It is acknowledged by the gold Monometallists that so far as extreme fluctuations in the value of the precious metals are concerned Bimetallism would be a great advantage. Now if there is one thing more than another which disorganises trade and creates confusion it is extreme fluctuations in the value of the precious metals, because it must be remembered that the functions of money are that it shall be a *measure of value* as well as a *store of value*.

If International Bimetallism became law there would be no fear of the markets being flooded with either of the precious metals — we have already seen that the annual increment of gold and silver has very little effect on their market value— the only difficulty would be to get enough of them and the effect would be to place fiduciary paper upon a firmer basis than it stands upon now.

What are the arguments against International Bimetallism? If athirst for knowledge we turn to the writings of gold monometallists we find that all their prophesies have been negatived by events.

They treat Bimetallists in a derisive sort of fashion as though we were propounding some new fangled nonsense, instead of asserting as we do, the advantages of a monetary system which has stood the test of centuries.

One of the arguments used against International Bimetallism is that, it could not be carried out in event of war because the agreement would then be broken. Now that is a very foolish argument, because there are already international agreements of a very delicate character which are not broken in event of war; witness for instance that of neutrality. But there is a far better reason why the belligerent nations would not break the Bimetallic agreement, and that is, it would be utterly against their interests to do so; in fact it would be financial ruin to them to do so. Thus we find the gold monometallists have to shift their ground from point to point until at last they get all huddled up into one corner and exclaim with one voice "well then, you will never get England to agree to it." But that is simply assertion and not argument, and there is good reason to hope that England will agree. It is only recently that the question has commenced to be understood and it is already getting a firm hold on the public mind.