Also, resolutions of the Farmers' Alliance, No. 42, Whitley County, Indiana, praying for the passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILES: Petition of citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., in favor of a bill for return of second-class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MOFFITT: Petition of C. P. Whitney and 96 others, citizens of Dickinson, N. Y., praying for the prompt passage of House bill 5987—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PARRETT: Petition and papers of Presley Hale, for pension, to accompany House bill 10457—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition, affidavit, and papers of Alexander Moore, for pension, to accompany House bill 10456—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Capt. G. R. Kellams, for pension, to accompany House bill 10555—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition, affidavit, and papers of Thomas J. Reed, for pension, to accompany House bill 10458—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINES: Petition of residents of Eddytown, Yates County, New York, for the passage of House bill 5987—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of New York, favoring passage of House bill 5987—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of citizens of Twenty-fourth District of Pennsylvania, asking for a national Sunday-rest law, against needless work in the Government's mail and military service and interstate commerce—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. REED, of Iowa: Eight petitions, to-wit: of 167 citizens of Malvern, Mills County, Iowa; of 38 citizens of Council Bluffs, Iowa; of 78 voters of Macedonia, Pottawatomie County, Iowa; of 27 voters of Guthrie County, Iowa; of 16 voters of Stanton, Montgomery County, Iowa; of 42 voters of Villisca, Montgomery County, Iowa; of 19 voters of Hawthorne, Montgomery County, Iowa; of 108 voters of Cass County, Iowa, praying for the passage of an act prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors into a State in contravention of the laws thereof—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, three petitions, of 75 citizens of Cass County, Iowa; of 300 citizens of Mills County, Iowa; of 200 citizens of Montgomery County, Iowa, asking for the enactment of a statute forbidding the importation of intoxicating liquors into States in which the sale of such liquors is prohibited by law—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Thomas McGuire, of Pulaski County, Arkansas, praying for the reference of his claim to the Court of Claims under act of March 3, 1883—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Petition of George M. Walter and 39 others, of Cabarrus County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENEY: Petition of A. J. McClure and 51 others, citizens of Putnam County, Ohio, praying that a pension be granted to Allen Strickland, late private Company F, Thirty-first Ohio Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SKINNER: Petition of Slade Chapman and others, of Pitt County, North Carolina, asking passage of Senate bill 2716—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SNIDER: Petition of William H. Cowles, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring free tuition for students with defective hearing at the National Deaf-Mute College at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWENEY: Three petitions of 108 voters of Clayton County, Iowa; of 48 voters of Fayette County, Iowa; of 26 voters of Floyd County, Iowa, in favor of the passage of an act prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors into a State in contravention of the laws thereof—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade, the Denver Real Estate Exchange and Denver Produce Exchange, of Denver, Colo., to make all obligations, contractual and non-contractual, payable at the option of the debtor in gold or silver or in gold or silver certificates—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of citizens of Bent County, Colorado, to open the Fort Lyon and old Fort Lyon military reservation to settlement—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TUCKER: Petition of Peter Sheets, of Augusta County, Virginia, praying that his war claim be referred to the Court of Claims under provisions of Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of H. C. Ferguson and 40 others, citizens of Appomattox County, Virginia, asking passage of Senate bill 2716—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TURNER, of Kansas: Petition of J. J. Breker and 315 others, of Reading, Pa., asking legislation prohibiting the adulteration of beer—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of M. K. Graff and 160 others, of Reading, Pa., asking legislation prohibiting the adulteration of beer—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WALKER, of Missouri: Petition of H. J. Statler and 45 others, citizens of Bollinger County, Missouri, asking passage of House bill 8984—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama: Petition of S. F. McGlocklin and 38 others, of Limestone County, Alabama, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of T. W. Motes and 236 others, of Limestone County, Alabama, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of M. A. Cook and 59 others, of Jackson County, Alabama, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charlotte Wallace, Lauderdale County, Alabama, asking that claim be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITING: Petition of John H. Brabb and 49 others, of Romeo, Mich., asking passage of a law for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILEY: Petition of citizens of St. Remy, Ulster County, New York, asking passage of House bill 5987—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILKINSON: Petition of Dr. D. Bornio and 17 others, of the city of New Orleans, La., protesting against the passage of sections 24 and 25 of House bill 8278, which would cause the destruction of the business known as ticket brokerage—to the Committee on Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June* 5, 1890.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 19, 1890, a report from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, containing the reply of the Commissioner to the letter of the governor of Florida, relating to swamp and overflowed land selections in that State; which, on motion of Mr. CALL, was, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented resolutions adopted by the United Presbyterian Church of North America, in general assembly at Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of the bill subjecting all intoxicating liquors shipped into the several States to the laws of such States; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PIERCE presented a petition of citizens of Nelson County, North Dakota, praying for the passage of a law to prevent the importation into any State or Territory of the United States from any other State or Territory, or from any foreign country, of any intoxicating liquors or any article the sale of which is prohibited by its constitution and laws; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of members of Dickey County Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of North Dakota, praying for the passage of the service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CASEY presented a petition of the Farmers' Alliance of Jamestown, N. Dak., praying for the passage of House bill 5353, known as the Butterworth bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Farmers' Alliance of Jamestown, N. Dak., praying for the passage of House bill 283, relating to compound lard; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of C. G. Strandberg and 21 others, citizens of Crystal River, Fla., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 3417, for the protection of actual settlers under the homestead and pre-emption laws upon phosphate lands in that State; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WASHBURN presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of the Windom silver bill before the adjournment of Congress; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the establishment of a limited postal-telegraph system substantially as outlined in Senate bill 1557; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. TELLER presented the petition of Erastus S. Joslyn, of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the passage of Senate bill 3616, for the relief of H. C. Stanton, administrator, and Erastus S. Joslyn; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of the Farmers' Alliance of Johnson County, Nebraska, and a petition of the Farmers' Alliance of Geranium, Nebr., praying for the passage of what are known as the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Conger compound-lard bill and the Butterworth option bill; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented a petition of salt manufacturers on St. Clair River, in the State of Michigan, praying for the repeal of the rebate on salt; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of the New York State Hop-Growers' Association and a petition of 91 citizens of Franklin County, New York, praying for a tariff duty of 15 cents per pound on imported hops; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3073) to construct a macadamized road from the city of Petersburgh, Va., to the national cemetery in the county of Dinwiddie, in said State, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. DAWES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3982) granting to the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska Railway Company power to sell and convey to the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company all the railway, property, rights, and franchises of the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska Railway Company in the Territory of Oklahoma and in the Indian Territory, reported it with amendments.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 330) for the relief of the honorably discharged soldiers, Thomas Wright and John Lamb, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3054) for the relief of William Smith and others, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 9961) granting a pension to Oran M. Collingsworth;

A bill (H. R. 6592) to grant a pension to Rachel Levy; and

A bill (H. R. 1824) granting a pension to Mrs. Christiana Frederika Zeutmeyer, of Fairfield, Minn.

Mr. HAMPTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4041) to remove the charge of desertion against William Gibbon, reported it without amendment.

Mr. PIERCE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 109) for the relief of Lucinda W. Grover, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3107) for the relief of Col. James Lindsay, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3596) granting to the Rio Grande Southern Railroad Company the right of way through the Fort Lewis military reservation in La Plata County, in the State of Colorado, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2855) for the relief of Matthew W. Berryman, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6454) to establish a national military park at the battle-field of Chickamauga, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. EVARTS, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred a resolution submitted by Mr. BATE May 13, 1890, directing the committee to inquire by what authority the public square north of the Executive Mansion has been selected for the site of the proposed monument to General Lafayette, submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3015) making an appropriation for a public monument to the memory of John Ericsson, the inventor and constructor of the Monitor, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6519) granting a pension to William M. Nourse, of Knoxville, Tenn.;

A bill (H. R. 6305) for the relief of Hayden Sorter; and

A bill (H. R. 8221) granting a pension to William White.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3398) for the relief of Samuel G. Hunter, asked that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia; which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PASCO introduced a bill (S. 4011) to authorize the Canaveral and South Florida Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Indian River and one across the Banana River, both in the State of Florida, and to establish the same, in each case, as a post-road; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 4012) to amend and re-enact section 3 of chapter 287 of the Statutes at Large, approved March 3, 1879; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4013) for the relief of Asa Kelly; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 4014) granting a pension to Emma L. Cain and minor children; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4015) granting a pension to Mary A. Curtis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PIERCE introduced a bill (S. 4016) granting a pension to Frank C. Myrick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a bill (S. 4017) for the relief of Nathan Kimball, postmaster at Ogden, Utah; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 4018) granting a pension to Persis Barnard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HIGGINS introduced a bill (S. 4019) for the relief of the officers and enlisted men of the Fifth and Sixth Regiments Delaware Volunteer Infantry and their legal representatives; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a bill (S. 4020) granting a pension to Stephen G. Folsom; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BARBOUR introduced a bill (S. 4021) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to amend and cancel the subdivision of part of square 112, known as Cooke Park; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a bill (S. 4022) to prohibit the exportation of intoxicating liquors to Africa and the islands of the Pacific Ocean; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MANDERSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 92) directing that names of sharp-shooters and military service institution medalists shall be inscribed in Army Register, and authorizing the wearing of their decorations by such medalists; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 93) providing for the printing of Report on the Forests of North America, for sale; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. PAYNE introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 94) declaring the retirement of Capt. Charles B. Stivers, of the United States Army, valid, and that he is entitled as such retired officer to his pay; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. BERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES FISH COMMISSION.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Fisheries in the investigation of the administration of the affairs of the United States Fish Commissioner's office, ordered by the resolutions of the Senate of the 3d instant, be authorized to employ a stenographer, and that the expenses of the investigation be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

CHARLES F. BOWERS.

Mr. McPHERSON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1293) for the relief of Charles F. Bowers.

REFUNDING TAX CLAIMS.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the vote to indefinitely postpone Senate bill 504, which was taken a week ago yesterday, be reconsidered, and that the bill with the adverse report be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 504) for the relief of the Continental Fire Insurance Company, the Eagle Fire Insurance Company, the City Fire Insurance Company, and the Commercial Mutual Insurance Com-

pany, all of New York City; the Western National Bank, the Merchants' National Bank, the Maryland Fire Insurance Company, and the Chesapeake Bank, of Baltimore, Md., and the Eastern Railroad Company of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed will be reconsidered, and the bill, with the adverse report, placed on the Calendar. It is so ordered.

TREASURY NOTES AND SILVER BULLION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If there be none, that order is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 2350) authorizing the issue of Treasury notes on deposits of silver bullion.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, a great many of our fellow-citizens, I believe a majority, are opposed to opening our mints to the free coinage of the silver of the world into legal-tender money. In my judgment the national conventions of both parties by a decisive majority would repudiate such a proposition. The last Democratic convention ignored the question altogether. The Republican national convention certainly was decidedly opposed to it, and if directly voted upon there I think an overwhelming majority would have been recorded in opposition.

The people opposed to free coinage include the possessors of the larger portion of our national wealth, and while they are investors in bank stocks, railroad stocks and bonds, and are largely the proprietors of our mineral deposits and manufacturing industries, in all that part of the country with which I am conversant they include nine-tenths of the agricultural population. Intelligent mechanics and "wage-earners"—I did not invent the phrase—are opposed to our free coinage of the world's silver. I believe that every man who has accumulated a surplus of property, or expects to by honest methods, over and above the expected expenditures, is opposed to it. I assert that to the opponents of the free coinage of silver this country is indebted for the capital and enterprise that have developed our agricultural, mineral, and manufacturing resources, and those who have extended and perfected our system of transportation; for twenty years they have extended our railroad system at the rate of 6,000 miles per year, creating States and building villages and cities. If they possess the wealth of the country they also have been endowed with the energy and ability to successfully use it in supplying homes and employment for millions of their fellow-citizens annually and for the development of the country. Nevertheless, in the discussion of this question they have been arraigned as "oppressors, usurers, robbers, and the obstructors" of national progress. "Wall street" is a term supposed to suggest conscienceless greed for and criminal methods to obtain money, and has been applied to the investors and creditor class of our people indiscriminately.

In 1873 silver was demonetized, and whoever carefully examines the record must be impressed that the movement was heartily approved by those at least who then represented the States that now, through their Representatives, clamor the most vociferously for the free coinage of silver. Those from the more easterly sections of the country who favored the measure are now denounced as criminals; the dead are pursued to their graves, and the living are assaulted in the honorable positions conferred upon them by their countrymen, and for the obvious purpose of convincing people somewhere that they have been robbed of valuable rights which they should hasten to repossess or regain.

Some of the advocates of this measure scarcely attempt to conceal in their rhetoric an appeal to that class of persons which is sorely burdened with debts and obligations to support the measure for the reason that it may prove a legal method of repudiation. Cheap money, with legal-tender qualities to pay and discharge individual indebtedness, seems to inspire very much of the eloquence we hear.

The people in all of the older States where the industries—and, mark you, I include agriculture—are well established, are opposed to the free coinage of the world's silver by our Government; this is the rule in the agricultural States. In those States where silver ore is a product or adventure and speculation have overstepped the boundary of discretion, very many are willing to accept a depreciated currency, with the expectation that this will advance the value of silver, and others hoping it may inflate property values for speculative purposes, and a majority doubtless are in favor of our free coinage of the world's silver.

It is a notorious fact that for years bonds and mortgages in the new States have been canvassed for and solicited by companies organized for the purpose, and placed in an Eastern market, and agricultural prosperity has been impeded thereby and their burden has become oppressive, and Western farmers who mortgaged to increase their holdings or to improve their property are distressed financially and many may be ready to accept any legal-tender money, even to the point of repudiation, that promises to relieve them of their indebtedness. Imbued with a spirit of speculation they risked beyond their resources and ability to pay; to a greater or less extent this has always been the experience in the development of new States, but the condition is not normal or natural to the whole country, which, therefore, will not debase or degrade the currency to afford relief to improvidence and reckless speculation.

I do not intend in this discussion to spend time over the history of money or the essays of the various writers on that subject. I grant that the larger the volume of money employed by a people in its domestic commerce the greater may be the value of the property as measured by it, but I most emphatically deny that prosperity will necessarily follow, and a recent illustration of this may be found in the Confederate currency during the late rebellion. I may as well say now as later on, in response to what we have heard in respect to the per capita amount of currency a Government should provide for its people (the amount in France and other countries has been referred to), that there should be an ample volume for the transaction of business, to regulate the rate of interest and value of property, and to facilitate its exchange; but that amount must depend upon the habits and intelligence of a people, the banking facilities, public and individual confidence in credits, and the distribution of money throughout a country.

If a people are ignorant they will hoard their money; if the banks are few in number, concentrated, with or without the established credit, the latter case of course the most embarrassing; if there is meager information of the financial strength of merchants and traders and an absence of facilities to obtain more or an indisposition to employ such facilities; or if the money is accumulated mainly at one point, and from that point distribution must be made for purchase, or other form of expenditure, an immense volume is required to create a sense of security and for remittance in trade in the exchange of commodities or the discharge of obligations.

With the conditions I have stated favorable, as they are in this country, a comparatively small amount is hoarded compared with our internal trade and commerce. A smal lamount is at any one time in process of remittance or transportation. Checks, drafts, bills of lading, and postal orders are as much a part of our currency as the representative note of coin, gold, or silver. Investigations by the Comptroller of the Currency demonstrate that not less than 94 or 95 per cent. of our commercial transactions through the agencies of banks are represented by checks and drafts, and that the percentage of coin and paper money actually exchanged or paid is not more than 5 or 6 per cent. in the volume of their transactions. I do not urge this as against increasing the volume of currency, but to illustrate that the volume of currency required in France, where nearly if not all the conditions I stated at the outset are less favorable than here, does not indicate the amount our people require.

I will now attempt to fairly state the position of those people so often criticised in the Senate as "oppressors, usurers, and robbers of the poor." No doubt there was a profound sentiment among them in favor of retaining our national-bank currency, but sometime since the hope was abandoned and in its place they accepted as a solution of the currency question and now favor, as I believe, a paper currency based dollar for dollar upon the coinage value of gold and the bullion value of silver. It is recognized that of the two metals gold is the more valuable as a commodity, and for the purpose of disposing of this question it is absolutely inconsequential how it became so. The fact exists and must be accepted, and in our coinage ratio of 16 to 1 of gold it follows that an equal purchasing power must be maintained—the silver with the gold dollar—or the latter will be retired from use. I do not suppose that any one contends that gold and silver dollars will be used side by side here, the one possessing 30 per cent., or the fraction even of 1 per cent., more purchasing or paying power than the other in the markets of the world.

It has been charged that capital is in favor of contraction. I deny it. It is invested in business or in stocks, real estate, and securities dependent upon industrial property. The owners are opposed to contraction and opposed to the free coinage of silver, believing that the silver dollar of 412½ grains would be less in its purchasing value than the gold dollar. Consequently the gold currency would be withdrawn from circulation, and to the extent of its volume, $680,000,000, for some time contracting the currency, and until exchanged for the less valuable silver with less purchasing power; they are opposed to either result.

In my judgment there is a practical agreement, by those gentlemen who are here supposed to favor contraction, that the Government should purchase silver at its bullion value up to the extreme limit that the silver coined into dollars, in the ratio of 16 to 1 of gold, can be maintained at the equal value of gold coinage in purchasing and paying power. They are in favor of buying for coinage and using as money for the basis of circulation all that we can use in commerce, and not drive out or retire gold from circulation.

The proposition, as I have stated it, it seems to me, would be accepted by all our people if understood, and without any considerable disagreement. In addition to our own production of gold, it has been constantly coming to us from abroad for years in balances aggregating $108,000,000 in the last fifteen years. During that entire period and longer our exports of merchandise to foreign countries have been in excess of our imports. Neither gold nor silver will come to us from abroad,

except in exchange for commodities, including stocks, bonds, and other securities, and for investment in property here. Balances from trade in the markets of the world are settled in gold, and will be, however we may legislate upon this subject. The amount of our exportations in excess of our importations will be settled in gold. No one contemplates an economic policy on the part of our Government, in view of our vast natural resources, that can change the balance against us, and from that source there should be a continual inflow of gold here from abroad if we maintain the equality between our gold and silver dollars.

Again, as long as the parity is maintained the foreign purchases of American securities and investment in American property and industries—foreign investments here—will be in gold, and from that source the inflow will be increased. Who challenges that gold as the basis of circulation is not equally good with silver? In all the silver-standard countries—I mean where the mints are open to the free coinage of all silver—there currency is at a discount with gold, and the inevitable result would be that so long as we were able under free coinage to maintain our coined silver nearer to the value of gold than elsewhere a speculative movement would force foreign silver upon us in exchange for our gold coinage, rapidly displacing it until at the same premium here as in the other silver countries.

It is self-evident that holders of American gold would exchange it for silver, coined or uncoined, for coinage here if we opened our mints to free coinage, so long as the American silver dollar as compared with gold had a greater purchasing power here than with silver elsewhere, and it follows that gold would be forced from circulation; it would be inevitable; and in this discussion I am not aware that any advocate of free coinage has declared in favor of this effect, but it is impossible to disguise that this issue is fairly presented by the proposition for our free coinage of the world's silver. The clamor, however, is for more money, not for poorer money; to increase the volume, not to impair its quality. The effect would be not to increase the volume immediately at least—rather contraction—but when increased a prompt degradation in its purchasing and debt-paying power would follow.

Who favors or will advocate the elimination of gold from our currency? Since the organization of the United States Mint in 1799, to and including 1889, we have coined of gold $1,511,532,733, and $584,543,528.20 of silver. From 1878 to and including 1889, our gold mines have yielded $419,875,000, and the commercial value of our silver production during the same period has been $483,030,000. In fifteen years we have imported, in exchange for property exported, or for securities and investment here, more than $108,000,000 in excess of exportations of gold. Why then would it be preferable that our domestic productions of gold should be sent abroad or that the steady inflow should cease? And I desire here again to deny that the wealth of the country or our national banks oppose or that there is any considerable sentiment, in Wall street even, against a silver currency. Both are wanted, gold and silver, but the latter in that quantity only that will permit our retaining the other as money and as a circulating medium.

If, sir, opening our mints to the free coinage of silver would increase and permanently maintain the value of the world's silver equal to the value of gold in the ratio of our coinage (16 to 1) the objection to free coinage would cease. If any Senator in this discussion has openly proclaimed his belief that it would I failed to hear him, and if there be one who did so, his expression of opinion was not justified by the facts and can not be established to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced investigator of the subject; but, assuming such a conclusion, one of the reasons for free coinage here fails, as the only effect upon the volume of the currency would be the possible exchange of a gold dollar for 412½ grains of foreign silver, for I suppose the world's product of silver is practically all used as money somewhere or in the arts.

