perpetrated by these two leading Christian (?) nations in the Philippines and South Africa prove the truth of the above statement. Undoubtedly the majority of the American people are opposed to the war in the Philippines, and would stop it if they could, to prevent the demoralizing effects of war and the increase of taxation, but the people are misled and

largely controlled by a sensual, selfish plutocracy, with headquarters in Lombard street, London, and Wall street, New York. Nevertheless, let us who are awaking do right, and "make a long pull, a strong pull, and all pull together," for righteousness, peace and joy in good, for all women, children and men, in all countries of earth.—E. Pluribus Unum, in Springfield Republican.

## WE SHOULD HIDE OUR FACES

Because This Nation has Become a Land Grabber, Invader and Despot as Much as Russia is in Manchuria.

The Denver News in discussing the awful crime enacted at Washington during last week says the action sets aside the whole theory of American government promulgated in the constitution, and makes the Philippines a sort of "crown colony," subject to the will of William the First.

Senator Vest offered an amendment "that the action of this government or its officials in the Philippines shall be subject to the constitution and laws of the United States so far as they are applicable." It was defeated, 45 to 25.

Senator Bacon offered an amendment to limit the grant of power to March 4, 1904. It was defeated, 46 to 26.

Senator Pettus offered an amendment that "every person in whom authority is vested under this grant of power shall take an oath to support the constitution of the United States." It was defeated.

Mr. Teller sought to attach an amendment modeled on that of the Missouri territory law of 1812 providing that fines shall be moderate, that no ex-post facto laws shall be passed and that other of the most ordinary safeguards against oppression be established. It was defeated, 41 to 23.

Senator Hoar offered an amendment that no official in the Philippines vested with executive power should exercise legislative or judicial power. It was defeated, 43 to 23, and the door is open for McKinley to create as many petty czars in the islands as he pleases.

In other words, the stars and stripes will float in the Philippines over people who are denied every right of American citizens and over whom we have no just claim, but the crown of Great Britain had on the American colonists. This country was founded by British colonists, but we are intruders in the Philippines demanding with armed force that the people shall submit to an arbitrary rule which we would not ourselves tolerate in this country for twenty-four hours.

In the matter of Cuba, too, the United States is placed in the attitude of breaking a most solemn pledge. At the outbreak of the Spanish war the congress passed a resolution which was signed by the president declaring: "The United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said islands except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is completed to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

The senate by a vote of 43 to 20 declared that the United States shall have "supervision of all foreign treaties. Control of Cuba's finances and credit. An indefinite right of intervention equivalent to the right of interfering in anything that congress thinks should be interfered with."

"Dictation by the United States in matters pertaining to sanitation. Absolute retention of the Isle of Pines by the United States. Sale or lease to the United States of such naval or coaling stations as it desires. Absolute confirmation of all rights granted during the military occupation of Cuba, including a large mass of highly valuable franchises, in the grant of which the Cubans had no part."

There is no use trying to disguise the fact that the world will point to us with scorn as devoid of regard for the most solemn pledge which a nation can give.

But what if it is possible to make some defense of the breach of faith toward Cuba on the ground of the law of necessity, the disposition made of the Philippines by congress violates every precept of liberty and every declaration of the constitution. By it we become landgrabbers, invaders and despots as much as the Russians in Manchuria.

## THE SILVER TRUST

An Arrangement Between a Few Men to Keep the Price of Silver Down for the Benefit of the British Exchequer.

It has long been known that there was an arrangement between a certain firm in this country and another in London to keep down the price of silver. This sort of thing has been backed up by a lot of gold standard bankers on both sides of the ocean. It was pure business on the part of the London men. They not only made money out of it for themselves, but they were greatly aiding the British government which has to supply silver for India. Every point that they could force silver down was that much gain to the British.

The producers of silver in this country got very tired of that thing and a concerted effort has been made by the smelting companies to break it up. These companies ran square against the powerful government combine in league with the gold standard bankers to destroy the value of silver and a fierce fight is now on. A trust has been formed that differs from all other trusts in that its object is to depress the price instead of increasing it. It

is more of a political trust than any thing else.

