THE NEW CONGRESS.

Work It May Be Expected To Undertake Soon.

The Financial Question Is One of the Greatest Importance and Cannot Be Shirked or Overlooked.

Now that the republicans have secured the next national house of representatives by a change that can be most fitly described in the language of Chairman Babcock of the congressional committee as a "deluge," it becomes pertinent to ask, What are they going to do with it? Large majorities are always dangerous, whether in legislative bodies or among the masses, and revolutions like that of last Tuesday are apt to lead to false conclusions.

The mistake which is most likely to be made by the majority of republicans in accounting for the result of the elections will probably be in attributing it entirely to a change of sentiment among the voters on the tariff.

No intelligent man can deny that the tariff figured largely in bringing about the immense republican gains, but it was by no means the only factor, and I know whereof I speak when I say that many of the most observing republican leaders fear that the change will be taken as authority from the people to the house to proceed upon the theory that the tariff is the only question to be considered. As a matter of fact the people are not so much concerned about the new tariff law as a whole as about the way in which it was enacted, and I believe, from a somewhat extended observation and study of the question, that if the facts could be arrived at accurately it would be found that dissatisfaction amounting almost to disgust, on account of this, would be found to be the principal cause of revolt, taking the country as a whole—this and the general feeling of unrest and disquiet which led many to seek a change upon general principles.

There is a lesson in Wilson's defeat which was the result of his intentions quite as much as of his accomplishments. In studying this lesson it is, however, well to bear in mind the fate of Mr. McKinley, representing the other extreme, at a former election. There is a lesson in his case as well as in Mr. Wilson's, and it is necessary to put the two together in order to obtain the full benefit of the truth that is taught. Is it not plain that the majority of the people do not want extreme tariff legislation—neither Wilson nor McKinleyism?

Will the republicans display their wisdom? As was said in the beginning, large majorities are dangerous. But there are some reasons for hope.

Ex-Speaker Reed will undoubtedly have a tremendous influence in shaping the policy of the next house. There is little doubt that he will be the next speaker, and as such he will name the ways and means committee. But whatever Reed's course maybe, there are many republican party leaders who will oppose extreme tariff legislation or a general discussion of the tariff question with a view to a radical and wholesale change.

What of the financial question—the silver question, for it amounts to that? I have avoided the discussion of this as one of the causes of the late upheaval, feeling that the people of the Rocky mountain region will be able to supply for themselves all that I could say on this subject. And as for its future in the hands of the republican party, that is a matter for our shrewdest manipulation and earnest progress. We are not without hope in that direction, but it is unnecessary at this time to thresh over the straw that has been beaten so thoroughly in the campaign which has so recently closed. Besides it is yet sixteen months before the change which has been arranged can be made in the house. Let me only add that without an increase of the volume of our currency the disgust and unrest among the people generally, which has been mentioned as one of the causes of the recent revolution, will continue, and unless the republican party shows a disposition to meet this demand, it will rise like a specter to confront that party in 1896. The only legitimate way to meet it is to provide for the use of our silver for money purposes on terms of equality with gold.—T. F. D. in Denver Times-Sun.

A Crucial Test.

The single gold standard is on trial in the United States. The issue between the single and the double standard has become, through national legislation, so plain, so free from other and collateral questions, that the desirability of the former as a fixed or even a temporary national policy is put to a severe test.

Self-appointed leaders of the late populist party profess to see, in the result of the recent election, fresh disappointment for the friends of bimetallism. These callous moiders of public opinion are so pessimistic in their judgment as to create the suspicion that their dismal views are the result of disappointed partisanship rather than of loyalty to the cause with respect to which they claim to be especially appointed.

The late election, so far as it can be considered as affecting the financial controversy, merely cleared the political atmosphere for a full and fair test of the pretensions of monometallists.

That there exists in this country and abroad a depression in the business affairs of men which treads closely upon the heels of disaster, no one can deny.

As to the cause of this depression, there has been a wide difference of opinion. Some say that there is too little money, that the price of money is too high and the price of man's labor and its results too low, a condition which must beget misery and in the end retrogression in place of progress.

The bimetallist not only holds this to be the cause, but holds the remedy to be the free coinage fo silver.

The monometallist, while admitting the dangerous condition of affairs, has sought to find the reason for it somewhere else than in a deficient currency.

At one time it was the Bland law and its repeal would surely bring the relief sought. The Bland law was repealed, but relief failed to put in an appearance. At another time it was the purchase clause of the Sherman law that bore the burden of a country's woe. The purchase clause was repealed, but the country looked in vain for the promised relief.

The democratic monometa llists insisted that republican high tariff was the culprit, and so successfully that this party was placed in power.

Tariff tinkering was undertaken. Free trade in doses was administered, but the disease raged with unabated fury.

The repuplican monometallists maintain that democracy's threat and partial accomplsihment of free trade was the responsible cause of business depression and financial disaster, and with such success that the verdict of the people has just been reversed.

Summing up, we have two distinct failures chargeable to monometallic nostrums. We have partial free trade on trial, the recorded judgment of the people that congress shall go no further in that direction, and therefore a quietus put upon the threat of continued disturbance in tariff affairs.

Should relief not come to those industries affected by the free trade enactments of the last congress, then the single gold standard is driven to bay and cannot escape the responsibility for continued disaster, misfortune and failure.

The late election has brought about that which is essential to the success of bimetallism—a true test, stripped of all complications, of the efficacy of monometallism.

The monometallist has exhausted every subterfuge. He must now meet, and meet fairly, the issue as between the wisdom of a single or a double standard. He can no longer shift the responsibility for general business depression at will and according to circumstance, upon free trade or protection.—Denver Times-Sun.