It is a fact that must not be ignored in this discussion that trading nations—people of a higher and more general intelligence and farthest advanced in civilization—prefer gold for their currency, and if there be any disposition on their part to halt in this policy, I have not discovered it. It is true political writers have discussed the question and there has been some agitation abroad, but in governmental circles the abandoment of gold as a standard by the most advanced European nations does not receive serious consideration, and without their concurrent action free coinage here would not raise silver to the gold standard.

The Senator from Oregon alluded, in his remarks the other day, to a letter written by Ottomar Haupt, a French financier, and from which I now read:

PARIS, *April* 26, 1890.

SIR: Although I have not the honor of being personally known to you and even without any introduction, I take the liberty of addressing you on a subject with which I am thoroughly acquainted and which in point of fact forms for a long number of years my particular study.

My name and my works are well known in the States; the American Government has for ever so long been a subscriber to my books, and the Directors of the Mint belong to my correspondence. At present I exchange letters with Mr. E. O. Leech, who, perhaps, will be good enough to explain matters further with regard to my knowledge about the question which I wish to bring before you, and which concerns the adoption of the silver bill in its present form.

Allow me to say at once that I am struck with surprise at the very idea that such a bill could ever become law in your country. If this really were the case you would rouse the whole financial and commercial world against you: you would provocate hundreds and thousands of arbitrage operations and others in order to inundate you with the depreciated silver against withdrawal of your valuable gold.

It is impossible to give you in this letter as accurate account of what would happen in point of fact, but if you will kindly refer to pages 13 and 14 of the accompanying book (a history of money by the same writer) you will see what the consequences would be if America, Germany, and France were to do what you wish to undertake single handed. These three countries—mighty as they are—all three together would break down in the course of time. How can you suppose for a moment that you alone can oppose depreciated and demonetized silver at a high price, all the world against you?

Here is then the true situation of the various states which you have to watch closely, and whose monetary politics will and must counteract and cause you confusion, loss, and regret.

First you have Roumania. This country is going to demonetize twenty-five or thirty millions in 5-franc pieces, and such is the speed displayed on the part of the Government with regard to the news from America that the minister of finance invites offers for the sale of that money already on the 10th of May next.

Then there is Belgium. You know what will happen with the Latin Union whose dissolution, or, to be more correct, whose settlement of the silver accounts, is close at hand. Already at the end of this very year the three debtor countries, Belgium, Italy, and Greece, have to take back from France their depreciated 5-franc pieces.

As you of course know, the Dutch Chambers have long ago already placed a discretionary power to sell 25,000,000 florins in pieces of 2½ florins, in the hands of the minister of finance, who, as a matter of course, will seize the first opportunity when you will raise the price of silver to sell you as much as he can.

But now comes the principal point in the whole affair, which, strange to say, has not been touched by anybody, and which alone should dictate your policy with regard to silver.

I speak of Germany. You are fully aware of the fact that this country stopped its sales of silver in 1878, when silver fell to about 50*d*. The loss was too heavy, they said at the time. But the thalers must be sold, as they have nothing more to do with the gold currency, and I myself have already seen the ministers and the leading persons of Government circles in order to engage them to resume at once these sales when circumstances will permit it. This without doubt will be done, and then, say 450,000,000 marks of fine silver will come on the market.

So you see, sir, that there are enormous quantities of the metal to sell at this present moment—millions and millions of dollars.

I beg to say that your whole country, your currency, and your credit will be ruined when you brave these evident, these palpable offers and sales, which will come, nay, which present themselves already this very day.

Suppose the bill is adopted, what will the consequence be? You will have to buy and coin 4,500,000 fine ounces per month, or 54,000,000 ounces per year—$70,000,000. Your country will yield, say, $39,000,000, less $8,000,000 used in the arts—will leave $51,000,000. You will therefore have to buy abroad, say, $20,000,000 against payment in gold.

Last year you had already a balance of export of gold against you of $50,000,000. Suppose, two years only go on in this way, you will lose twice $70,000,000—$140,000,000 in gold—and gain on the other hand two years' coinages at $70,000,000—$140,000,000 in silver.

I assume with others that your stock of gold is even $680,000,000 against $450,000,000 in silver on the 1st of July, fractional currency included; two years hence you will have $540,000,000 in gold against $590,000,000 in silver.

The commercial community of the whole world will look with suspicion on your manipulations. Silver can not, will not reach the old price at about 59*d*. (your coinage price); a free premium will be offered to all bankers of America and Europe to sell it "a bear" without the least danger.

The Indian parities of the exchange on London will never follow the price of the metal which you mean to dictate. Such confusion may arise of this state of things that silver may be called back from India and sold to America.

Beware of exaggerations. Already the price of silver to-day—48*d*. and $1.07 in New York—is out of question with regard to the Indian exchange, which ought to be accorded to this price nearly 1*s*. 6½*d*. per rupee, while it stands at 1*s*. 5¾*d*.

Pardon my addressing you such a letter; but I take the greatest interest in your country and wish to prove it.

The accuracy of the foregoing statements is accepted by the commercial public, and, if true, they may well startle those who favor our free coinage of the world's silver. Still they are not more serious than would be the speculative movements that would force silver upon us in the manner I have suggested.

Commencing with May and ending with December, 1889, we lost $49,661,101 by exports of gold, bullion, and coin. The commercial people of the world are greedy for our gold.

Mr. President, in the discussion of this question we have heard gloomy descriptions of our situation at the present time, prophecies of the prosperity and beneficent effect that would follow free coinage. In the past, prophecies of the effect of this or that economic policy have already been fulfilled, and national progress is marked by the wrecked reputations of the careful observers who attempted to forecast the future, and I shall spend no time in respect to the, as I esteem them, wild assertions of what may be reasonably expected.

A word, however, in respect to the financial condition of European and our own people, the progress being made, and the clamor that prosperity has been impeded. And first, I will call attention to some few facts that I have been able to collect in respect to Germany. The German Government has come in for its full share of criticism, and we might expect a revolution there as soon as the speeches we have heard had reached the German people if that highly intelligent, trading, and commercial people believed them.

Between 1880 and 1887 the sugar product of Germany increased 64 per cent., and her export of sugar increased 82 per cent.; her employés in mining in the same period increased 21 per cent., and the product in pig and foundry iron increased in the same period 48 per cent.; the workers on her iron and steel in the period from 1875 to 1882 increased 22 per cent. in number, and the product from manufactures of iron and steel increased from 1880 to 1888 26 per cent.; her total export trade from 1880 to 1888, inclusive, increased 26 per cent. in volume and 11 per cent. in value; the tonnage of railroads from 1885 to 1887, both inclusive, increased 10 per cent.; her water transportation in passengers increased 16 per cent. and in tonnage 52 per cent. in the same period.

The increase of her population from 1875 to 1885 was only 9.6 per

cent. Poor Germany, the demonetization of silver has evidently ruined her, crushing her industries, oppressing her people, and we may expect her to promptly follow our example—if we set one—of rushing to a silver standard.

Let me invite your attention for a moment to our own industries, the manufacture of cottons, woolen goods, chemicals, paper, agricultural implements, lumber, flour, glass, iron, and steel, and ship-building, the leading industries of our country.

These industries are so organized that their reports practically give us their condition now as compared with ten years ago. The estimated capital employed in 1890 is $1,784,740,082 as against $1,165,015,748 for 1880; the hands employed in 1890 are estimated at 1,274,383 as against 844,776 in 1880; there was paid in wages in 1880 $256,795,327, and it is estimated that $350,689,508 will be paid in 1890; the value of material used in 1880 was $1,197,204,561, and the estimate for 1890 is $1,576,302,978; the value of the product in 1880, $1,774,127,423, and the estimate for 1890 is $2,293,779,228.

In the last eight years the metallic products of the United States have increased $50,000,000 worth; and in what are known as non-metallic products the increase has been nearly $100,000,000.

So far as one is able to estimate from the statistics that have been furnished by the leading industries, the reports of the Agricultural Department and those of the Geological Survey, the wealth per capita in this country has increased in the last decade to $1,000. From 1870 to 1880 the increase was from $780 to $870.

In the six cereal products (wheat, corn, rye, oats, barley, buckwheat), as reported by the statistician of the Department of Agriculture, there was an increase of 44.3 per cent. in the average annual production and of 30 per cent. in the average farm value of crops for the past nine years over that for the preceding ten years.

The two decades preceding 1880, in respect to material prosperity of our country, are without parallel in the history of the nations of the world. The expenditures by the General Government and by the States amounted to at least $9,000,000,000, not paid in exchange for property for the people or the development of the country, but to support armies in the field and prosecute a great civil war. Property of the value of $1,200,000,000 was destroyed in the seceding States, and for four years their productions, in those pursuits which create national and individual wealth, were suspended. Nearly three millions of workers and producers were for three years called from our industries; nearly half a million of men were killed in the conflict, and a million more were disabled in various degrees. The funded national debt reached nearly $3,000,000,000. It has been reduced to less than eight hundred millions. The valuation of the property of the people in 1860 amounted to about $16,000,000,000, including the value of the slaves; in 1870 to $30,000,000,000, and the slaves had been enfranchised; in 1880 to over $43,000,000,000, and, as indicated from the returns from the largest industries of the country and the reports I have referred to, the last decade will show an increase in property and prosperity largely in excess of either the two preceding it.

It was asserted here the other day that our country was filled with idle men and unemployed labor. I deny it. Idleness is not enforced, and there is labor for all at remunerative rates. Annually for ten years over five hundred thousand immigrants have sought our country for employment, and with these yearly additions from abroad to our labor force there has not been any decrease in the rate of wages during that period. The immigrants find employment and continue to come.

I have already given the increase in the number of those employed in our mechanical industries. The number engaged in agriculture is not so available. Their wages, however, are not fixed by organizations in that industry formed to regulate prices, but depend upon the law of supply and demand. The subject has been investigated by the Agricultural Department, through its regular correspondents and agents, and from which report I quote the following result:

The average daily wages of the ordinary farm laborer in the State of New York in 1879 was 92 cents without board and 68 cents with board; in 1880, $1.21 without board and 90 cents with board; and for 1890, $1.23 cents without board and 90 cents with board.

In the State of Illinois in 1879 the same laborers received $1.01 without board and 73 cents with board, and in 1890, $1.13 without board and 86 cents with board.

In Iowa in 1879 the same laborers received $1.12 without board and 80 cents with board, and in 1890, $1.23 without board and 95 cents with board. There has been no material change during the past ten years in the daily wages paid in that the greatest and the most important of all our industries, where, as I have stated, the demand absolutely fixes the price without the intervention of organizations. In this connection permit me to add that the labor supply in the mechanical industries is recruited from immigration and farm laborers, with the result that relative wages for years have been established between the two, and there has been no decline in the value off arm labor, notwithstanding the price of the products of agriculture—or their farm value—is somewhat lower at the present time than in the preceding years. This depression has been dwelt upon as due to the contraction of currency and as an evidence that our industries are not prospering.

But at this point I will eliminate agriculture from the discussion and confine myself to transportation, the mechanical or manufacturing industry, referring to agriculture again later. The lower rates of the one and the decreased values of the products of the others are in no sense an evidence that they are not prospering. Often has the fact been dwelt upon here in our tariff discussion that both were due to the increased tonnage of the one and the increased product of the other, aided by the improved machinery, methods, and management of both. The vast supply of manufactured products of this country, also contributed to the world's supply, has forced down the price here and everywhere, but a smaller profit upon an increased volume of business has equally well compensated the labor and capital employed. What I have stated with reference to the condition of these leading industries of this country demonstrates that they have enjoyed as high or a higher degree of prosperity in this decade than in any preceding it.

That the mechanical or manufacturing industries and transportation companies are prosperous is proved beyond dispute by the continued investment of capital in them, their growth and extension, and the increase of the labor they employ.

Special mention, however, should be made of agriculture; and it must be borne in mind that the severity of competition, from the increase in the quantity produced, by the increased facilities for and the reduction in charges for transportation extending the area of supply and productive power of the world, now, as they always have, affect prices. Within ten years the agricultural acreage of this country has been extended 1,500,000 acres at least. Our various agricultural products, including meat, for the past year were largely in excess of those of ten years ago, and above the relative increase in population; what I mean is that the production has advanced faster than the population has increased.

South America grows more wheat than is required for her domestic consumption. This is true of Australasia; India has a surplus of from 10 to 15 per cent. Eastern Europe raises a surplus and Western Europe is practically the only market for all the surplus.

The Suez Canal and the extension of the railroad systems in foreign countries have extended agriculture, largely increased its products and sharpened the competition with us, and a decline in price, it should be borne in mind, is never in the ratio of the increase in the product, but greater. Especially is this true if there is a surplus beyond the ordinary consumption; then the market will be supplied until the price there reaches very nearly if not exactly the cost of transportation from the point of actual production. It is proper to remark in this connection that the decline in the export price does not measure the decline in the farm value. I have seen it stated by a careful statistician that the decline in the cost of transportation of a bushel of wheat from Chicago to New York within a few years—twenty at the outside—has been nearly 30 cents.

It must also be borne in mind that this lessened cost of transportation must first be deducted from the export price before it is any indication of the price at the point of production.

I do not desire it understood that I am opposed to any expansion of our currency. Quite the contrary; but I am opposed to any legislation that in my judgment would produce, as I believe the opening of our mints to the free coinage of the world's silver would, an immediate contraction of our currency, for a period of time at least, and certainly until we were absolutely upon a silver basis. I am opposed to any policy that depreciates the standard value of our money below that which measures the commerce of the world. In time probably free coinage would substitute silver for our gold and inflate the currency to just the extent that the bullion value of silver is below that of gold; but that it will correspondingly increase the value of property has not been the experience of India, and whether that increase applied to our commercial transactions and our vast possessions of property would to any considerable degree enhance domestic values is a question I do not care to discuss. I believe that it would disarrange business; from an expectation that it might advance prices unhealthy speculation would be promoted, the percentage of credits to the capital employed would be increased, and depression and bankruptcy would swiftly follow.

So long as we trade with other nations gold will measure the value of the commodity in exchange or foreign commerce, and if the purchasing power of our money is decreased, to that extent the wages paid to the wage-earner all over the country, on the farm, in the shop and factory, and in transportation, would have less purchasing power; which would mean less compensation, and an increase in wages would eventually follow the first payment in the depreciated currency, and then all classes of proprietors, on farms and in factories, and upon lines of transportation, would be compelled to pay for labor and for all their supplies and raw materials practically upon a gold basis at least.

The rates are now fairly adjusted to the capital employed, cost, market values, and profit, and for eight or ten years there has been little or no variation. Neither has there been any considerable variation within the same period in the price or value of food products, clothing, rents, etc., purchased by the workingmen or laborers; their living expenses, including the entire range of expenditures, have been unchanged or lowered. The effect of separation of gold and silver will be the same as between the two metals in Mexico, the Central and South American States, India, and other countries: less purchasing power. The strug-

gle to increase the wages of labor would be long and severely contested. Proprietors would hardly know the advance they could afford to pay for the advance in their price would be speculative, varying with the premium on gold. Labor, in justice, would be entitled to it because the depreciated or clipped dollar paid for wages would have less purchasing power.

I favor most emphatically the maintaining of the highest rates of compensation for labor consistent with the ability of capital to employ it; when that limit is passed, however, idleness of the one and loss to the other follow, and I deprecate an unnecessary struggle between the two forced by depreciation of the purchasing power of our money. In my judgment gold and silver can not approximate nearer than 20 per cent., and I doubt if nearer than at the present time; but call it 20 per cent., and you should contemplate eventually, after a long struggle, the addition of that amount to the present annual wages, now aggregating $1,156,399,537, without any increase in the value, and our industries must adapt themselves to this new condition, for all must accept the situation. Will they increase the price of their products? Will wheat command a higher price, or meat, or the fabrics we wear? I do not know. I have always believed prices depended upon production, improved methods of business, cheapened cost, and supply and demand.

Who openly advocates here that this country would better enter upon speculative changes that in the past—we are not without experience—have resulted only in financial embarrassment to the people and the country?

We introduce into our foreign commerce this element, that our merchants must buy gold with which to settle and pay for their importations, each one for himself buying a foreign bill of exchange for remittance to his credit. The market values of goods in the markets of the world are measured, as I have said, by gold. And I do not hesitate to express the opinion that an element of fluctuation in price would be introduced prejudicial to our commerce and domestic trade, and disturbing manufacture here.

We would again encounter the experience of the years of the war and subsequently before resumption, when gold speculators raised commercial values from day to day, disturbing and oppressing all the productive industries. And all this is averted if we pursue a policy which will accumulate our national production of gold at home, together with the balances in our favor in the exchange of commodities and for securities placed abroad and foreign investments here rather than use it for the purchase of more silver for our coinage.

And in this consideration I must call attention to the effect upon our customs taxes or duties. They will be payable in silver. So long as that metal in the ratio of our coinage is at a parity with gold we maintain the present measure of protection; when measured by the gold standard, if silver has depreciated, to just that extent you remove protection. This may not disturb the other side of the Chamber, but it should and will solidify all in the North and South, East and West, who prefer protection of our industries rather than the unlimited coinage of silver by our Government against the measure.

I do not urge that in opening our mints to the free coinage of the world's silver all the errors are involved that mark the era of speculation and the rise, decline, and fall of prices recited in Thiers's Memoirs of John Law and the Mississippi Bubble, but attempting to depreciate the value of our money, and thus to inflate prices, is a great stride in that direction.

But it is urged that no increase is proposed beyond the necessities of production and transportation in domestic trade and our foreign commerce. Then there should not be an increase in the volume of money so long as prosperity is not only maintained but increased; the wonderful progress in the last twenty years has been demonstrated, or if in any particular industry a temporary depression exists it is due to other than a contraction of the currency and to natural causes. Certainly there is no occasion to increase the currency to the danger edge of the evils I have referred, in an experiment to advance the price of silver.

Mr. President, granting that our free coinage of the world's silver would increase our currency to the extent of the gap between gold and silver, there would be substituted for our $680,000,000 a coinage value of $680,000,000 worth of fine silver. Grant that the coinage value would be 30 per cent. in excess of the bullion value, and there would be a practical increase of our currency to just that amount.

Mr. EDMUNDS. You create a gap.

Mr. HISCOCK. I agree that just to the extent that you create a gap between the two the free coinage of the world's silver here eventually would increase our currency.

Mr. PLATT. It would take ten years to do it.

Mr. HISCOCK. I suppose some way can be found to get its representative out. If you have the free coinage of silver it may be followed or accompanied by a provision that notes may be issued for that, for no one wants the metal dollar; all would prefer the paper money.

Mr. PLATT. If it does not interrupt the Senator, let me suggest that to replace the gold by the coinage of silver would take some ten years at the present capacity of our mints.

Mr. HISCOCK. Do I understand the Senator from Connecticut to say that it can not be deposited in our mints and for its coinage value certificates issued which would be legal tenders?

Mr. PLATT. That might be done.

Mr. ALDRICH. The proposition of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] allows that.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from New York will indulge me just a moment, I will say that the opening of the mints to the free coinage of silver puts the silver in circulation.

Mr. HISCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Under the amendment that I propose to offer, if a party prefers, instead of circulating the silver dollar, as he may, to circulate the certificate, he may do just what he does under the existing law. The suggestion that there is no way to get it out under free coinage certainly indicates that whoever makes the suggestion has not studied the question very carefully.

Mr. HISCOCK. Certainly. I agree entirely with the Senator from Colorado on that point.

Mr. PLATT. He can not get it out as coin.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Connecticut will indulge me for a moment, let me ask whether he understands that when a man carries his gold to the mint he gets the identical coin, that is the gold, that he takes there? Not at all.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from New York consent to these interruptions?

Mr. PLATT. I will answer that again.

Mr. TELLER. I have refrained from interrupting the Senator from New York because he has a prepared speech. When he gets through, if he will allow me, I should like to ask him a few questions, but I do not like to do it when he is proceeding with his remarks.

Mr. HISCOCK. I do not purpose to play the prophet or foretell the extent to which it would inflate prices, real-estate values in this country, and of all those products grown upon and mined from the earth and manufactured in our factories. Our national wealth is estimated at $1,000 per capita, or about sixty-five thousand million dollars. The effect might be infinitesimal, except as influenced by speculations in gold, which we should be compelled to buy. This increase of our currency would not be distributed pro rata or per capita to the people, but to the holders of American gold who might exchange it for silver, and to the silver refiners of the American production, and it would be a long time before beneficial results would reach the owners of mortgaged farms in Missouri and Kansas, either by the purchase of their property or loans of money to them by those gentlemen or corporations. Every dollar of the increase in the currency, through the only method by which it can be made, would be reduced to possession by those grasping, greedy capitalists and corporations, to whom so much time has been devoted in portraying their greed, rapacity, and oppressions. Every dollar of the inflated currency would first reach the pocket of the people who have the money now, and in the precise proportion of their holdings.

