

WHAT OF THE SILVER DOLLAR?

Under the above caption the Douglas County World-Herald prints the following as to currency:

"THE CONSERVATIVE proclaims, without fear of successful controversion by Allen, Bryan, or any other populist or fusionist, that—Any quantity of gold in bullion or any quantity of silver in bullion should be of exactly the same value as the same quantity of gold or the same quantity of silver in coin. 'The melting pot is the test of coined money. That which loses value in melting is bad money. And that which does not lose is good money.'"

The advocates of bimetallism also say that 'any quantity of gold in bullion or any quantity of silver in bullion should be of exactly the same value as the same quantity of gold or the same quantity of silver in coin.' When silver was admitted to the mints for free and unlimited coinage this was as true of silver as it was of gold. When silver was barred from the mints the price of silver bullion began to decline. Let us restore silver to its mint privileges and thus accomplish what Mr. Morton pretends to desire.

When, however, we agree with Mr. Morton's first statement, it does not necessarily follow that we indorse his second statement that "the melting pot is the test of coined money. That which loses value in melting is bad money. And that which does not lose is good money." Will Mr. Morton enlarge on this point? When a silver dollar is placed in the melting pot it is "good money." It loses its value in melting and becomes not "bad money," but no money at all. Does the fact that the melted dollar has lost its identity as money, or, if you please, its "value," make "bad money" of the silver dollars that have not been melted?

Anticipating that Mr. Morton will answer the last question in the affirmative and will declare the silver dollar is not good money in any condition, The World-Herald would ask how it happens that this government has outstanding something more than \$400,000,000 of "bad money" and its representative?

If "the melting pot is the test of coined money," what of the silver dollar?

THE CONSERVATIVE, answering says:

In 1893 India closed her mints to free coinage because silver had—with the India mints wide open to free coinage—dropped sixteen cents an ounce in the bullion markets of the world. The closing of the mints to free coinage was caused by the discount on silver and not the discount on silver by the closing of the mints. If keeping the mints open to the unlimited free coinage of silver could have brought silver back to par would the mints have been closed? The World-Herald may see here the error of its assertion that "when silver was barred from the mints the price of silver bullion began to decline!"

The historical, recorded fact as to barring silver from the mints is, that it was barred because it had declined as bullion until it was relatively to gold bullion below par. The makeshift authors of the Bland-Allison act which became

a law February 28, 1878, held the same illogical and pernicious views which The World-Herald now advocates. Allison of Iowa and Bland of Missouri declared that opening the mints of the United States to the coinage of silver bullion into four hundred and twelve and a half grain dollars at a rate consuming from two to four millions of ounces a month, besides making those dollars "a legal-tender at their nominal value for all debts and dues public and private" would keep silver up to a par with gold! But the experiment failed utterly. Up to that time from its inception this government had coined only eight millions of silver dollars. And under the Bland-Allison act before 1890 three hundred and eighty millions of new silver dollars were put into circulation and by 1893 there were four hundred and nineteen millions of Bland-Allison silver dollars emitted by the United States mints. But the Bland-Allison act, instead of enhancing silver saw that metal decline fifty per cent as to the value of the bullion in a 412½ grain dollar. The Douglas County World-Herald can observe the fallacy of its reasoning by a perusal of the Bland-Allison act, the message vetoing it by President Hayes and the bullion market reports showing a steady decline. So decidedly a failure, so diametrically different in results from predictions, was this Bland-Allison botch of a law that even its originators and advocates favored its repeal July 14, 1890.

The act of July 14, 1890, took the place of the Bland-Allison failure to maintain the price of silver; it "directed the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of treasury notes thereon." It compels "the secretary of the treasury to purchase from time to time silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces each month, or so much thereof as may be offered." It was thought by McKinley and other advocates of free coinage then prominent that this would help keep up the bullion price of silver. But silver continued to decline. And in 1893 this later makeshift in finance known as the Sherman act was condemned as disastrous to the country and repealed.

Good Money and Bad Money.

The Douglas County World-Herald objects to a quotation from that leading bimetalist of Europe, Henri Cernuschi. He said "the melting pot is the test of coined money. That which loses value in melting is bad money. And that which does not lose is good money."

Before a silver dollar is placed in the melting pot it is good money because the government of the United States has pledged itself to maintain it at a parity with the gold dollar. When it is melted down it becomes bad because the government has not pledged itself to

maintain at a market parity the bullion in a silver dollar with the bullion in a gold dollar. When a gold dollar has been melted down it has, in bullion, the same purchasing power it had as coin. And it needs no governmental aid to make it current in all the markets of mankind. The United States is liable for more than four hundred millions of silver dollars which it has uttered to circulate on and be held at a parity with gold. They, as bullion values, are bad dollars. They are good as currency dollars only because of a pledge which makes them, through treasury notes, convertible into gold.

Melt all the gold coin the United States has ever minted into bullion; melt all the silver coin the same way. And there being no less of purchasing power in the former and a loss of more than fifty per cent purchasing power in the latter, THE CONSERVATIVE concludes that the former is good money and the latter bad money.

"BENEVOLENT ASSIMILATION."

In their amusing and brain-splitting prestidigitations the administration organs and presidential apologists are having a vast amount of fun with themselves and offering no small amount to critical students of our "foreign (foreign in more than one sense) policy." In a recent issue such an "organ" propounds the following questions: "When the Philippines have been conquered by the military arm, what then?" "We cannot undertake to say how this status harmonizes with the president's scheme of benevolent assimilation." "Benevolent assimilation means something else in the common acceptance of language."

It certainly does! But since the advent of McKinleyism, language has been so twisted that even a Philadelphia lawyer could not tell what humanitarianism or constitutionalism means. Freedom seems to mean to buy men first and then assimilate them with benevolent bombs and fixed bayonets. Herrmann is nowhere with McKinley as a prestidigitator. McKinleyism seeks to assimilate men with a club and then give them government milk from the cow of benevolence. This is no new Americanism. It is the same benevolent assimilation we have offered the Indians and the black men. It is the same benevolent assimilation our English connection offered the Hindoos, and the nations of Europe are now offering the Chinese and many African people. It is the kind of benevolent assimilation we offer the thief and murderer. It is the same benevolent assimilation the negro is now receiving in the South. If that kind of assimilation ever succeeds in engendering benevolent feelings in those thus assimilated they possess some kind of an unmanly virtue hitherto unknown among the races of men.

FRANK S. BILLINGS.