The London Statist sees an advantage for silver in the Guggenheim control of the American Smelting and Refining company, which will break up the pernicious practice of allowing the firm which controls the sale of the bullion to work both sides of the market—the seller's side in New York and the buyer's side in London. This is precisely what the Lewishons have been doing, and it is particularly the practice that the Guggenheims object to.

As shown by the Statist and by the British board of trade the statistics of the London market since the opening of the year have been favorable to silver. Yet the price there has declined from an average of 64.14 cents per ounce for December, 1900, to 61.36 cents per ounce February 25, a drop of some twenty-four points. In the meantime the price of silver is firm at the ideal price, 16 pence per rupee, while shipments of silver to India, China and the Straits, from January 1 to February 1, 1901, show a gain of 420, 819 over the like period in 1900.

Arrivals of silver in London last week reached 237,000 and shipments for the same period 147,000, all to the mints, at Bombay and Calcutta. This shows that the Lewishons are holding nothing back, and that the London end of the concern is making a stiff profit on its Indian sales. The low quotation to the miner at a season of the year when treatment contracts are made is another story.

That the statistical position of silver in this country is unusually favorable is shown by the New York Engineering and Mining Journal. In its issue for last Saturday it says:

"The total imports of silver for the year 1900 were valued by the treasury department at \$58,780,105, of which silver to the value of \$14,699,531 was in coin or bullion, and \$25,080,574 in ores and base bullion. The mistake in the first statement was in including the latter amount, which is really duplicated in the report of silver refined in this country from foreign material. The corrected statement is given below, in values computed at the average price of silver for the year, 61.41 cents per fine ounce:

Production from ores mined in the United States.....	\$37,085,248
Production from imported ores and base bullion.....	28,423,219
Total production.....	\$65,508,467
Imports in coin and refined bullion.....	14,699,531
Total supply from new sources.....	\$80,207,998
Exports, domestic, in coin and refined bullion.....	\$58,756,913
Exports, domestic, in ores and base bullion.....	515,755
Exports, foreign, in coin and refined bullion.....	6,948,996
	66,231,664

Balance retained in U. S., \$13,986,332. Equivalent fine silver at average price, ounce..... 22,779,046. "It is possible that there may be still a small duplication in this statement, since the imports in refined bullion may include some material, in silver bars or ore bars, which is parted or refined in this country, and so included in the quantity produced here from imported ores or bullion. This amount it is not possible to ascertain from the treasury or other reports. The quantity given above represents approximately the silver used in the arts in this country, since there is no reason to believe that there was any large accumulation of stocks during the year."

The imports of silver into the United States, in all forms in 1900 reached \$39,780,105, compared with \$30,843,929 in 1900. Exports of silver to all countries and in all forms footed up \$66,221,664, compared with \$53,461,737 in the year previous. Thus, while this country gained little or no silver from mining compared with 1900 its gain by import was \$5,936,176, which is more than offset by an increase of \$12,750,927 in exports.

The quantity received from South America is increasing, but is still comparatively small. Of the exports last year \$1.4 per cent went to Great Britain, 10 per cent to China, only 2.5 per cent going to other countries. China and India were also the ultimate destinations of a large part of the silver sent to London. We imported in 1900 \$3,078,666 from Mexico and sent to that country but \$32,472, showing that much of the Mexican bullion is handled in our refineries.

If we add these favorable figures to the fact that the bullionizing bills are hopelessly stalled in the house of representatives we may reasonably conclude that the outlook for silver is not half bad. If the mines are not halted by executive action the Sherman bullion reserve will be entirely used up by February, 1902.

If there ever was a set of men whose consciences have been seared with a hot iron, it is the imperialistic preachers. They have become so besotted with commercialism that they cannot distinguish any longer between morals and depravity. When one of them was confronted with a few questions about how he could go into the pulp and read "Thou shalt not kill" and then advocate the killing of the Filipinos and the looting of their islands, he looked at the questioner in the greatest amazement and then declared that a man who would ask such questions must be crazy. That is exactly the way some of the preachers acted when we declared that human slavery should be abolished. These men have come down to a level with the lowest politician.