I favor the bill reported by the Committee on Finance, by the Senator from Nevada, and bearing his name, and I can not but feel that he has made a great mistake in disowning his paternity of the measure. We can maintain our silver coinage under it, or the representative notes, at a parity with gold, because it will only make legal-tender money of about our domestic product of silver. It will not enforce the importation of foreign silver to any considerable extent, if to any extent whatever, and we will be able, as I trust and believe, to hold what we already have and our future productions of gold, and continue to accumulate in the future as in the past from abroad. And compared with the free coinage of the world's silver, our volume of currency will be increased in gold, on the basis of the last five years' annual production, $33,000,000 a year; the average annual importation here for ten years has been about $18,000,000, and the notes representing silver will amount to $54,000,000, all aggregating $105,000,000 annually. Would it not be a large enough increase of our currency?

I do not here mention those causes that would decrease the volume of our national currency, for they apply equally to free coinage. Certainly none of the disastrous effects that I believe I have feebly described would follow, and the difference between the volume of currency as compared with that expected under free coinage is too inconsequential, applied to our domestic and foreign trade, in the healthful inflation of prices, to tempt our Government to try that experiment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, if no Senator on the other side of the Chamber desires to address the Senate, I will avail myself of this opportunity, though I did not intend to speak upon this question until a later stage, when we had some bill supported by somebody to debate. The bill that was reported from the Committee on Finance seems to me like an uneasy ghost, wandering without an owner or a father, without compass or without guide, with no one to call for a vote and no one to demand a solution of the difficult question with which it assumes to deal. Still, as I am compelled to be absent from the Senate Chamber on other important business of the Senate, I will avail myself of this opportunity to say what I have to say rather than at some future time, when it may interfere more with the public business.

I approach the discussion of this bill and the kindred bills and amendments pending in the two Houses with unaffected diffidence. No

problem is submitted to us of equal importance and difficulty. Our action will affect the value of all the property of the people of the United States, and the wages of labor of every kind, and our trade and commerce with all the world. In the consideration of such a question we should not be controlled by previous opinions or bound by local interests, but, with the lights of experience and full knowledge of all the complicated facts involved, give to the subject the best judgment which imperfect human nature allows. With the wide diversity of opinion that prevails, each of us must make concessions in order to secure such a measure as will accomplish the objects sought for without impairing the public credit or the general interests of our people. This is no time for visionary theories of political economy. We must deal with facts as we find them and not as we wish them. We must aim at results based upon practical experience, for what has been probably will be. The best prophet of the future is the past.

To know what measures ought to be adopted we should have a clear conception of what we wish to accomplish. I believe a majority of the Senate desire, first, to provide an increase of money to meet the increasing wants of our rapidly growing country and population and to supply the reduction in our circulation caused by the retiring of national-bank notes; second, to increase the market value of silver, not only in the United States, but in the world, in the belief that this is essential to the success of any measure proposed, and in the hope that our efforts will advance silver to its legal ratio with gold, and induce the great commercial nations to join with us in maintaining the legal parity of the two metals or in agreeing with us in a new ratio of their relative value; and, third, to secure a genuine bimetallic standard, one that will not demonetize gold or cause it to be hoarded or exported, but that will establish both gold and silver as standards of value, not only in the United States, but among all the civilized nations of the world.

Believing that these are the chief objects aimed at by us all and that we differ only as to the best means to obtain them, I will discuss the pending propositions to test how far they tend, in my opinion, to promote or defeat these objects.

And, first, as to the amount of currency necessary to meet the wants of the people. The paper money in actual circulation, which is the active money in nearly all domestic transactions in the United States, consisted of the following items on the 1st day of May, 1890:

Legal-tender United States notes	$346,881,016
Certificates of deposit	8,795,000
Gold certificates (less amount held in Treasury)	134,642,839
Silver certificates (less amount held in Treasury)	292,923,348
Old demand notes	56,442
Fractional currency	6,912,549
National-bank notes	189,442,472
Total	979,453,667

The aggregate of $979,000,000 is subject to a reduction of notes lost or destroyed by the casualties of time, of which it is hard to make an estimate. The fractional currency and demand notes may be considered as out of circulation, though a part of them will be presented for redemption. The gold and silver certificates, being of recent origin, may be counted as outstanding. The United States notes have been in circulation for twenty-seven years. The estimated loss, according to the present Treasurer of the United States, is about 2 per cent. The loss of bank-notes inures to the benefit of the United States and is estimated to equal or exceed that of United States notes. If these estimates can be relied on, the volume of currency is diminished by lost notes about $12,000,000 leaving of paper money outstanding $967,000,000.

But it must be remembered that, of the $189,000,000 of national-bank notes outstanding, $60,521,556 is in process of redemption and cancellation, and that the same amount of lawful money is held in the Treasury to redeem these notes. It is manifest that both sums should not be counted as in circulation, thus reducing the aggregate of paper circulation to $907,000,000. To this must be added the gold and silver now in circulation. As to silver coin, it can be stated with substantial accuracy as follows:

Standard silver dollars in circulation October 1, 1889	$57,554,100
Subsidiary silver coin in circulation October 1, 1889	52,931,352
	110,485,452

As to gold coin in circulation, the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury at the same date, October 1, 1889, was $375,947,715 and his estimate of total circulation at that date was $1,405,018,000.

While some of these estimated items, especially that of gold in circulation, may be subject to many grains of allowance, it is reasonably certain that the current money in use in the United States is now about $1,400,000,000. In this sum I do not include the gold and silver coin in the Treasury represented by certificates in circulation. And it must be remembered that much of this sum of $1,400,000,000 is held in the Treasury and in banks as reserves required by law.

Is this volume of current money sufficient for the foreign and domestic exchanges of the people of the United States? I concede that, by reason of the great extent of our country, its vast diversified productions, its increasing population, and the push and energy of our people, they need a larger circulating medium than an equal number in an older and more densely populated country. But nowhere else are the substitutes for money better understood and in more general use.

From a table for the first time compiled in the year 1881 from actual returns from all the national banks, it was found that the receipts of those banks upon a single day were $295,000,000, while the receipts of the banks in New York and Chicago were more than one-half of that amount. These data also show that the proportion of gold coin received was less than 1½ per cent.; of silver, less than one-fourth of 1 per cent.; of paper money less than 5 per cent., and of checks and drafts about 95 per cent., while the proportion of the receipts of the banks in New York City was more than 98 per cent. in checks and drafts and less than 2 per cent. in coin and paper. If the daily receipts or payments of the banks of the country were to be made exclusively of gold and silver coin, the total coinage of the year, amounting to $60,000,000, which kept employed in its manufacture the whole force of the Mint of the country (consisting of a small regiment of men) during the entire year, would be sufficient only to supply the banks of the country in making payments for one-third of a bank day, or one hour and forty minutes, so that the money of the country has very little proportion to the business of the country.

The total amount of coin manufactured at the mints in a year, if used exclusively in making payments, would be exhausted by the national banks of New York and Chicago in less than a single day. The whole of the coin and currency of the country now in circulation, $1,400,000,000, would supply the national banks of the country, if their payments were made exclusively in coin and currency, for five days only.

The table referred to is as follows:

Table from report of the Comptroller of Currency for 1881, *showing total receipts and proportions of gold coin, silver coin, paper money, and checks and drafts.*

[In this table are shown, both for June 30 and for September 17, the proportions of gold coin, silver coin, paper money, and checks and drafts, including clearing-house certificates, to the total receipts in New York City, in the other reserve cities, and in banks elsewhere, separately, and also the same proportions for the United States.]

Localities.	Number of banks.	Receipts.	Proportions.			
			Gold coin.	Silver coin.	Paper currency.	Checks, drafts, etc.
June 30, 1881.						
			Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
New York City	16	$167,437,759	0.27	0.01	1.02	98.70
Other reserve cities	187	77,100,715	0.76	0.15	4.71	94.38
Banks elsewhere	1,731	40,175,542	2.04	0.77	15.47	81.72
United States	1,966	284,714,016	0.65	0.16	4.06	95.13
September 17, 1881.						
New York City	48	$165,193,347	0.54	0.01	0.65	98.80
Other reserve cities	189	77,922,247	1.86	0.18	5.61	92.35
Banks elsewhere	4,895	52,118,185	3.31	0.08	14.27	81.74
United States	2,132	295,233,779	1.38	0.17	4.36	94.00

This table shows the proportions of money of different kinds, checks, drafts, etc., that are paid in the ordinary business of the country, showing that the actual circulation plays a very insignificant part in the business of this country.

Besides, the use of banks and banking institutions of every grade and degree is more common in the United States than anywhere else. In every town of any importance in the United States there are banks of issue or banks of exchange or banking offices or savings-banks or institutions of a similar character for the care and deposit of money in the transaction of monetary business, greater in number and in aggregate than all the institutions of the kind in Europe. Thus there has grown into the customs of the country the use of credit money in the form of drafts, checks, and certificates to a far greater extent than anywhere else, leaving money in circulation to transact only the smaller business of the country.

The best way to test the sufficiency of this sum of $1,400,000,000 to conduct the business of our country is to compare the volume of the currency to-day with that of former periods. In making this comparison I do not take a period before the war, when we had practically no national currency but gold and silver coin, and that in comparatively very small amounts. This was at a time when a great party was dominant which denied the power of the United States to issue any form of paper money, and under the pretense of States' rights crippled the Government of many of the essential rights of a nation and left to the several States the imperial right to issue paper money through private corporations. It is a marvel that the country grew into such proportions with a currency so vicious, insecure, insufficient, and at times worthless as State-bank paper money. It did grow in spite of it, but no student of American history would propose a recurrence to such a

policy. Our currency was then the worst existing in any commercial nation, but the necessities of the war and more liberal opinions as to the powers and functions of the National Government led to restrictions upon State paper money and the adoption of national paper money, which is now conceded by the most advanced nations as the best ever devised by man.

Let us take a period when this national policy was well established. On the 1st of March, 1878, before resumption, and at the date of the passage of the silver act, the aggregate currency in circulation was $805,793,807, including $80,000,000 of gold, or $600,000,000 less than now, being $16.50 per capita, while now it is $22 per capita.

On the 1st of October, 1880, after resumption and at a time of great prosperity, the total amount of paper money in circulation, exclusive of that held in the Treasury, was $690,430,147, as follows:

United States notes	$329,417,403
National-bank notes	340,329,453
Silver certificates	12,203,191
Gold certificates	7,480,100
	690,430,147

This included only $12,200,000 of silver certificates and $7,480,000 gold certificates. Now we have $292,000,000 of silver certificates and $134,000,000 gold certificates, but the national-bank circulation was then $344,505,427 and is now $189,000,000.

During all this period the volume of money in actual circulation was increasing. I here present a table showing that each and every year from 1878 to this year the currency of the country in actual circulation has been increasing year by year more than the population has increased.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator tell us how much it actually increased last year?

Mr. SHERMAN. The statement——

Mr. TELLER. I challenge the statement that the Senator makes and I want him now to tell us.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know the Senator challenges everything, but I take this from the Treasury report, the highest authority we can quote in this country. Here is the table——

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will call his attention to the fact that the Secretary's report shows that the circulation increased last season less than $8,000,000, and that certainly does not bear out his statement that it has increased as fast as the population.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not think this way of interrupting an argument a very good one, but I think the Senator is not correct. I have the statement here before me, and I will read it to him, although I did not intend to weary the Senate with going over all these figures.

The increase each year, in the different kinds of money, is exhibited in the following table:

The amount and kinds of money in actual circulation on certain dates from 1878 *to* 1889.

Year.	Date.	Total circulation.	Gold coin.	Standard silver dollars.	Subsidiary silver.
1878	March 1	$805,793,807	$82,530,163	.....	$53,573,833
1879	October 1	862,579,754	123,698,157	$11,074,230	54,088,747
1880	October 1	1,022,033,685	261,320,920	22,914,075	48,368,543
1881	October 1	1,147,892,435	328,118,146	32,230,038	47,859,327
1882	October 1	1,188,752,363	358,351,956	33,801,281	47,153,750
1883	October 1	1,236,650,032	346,077,784	39,783,527	48,170,263
1884	October 1	1,261,569,924	341,485,840	40,322,042	45,344,717
1885	October 1	1,286,630,871	348,268,740	45,275,710	51,328,206
1886	October 1	1,264,889,561	364,894,599	60,170,793	48,176,838
1887	October 1	1,353,485,690	391,090,890	60,614,524	50,414,706
1888	October 1	1,384,340,280	377,329,865	57,959,356	52,020,975
1889	October 1	1,405,018,000	375,947,715	57,554,100	52,931,352

Year.	Date.	Gold certificates.	Silver certificates.	United States notes.*	National-bank notes.
1878	March 1	$44,364,100	.....	$311,436,971	$313,888,740
1879	October 1	14,843,200	$1,176,720	327,747,762	329,950,938
1880	October 1	7,480,100	12,203,191	329,417,403	340,329,453
1881	October 1	5,239,320	52,590,180	327,655,884	354,199,540
1882	October 1	4,907,440	63,204,780	325,272,858	356,060,348
1883	October 1	55,014,940	78,921,961	321,356,596	347,324,961
1884	October 1	87,389,660	96,491,251	325,786,143	324,750,271
1885	October 1	118,137,790	93,656,716	318,736,684	311,227,025
1886	October 1	84,691,807	95,387,112	310,161,935	301,406,477
1887	October 1	97,984,683	154,354,826	329,070,804	269,955,257
1888	October 1	134,838,190	218,561,601	306,052,053	237,578,240
1889	October 1	116,675,349	276,619,715	325,510,758	199,779,011

* Includes outstanding clearing-house certificates of the act of June 8, 1872.

Mr. President, this is the best information we can have, and if we can not rely upon the official reports of the officers of the Government, what can we rely upon? What newspaper scrap should be brought here to face down figures like these?

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not like to yield and I do not like to refuse.

Mr. TELLER. I do not want that statement to go out uncontradicted.

Mr. SHERMAN. Since the Senator takes it in that way, I will go on.

Mr. TELLER. Very well; I will contradict it by the record when the Senator gets through.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a great deal better, and it is a much more orderly way of proceeding in the Senate.

It is a fact that there has been a constant increase of currency. It is a fact which must be constantly borne in mind. If any evils now exist such as have been so often stated, such as falling prices, increased mortgages, contentions between capital and labor, decreasing value of silver, increased relative value of gold, they must be attributed to some other cause than our insufficient supply of circulation, for not only has the circulation increased in these twelve years 80 per cent., while our population has only increased 36 per cent., but it has all been maintained at the gold standard, which, it is plain, has been greatly advanced in purchasing power. If the value of money is tested by its amount, by numerals, according to the favorite theory of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], then surely we ought to be on the high road of prosperity, for these numerals have increased in twelve years from $805,000,000 to $1,405,000,000 in October last and to $1,420,000,000 on the 1st of this month. This single fact disposes of the claim that insufficient currency is the cause of the woes, real and imaginary, that have been depicted, and compels us to look to other causes for the evils complained of.

I admit that prices for agricultural productions have been abnormally low and that the farmers of the United States have suffered greatly from this cause. But this depression of prices is easily accounted for by the greatly increased amount of agricultural production, the wonderful development of agricultural implements, the opening of vast regions of new and fertile fields in the West, the reduced cost of transportation, the doubling of the miles of railroads, and the quadrupling capacity of railroads and steam-boats for transportation, and the new-fangled forms of trusts and combinations which monopolize nearly all the productions of the farms and workshops of our country, reducing the price to the producer and in some cases increasing the cost to the consumer. All these causes co-operate to reduce prices of farm products. No one of them can be traced to an insufficient currency, now larger in amount in proportion to population than ever before in our history.

But to these causes of a domestic character must be added others, over which we have no control. The same wonderful development of industry has been going on in other parts of the globe. In Russia, especially in Southern Russia, vast regions have been opened to the commerce of the world. Railroads have been built, mines have been opened, exhaustless supplies of petroleum have been found, and all these are competitors with us in supplying the wants of Europe for food, metals, heat, and light. India, with its teeming millions of poorly paid laborers, is competing with our farmers, and their products are transported to market over thousands of miles of railroads constructed by English capital or by swift steamers through the Red Sea and the Suez Canal, reaching directly the people of Europe whom we formerly supplied with food. No wonder, then, that our agriculture is depressed by low prices, caused by competition by new rivals and agencies.

Any one who can overlook these causes and attribute low prices to a want of domestic currency, that has increased and is increasing continually, must be blind to the great forces that in recent times throughout the world are tending by improved methods and modern inventions to lessen the prices of all commodities. A surplus of a very small percentage of an article that will perish within a year, as a matter of course, depreciates the value of the whole stock on hand. It is very unlike the effect upon an article of permanent and enduring value like the metals. The reasons why the products of labor have cheapened in price are thus forcibly stated by C. P. Williams in a recent number of Rhodes's Journal of Banking:

The advance in the wages of labor proves that gold has not appreciated. And the wages of labor have advanced at the same time that the products of labor have cheapened in price. Why, the past half century, and more particularly the past quarter century, has revolutionized commerce and production: first, by inventions and machinery and steam power in aid of productiveness of human labor; second, by steam-ships taking the place of sails on all the lines of ocean commerce, shortening the time of the voyage and cheapening the cost of transportation and commercial intercourse; third, by the net-work of railways through all the more progressive countries, diminishing the cost of internal transportation and intercourse to one-fourth the former cost in both time and money; fourth, in belting both the continents and the seas with the telegraph, by which we have at our breakfast-tables the news of yesterday from the most distant corners of the earth, formerly taking six months to reach us; fifth, by our improved method of exchanges, lessening by three-fourths the actual quantity of money—gold and silver—used by commerce, and thereby lessening its cost.

These improvements, the result of advanced civilization and of fertile invention, are recognized by all intelligent economists and statesmen as fully accounting for the cheapened prices of commodities, while human labor advances in its reward, and gold as well as silver depreciates in value. As Mulhall, the English statistician, says: "It would be monstrous if prices remained the same in spite of cheapened transport, improved machinery, and all the effects of scientific progress."

The farmer will really see, in view of this recital, how his interests are affected. If his products are somewhat reduced in value, so are all articles of his consumption cheapened in still greater ratio.

A rapid or unexpected fall or rise in prices of agricultural productions is not a new experience in our country or in other countries in the world. Nothing is more uncertain in price than the perishable articles which form the common food of mankind. In my own experience I have seen the price of wheat fall in Ohio as low as 50 cents and rise to $2 without any apparent appreciation or diminution of the currency. Some fifty years ago a very popular and excellent man was a candidate for the Legislature in Ohio and his election was supposed to be assured, but an advertisement was found in a local paper of some twenty or thirty years before that time, in which he, as a miller, offered to pay 30 cents a bushel for wheat in cash. This offer was thought so illiberal that the candidate was easily beaten, although when the facts were known it was shown that he offered to pay the market price, 30 cents, in cash, while all other bidders would only give 30 cents in store pay.

These fluctuations depend upon the law of supply and demand, involving facts too numerous to state, but rarely depending on the volume of money in circulation. An increase of currency can have no effect to advance prices unless we cheapen and degrade it by making it less valuable; and if that is the intention now, the direct and honest way is to put fewer grains of gold or silver in our dollar. This was the old way, by clipping the coin, adding base metal.

If we want a cheaper dollar we have the clear constitutional right to put in it 15 grains of gold instead of 23, or 300 grains of silver instead of 412½, but you have no power to say how many bushels of wheat the new dollar shall buy. You can, if you choose, cheapen the dollar under your power to coin money and thus enable a debtor to pay his debts with fewer grains of silver or gold under the pretext that gold or silver has risen in value, but in this way you would destroy all forms of credit and make it impossible for nations or individuals to borrow money for a period of time. It is a species of repudiation.

The best standard of value is one that measures for the longest period its equivalent in other products. Its relative value may vary from time to time. If it falls, the creditor loses; if it increases, the debtor loses; and these changes are the chances of all trade and commerce and all loaning and borrowing. The duty of the Government is performed when it coins money and provides convenient credit representatives of coin. The purchasing power of money for other commodities depends upon changing conditions over which the Government has no control. Even its power to issue paper money has been denied until recently, but this may be considered as settled by the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in the legal-tender cases. All that Congress ought to do is to provide a sufficient amount of money, either of coin or its equivalent of paper money, to meet the current wants of business. This it has done in the twelve years last passed at a ratio of increase far in excess of any in our previous history.

Surely, if an abundance of good money constantly increasing in volume, all equal to gold, is the elixir of life in our trade and commerce and should bring prosperity to our people and good prices and good markets for our farmers, now would be the good time come; but experience has shown that the prices have fallen as our currency increased. Nor can it be said that industries are idle or that the country has not reasonably prospered in general growth and production.

Still it is apparent that there is a general feeling in the country that Congress ought to provide for additional circulation, or, at least, supply a substitute for the national-bank notes being rapidly retired. The sole cause of this retirement is the payment by the United States of its bonds held as security for the notes of national banks. Congress has repeatedly refused to allow these banks to issue notes to the amount of the real value of the bonds deposited, or even to their face value, and has steadily shown its opposition to the system of national banks by refusing to pass any measure of relief, however just and meritorious, so that the friends of the national-bank system feel that its end is near at hand.

The 4½ per cent. bonds, amounting to $112,521,250, will mature next year, and the 4 per cent. bonds, amounting to $606,551,000, will mature in 1907 and be paid, leaving no basis for the national-bank system, and there is no disposition on the part of Congress to prescribe any other security for circulating bank notes. We must then legislate in view of the fact that the $60,000,000 of national-bank notes now outstanding and secured by a deposit of lawful money must soon be paid off, that the circulating notes based upon 4½ per cent. bonds will probably be retired within a year, and that the balance of the circulating notes, amounting on April 30 to $128,920,916, will be retired prior to 1907. This fact alone compels us to provide for some substitute for these circulating notes.

Under the law of February, 1878, the purchase of $2,000,000 worth of silver bullion a month has by coinage produced annually an average of nearly $3,000,000 a month for a period of twelve years, but this amount, in view of the retirement of the bank notes, will not increase our currency in proportion to our increasing population. If our present currency is estimated at $1,400,000,000 and our population is increasing at the ratio of 3 per cent. per annum, it would require $42,000,000 increased circulation each year to keep pace with the increase of population; but as the increase of population is accompanied by a still greater ratio of increase of wealth and business, it was thought that an immediate increase of circulation might be obtained by larger purchases of silver bullion to an amount sufficient to make good the retirement of bank notes and keep pace with the growth of population. Assuming that $54,000,000 a year of additional circulation is needed upon this basis, that amount is provided for in this bill by the issue of Treasury notes in exchange for bullion at the market price. I see no objection to this proposition, but believe that Treasury notes based upon silver bullion purchased in this way will be as safe a foundation for paper money as can be conceived.

Experience shows that silver coin will not circulate to any considerable amount. Only about one silver dollar to each inhabitant is maintained in circulation with all the efforts made by the Treasury Department, but silver certificates, the representatives of this coin, pass current without question and are maintained at par in gold by being received by the Government for all purposes and redeemed if called for. I do not fear to give to these notes every sanction and value that the United States can confer. I do not object to their being made a legal tender for all debts, public or private. I believe that if they are to be issued they ought to be issued as money, with all the sanction and authority that the Government can possibly confer. While I believe the amount to be issued is greater than is necessary, yet in view of the retirement of bank notes I yielded my objections to the increase beyond $4,000,000. As an expedient to provide increased circulation it is far preferable to free coinage of silver or any proposition that has been made to provide some other security than United States bonds for bank circulation. I believe it will accomplish the first object proposed, a gradual and steady increase of the current money of the country.

But this measure can be greatly aided by a proper treatment of the national banks. These banks have fully met all expectations. They have furnished circulating notes without cost and without loss to the Government or people of the United States. The total tax collected from the national banks up to July 1, 1889, amounted to $7,855,887.74 on capital, $60,940,067.16 on deposits, and $68,868,180.67 on circulation, making a total of $137,664,135.57, besides full taxes to the States and cities and towns where located. No system of banking has ever been more successful. It is distributed through all parts of the country, is free and open to all without limit. Its strength is in United States bonds deposited as security for the notes, its weakness is in the rapid payment of these bonds and the difficulty of finding a proper substitute. But surely while these bonds are outstanding they ought to be accepted as security for their face value. This alone would check the retirement of bank notes and probably increase their issue. And yet it is those who demand "more money" that resist so plain a remedy.

And there is still another measure of relief against a contraction of the currency. Under the present law national banks, compelled by the payment of their bonds to retire their circulation, must deposit in the Treasury notes equal in amount to the bank notes to be retired. The United States then assumes the payment of the bank notes when presented, but, as the law now stands, must retain the United States notes held in the Treasury for that purpose. This is a direct and immediate contraction of the currency. To avoid this I propose that these United States notes shall be covered into the Treasury, but be paid out on the public debt or for other purposes, and thus be restored to circulation. The bank notes will continue in circulation until presented to the Treasury for redemption. They will become in legal effect United States notes and will only be presented for payment when unfit for use. The same process will apply to the remaining bank circulation when and as it is surrendered by the banks.

These two measures will be effective to stop the contraction of the currency. This would delay and postpone the further retirement of bank currency until 1907, when the policy of basing Treasury notes upon gold and silver bullion will be proven to be either a success or a failure. If Senators really desire to secure more money, good money, based upon gold and silver coin and bullion, they can secure it without the hazard of the dangerous experiment of the free coinage of silver and of detaching the United States from the standards of value recognized by the principal commercial, civilized, and christian nations of the world.

I have thus stated my view of the best mode to provide for a gradual increase of money for circulation and to provide a substitute for national-bank notes retired when and as the bonds of the United States are retired.

And now, Mr. President, I come to the second object of desire, to increase the market value of silver, not only in the United States, but in the world, in the belief that this is essential to the success of any measure proposed and in the hope that our efforts will advance silver to its legal ratio with gold and induce the great commercial nations to join with us in maintaining the legal parity of the two metals or in agreeing with us in a new ratio of their relative value.

To decide how this can be done we must know the precise legal status of silver, how it was affected by the acts of 1834 and 1853 and the coinage act of 1873. After the suspension of the coinage of the silver dollar in 1805 fractional silver coins and also gold coins were issued from the mints; but as gold, by being undervalued, was drawn from our country, fractional silver and foreign coin were the only coin

in circulation. One ounce of gold was worth more than 15 ounces of silver, and therefore gold went to countries where it would buy 15½ ounces of silver. To avoid this and to invite gold to our country, the acts of 1834 and 1837 changed the ratio so that 1 ounce of gold was rated at 16 ounces of silver. This was a mistake in the opposite direction, for 16 ounces of silver were worth more in Europe than 1 ounce of gold, and silver disappeared from the United States and gold became our only coin.

To meet this difficulty and to secure the use of both metals, Congress, by the act of 1853, following the example of England, provided for a coinage of fractional silver containing less grains of silver and a legal tender for only $5, and thus silver and gold—gold as the standard and silver as subsidiary—were the coin of our country. The silver dollar had disappeared long years before. None were to be found except as curiosities. Only $8,045,838 had been coined from 1793 up to 1873, or less than three months' coinage under the present law. Under these conditions we entered upon the civil war, when gold and silver alike disappeared from our currency. Paper money alone, from the 1 cent stamp to the $5,000 United States note, was then our domestic currency. We exacted gold for duties on imported goods to enable us to maintain the credit of our bonds. It did not circulate, but was a commodity at a premium for seventeen years until resumption. We heard nothing in Congress of coinage until the abortive effort to devise an international coin as a medium of exchanges between nations, a gold coin that would be the exact equivalent of £1, or $5, or 25 francs.

This was at the Paris conference in 1867, and my letter in support of it was quoted in this debate. I stand by that letter, every word of it. At that time it expressed the almost universal desire of our people, it was approved by the Paris conference, and would have been adopted by the leading commercial nations but for the refusal of Great Britain to make the slight change requisite in her pound sterling. It is now the hope and expectation of the leading scientists of the world and will be the first step of the first successful international monetary conference—an international coin which will contain so many grains of gold and be the exact equivalent of 25 francs, $5, £1, so that with this international coin a man may travel everywhere. That was only defeated by the narrow idea of the British Government, who refused to change their pound sterling in intrinsic value from 484 to 479 and a fraction, and they declined to do it. It did not deal with or affect the silver question at all.

The next we heard of coins and coinage was in a report from the Secretary of the Treasury on the 25th of April, 1870, transmitting the bill now known as the coinage act of February 12, 1873, which is here before me. This bill was, on its face, a revision of all the laws relating to the Mint and coinage of the United States. It stated what coins of gold and silver and what minor coins should be coined, and of what metal composed. It dropped from the coins of the United States the silver dollar of 412½ grains. And now we are told that this coin was surreptitiously dropped, that a conspiracy existed to deprive the country of one-half of its money with a view to increase the value of the remainder.

I mean now to place upon the record proofs so absolutely conclusive that this is a false cry that if any man hereafter repeats it in the Senate and the House the evidence of the falsehood will stare him in the face.

What was the silver dollar that was said to be demonetized surreptitiously by this act? To some men it is a kind of fetich, made an object of superstitious worship which it is sacrilegious to disturb. It was a coin authorized by the act of April 2, 1792, containing 416 grains of standard silver, afterwards reduced to 412½ or 371¼ grains of pure silver. It was based upon the ratio of 15 to 1, admitted from the beginning to be incorrect. There were coined of these dollars prior to 1805 1,439,517, or about one-half of one month's coinage of the silver dollar now. President Jefferson then suspended their coinage. Mr. Campbell P. White, in an appendix to his famous report, upon which the act of 1834 was founded, transmits a letter from Samuel Moore, Director of the Mint at Philadelphia, under date of May 25, 1832, in which he says:

> The President, in 1805, interposed more efficiently by directing that the coinage of dollars should be suspended at the Mint; this remedy met the particular exigence. The Chinese, through prejudice, undervalued the dollar; the lower denominations they refused.

Mr. J. K. Upton, in his book, Money in Politics, says:

> The silver was now (1805) the unquestioned unit of account, and in this coin all contracts calling for dollars could be satisfied. Mr. Jefferson, who was then President, had favorably indorsed the ratio of 1 to 15 proposed by Mr. Hamilton and adopted in the coinage act of 1792. He believed that both metals could and would circulate side by side under the relations fixed by that act. He desired that gold should circulate as well as silver, and, to prevent the expulsion of gold, he peremptorily ordered the Mint to discontinue the coinage of the silver dollar, and Congress and the country seemed to have approved his action, although taken without authority, if not in direct violation, of law. To the effect of this executive interference is probably due the fact that from 1806 to 1836 no silver dollars were coined.

So this dollar so anxiously sought for was demonetized by Mr. Jefferson, who was familiar with the history of its coinage, and that continued practically until our civil war, as I shall presently show. Not one dollar of this coin was issued from its suspension by Mr. Jefferson until after the passage of the act of 1834, and only $1,300 prior to 1840. From that time until the approach of the civil war the issue was comparatively insignificant, varying yearly from $1,100 to $184,000, the highest amount in any one year. Yet during this period, from 1805 to 1860, over $100,000,000 of fractional silver coins were issued and in circulation, all of which was demonetized in the general sense from 1834, being a legal tender for only $5. The silver dollar had fallen into desuetude. As the war approached and until 1873, about 5,000,000 silver dollars were coined, solely for exportation to China and Japan, but none of them entered into circulation. Many of us never, prior to 1878, saw a silver dollar. It was an image of the past, lost to sight and memory, conceived by Hamilton, suspended by Jefferson, and ignored by two generations except as a convenience for the exportation of silver bullion.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. Allow me to say one word.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I have not known that those who advocated the recoinage of silver insist that a particular species of coin shall be coined at the mint. I ask the Senator how many gold dollars have been coined?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have given the amount of gold.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. But I ask him to state the amount of gold dollars, not the amount of ten-dollar pieces. I want to say right here that up to and including 1846 there was more full legal-tender silver money coined than gold, and that it was not the silver dollar that the silver men were insisting upon coining, but silver money with full legal-tender functions, whether in the form of half-dollars or quarter-dollars or any other kind of silver coin; that it was half-dollars, the more convenient coin, that were coined, and not the dollar piece. It is of no consequence whether it was a dollar piece or a half-dollar piece that was coined.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will come to that in a moment. The half-dollar was never coined except as a subsidary coin and it was only a legal tender for $1. The half-dollar since 1853 has only been a legal tender for $1.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I am speaking of the fact that from the foundation of the Government up to and including 1846 more legal-tender silver money was coined than gold in this country.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator allow me just one moment?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will say, as I said to the Senator from Colorado, that I do not like to refuse and I do not like to consent.

Mr. MITCHELL. I only want to occupy one moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will hear the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think a false impression has been given generally as to the action of Thomas Jefferson, referred to by the Senator from Ohio. There was not a general suspension of silver coinage, only the silver dollar, not the suspension of silver entirely. The Senator surely does not mean to convey the impression that Jefferson's action related to anything more than the suspension of the coinage of the silver dollar, not to the half dollars or any other silver?

Mr. SHERMAN. The dollar I am talking about altogether.

Mr. MITCHELL. And the other coins were all legal tender?

Mr. SHERMAN. I am talking about the dollar of the fathers.

I will repeat the sentence that was broken by the interruption of my friend from Nevada. This policy was an image of the past, lost to sight and memory, conceived by Hamilton, suspended by Jefferson, and ignored by two generations except as a convenience for the exportation of silver bullion.

No wonder that the Senator from Nevada did not know that the silver dollar was demonetized. The wonder is that he knew of its existence. The revisers of the United States statutes were oblivious to it, for, while the act of 1873 dropped it from coinage and forbade its issue from the mints, that act did not take from the silver dollars, if in existence, their legal-tender quality. While the whole mass of fractional silver coins issued under the act of 1853 had been for nineteen years a legal tender only for $5, the silver dollar was among the people an unknown coin.

But it is not the legal qualities of the silver dollar I have to deal with, but it is the imputation that it was dropped from our coinage surreptitiously, done by stealth, unlawfully; this is the charge that I repel. I was chairman of the Committee on Finance when the act of 1873 was considered and passed. My associates in 1871 were Senators JUSTIN S. MORRILL, George H. Williams, Alexander G. Cattell, Willard Warner, Reuben E. Fenton, and Thomas F. Bayard. The Committee on Coinage of the House, having charge of the bill, consisted of Messrs. William D. Kelley, Samuel Hooper, John Hill, Noah Davis, Peter W. Strader, and John A. Griswold. What motive could we have for such a cowardly, disgraceful proceeding? On the 25th of April 1870, when the bill was sent to us by the Secretary of the Treasury, the silver dollar was worth $1.0312 in gold in the markets of the world. This was before Germany had sold her silver and adopted the gold standard, before the slightest sign of the depreciation of silver. Could we so far foresee the future?

But I will not leave this matter to argument or inference. The bill on its face shows that it was a bill revising all the laws relating to mints and coinage. In the bill sent to us on the 25th of April, 1870, the silver dollar was omitted and its further issue prohibited. Here is a copy of the bill sent to us with the report. [Exhibiting.] I will read the fifteenth section. The fourteenth section provides the weight of the double eagle, etc., giving the weight of the gold coins. The fifteenth section was as follows:

SEC. 15. *And be it further enacted*, That, of the silver coins, the weight of the half-dollar, or piece of 50 cents, shall be 192 grains, and that of the quarter-dollar and dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; that the silver coin issued in conformity with the above section shall be a legal tender in any one payment of debts for all sums less than $1.

That is, "for all sums less than $1." Then here is section 18, just following it:

SEC. 18. *And be it further enacted*, That no coins, either of gold, silver, or minor coinage, shall hereafter be issued from the mint other than those of the denominations, standards, and weights herein set forth.

Not only was the silver dollar omitted, but there was an express provision that no other coin except those mentioned should be issued from the mint. So not only were the names of the coins designated, their weight and measure fixed, but all others were prohibited by the law of 1873 and on the face of the bill. That bill was sent to us here at the time when the silver dollar was demonetized.

With the letter of the Secretary of the 25th of April, 1870, Mr. Knox, under a conspicuous, large-typed heading—"SILVER DOLLAR; ITS DISCONTINUANCE AS A STANDARD"—says:

The coinage of the silver-dollar piece, the history of which is here given, is discontinued in the proposed bill. It is by law the dollar unit, and, assuming the value of gold to be fifteen and one-half times that of silver, being about the mean ratio for the past six years, is worth in gold a premium of about 3 per cent. (its value being $1.0312), and intrinsically more than 7 per cent. premium in our other silver coins, its value thus being $1.0742.

The present laws consequently authorize both a gold-dollar unit and a silver-dollar unit, differing from each other in intrinsic value. The present gold-dollar piece is made the dollar unit in the proposed bill, and the silver-dollar piece is discontinued.

What can be clearer than that? That message was sent to us.

Mr. DAWES. Did that accompany the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly. Here is the document.

If, however, such a coin is authorized it should be issued only as a commercial dollar, not as a standard unit of account, and of the exact value of a Mexican dollar, which is the favorite for circulation in China and Japan and other Oriental countries.

This bill was not acted upon in the Senate until the next session of Congress. In the mean time a copy of it was sent to all the experts in the United States. The bill sent to them included among the silver coins a dollar of 384 grains instead of the old dollar of 412½ grains, thus not only dropping out the old dollar, but substituting a token dollar not a legal tender. The replies were sent to the House of Representatives in obedience to a resolution of the House on the 25th of June, 1870.

I have, then, here before me a voluminous report of Mr. Boutwell, the Secretary of the Treasury, of 100 printed pages. It contains a full statement of the objects of the bill, the necessity for the proposed revision, with reports, among others, from Robert Patterson, F. Peale, H. R. Linderman, James Ross Snowden, G. F. Dunning, and E. B. Elliot, all of them known as scientific experts and the principal officers of the mints and assay offices. Each of them discussed the provisions of the bill.

The necessity for the revision of the coinage law was admitted on all hands. It had been recommended by Secretary Chase and his assistant, Mr. Harrington, by Secretary McCulloch and his assistant, Mr. Chandler, now a member of the Senate. There had been no codification of the mint laws for thirty-five years. The different acts of Congress in reference to the service were scattered through all the various volumes of the statutes. The English Government had recently revised its mint laws, introducing important reforms. The "coinage act of 1873" was framed with a like purpose. The operations of the Mint were not suspended during the war.

The amount of coinage during the suspension of specie payments, 1861–1879, was $735,320,317, while the total coinage from 1792, the year of the establishment of the Mint, to 1861, a period of seventy years, was but $599,428,229. There was 50 per cent. more coined in the eighteen years after 1861 than during the whole period of the Government before 1861. The business of the Mint was rapidly increasing and the wisdom of creating a bureau of the mint in the Treasury Department was apparent to every one.

The section of the bill which discontinues the coinage of the old silver dollar was discussed by all the experts. Hon. James Pollock, formerly governor of Pennsylvania, then Director of the Mint, favored the reduction of the weight of the silver dollar from 412½ grains to 384 grains, as he had previously recommended in his annual report of 1861. Robert Patterson was in favor of the abolishment of the silver dollar, half-dime, and three-cent piece. He said: "Gold becomes the standard of which the gold dollar is the unit. Silver is subsidiary, embracing coins from the dime to half-dollar." The heading of this paragraph was printed in capital letters, thus: "SILVER DOLLAR, HALF-DIME, AND THREE-CENT PIECE DISCONTINUED, AND COINS LESS THAN DIME OF COPPER, NICKEL, LEGAL TENDER—ONE-CENT PIECE OF ONE GRAM IN WEIGHT."

The same report contains a letter dated June 10, 1870, from E. B. Elliot, late Actuary of the Treasury Department (page 70), well known to many Senators, now dead, which gives a brief history of the silver dollar, headed as follows, in capital letters:

THE STANDARD SILVER DOLLAR—ITS DISCONTINUANCE AS A STANDARD.

The bill proposes the discontinuance of the silver dollar, and the report which accompanies the bill suggests the substitution for the existing standard silver dollar of a trade coin of intrinsic value equivalent to the Mexican silver piastre or dollar.

Franklin Peale, formerly melter and refiner of the Mint at Philadelphia, says:

To designate what the weight of silver coinage should be at this time is a difficult problem, and should be carefully considered by competent financiers, bullionists, and Mint officers before any law is enacted.

The heading of this paragraph was in capital letters, as follows: "Weight of silver coin should be carefully considered."

Mr. Peale recommended the discontinuance of the coinage of the one-dollar and three-dollar gold pieces and gave his reasons therefor.

Dr. H. R. Linderman, formerly Director of the Mint, discussed the subject in a paragraph which was headed in capitals as follows: "DISCONTINUANCE OF SILVER DOLLAR."

Hon. James Ross Snowden discussed the same subject in a paragraph which was headed in capitals as follows: "THE PRESENT SILVER DOLLAR SHOULD NOT BE DISCONTINUED."

Hon. George F. Dunning, late superintendent of the assay office in New York, the officers of the United States mint at San Francisco, and others discussed this feature of the bill.

It was well said in the report of the Comptroller of the Currency in 1876:

If the question of the double standard did not become prominent in the discussion of the bill it was for the reason that usage had established the gold dollar as the unit, the silver dollar, on account of its greater relative value, having, with the Mexican dollar and pistareen, disappeared from the circulation of the country. The coinage act of 1873 simply registered in the form of a statute what had been really the unwritten law of the land for forty years.

We had this one-hundred-page document sent by Secretary Boutwell, with returns from all the officers of the Mint and the experts throughout the country, probably thirty or forty of them. We had at that time, when we considered the bill, the previous letter of our Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, who had charge of the Mint, recommending the passage of the bill, with a copy of the bill, and copies of the bill were sent broadcast, omitting entirely the silver dollar and calling special attention to that omission in every possible way.

Now, Mr. President, with all this copious information in both Houses this coinage bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance on the 19th of December, 1870. On the 9th and 10th days of January, 1871, it was debated for two full days, mainly upon the coinage charge of three-tenths of 1 per cent., by Senators Cole, Williams, Corbett, STEWART, and Casserly against the charge and MORRILL and SHERMAN for it. The bill was read in full, and a number of amendments made, but the coinage provision was defeated and the charge for coinage was repealed.

The bill passed by a vote of 36 yeas and 14 nays, January 10, 1871. Among the nays I find the names of MORRILL and SHERMAN, no doubt because against their advice all coinage charges were repealed. Among the yeas I find the names of Casserly, Cole, Corbett, Nye, STEWART, and Williams, every Senator from the Pacific coast. It was that bill that omitted and excluded the silver dollar from our coinage, and, in accordance with the act of 1853, continued all silver coinage as subsidiary and a legal tender for $5 only. No bill was ever more broadly proclaimed or publicly discussed in all its details than this, and yet my venerable friend [Mr. MORRILL] and myself, who voted against the bill, have been singled out and named as dupes or conspirators, while gentlemen who voted for the bill were victims of a plot, ignorant of its provisions, and generally taken in! It is better far to stand manfully for what we did honestly, even if we were mistaken, which to this hour I do not think we were. Is it possible that any man who participated in this debate could have been ignorant that the old silver dollar of 1792 was dropped from our coinage by this bill? Is it not more likely that he was indifferent to it or had forgotten it? I knew and recall the dropping out of the silver dollar, and neither plead ignorance nor negligence, but I had not the omniscient power to see into the future, when the dollar suspended by Jefferson, demonetized by Jackson and Benton, superseded by subsidiary half-dollars by Pierce and Hunter, turned into a trade-dollar in 1873, would become the idol of the Democratic party in 1890, as the best expedient for cheap money, the most plausible pretext for confiscating a portion of public and private debts.

This bill was sent to the House, referred to the Committee on Coinage, and reported favorably, but no action was taken upon it during that session. Early in the called session following Mr. Kelley introduced an original bill substantially similar to the bill of the preceding Congress, but with this important modification of section 16. The House bill recommended a subsidiary dollar of 384 grains with limited legal tender in place of the old dollar of 412½ grains. So the other House had inserted in the bill when it was reintroduced by Mr. Kelley this subsidiary coin of 385 grains, containing 26½ fewer grains than the old silver dollar, and made subsidiary coin like the former subsidiary coin of half-dollars and quarter-dollars.

The bill finally became a law on the 12th of February, 1873, nearly

three years after it was introduced into Congress. It was reprinted thirteen times and extra copies were printed for circulation. It was conned over, amended, and debated almost as copiously as the bill now pending, and no man in either House proposed to retain the old silver dollar. It was not mentioned, it was not thought of. It was an afterdevice. The fact that it was omitted from our coins was referred to in debate in both Houses. Mr. Hooper, in the House of Representatives, said:

Section 16 re-enacts the provisions of existing laws defining the silver coins and their weights respectively, except in relation to the silver dollar, which is reduced in weight from 412½ to 381 grains, thus making it a subsidiary coin in harmony with the silver coins of less denominations, to secure its concurrent circulation with them. The silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value being greater than its nominal value, long since ceased to be a coin of circulation, and is melted by manufacturers of silverware. It does not circulate now in commercial transactions with any country, and the convenience of those manufacturers in this respect can better be met by supplying small stamped bars of the same standard, avoiding the useless expense of coining the dollar for that purpose.

Here it was pointed out by Mr. Hooper, a very distinguished financier, as we know, that it was not only proposed to drop the old dollar, but to substitute a dollar containing 26½ grains less than the old dollar, and that was adopted by the House. Mr. Stoughton and Mr. Potter, both leading members, supported the proposition.

Mr. Kelley, whose honorable life we have recently commended, advocated the single standard of gold:

Mr. KELLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. Potter] if he knows of any Government in the world which makes its subsidiary coinage of full value? The silver coin of England is 10 per cent. below the value of gold coin. And acting under the advice of the experts of this country and of England and France, Japan has made her silver coinage within the last year 12 per cent. below the value of gold coin, and for this reason: It is impossible to retain the double standard. The values of gold and silver continually fluctuate. You can not determine this year what will be the relative values of gold and silver next year. They were 15 to 1 a short time ago; they are 16 to 1 now.

Hence, all experience has shown that you must have one standard coin, which shall be a legal tender for all others, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage of silver, which shall circulate in all parts of your country as legal tender for a limited amount and be redeemable at its face value by your Government.

So it appears that these honorable gentleman not only knew what they were about, but gave their reasons for adopting the 384-grain dollar instead of the old dollar of 412½ grains, and the House acted with full knowledge in adopting the French dollar and made it a subsidiary coin or a legal tender for but $5. When the House bill came to the Senate it contained the silver dollar of 384 grains, and also fractional coins of the same relative value, precisely in accordance with the coins of 1853, except that the 384-grain dollar, made a legal tender for only $5, was substituted for the old silver dollar of 412½ grains, which was a full legal tender. This, it appears, was explained by me on the 17th of January, 1873, in the following words:

Mr. SHERMAN. The bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar provided for by this bill is the precise equivalent of the five-franc piece.

Now, unless some Senator then a member of this body did not know the difference between a five-franc piece and a dollar, he certainly must not have been listening to me or he would have been clearly informed:

It contains the same number of grams of silver; and we have adopted the international gram instead of the grain for the standard of our silver coinage. The "trade dollar" has been adopted mainly for the benefit of the people of California and others engaged in trade with China.

I presented a petition here from the Legislature of California asking us to give them a dollar more valuable than the Mexican coin, in order that they might have a convenient mode of transporting their silver bullion, then not used at all among the people of the United States as currency.

That is the only coin measured by the grain instead of by the gram. The intrinsic value of each is to be stamped upon the coin.

Afterwards Mr. Casserly said that a dollar somewhat more valuable than the Mexican dollar would be a convenient coin for the exportation of silver in the Chinese trade; and he produced a memorial from the Legislature of California asking Congress to provide for such a coin, and we did provide for the trade-dollar of 420 grains, to be coined at any mint at the expense of the owner of the bullion. Other amendments were made and the bill passed. A conference was ordered on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses and was held. The House conferees agreed to the amendment in respect to the trade-dollar and provided "that any owner of silver bullion may deposit the same at any mint to be formed into bars or into dollars of the weight of 420 grains troy, designated in this act as trade-dollars." This dollar took the place of the 384-grain dollar. The report was signed by the conferees of both Houses, JOHN SHERMAN, John Scott, T. F. Bayard, managers on the part of the Senate, and S. Hooper and W. L. Stoughton, managers on the part of the House. The report was read in the Senate February 6 and in the House February 7, 1873, and agreed to.

I do not see how a member of either House, in the face of the recommendation of the Treasury Department and of the debate in both Houses on this very question, can repeat the imputation against the living and the dead of secretly and surreptitiously demonetizing the silver dollar without confessing to a grave neglect of public duty or a want of common intelligence. When this matter was discussed here in March, 1888, by the lamented Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Beck, he repeated the stale charge that the old silver dollar was surreptitiously dropped from our coinage, and I promptly replied in a speech I hold in my hand. I produced the original bills from the files of the Senate. I produced the memorial of the Legislature of California and conclusively answered this charge, not only for myself, but for every member of the Senate and House of Representatives that passed that bill, and, I am glad to say, to the entire satisfaction of the then Senator from Kentucky.

And now, sir, I intend to add the testimony of one more witness, that of Hon. Abram S. Hewitt of New York, who gave to this subject the most careful study. He said in his speech in the House of Representatives on the 5th of August, 1876, as follows:

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] on the 3d instant stated that the coinage act of 1873 "was passed surreptitiously and without discussion, and was one of the grossest measures of injustice ever inflicted upon any people." The honorable Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] and the honorable gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] have made similar statements, and these statements have been reiterated by the press of the country and repeated again to-day by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Fort]. In answer to these charges I propose, at the risk of being tedious, but in order to refute them once for all, to give, in a note at the foot of my remarks, the history of the coinage act of 1873, as shown by the records of the Treasury Department and of Congress.

* * * * * * *

I have felt it necessary to make this weary statement in order to prove that the legislation of 1873 was not surreptitiously enacted, traveling over ground that has been occupied in part by other members who have addressed the House, and in part by the daily press, because there is nothing so unpalatable to the American people as "tricks" in legislation, of which the Committee on Mines and Mining will be fully conscious when it comes to be generally understood how far they have exceeded the legitimate line of their duty in bringing forward this bill, which could never have been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which it properly belonged.

I will ask the Reporter to insert at the end of my remarks the historical statement of the coinage act of 1873, prepared by this gentleman, and I will not weary the Senate by reading it. It contains a most complete analysis and statement of every stage of the passage of the bill.

Now, sir, I shall leave this question, upon which perhaps I show a little more feeling than I ought. It is pretty hard to chase down a lie so often repeated, but I thought it necessary to do it, and set forth the matter here, not only for myself, but also for all others engaged in that legislation.

If, after this second vindication of the members of the Forty-second Congress, this baseless charge is repeated I shall content myself with denouncing it as a falsehood.

And now, sir, I recur to my second proposition, how to increase, if possible, the market value of silver to its legal ratio to gold, that of 16 to 1. In 1878 the United States commenced the experiment under the act of February 28, 1878, by remonetizing the silver dollar of 412½ grains of standard silver and by purchasing silver bullion at the market price to the amount of $2,000,000 worth a month and coining it into silver dollars. We know the result of that experiment. Silver bullion steadily declined in value. This table gives the average price of silver in London each fiscal year, 1873–1889, and the value of an ounce of fine silver at par of exchange, with decline expressed in percentages, each year since 1873:

Year.	Price in London.	Value of a fine ounce.	Decline from 1873.
	Pence.	*Dollars.*	*Per cent.*
1873	59.2500	1.29883	.....
1874	58.3125	1.27827	1.6
1875	56.8750	1.24676	4.
1876	52.7500	1.15634	11.
1877	54.8125	1.20156	7.5
1878	54.3107	1.19050	8.3
1879	50.8125	1.11387	14.2
1880	52.4375	1.14954	11.5
1881	51.9375	1.13852	12.3
1882	51.8125	1.13623	12.5
1883	51.0230	1.11826	13.9
1884	50.7910	1.11339	14.3
1885	49.8430	1.09262	15.9
1886	47.0380	1.03112	20.6
1887	44.8430	.98301	24.3
1888	43.6750	.95741	26.3
1889	42.4990	.93163	28.3

The silver dollar, though a full legal tender, with every effort made by successive Secretaries of the Treasury, could not be kept in circulation to an amount exceeding $60,000,000. When pressed into circulation it steadily returned to the Treasury, and on June 1 the amount in circulation was $56,348,174 and the amount in the Treasury was $309,988,092. But the certificates based upon the dollars were issued and readily circulated as money and now form nearly one-third of all the paper circulation in the country and are received and paid out on a parity with United States notes and gold coin. This experiment clearly establishes two things: One is that silver dollars can not be made to circulate as money in excess of a very moderate amount for change or in small transactions. The other is that the coinage of silver dollars does not tend to advance the price of silver in the markets of the world.

But it is said that the reason of this failure is that executive officers neglected or refused to exercise the discretionary powers given them to buy and coin bullion to the extent of $4,000,000 per month. There is no ground for this contention. If the coinage of $2,000,000 worth of silver did not check the fall of silver, but steadily accelerated its fall, what would have been the natural effect of the coinage of $4,000,000? The very presence of $290,000,000 of silver coin known to be in our Treasury vaults that can at will be dumped upon the markets of the world is the great bearish fact, the menace that tends to depreciate the price of silver. If this great sum had been scattered among the hordes of Asia, where it is largely used as ornaments and where it is the only standard of value, it would be mingled in the vast unknown mass of three thousand millions of silver estimated as existing in the world.

But we have made this impossible. We have been careful to buy silver bullion in the market at about $1 for an ounce of 480 grains and have coined 371 grains of this silver and called it a dollar. We have given to this dollar, when circulated at home, certain qualities which make it current here as a dollar, but it is not current anywhere else in the world. All other nations can buy silver bullion as cheap as the United States and coin it for less cost. This bullion is an ample security for its cost, and if represented by notes not greater in amount than the cost of the bullion they can easily be kept in circulation, but the coin can not be. Its forced circulation would depreciate it in every State in the Union, especially in California and Nevada, where a large proportion of contracts are payable in gold.

As coin in the vaults of the Treasury it is in far more danger from thieves; it is more expensive to handle and to guard than bullion, ton for ton. It is easily counterfeited or duplicated. It is a vast hoard always in sight, known to all men, increasing yearly. Suppose instead of $290,000,000 it was $580,000,000, would this tend to increase its value? Our silver in the form of coin does not and can not circulate in any country but our own. It is of less value in any foreign country than bullion, for to be coined there it must be converted into bullion, It is the opinion of many wise men that if the United States had only coined as much silver as could be circulated at home, leaving the surplus to find its natural market as bullion, the price of it would not have receded to the rate at which it has been sold; but, be this as it may, its continued coinage when not needed as money is not only a useless expense, but tends to lower the price of bullion.

What then can we do to arrest the fall of silver and to advance its market value? I know of but two expedients. One is to purchase bullion in large quantities as the basis and security of Treasury notes, as proposed by this bill. The other is to adopt the single standard of silver and take the chances for its rise or fall in the markets of the world. I have already stated the probable results of the hoarding of bullion. By purchasing in the open market our domestic production of silver and hoarding it in the Treasury we withdraw so much from the supply of the world, and thus maintain or increase the price of the remaining silver production of the world. It is not idle in our vaults, but is represented by certificates in active circulation. Sixteen ounces of silver bullion may not be worth 1 ounce of gold, still $1 worth of silver bullion is worth $1 worth of gold.

What will be the effect of the free coinage of silver? It is said that it will at once advance silver to par with gold at the ratio of 16 to 1. I deny it. The attempt will bring us to the single standard of the cheaper metal. When we advertise that we will buy all the silver of the world at that ratio and pay in Treasury notes, our notes will have the precise value of 371½ grains of pure silver, but the silver will have no higher value in the markets of the world. If, now, that amount of silver can be purchased at 80 cents, then gold will be worth $1.25 in the new standard. Free coinage means the substitution of a cheaper standard. All labor, property, and commodities will advance in nominal value, but their purchasing power in other commodities will not increase. If you make the yard 30 inches long instead of 36 you must purchase more yards for a coat or a dress, but do not lessen the cost of the coat or the dress. You may by free coinage, by a species of confiscation, reduce the burden of a debt, but you can not change the relative value of gold or silver or any object of human desire. The only result is to demonetize gold and to cause it to be hoarded or exported. The cheaper metal fills the channels of circulation and the dearer metal commands a premium.

If experience is needed to prove so plain an axiom we have it in our own history. At the beginning of our National Government we fixed the value of gold and silver as 1 to 15. Gold was undervalued and fled the country to where an ounce of gold was worth 15½ ounces of silver. Congress, in 1834, endeavored to rectify this by making the ratio 1 to 16, but by this silver was undervalued. Sixteen ounces of silver were worth more than 1 ounce of gold and silver disappeared. Congress, in 1853, adopted another expedient to secure the value of both metals as money. By this expedient gold is the standard and silver the subsidiary coin, containing confessedly silver of less value in the market than the gold coin, but maintained at the parity of gold coin by the Government.

The bill was carried forward in the Senate Chamber by Mr. Hunter, of Virginia, and many of the most distinguished men of that day participated in the debate upon it, where it was fully discussed and its passage put upon the ground that it was impossible to make the two metals always equal to each other so that their relative value would not change. Therefore, gold was adopted as the standard and silver was to be used so far as it could be as a subsidiary coin for currency. In that way both metals have run side by side from that day to this, and under that law more gold and silver coin—fourfold more of both metals—has been coined than under the old system of up Jo and down Jack, the system of a changeable ratio.

This system has been maintained now for thirty-six years, more than an average lifetime. Under it the coinage of silver has enormously increased. From 1792 to 1853 the entire coinage of silver was $79,241,904.50, including $2,506,890 of standard silver dollars. From 1853 to 1873, when the coinage act was passed, the coinage of silver dollars was $5,538,948, and of fractional silver (subsidiary) was $60,361,032.10. Under the act of 1873 there were issued 35,965,924 trade dollars, and $5,445,264.40 fractional silver. Under the resumption act of 1875, there was coined of fractional silver $48,082,580. Under the act of 1878 there were coined of standard silver dollars $363,626,266, as shown by the following table:

Coinage of silver in the United States.

Period.	Standard silver dollars.	Trade dollars.	Fractional silver.	Total.
1792-1853	$2,506,890		$76,735,014.50	$79,241,904.50
1853-1873	5,538,948		60,361,032.10	65,899,980.10
Act of 1873		$35,965,924	5,445,264.40	41,411,188.40
Act of 1875			48,082,580.05	48,082,580.05
Act of 1878	363,626,266			363,626,266.00
Total	371,672,104	35,965,924	190,623,891.05	598,261,919.05

E. O. LEECH, *Director of the Mint.*

BUREAU OF THE MINT, *May* 28, 1890.

It is a remarkable fact that since 1853, when all silver coin was made from bullion bought by the Government, the coinage and use of silver has been much greater than when the coinage of silver was free. Under the free-coinage system prior to 1853 we coined in silver $79,241,904.50, and under coinage limited to bullion bought by the Government we coined in silver $519,020,014.55. Under the present system we have also maintained an increasing coinage of gold and have now in the United States among the people or in the vaults of the Treasury $689,275,007 in gold coin or bullion, all of which is either circulating as money or is the basis of paper money in active circulation.

Under the free-coinage system the cheaper metal was the only money of the country; the other fled to foreign countries. A rise or fall of 3 per cent. would demonetize one or other of the metals. Under the present system the people are indifferent to the fluctuations in the bullion market and they know they have a fixed standard of value and that the Government, the custodian of their money, will maintain the parity of the purchasing power of their coins whatever may be the market value of the metal contained in them.

The gold standard has been the recognized policy of all the great political parties that have longest controlled the Government of the United States. The Federal party in the beginning sought to secure it by ascertaining the precise relative market value of the two metals and coining both as money, but erroneously fixed the ratio at 15 to 1. When the Democratic party came into power, Mr. Jefferson, to secure the circulation of gold, suspended the coinage of the silver dollar, but a faulty ratio stood in his way. General Jackson and Benton and their associates in 1834, with the avowed purpose to restore gold, or "Benton mint drops," as they were called, to circulation, changed the ratio to 16 to 1, but this banished all silver coin. In the administration of President Pierce in 1853 the present system was adopted, by which gold became the unit of value and the coinage of silver was made subsidiary, but was always maintained in purchasing power the equal of gold, dollar for dollar.

And so when the Republican party came into power, though driven by the stress of war to the almost exclusive use of credit money, yet as soon as possible it resorted to the policy of 1853, of gold as the unit and silver as subsidiary, and coined both metals in greater sums than ever before, and maintained their parity by a limitation of the coinage of the cheaper metal and its prompt redemption by being received at its legal ratio into the Treasury as the equivalent of gold. By this policy it has combined in use within twelve years over $800,000,000 of gold and silver coin, and with ample reserves of their coin in the Treasury now keeps in active circulation over $900,000,000 of paper money, which is in our own country and in all parts of the world received and paid out as the equivalent of gold or silver coin.

The adoption of free coinage now will be a reversal of the established policy of the Government from its beginning. It will limit our coinage to a single metal, for who will deposit gold for coinage into dollars when it is worth more in the markets of the world? If a fluctuation of 3 per cent. drove gold and silver alternately from our country, how much more would a fluctuation of 20 or 30 per cent.?

But it is said by the friends of free coinage that France maintains

both silver and gold as money. So it does, precisely as we do. They hold, as estimated by the Director of the Mint, $900,000,000 of gold and $700,000,000 in silver. This money is kept at par with each other by being received into the Bank of France as money and is only paid out when needed, precisely as the United States Treasury receives silver and gold and pays out such money as is lawfully demanded. But there is no free coinage in France or in any country of Europe. France would consider it suicidal to adopt free coinage.

In 1865, when 15½ ounces of silver were worth more than 1 ounce of gold and Chevalier and others favored the single standard of silver, the nations forming the Latin Union agreed by treaties to continue for ten years to receive and pay out the coins of the respective Governments to an amount limited and defined by the treaties. The object was to prevent gold, as the cheaper metal, from excluding silver. This treaty was extended ten years, and, in the mean time, silver had fallen below the French ratio of 15½ to 1. The treaty continued during all the period of the extreme fall of silver, when 1 ounce of gold was worth 22 ounces of silver, and the treaty is now continued year by year, liable at any time to be abandoned at the will of either of the treaty powers. The tendency of public opinion in Europe is to abandon the double standard and rest all obligations upon gold alone.

The United States and France, both Republics, are now upholding the double standard, not upon the basis of free coinage, but by refusing to coin silver except in limited amounts, and each maintaining the parity in purchasing power of its coins by receiving them and paying them out as money, or by holding bullion and coin of both metals as security for the redemption in coin of circulating notes. France and the United States have co-operated heartily with each other in two international conferences to establish the free coinage of silver and gold by the commercial nations of the world upon a common ratio, both admitting that neither or both nations combined can with safety enter upon such an experiment. Shall we try the experiment alone? And we have the good fortune to have two members of this commission members of this body. As sure as fate, as certain as the waters of the ocean will find their level, silver will be the only standard of value in the United States. We will detach ourselves from the standards and monetary policy of the great civilized and christian nations of the world, and take our place with China, Japan, India, and South America. The pound sterling will be worth $6 instead of $4.846; the franc, the thaler, and the florin, 25 per cent. more than now. Our dollar will be, as in colonial times, worth less than 3 shillings, or about 4 francs.

But it is said that those of us who demand the gold standard or paper money always equal to gold are the representatives of capital, money-changers, bondholders, Shylocks, who want to grind and oppress the people. This kind of argument I hoped would never find its way into the Senate Chamber. It is the cry of the demagogue, without the slightest foundation. All these classes can take care of themselves. They are the men who make their profits out of the depreciation of money. They can mark up the price of their property to meet changing standards. They can protect themselves by gold contracts. In proportion to their wealth they have less money on hand than any other class. They have already protected themselves to a great extent by converting the great body of the securities in which they deal into gold bonds, and they hold the gold of the country, which you can not change in value. They are not, as a rule, the creditors of the country.

The great creditors are savings-banks, insurance companies, widows and orphans, and provident farmers and business men on a small scale. The great operators are the great borrowers and owe more than is due them. Their credit is their capital and they need not have even money enough to pay their rent.

But how will this change affect the great mass of our fellow-citizens who depend upon their daily labor? A dollar to them means so much food, clothing, and rent. If you cheapen the dollar it will buy less of these. You may say they will get more dollars for their labor, but all experience shows that labor and land are the last to feel the change in monetary standards, and the same resistance will be made to an advance of wages on the silver standard as on the gold standard, and when the advance is won it will be found that the purchasing power of the new dollar is less than the old. No principle of political economy is better established than that the producing classes are the first to suffer and the last to gain by monetary changes.

I might apply this argument to the farmer, the merchant, the professional man, and to all classes except the speculator or the debtor who wishes to lessen the burden of his obligations, but it is not necessary.

It is sometimes said that all this is a false alarm, that our demand for silver will absorb all that will be offered and bring it to par with gold at the old ratio. I have no faith in such a miracle. If they really thought so, many would lose their interest in the question. What they want is a cheaper dollar that would pay debts easier. Others do not want either silver or gold, but want numbers, numerals, the fruit of the printing-press, to be fixed every year by Congress as we do an appropriation bill.

Now, sir, I am willing to do all I can with safety, even to taking great risks to increase the value of silver to gold at the old ratio, and to supply paper substitutes for both for circulation, but there is one immutable, unchangeable, ever-existing condition, that the paper substitute must always have the same purchasing power as gold and silver coin maintained at their legal ratio with each other. I feel a conviction, as strong as the human mind can have, that the free coinage of silver now by the United States will be a grave mistake and a misfortune to all classes and conditions of our fellow-citizens. I also have a hope and belief, but far from a certainty, that the measure proposed for the purchase of silver bullion to a limited amount and the issue of Treasury notes for it will bring silver and gold to the old ratio and will lead to an agreement with other commercial nations to maintain the free coinage of both metals.

And now, sir, I want to state in conclusion, without any purpose to bind myself to detail, that I will vote for any measure that will, in my judgment, secure a genuine bimetallic standard, one that will not demonetize gold or cause it to be hoarded or exported, but will establish both silver and gold as common standards and maintain them at a fixed ratio, not only in the United States, but among all the nations of the world. The principles adopted by the acts of 1853 and 1875 have been sustained by experience and should be adhered to. In pursuance of them I would receive into the Treasury of the United States all the gold and silver produced in our country at their market value, not at a speculative or forced value, but at their value in the markets of the world. And for the convenience of our people I would represent them by Treasury notes to an amount not exceeding their cost. I would confer upon these notes all the use, qualities, and attributes that we can confer within our constitutional power, and support and maintain them as money by coining the silver and gold as needed upon the present legal ratios, and by a pledge of all the revenues of the Government and all the wealth and credit of the United States. And I would proclaim to all our readiness, by international negotiations or treaties, to bring about an agreement among nations for common units of value and of weights and measures for all the productions of the world.

This hope of philosophers and statesmen is now nearer realization than ever before. If we could contribute to this result it would tend to promote commerce and intercourse, trade and travel, peace and harmony among nations. It would be in line with the civilization of our age. It is by such measures statesmen may keep pace with the marvelous inventions, improvements, and discoveries which have quadrupled the capacity of man for production, made lightning subservient to his will, revealed to him new agencies of power hidden in the earth, and opened up to his enterprise all the dark places of the world. The people of the United States boast that they have done their full share in all this development, that they have grown in population, wealth, and strength, that they are the richest of nations, with untarnished credit, a model and example of self-government without kings or princes or lords. Surely this is no time for a radical change of public policy which seems to have no motive except to reduce the burden of obligations freely taken, a change likely to impair our public credit and produce disorder and confusion in all monetary transactions. Others may see reasons for this change, but I prefer to stand by the standards of value that come to us with the approval and sanction of every party that has administered the Government since its beginning.

APPENDIX.

[Extract from speech of Hon. A. S. Hewitt, of New York, in the House of Representatives, August 5, 1876.]

On April 25, 1870, the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted the following letter to Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *April* 25, 1870.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a bill revising the laws relative to the Mint, assay offices, and coinage of the United States, and accompanying report. The bill has been prepared under the supervision of John Jay Knox, Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, and its passage is recommended in the form presented. It includes, in a condensed form, all the important legislation upon the coinage, not now obsolete, since the first mint was established, in 1792; and the report gives a concise statement of the various amendments proposed to existing laws and the necessity for the change recommended. There has been no revision of the laws pertaining to the Mint and coinage since 1837, and it is believed that the passage of the inclosed bill will conduce greatly to the efficiency and economy of this important branch of the Government service.

I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

GEO. S. BOUTWELL,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The report and the bill were referred on April 28, 1870, to the Finance Committee of the Senate, and subsequently, on May 2, 1870, five hundred additional copies were ordered to be printed for the use of the Treasury Department. The report says:

"The method adopted in the preparation of the bill was first to arrange in as concise a form as possible the laws now in existence upon these subjects, with such additional sections and suggestions as seemed valuable. Having accomplished this, the bill, as thus prepared, was printed upon paper with wide margin, and in this form transmitted to the different mints and assay offices, to the First Comptroller, the Treasurer, the Solicitor, the First Auditor, and to such other gentlemen as are known to be intelligent upon metallurgical and numismatical subjects, with the request that the printed bill should be returned with such notes and suggestions as experience and education should dictate. In this way the views of more than thirty gentlemen who are conversant with the manipulation of metals, the manufacture of coinage, the execution of the present laws relative thereto, the method of keeping accounts, and of making returns to the Department, have been obtained with but little expense to the Department and little inconvenience to correspondents. Having received these suggestions, the present bill has been framed, and it is believed to comprise within the compass of eight or ten pages of the Revised Statutes every important provision contained in more than sixty different enactments upon the Mint, assay

offices, and coinage of the United States, which are the result of nearly eighty years of legislation upon these subjects."

The amendments proposed by the bill were as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

"The new features of the bill now submitted are chiefly: the establishment of a mint bureau at the Treasury Department, which shall also have charge of the collection of statistics relative to the precious metals; the consolidation of the office of superintendent with that of the Treasurer, thus abolishing the latter office and disconnecting the Mint entirely from the office of assistant treasurer; the repeal of the coinage charge, and authorizing the exchange of unparted for refined bars; a reduction in the amount of wastage, and the tolerance (deviation in weight and fineness) in the manufacture of coin; requiring the token coinage to be of one material of uniform value, and to be redeemed under proper regulations when issued in excess, and the expense of its manufacture to be paid from specific appropriations, and not from the gain arising in its manufacture, as heretofore; an entire change in the manner of issuing the silver (subsidiary) coinage; discontinuing the coinage of the silver dollar; limiting the amount of silver to be used as alloy, so as to make the gold coinage of uniform color; the destruction of the dies not in use annually; requiring vouchers to pass between the different officers of the Mint in all transfers of bullion or coin; requiring increased bonds from officers of the Mint, and authorizing each officer to nominate his subordinate before appointment; and also making it an offense to increase or diminish the weights used in the Mint."

The report of Mr. Knox called special attention to the discontinuance of the silver dollar as a standard, as may be seen from the following paragraph on page 11:

"SILVER DOLLAR—ITS DISCONTINUANCE AS A STANDARD.

"The coinage of the silver-dollar piece, the history of which is here given, is discontinued in the proposed bill. It is by law the dollar unit and, assuming the value of gold to be fifteen and one-half times that of silver, being about the mean ratio for the past six years, is worth in gold a premium of about 3 per cent. (its value being 103.12) and intrinsically more than 7 per cent. premium in our other silver coins, its value thus being 107.42. The present laws consequently authorize both a gold-dollar unit and a silver-dollar unit, differing from each other in intrinsic value. The present gold-dollar piece is made the dollar unit in the proposed bill and the silver-dollar piece is discontinued. If, however, such a coin is authorized, it should be issued only as a commercial dollar, not as a standard unit of account, and of the exact value of the Mexican dollar, which is the favorite for circulation in China and Japan and other Oriental countries."

The appendix to the report contained a copy of the English coinage act of 1870, and four tables giving (1) the existing coinage, including the silver dollar; (2) the proposed coinage in which the silver dollar was omitted; (3) a metric system of coinage suggesting the issue of a subsidiary silver coinage consisting of two half-dollars constituting in weight and fineness an exact equivalent to the French five-franc piece, and a quarter-dollar and dime with proportionate weight and fineness, which proposition was finally adopted; (4) a table giving a comparison of coinage existing and proposed. A note at the foot of this table states that the silver dollar, half-dime, and three-cent piece are omitted in the proposed bill. Subsequently, on June 25, 1870, the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to the House of Representatives a letter of the then Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, together with copies of the correspondence of the Department with the officers of the different mints, assay offices, and other experts in reference to the bill and report previously submitted.

The bill in its original form, which was transmitted to the correspondents throughout the country for consideration and comment, contained the following section, as appears from the manuscript copy at the Treasury Department:

"SEC. 15. *And be it further enacted*, That of the silver coins [the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains] (now 412½ grains) the weight of the half-dollar or piece of 50 cents shall be 192 grains; and that the quarter-dollar and dime [and half-dime] shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth [and one-tenth] of the weight of said half-dollar. That the silver coin issued in conformity with the above sections shall be a legal tender in any one payment of debts for all sums [not exceeding $5, except duties on imports] *less than* $1."

If the words inclosed in [brackets] of the section as here given are excluded and the words in *italics* included, the section will conform precisely to the section which was transmitted to Congress and which passed the Senate on January 9, 1871.

The dollar of 384 grains was proposed in the rough revision of the bill for the purpose of obtaining an expression of opinion in reference to the proposed omission of the dollar piece and the words "except duties on imports" inserted for the reason that a regulation or usage at the custom-house in New York limits the payment of silver coins to the fractional parts of a dollar, except when the payment to be made is $5 or less. Several gentlemen in their criticisms upon the rough revision of the bill referred to this section.

Hon. James Pollock, the Director of the Mint at Philadelphia, said:

"SEC. 11. The reduction of the weight of the whole dollar is approved, and was recommended in my annual report of 1861." (Page 10.)

Mr. Robert Patterson, of Philadelphia, sent to Mr. Knox some notes on the bill suggesting amendments. He called attention to one of these in the following words:

"The silver dollar, half-dime, and three-cent piece are dispensed with by this amendment. Gold becomes the standard money, of which the gold dollar is the unit. Silver is subsidiary, embracing coins from the dime to half-dollar; coins less than the dime are of copper-nickel. The legal tender is limited to necessities of the case; not more than a dollar for such silver or 15 cents for the nickels."

Mr. Franklin Peale, formerly melter and refiner and chief coiner of the Mint at Philadelphia, recommended the discontinuance of the three and one dollar gold pieces, and supplying the place of the latter with a proper silver coin to be used as change. Dr. H. R. Linderman, the present Director of the Mint, said:

"Section 11 reduces the weight of the silver dollar from 412½ to 384 grains. I can see no good reason for the proposed reduction in the weight of this coin. It would be better, in my opinion, to discontinue its issue altogether. The gold dollar is really the legal unit and measure of value. Having a higher value as bullion than its nominal value, the silver dollar long ago ceased to be a coin of circulation; and being of no practical use whatever its issue should be discontinued."

Mr. James Ross Snowden, formerly Director of the Mint, said:

"I see that it is proposed to demonetize the silver dollar. This I think unadvisable. Silver coins below the dollar are now not money in a proper sense, but only tokens. I do not like the idea of reducing the silver dollar to that level. It is quite true that the silver dollar, being more valuable than two half-dollars or four quarter-dollars, will not be used as a circulating medium, but only for cabinets and perhaps to supply some occasional or local demand; yet I think there is no necessity for so considerable a piece as the dollar to be struck from metal which is only worth 94 cents. When we speak of dollars let it be known that we speak of dollars not demonetized and reduced below their intrinsic value, and thus avoid the introduction of contradictory and loose ideas of the standards of value."

Mr. George F. Dunning, formerly superintendent of the United States assay office in New York, proposed that the law in regard to the silver coinage should be in the following language:

"SEC. 11. *And be it further enacted*, That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, a half-dollar, a quarter-dollar, a dime or tenth of a dollar, and a half-dime or twentieth of a dollar; and the standard weight of the silver coins shall be in the proportion of 384 grains to the dollar, and these coins shall be a legal tender in all payments not exceeding $5."

The officers of the San Francisco branch mint made the following suggestions:

"Section 11. Would not the proposed change in the weight of the silver dollar disturb the relative value of all our coinage, affect our commercial conventions, and possibly impair the validity of contracts running through a long period? Might not the dollar be retained as a measure of value, but the coinage of the piece for circulation be discontinued?"

Mr. E. B. Elliott, of the Treasury Department, gave a complete history of the silver dollar, and suggested the issue of a commercial dollar of nine-tenths fineness, and containing of pure silver just 25 grams, in place of the then existing silver dollar of 412½ grains, the proposed silver dollar being almost the exact equivalent of the silver contained in the older Spanish-Mexican pillared dollar, established in 1704 by proclamation of Queen Anne as a legal tender of payment and accepted as par of exchange for the British colonies of North America at the rate of fifty-four pence sterling to the dollar, or four and four-ninth dollars to the pound sterling.

On December 19, 1870, the bill was reported from the Finance Committee of the Senate and printed with amendments.

On January 9, 1871, in accordance with previous notice, the bill came before the Senate and was discussed during that day and the following day by Senators SHERMAN, Sumner, Bayard, STEWART of Nevada, Williams, Casserly, MORRILL, and others, and passed the Senate on the 10th by a vote of 36 yeas to 14 nays.

On January 13, 1871, on motion of Hon. William D. Kelley, the Senate bill was ordered to be printed. On February 25, 1871, Mr. Kelley, the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, reported the bill back with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, when it was again printed and recommitted. Mr. Kelley again, on March 9, 1871, introduced the bill in the Forty-second Congress, when it was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Coinage, when appointed.

On January 9, 1872, the bill was reported by Mr. Kelley, chairman of the Coinage Committee, with the recommendation that it pass. The bill was read and discussed at length by Messrs. Kelley, Potter, Garfield, Maynard, DAWES, HOLMAN, and others. Mr. Kelley, in the opening speech, said:

"The Senate took up the bill and acted upon it *during the last Congress* and sent it to the House; it was referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and received as careful attention as I have ever known a committee to bestow on any measure.

* * * * * * *

"We proceeded with great deliberation to go over the bill, not only section by section, but line by line and word by word: the bill has not received the same elaborate consideration from the Committee on Coinage of this House, but the attention of each member was brought to it at the earliest day of this session; each member procured a copy of the bill and there has been a thorough examination of the bill again."—*Congressional Globe*, volume 100, page 322.

Mr. Kelley on the same day also said:

"There are one or two things in this bill I will say to the gentleman from New York, with his permission, which I personally would like to modify; that is to say, I would like to follow the example of England and make a wide difference between our silver and gold coinage. * * *

"I would have liked to have made the gold dollar uniform with the French system of weights, taking the gram as a unit." (Page 323, volume 100.)

On January 10, 1872, the bill after considerable discussion was again recommitted, and on February 9, 1872, it was again reported from the Coinage Committee by Hon. Samuel Hooper, printed and recommitted, and on February, 13, 1872, reported back by Mr. Hooper with amendments, printed, and made the special order for March 12, 1872, until disposed of.

On April 9, 1872, the bill came up in the House for consideration. Mr. Hooper in a carefully prepared speech of ten columns, explained the provisions of each section of the bill. In this speech (page 2306, volume 102 of the Congressional Globe) he says:

"Section 16 re-enacts the provisions of the existing laws defining the silver coins and their weights, respectively, except in relation to the silver dollar, which is reduced in weight from 412½ to 384 grains, thus making it a subsidiary coin in harmony with the silver coins of less denomination to secure its concurrent circulation with them. The silver dollar of 412½ grains, by reason of its bullion or intrinsic value being greater than its nominal value, long since ceased to be a coin of circulation, and is melted by manufacturers of silverware. It does not circulate now in commercial transactions with any country, and the convenience of these manufacturers in this respect can better be met by supplying small stamped bars of the same standard, avoiding the useless expense of coining the dollar for that purpose."

Mr. Stoughton, of the Coinage Committee, also made a speech of seven columns, in which he says:

"The silver coins provided for are the dollar, 384 grains troy, the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and dime, of the value and weight of one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the dollar, respectively, and they are made a legal tender for all sums not exceeding $5 at any one payment. The silver dollar, as now issued, is worth for bullion 3½ cents more than the gold dollar and 7½ cents more than two half-dollars; having a greater intrinsic and nominal value, it is certain to be withdrawn from circulation whenever we return to specie payment, and to be used for only manufacture and exportation as bullion."

The latter, in commenting upon the bill, says:

"Mr. Speaker, this is a bill of importance. When it was before the House in the early part of this session I took some objections to it which I am inclined now to think, in view of all the circumstances, were not entirely well founded, but after further reflection I am still convinced that it is a measure which it is hardly worth while for us to adopt at this time. * * * This bill provides for the making of changes in the legal-tender coin of the country and for substituting as legal-tender coin of only one metal instead as heretofore of two. I think myself this would be a wise provision, and that legal-tender coins, except subsidiary coin, should be of gold alone; but why should we legislate on this now when we are not using either of those metals as a circulating medium?

"The bill provides also for a change in respect of the weight and value of the silver dollar, which I think is a subject which, when we come to require legislation about it at all, will demand at our hands very serious consideration, and which, as we are not using such coins for circulation now, seems at this time to be an unnecessary subject about which to legislate." (Page 2310, volume 102.)

Mr. Kelley also said:

"I wish to ask the gentleman who has just spoken [Mr. Potter] if he knows of any government in the world which makes its subsidiary coinage of full value. The silver coin of England is 10 per cent. below the value of gold coin, and, acting under the advice of the experts of this country and of England and France, Japan has made her silver coinage within the last year 12 per cent. below the value of gold coin, and for this reason: It is impossible to retain the double standard. The values of gold and silver continually fluctuate. You can not determine this year what will be the relative values of gold and silver next year. They were 15 to 1 a short time ago; they are 16 to 1 now.

"Hence all experience has shown that you must have one standard coin which shall be a legal tender for all others, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage of silver, which shall circulate in all parts of your country as legal tender for a limited amount and be re-

deemable at its face value by your Government. But, sir, I again call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentlemen who oppose this bill insist upon maintaining a silver dollar worth 3½ cents more than the gold dollar and worth 7 cents more than two half dollars, and that so long as those provisions remain you can not keep silver coin in the country."

On May 27, 1872, the bill was again called up by Mr. Hooper for the purpose of offering an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the bill as amended passed that day—yeas 110, nays 13.

Just previous to the passage of the bill Mr. McNeely, of the Coinage Committee, said:

"As a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, having carefully examined every section and line of this bill and generally understanding the subject before us, I am satisfied that the bill ought to pass." (Page 3883, volume 104.)

The substitute reported by Mr. Hooper and passed by the House, so far as it refers to silver coinage, was identical with the bill previously reported from the Coinage Committee by him. It was also identical with the bill introduced by Mr. Kelley, with the single exception of the provision authorizing the coinage of a silver dollar weighing 384 grains. The bill of Mr. Kelley, so far as it related to the silver coinage, was identical with the bill which was prepared at the Treasury Department, and which had passed the Senate, excepting that the latter bill made the silver coin a legal tender for all sums less than $1, while the bill of Mr. Kelley made the silver coins a legal tender for $5 in any one payment.

The bill was again printed in the Senate on May 29, 1872, and referred to the Finance Committee. Senator SHERMAN, in reporting it back on December 16, 1872, said:

"This bill has, in substance, passed both Houses, except that the Senate bill enlarged and increased the salaries of the officers of the Mint; it was passed by the Senate at the session of the last Congress, went to the House, and now, somewhat modified, has passed the House at this Congress, so that the bill has practically passed both Houses of Congress. The Senate Committee on Finance propose a modification of only a single section; but as this is not the same Congress that passed the bill in the Senate, I suppose it will have to go through the form of a full reading unless the Senate are willing to take it on the statement of the committee, the Senate already having debated it and passed it." (Page 203, volume 106, third session Forty-second Congress.)

After further debate, on motion of Mr. Cole, the bill was printed in full with amendments.

On January 7, 1873, it was again reported with amendments and again printed for the information of the Senate. It passed that body on January 17, 1873, after a discussion occupying nineteen columns of the Congressional Globe. In the course of the debate Senator SHERMAN said:

"This bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar [two half-dollars] provided for by this bill is the precise equivalent of a 5-franc piece. It contains the same number of grams of silver, and we have adopted the international gram instead of the grain for the standard of our silver coinage. The trade-dollar has been adopted mainly for the benefit of the people of California and others engaged in trade with China.

"That is the only coin measured by the grain instead of by the gram. The intrinsic value of each is to be stamped upon the coin. The Chamber of Commerce of New York recommended this change, and it has been adopted, I believe, by all the learned societies who have given attention to coinage, and has been recommended to us, I believe, as the general desire. That is embodied in these three or four sections of amendment to make our silver coinage correspond in exact form and dimensions and shape and stamp with the coinage of the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted an international silver coinage." (Page 672, volume 106, third session, Forty-second Congress.)

The bill was sent to the House, and on January 21, 1873, on motion of Mr. Hooper, it was again printed with amendments, and subsequently committees of conference were appointed, consisting of Messrs. Hooper, Houghton, and McNeely, of the House, and Senators SHERMAN, Scott, and Bayard, of the Senate. The reports of the committees of conference were agreed to, and the bill became a law on February 12, 1873, substantially as originally prepared at the Treasury.

The bill as prepared at the Treasury omitted the silver-dollar piece, and the report stated the fact of its omission three different times and gave the reasons therefor. The silver-dollar piece was omitted from the bill as it first passed the Senate. It was also omitted from the bills reported by Mr. Kelley; but in the bills reported by Mr. Hooper a new silver dollar was proposed equal in weight (384 grains) to two of the half-dollars then authorized.

The Senate substituted a trade-dollar weighing 420 grains in place of the dollar of 384 grains, in accordance with the wishes of the dealers in bullion upon the Pacific coast, that being considered by them as the most advantageous weight for a coin to be used for shipment to China and Japan.

The weight of the subsidiary silver coin was increased about one-half per cent. in value, making the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and dime, respectively, of the weight of 12½ grams, 6¼ grams, and 2½ grams, or precisely one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth, respectively, of the weight of the French 5-franc piece. All of said coins were made a legal tender in nominal value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment. The bill was read in full in the Senate several times, and the record states on January 9, 1872, that it was read in the House. It was undoubtedly read at other times. The bill was printed separately eleven times and twice in reports made by the Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, thirteen times in all by order of Congress. It was considered at length by the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Coinage Committee of the House during five different sessions, and the debates upon the bill in the Senate occupied sixty-six columns of the Globe and in the House seventy-eight columns of the Globe.

The Secretary of the Treasury called the special attention of Congress to the bill in his annual reports for 1870, 1871, and 1872. In his report of 1872 he says:

"In the last ten years the commercial value of silver has depreciated about 3 per cent. as compared with gold, and its use as a currency has been discontinued by Germany and by some other countries. The financial condition of the United States has prevented the use of silver as currency for more than ten years, and I am of opinion that upon grounds of public policy no attempt should be made to introduce it, but that the coinage should be limited to commercial purposes, and designed exclusively for commercial uses with other nations.

"The intrinsic value of a metallic currency should correspond to its commercial value, or metals should be used for the coinage of tokens redeemable by the Government at their nominal value. As the depreciation of silver is likely to continue, it is impossible to issue coin redeemable in gold without ultimate loss to the Government; for when the difference becomes considerable the holders will present the silver for redemption and leave it in the hands of the Government, to be disposed of subsequently at a loss.

"Therefore, in renewing the recommendations heretofore made for the passage of the mint bill, I suggest such alterations as will prohibit the coinage of silver for circulation in this country, but that authority be given for the coinage of a silver dollar that shall be as valuable as the Mexican dollar, and to be furnished at its actual cost."

As a final answer to the charge that the bill was passed surreptitiously, I append, first, a copy of the section in reference to the issue of silver coins as printed in the report of the Treasury Department and as passed by the Senate; second, a copy of the section as reported by Mr. Kelley; third, a copy of the section as reported by Mr. Hooper; fourth, a copy of the section as finally passed by the Senate and agreed upon by the conference committee.

The following section was printed in the two reports of John Jay Knox, Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, to Congress; also in Senate bill 859, Forty-first Congress, second session, April 28, 1870; in Senate bill 859, December 19, 1870, and January 11, 1871, third session Forty-first Congress, as reported by Mr. SHERMAN:

"SEC. 15. *And be it further enacted*, That of the silver coins the weight of the half-dollar, or piece of 50 cents, shall be 192 grains; and that of the quarter-dollar and dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollars; that the silver coin issued in conformity with the above section shall be a legal tender in any one payment of debts for all sums less than $1."

The following section was printed in Senate bill 859, Forty-first Congress, third session, February 25, 1871, and House bill No. 5, Forty-second Congress, first session, March 9, 1871, as reported by Mr. Kelley:

"SEC. 15. *And be it further enacted*, That of the silver coins the weight of the half-dollar, or piece of 50 cents, shall be 192 grains; and the quarter-dollar and dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; which coins shall be a legal tender, at their denominational value, for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

The following section was printed in House bill No. 2934, May 29, 1872; House bill No. 1427, February 9, 1872, and February 13, 1872, Forty-second Congress, second session, as reported by Mr. Hooper:

"SEC. 16. That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, and a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains; the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coins shall be a legal tender, at their denominational value, for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

The following section was printed in House bill No. 2934, December 16, 1872, January 7, 1873, and January 21, 1873, Forty-second Congress, third session, as reported by Mr. SHERMAN:

"That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade-dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade-dollar shall be 420 grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar shall be 12½ grains [grams]; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; and said coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment."

The following section was contained in all of the different bills and the coinage act of 1873:

"SEC. 18. *And be it further enacted*, That no coins, either of gold, silver, or minor coinage, shall hereafter be issued from the Mint other than those of the denominations, standards, and weights herein set forth."

Copies of the different bills may be obtained at the document-room of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I congratulate myself and I congratulate the country that the mask is off this so-called silver party that has paraded the committee's bill before the Senate. If there was any question as to the attitude of the distinguished gentleman who had taken his seat before I got up, no person who has listened to him can doubt it now. He is for the single standard, the gold standard to be the only standard, he is for the abandonment of silver as a money metal, to be used simply as subsidiary coin, or else his words mean nothing. I welcome the issue. The people of the United States will be glad to know that the so-called silver party who have heretofore been avowed goldites have resumed their natural, normal position and place.

Mr. President, I do not intend to reply to what the Senator from Ohio has said now, because the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] wishes to make some remarks. I only want to say that the statement made by him that this country has been on a gold basis at any time except between 1873 and 1878 has not the slightest scintilla of evidence to support it. We never were on a gold basis. There never was a demonetization of silver in this country as the Senator states. I rose to do what the Senator declined to allow me to do, correct an error of his when he stated that the circulation of this country had kept pace with the population.

He stated that the per capita of this country was $22. If so, the increase every year having been about a million, there must have been $22,000,000 last year of increased circulation. I was not able to hear from the rear where I sat, being back of the Senator, just the amount that he gave as the increase last year, but I challenged the statement when he said it was in proportion to the increase of population, because that is not true.

Mr. SHERMAN. Twenty-two million.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator said he went to the Treasury Department for its report. So did I. I have it here stated in at least three or four different places, and I will read it, and then I will drop the matter. But I shall take occasion to reply to some of what I will say, with all due politeness, are misstatements of fact in the Senator's remarks. I think the Senator's facts are as much out of joint as his logic.

Mr. President, the report of the Treasurer of the United States—you can find it on pages 10 and 11—starts out and gives us the Treasury report of the year 1889, the last report out. The Treasurer starts out and gives a statement of all the coin and all the paper money in this country and foots it up as amounting in 1889 to $2,099,000,000 in round numbers, gold and silver and paper money; and that is the statement which goes out to everybody, that we have that amount of money. But the Treasurer says:

From the face of the preceding statements it would appear that there was an increase both in the aggregate monetary supply and in the amount held by the people. The certificates of deposit are, however, merely representative of moneys in the Treasury, and to count them with the coin and notes to which they give title would be a duplication.

That is what is being done by the advocates of plenty of money. I do not understand that the Senator from Ohio who has just addressed the Senate is in that category, because he said the other day that we needed more money, but did not say how much:

If these be eliminated, and the actual moneys disposed according to ownership, the result will be as shown below:

	Outstanding.	In Treasury.	In circulation.
June 30, 1888.			
Gold	$705,818,855.00	$193,610,172.46	$512,208,682.54
Silver	386,572,835.35	79,923,468.70	306,649,366.65
Notes	606,512,959.32	45,787,874.89	560,775,084.43
Total	1,698,904,649.67	319,271,516.05	1,379,633,133.62
June 30, 1889.			
Gold	680,063,505.00	186,257,490.79	493,806,014.21
Silver	420,548,929.00	57,792,586.52	362,756,342.48
Notes	565,482,986.47	34,493,508.05	530,989,478.42
Total	1,666,095,420.47	278,543,585.36	1,387,551,835.11

He shows, Mr. President, that the actual circulation is $1,387,000,000 which taken from the circulation that was issued last year the accounts show is about $8,000,000 increase.

I will read it so that there shall be no misunderstanding:

These figures make apparent a contraction of about $33,000,000 in the currency, resulting from the changes already pointed out in the stock of gold, silver, and national-bank notes. In combination with this the $41,000,000 paid out of the Treasury produced an increase of $8,000,000 in the circulation.

To be accurate, Mr. President, it is $7,917,702.

I put that statement of the Treasurer of the United States as published against the statement of the Senator from Ohio which he declined to allow me to correct.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, from the foundation of this Government to 1873, any person having either gold or silver bullion could take it to the Mint of the United States and obtain coin for it at the ratio fixed. That is an admitted fact. The act of 1873

DEPRIVED THE CITIZEN OF THAT PRIVILEGE.

The question is now whether or not that act was passed advisedly, accidentally, or otherwise; whether it was discussed in the Senate and understood in the House or whether it was not. The discussions fortunately are all recorded. Consequently the fact, as to passage or not, can be determined without any mistake by the records. Inasmuch as I am constantly pointed to as having been here and participating in the proceedings and inasmuch as I have recently stated that I did not know when this occurred and was unconscious of having participated in this measure, I propose to exhibit the facts as they are and put them in the RECORD, so that any man can judge and determine for himself. The statement thereof may be a little dry, but I will not be as long showing exactly how it appeared as you may suppose.

Mr. President, on the 28th of April, 1870, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] introduced in the Senate a long bill (S. 859) entitled "A bill revising the laws relative to the mints, assay offices, and coinage of the United States," which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (Congressional Globe, 1869–'70, part 4, page 3051.) It was reported by the Finance Committee with amendments December 19, 1870, and discussed in the Senate January 9 and 10, 1871. (Congressional Globe, 1870–'71, part 1, third session, Forty-first Congress, page 394.)

When this bill came up for consideration in the Senate

THE ONLY CONTROVERSY WHICH AROSE

with regard to it was in relation to an amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which was vigorously opposed by all the Pacific coast delegation. This was the bill to which the Senator has alluded and which had been recommended by the Treasury Department. This was the amendment offered by the Senator, which occasioned all the discussion that occurred:

For coinage, whether the gold and silver deposited be coined or cast into bars or ingots, in addition to the charge for refining or parting the metals, three-tenths of 1 per cent.—*Congressional Globe*, 1870–'71, part 1, third session, Forty-first Congress, page 368.

A long discussion followed, and it was held that the provision was a discriminating tax against bullion, for, in addition to paying the ordinary charges, it would discourage the taking of bullion to our mints and make its market value for shipment greater than its value at the mint. It was very ably discussed by many Senators for a long time.

The amendment was adopted in Committee of the Whole by a yea-and-nay vote of 25 to 22. (Congressional Globe, 1870–'71, part 1, third session, Forty-first Congress, page 377.)

No other amendment which excited discussion was acted upon in the Senate, except little formal amendments. In fact, all the amendments, except the tax amendment,

RELATED TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE MINTS.

After the bill was reported to the Senate, Mr. Cole, of California, demanded a separate vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to tax bullion. Another long and animated discussion followed, after which the amendment was rejected by a yea-and-nay vote of 23 to 26. (Congressional Globe, 1870–'71, part 1, third session, Forty-first Congress, pages 394–399.)

The Senator from Ohio, having failed to secure the passage of the amendment to tax bullion, abandoned the bill and asked for the yeas and nays on its final passage. The bill was passed by a vote of 36 to 14. (*Ibid.*, page 399.) My name is recorded in the affirmative and that of the Senator from Ohio in the negative.

There was not a word of discussion in regard to coinage in the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask the Senator from Nevada whether that bill did not drop the silver dollar; whether the silver dollar was not omitted from that bill and prohibited from among the coins.

Mr. STEWART. It was Mr. Knox's bill, and it did what the Senator states. But the attention of nobody was called to it; and in this connection I will say, it is very strange that so important a measure as that, if it had been discussed, been indorsed everywhere, and was generally known, was not alluded to while the bill was before the Senate. The only question discussed was this question of taxing bullion.

I did not know

THAT THE BILL MADE ANY CHANGE IN THE COINAGE

of either gold or silver, but supposed, as the title indicated, that it was a mere codification of the Mint laws. There certainly was no suggestion in the Senate that the bill made any change in the standards of gold or silver or that the coinage of either metal would be affected thereby. It is undoubtedly true that previous to the introduction of the bill the Senator from Ohio and the Comptroller of the Currency, John Jay Knox, had recommended the demonetization of silver, and the Secretary of the Treasury had forwarded the report of the Comptroller to Congress, recommending such action. But it attracted no attention and was passed over in the same manner that other printed matter relating to technical subjects usually is. It is impossible for any Senator to keep the run of all the public documents printed. He could not read them if he did no other business. It is the duty of the committee having charge of particular subjects to examine such documents and bring before the Senate all matters of importance. The Committee on Finance failed to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the bill

CONTAINED A PROVISION WHICH WOULD DEMONETIZE SILVER.

I will not trace the proceedings in the House which relate to this great change in our silver coinage, except to remark that they prove that the question of demonetizing silver was never considered in that body. The fact, which I will hereafter show, that the leading members of the House and of the Senate did not know that silver was demonetized for several years afterwards, demonstrates that the matter was not understood at the time the act became a law.

The bill which demonetized silver, as it passed the House, contained a dollar which was precisely the equivalent of the five-franc piece. It limited the legal-tender quality of the silver coinage to $5,

WHICH FATAL DEFECT WAS NOT NOTICED.

This bill passed the House May 27, 1872. (Congressional Globe, 1872–'73, part 5, page 3843.) The sixteenth section of this measure as it came from the House contained a silver dollar of 384 grains, which was the exact equivalent of the five-franc piece of France and adopted the European ratio of 15½ to 1.

On the 28th day of May the bill was reported to the Senate, and the next day referred to the Committee on Finance. (*Ibid.*, pages 3961 and 3986.) That committee, on December 16, reported the bill back to the Senate with various amendments. (Cong. Globe 1872–'73, part 1, page 203.) The amendments were printed January 7, 1873. (*Ibid.*, page 363.) The bill was discussed and passed January 17, 1873. (*Ibid.*, pages 661, 668–674.) The amendments reported by the Committee on Finance were acted upon *seriatim*, and, with one exception, in the usual manner. Section 16 of the bill, which provided for the silver coins of the United States, contained, among other things, as before remarked, a silver dollar of 384 grains. The recommendation of the committee was to strike out the sixteenth section of the House bill and substitute therefor the provision which demonetized silver. The substitute proposed by the committee, and which is now section 3513 of the Revised Statutes, and which was not read or discussed, is as follows:

SEC. 3513. The silver coins of the United States shall be a trade-dollar, a half-dollar, or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar, or twenty-five-cent piece, a dime, or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade-dollar shall be four hundred and twenty grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar shall be twelve grams and one-half of a gram; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar.

Another section limited the legal tender of the new trade-dollar to five dollars. The amendments, as before stated, were considered *seriatim*. When section 15 was reached it was stricken out; consequently section 16 of the House bill would then become section 15 of the amended Senate bill. The Congressional Globe shows that no action was taken on section 16 of the House bill. On the contrary, after acting on section 15, the next amendment of the House bill considered was section 17, which had been section 16 of the amended Senate bill. This amendment related to the minor coins and it was adopted without debate.

The next amendment was one to section 19 of the House bill and

section 18 of the Senate amended bill. This amendment provided for omitting the eagle on the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, and prescribed in lieu thereof the weight and fineness of the coin, so that the section when amended would read as follows:

SEC. [19] 18. That upon the coins of the United States there shall be the following devices and legends: Upon one side there shall be an impression emblematic of liberty, with an inscription of the word "Liberty" and the year of the coinage, and upon the reverse shall be the figure or representation of an eagle, with the inscription "United States of America" and "E Pluribus Unum," and a designation of the value of the coin; but on the gold dollar and the three-dollar piece, the silver dollar, the half-dollar, the quarter-dollar, the dime, five, three, and one cent pieces the figure of the eagle shall be omitted; and on the reverse of the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed the weight and fineness of the coin; and the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may cause the motto "In God we Trust" to be inscribed upon such coins as shall admit of such motto; and any one of the foregoing inscriptions may be on the rim of the gold and silver coins.

I have got the record here—anybody can examine it—showing that that was omitted and not mentioned. Mr. Casserly, of California, was watching the bill. He said:

I regret that the eagle is to disappear from the dollar, half-dollar, and quarter-dollar of our coinage. It will hardly be possible to think of a half-dollar or a quarter-dollar as being such a coin without the eagle upon it.

A dialogue followed between the Senator from Ohio and Mr. Casserly, in which the chairman of the Finance Committee explained fully and particularly why it was necessary to have the weight and fineness stamped upon the dollar, half-dollar, and quarter-dollar of our silver coinage.

The chairman said:

If the Senator will allow me, he will see that the preceding section provides for coin which is exactly interchangeable with the English shilling and the five-franc piece of France; that is, a five-franc piece of France will be the exact equivalent of a dollar of the United States in our silver coinage; and in order to show this wherever our silver coin shall float—and we are providing that it shall float all over the world—we propose to stamp upon it, instead of our eagle, which foreigners may not understand and which they may not distinguish from a buzzard or some other bird, the intrinsic fineness and weight of the coin.—*Congressional Globe*, 1872-'73, part 1, third session, Forty-second Congress, page 672.

Mr. Casserly was still dissatisfied with this explanation. He wanted the eagle.

Mr. SHERMAN again said:

This bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe.

That is, the Latin Monetary Union.

Mr. SHERMAN. The dollar there is exactly two half-dollars, corresponding with the French coin.

Mr. STEWART. I would rather not be interrupted. I want to give it connectedly if possible. By interruptions the discussion will be disconnected. The Senator referred to the preceding section, which, it may be remarked, contained a dollar the equivalent of the five-franc piece, and not to the proposed amendment, which was never read and which contained the trade-dollar, which was not equivalent to the five-franc piece, but contained 420 grains of standard silver.

This bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar provided for by this bill is the precise equivalent of the five-franc piece. It contains the same number of grams of silver, and we have adopted the international gram instead of the grain for the standard of our silver coinage. The "trade-dollar" has been adopted mainly for the benefit of the people of California and others engaged in trade with China. That is the only coin measured by the grain instead of by the gram. The intrinsic value of each is to be stamped upon the coin.

* * * * * * *

The Chamber of Commerce of New York first recommended this change, and it has been adopted, I believe, by all the learned societies who have given attention to coinage, and has been recommended to us, I believe, as the general desire. That is embodied in these three or four sections of amendment, to make our silver coinage correspond in exact form and dimensions and shape and stamp with the coinage of the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted an international silver coinage.—*Ibid.*

As before stated, the substitute for the sixteenth section of the House bill,

WHICH DEMONETIZED SILVER,

was not read and acted upon in the Senate; at all events, the Globe fails to show that it was.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will allow me, he has now in his possession the original bill which shows the particular item.

Mr. STEWART. Yes, and I will state it all. I will come to that if you will let me go on, and I will put it in the RECORD so that everybody may study it. It is possible that the Reporter failed to record the action of the Senate, but it is very improbable. It is doubtful, indeed, if such a failure ever occurred before or since, and it is strange that the most important amendment that was ever considered by the Senate, an amendment which

DEMONETIZED ONE OF THE PRECIOUS METALS,

should have been omitted by the Reporter. If there was nothing, however, but the omission to record in the Globe the fatal amendment, a possible doubt might exist; but the discussion as to the inscription on the silver dollar, which arose on the amendment to section 19 of the House bill, to which I have called the attention of the Senate, seems to establish beyond the possibility of doubt that the original section 16 of the House bill was retained and was in the bill as it passed the Senate.

The whole argument of the Senator from Ohio for substituting the weight and fineness on the silver dollar in place of the eagle was to designate its value, because it was to be an international coin, and to show that it was the exact equivalent of the five-franc piece. This argument could not have had reference to the trade-dollar of 420 grains in the proposed amendment; on the contrary

IT WAS EXPRESSLY STATED

that the reason applied to the silver dollar of 384 grains. The dollar in the original section of the House bill was to be of 384 grains; it was the exact equivalent of the five-franc piece, whereas the dollar provided for in the amendment which was not acted upon contained 420 grains and was called a standard dollar.

The fact that the legal tender of the silver coins in the House bill was limited to $5 is immaterial so far as it relates to what occurred in the Senate. That limitation was not brought to the attention of the Senate, but, on the contrary, as has already been shown, the Senator from Ohio said:

This bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar provided for by this bill is the precise equivalent of the five-franc piece.

The silver coinage of the associated nations of Europe was a full legal tender. Consequently, the effect of what the Senator from Ohio said of the section of the House bill was that it contained a dollar equivalent to the five-franc piece, which was a full legal tender.

On the record the evidence seems conclusive that the fatal provision demonetizing silver

WAS NEVER ACTED UPON IN THE SENATE,

but was incorporated in the bill by the engrossing clerk. And it should be here remarked that the engrossing clerk could not be blamed for his action, because upon the copy used at the desk the amendment to section 16 is marked "agreed." So that mistake might have been made at the clerk's desk. I have the original here. There was no provision in the bill which passed the Senate to prevent the owner of silver bullion from presenting his bullion at the Mint and demanding coin therefor. Silver bullion was excluded from free coinage, except into trade-dollars, by the following clause in the report of the conference committee:

No deposit of silver for other coinage [than trade-dollars] shall be received. (Congressional Globe, 1872-'73, part 2, third session, Forty-second Congress, page 1150.)

So that there was a provision in the conference committee's report excluding silver. It prevented the owner of silver from taking it to the mints and exchanging it for anything but the trade-dollar.

But, as I have said, the fatal amendment which demonetized silver was never read in either House. It was adopted in the conference report as number 6, and here is the conference report, and the numbers run from 1 to 20. This fatal amendment demonetizing silver was numbered 6. The House did not hear it read because it went in by a number. It was simply number 6 in the conference between the two Houses. It was slightly amended in the conference report, but not in such a manner as to indicate what number 6 was.

In order that every Senator may have an opportunity of examining this remarkable legislation, I ask leave to print in my remarks, first, the House bill as originally reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, with the proposed amendments of the committee, and also with the action of the Senate on those amendments, as indicated by the marks of the reading clerk, and that will give it all. Here is the original copy which I have secured from the files, and I ask the Reporter to give it back to the Secretary of the Senate, as it is an important document and I have not another copy of it.

Now, as to the proceedings in the Senate when the bill with its amendments was under consideration as shown by the Congressional Globe. I have the proceedings here, and I will print them *seriatim*, so that all can take the bill and the proceedings that follow it and see what they were; then the engrossed amendments to the bill, and immediately after that I will have the conference report inserted. All these are out of print and inaccessible to the public, and by printing them *seriatim* as they occur the history of the whole thing will appear. By these documents it will be shown that the fatal demonetizing amendment

WAS NEVER READ IN EITHER HOUSE.

It went by number 6 in the report. I have the record here and will have it printed so that everybody can examine it and make no further mistake.

The record is as follows:

[Note in explanation of the bill (H. R. 2934) printed below.

1. The body of the bill, printed in brevier, is as it came from the House.

2. Amendments to insert, reported by Committee on Finance, are in *italics*.

3. Amendments to strike out, reported by Committee on Finance, are in [brackets].

4. Amendments made by the Senate striking out words are in brevier, with brackets, and the words inserted in lieu thereof in the handwriting of the Clerk, are in SMALL CAPS.

5. Amendment reported by Committee on Finance, on page 12, section 18, line 9, in *italics* and brackets, was disagreed to by the Senate.

6. Amendment to strike out, on page 14, section 24, lines 5 and 6, was moved in the Senate, and is in SMALL CAPS and brackets.
7. The word "agreed," in the handwriting of the Clerk, showing what amendments were agreed to, is indicated by LARGE CAPS.
8. The exact pages and lines of the original bill are indicated.]

42d CONGRESS, 3d SESSION. H. R. 2934.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

MAY 29, 1872.

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DECEMBER 16, 1872.

Reported by Mr. SHERMAN with amendments, viz: Strike out the parts in [brackets] and insert the parts printed in *italics*.

JANUARY 7, 1873.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Finance, reported additional amendments, which were ordered to be printed with the bill.

AN ACT

Revising and amending the laws relative to the mints, assay-offices, and coinage of the United States.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Mint of the United States is hereby established as a
4 Bureau of the Treasury Department, embracing in its organ-
5 ization and under its control all mints for the manufacture of
6 coin, and all assay-offices for the stamping of bars, which are
7 now, or which may be hereafter, authorized by law. The
8 chief officer of the said Bureau shall be denominated the Di-
9 rector of the Mint, and shall be under the general direction of
10 the Secretary of the Treasury. He shall be appointed by the
11 President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate,

2

12 and shall hold his office for the term of five years, unless
13 sooner removed by the President, upon reasons to be commu-
14 nicated by him to the Senate.
1 SEC. 2. That the Director of the Mint shall have the
2 general supervision of all mints and assay-offices, and shall
3 make an annual report to the Secretary of the Treasury of
4 their operations, at the close of each fiscal year, and from
5 time to time such additional reports, setting forth the opera-
6 tions and condition of such institutions, as the Secretary of
7 the Treasury shall require, and shall lay before him the
8 annual estimates for their support. And the Secretary of the
9 Treasury shall appoint the number of clerks, classified ac-
10 cording to law, necessary to discharge the duties of said Bu-
11 reau.
1 SEC. 3. That the officers of each mint shall be a super-
2 intendent, an assayer, a melter and refiner, and a coiner, and,
3 for the mint at Philadelphia, an engraver, all to be appointed
4 by the President of the United States, by and with the ad-
5 vice and consent of the Senate.
1 SEC. 4. That the superintendent of each mint shall have
2 the control thereof, the superintendence of the officers and
3 persons employed therein, and the supervision of the business
4 thereof, subject to the approval of the Director of the Mint,
5 to whom he shall make reports at such times and according
6 to such forms as the Director of the Mint may prescribe,

3

7 which shall exhibit in detail, and under appropriate heads,
8 the deposits of bullion, the amount of gold, silver, and minor
9 coinage, and the amount of unparted, standard, and
10 refined bars issued, and such other statistics and
11 information as may be required. The superintend-
12 ent of each mint shall also receive and safely keep,
13 until legally withdrawn, all moneys or bullion which shall
14 be for the use or the expenses of the mint. He shall re-
15 ceive all bullion brought to the mint for assay or coinage;
16 shall be the keeper of all bullion or coin in the mint, except
17 while the same is legally in the hands of other officers; and
18 shall deliver all coins struck at the mint to the persons to
19 whom they shall be legally payable. From the report of the
20 assayer and the weight of the bullion, he shall compute
21 the value of each deposit, and also the amount of the charges
22 or deductions, if any, of all which he shall give a detailed
23 memorandum to the depositor; and he shall also give at the
24 same time, under his hand, a certificate of the net amount of
25 the deposit, to be paid in coins or bars of the same species of
26 bullion as that deposited, the correctness of which certificate
27 shall be verified by the assayer, who shall countersign the
28 same; and in all cases of transfer of coin or bullion, he shall
29 give and receive vouchers, stating the amount and character
30 of such coin or bullion. He shall keep and render, quarter-
31 yearly, to the Director of the Mint, for the purpose of adjust-

4

32 ment, according to such forms as may be prescribed by the
33 Secretary of the Treasury, regular and faithful accounts
34 of his transactions with the other officers of the
35 mint and the depositors; and shall also render to him a
36 monthly statement of the ordinary expenses of the mint or
37 assay-office under his charge. He shall also appoint all
38 assistants, clerks, (one of whom shall be designated "chief
39 clerk,") and workmen employed under his superintendence;
40 but no person shall be appointed to employment in the offices
41 of the assayer, melter and refiner, coiner, or engraver, except
42 on the recommendation and nomination in writing of those
43 officers, respectively; and he shall forthwith report to the
44 Director of the Mint the names of all persons appointed by
45 him, the duties to be performed, the rate of compensation,
46 the appropriation from which compensation is to be made,
47 and the grounds of the appointment; and if the Director of
48 the Mint shall disapprove the same, the appointment shall be
49 vacated.
1 SEC. 5. That the assayer shall assay all metals and
2 bullion, whenever such assays are required in the operations
AGREED OR SAMPLES OF BULLION
3 of the mint; he shall also make assays of coins ^ whenever
4 required by the superintendent.
1 SEC. 6. That the melter and refiner shall execute all
2 the operations which are necessary in order to form ingots of
3 standard silver or gold, and alloys for minor coinage, suitable

5

4 for the coiner, from the metals legally delivered to him for
5 that purpose; and shall also execute all the operations which
6 are necessary in order to form bars conformable in all
7 respects to the law, from the gold and silver bullion delivered
8 to him for that purpose. He shall keep a careful record of
9 all transactions with the superintendent, noting the weight
10 and character of the bullion; and shall be responsible for all
11 bullion delivered to him until the same is returned to the
12 superintendent and the proper vouchers obtained.
1 SEC. 7. That the coiner shall execute all the operations
2 which are necessary in order to form coins, conformable in all
3 respects to the law, from the standard gold and silver ingots,
4 and alloys for minor coinage, legally delivered to him for
5 that purpose; and shall be responsible for all bullion delivered
6 to him, until the same is returned to the superintendent and
7 the proper vouchers obtained.
1 SEC. 8. That the engraver shall prepare from the
AGREED WORKING
2 original dies already authorized all the [wording] ^ dies required
3 for use in the coinage of the several mints, and, when new
4 coins or devices are authorized, shall, if required by the
5 Director of the Mint, prepare the devices, models, molds,
6 and matrices, or original dies, for the same; but the Director
7 of the Mint shall nevertheless have power, with the approval
8 of the Secretary of the Treasury, to engage temporarily for
9 this purpose the services of one or more artists distinguished

6

10 in their respective departments of art, who shall be paid for
11 such service from the contingent appropriation for the mint
12 at Philadelphia.
AGREED ASSAY
1 SEC. 9. That whenever any officer of a mint or ^ office
2 shall be temporarily absent, on account of sickness or any
3 other cause, it shall be lawful for the superintendent, with the
4 consent of said officer, to appoint some person attached to
5 the mint to act in the place of such officer during his absence;
6 but all such appointments shall be forthwith reported to the
7 Director of the Mint for his approval; and in all cases what-
8 soever the principal shall be responsible for the acts of his
9 representative. In case of the temporary absence of the
10 superintendent, the chief clerk shall act in his place; and in
11 case of the temporary absence of the Director of the Mint,
12 the Secretary of the Treasury may designate some one to act
13 in his place.
1 SEC. 10. That every officer, assistant, and clerk of the
2 mint shall, before he enters upon the execution of his office,
3 take an oath or affirmation before some judge of the United
4 States, or judge of the superior court, or of some court of
5 record of any State, faithfully and diligently to perform the
6 duties thereof, in addition to other official oaths prescribed by
7 law; which oaths, duly certified, shall be transmitted to the
8 Secretary of the Treasury; and the superintendent of each

7

mint may require such oath or affirmation from any of the employees of the mint.

SEC. 11. That the superintendent, the assayer, the melter and refiner, and the coiner of each mint, before entering upon the execution of their respective offices, shall become bound to the United States, with one or more sureties, approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, in the sum of not less than ten nor more than fifty thousand dollars, with condition for the faithful and diligent performance of the duties of his office. Similar bonds may be required of the assistants and clerks, in such sums as the superintendent shall determine, with the approbation of the Director of the Mint; but the same shall not be construed to relieve the superintendent or other officers from liability to the United States for acts, omissions, or negligence of their subordinates or employees: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, at his discretion, increase the bonds of the superintendent.

SEC. 12. That there shall be allowed to the Director of the Mint an annual salary of four thousand five hundred dollars, and actual necessary traveling expenses in visiting the different mints and assay-offices, for which vouchers shall be rendered, to the superintendents of the mints at Philadelphia and San Francisco, each four thousand five hundred dollars; to the assayers, melters and refiners, and coiners of said mints, each three thousand dollars; to the engraver of the mint at

8

Philadelphia, three thousand dollars; to the superintendent of the mint at Carson City, three thousand dollars; and to the assayer, to the melter and refiner, and to the coiner of the mint at Carson City, each, two thousand five hundred dollars; to the assistants and clerks such annual salary shall be allowed as the Director of the Mint may determine, with the approbation of the Secretary of the Treasury; and to the workmen shall be allowed such wages, to be determined by the superintendent, as may be customary and reasonable according to their respective stations and occupations, and approved by the Director of the Mint; and the salaries provided for in this section, and the wages of the workmen permanently engaged, shall be payable in monthly installments.

SEC. 13. That the standard for both gold and silver coins of the United States shall be such that of one thousand parts by weight nine hundred shall be of pure metal and one hundred of alloy; and the alloy of the silver coins shall be of copper, and the alloy of the gold coins shall be of copper, or of copper and silver; but the silver shall in no case exceed one-tenth of the whole alloy.

SEC. 14. That the gold coins of the United States shall be a one-dollar piece, which, at the standard weight of twenty-five and eight-tenths grains, shall be the unit of value; a quarter-eagle, or two-and-a-half dollar piece; a three-dollar piece; a half-eagle, or five-dollar piece; an eagle, or ten-dol-

9

lar piece; and a double-eagle, or twenty-dollar piece. And the standard weight of the gold dollar shall be twenty-five and eight tenths grains; of the quarter-eagle, or two-and-a-half-dollar piece, sixty-four and a half grains; of the three-dollar piece seventy-seven and four-tenths grains; of the half-eagle, or five-dollar piece, one hundred and twenty-nine grains; of the eagle, or ten-dollar piece, two hundred and fifty-eight grains; of the double-eagle, or twenty-dollar piece, five hundred and sixteen grains; which coins shall be a legal tender in all payments at their nominal value when not below the standard weight and limit of tolerance provided in this act for the single piece, and, when reduced in weight, below said standard and tolerance, shall be a legal tender at

AGREED

valuation in proportion to their actual weight; [and any gold coin of the United States, if reduced in weight by abrasion not more than one-half of one per centum on the double-eagle and eagle, and one per centum on the other coins, below the standard weight prescribed by law, shall be received at their nominal value by the United States Treasury and its offices, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe for the protection of the Government against fraudulent abrasion or other practices; and any gold coins in the Treasury of the United States reduced in weight below this limit of abrasion shall be recoined.]

AGREED

[SEC. 15. That any gold coin now in circulation the

10

weight of which is below the limit of abrasion prescribed in this act may be received at the mints in Philadelphia and San Francisco at par in exchange for silver coins: *Provided*, That the circulation of such gold coin, as shown by the date of coinage, has been sufficient to produce such loss by natural abrasion; and the coins so received shall be recoined; but no gold coins which appear to have been artificially reduced shall come within the provisions of this section.]

AGREED

SEC. [16] 15. [That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five cent piece, and a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be three hundred and eighty-four grains; the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coins shall be a legal tender, at their nominal value, for any amount not exceeding five dollars in any one payment.] *That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade-dollar, a half-dollar, or fifty-*

AGREED A DIME OR TEN-CENT PIECE

cent piece, a quarter-dollar, or twenty-five-cent-piece ⋀; and the weight of the trade-dollar shall be four hundred and twenty grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar shall be twelve grams and one-half of a gram; the quarter dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one fifth of the weight of said half-dollar; and said coins shall be a legal

11

tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding five dollars in any one payment.

AGREED

SEC. [17] 16. [That the minor coins of the United States shall be a five-cent piece, a three-cent piece, and a one-cent piece; and the alloy for minor coinage shall be of copper and nickel, to be composed of three-fourths copper and one-fourth nickel; the weight of the piece of five cents shall be five grams, or seventy-seven and sixteen-hundredths grains troy; of the three-cent piece, three grams, or forty-six and thirty-hundredths grains; and of the one-cent piece, one and one-half grams, or twenty-three and fifteen-hundredths grains; which coins shall be legal tender, at their nominal value, for any amount not exceeding twenty-five cents in any one payment.]

AGREED

That the minor coins of the United States shall be a five-cent piece, a three-cent piece, and a one-cent piece, and the alloy for the five and three cent pieces shall be of copper and nickel, to be composed of three-fourths copper and one-fourth nickel and the alloy of the one-cent piece shall be ninety-five per centum of copper and five per centum of tin and zinc, in such proportions as shall be determined by the Director of the Mint. The weight of the piece of five cents shall be seventy-seven and sixteen-hundredths grains, troy; of the three-cent piece, thirty grains; and of the one-cent piece, forty-eight grains; which coins shall be a legal tender, at their nominal

12

value, for any amount not exceeding twenty-five cents in any one payment.

SEC. [18] 17. That no coins, either of gold, silver, or minor coinage, shall hereafter be issued from the mint other than those of the denominations, standards, and weights herein set forth.

SEC. [19] 18. That upon the coins of the United States there shall be the following devices and legends: Upon one side there shall be an impression emblematic of liberty, with an inscription of the word "Liberty" and the year of the coinage, and upon the reverse shall be the figure or representation of an eagle, with the inscriptions "United States of America" and "E Pluribus Unum", and a designation of the value of the coin; but on the gold dollar and three-dollar

DISAGREED

piece, [*the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar,*] the dime, five, three, and one cent piece the figure of the eagle shall be

AGREED

omitted; *and on the reverse of the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed the weight and the fineness of the coin;* and the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may cause the motto "In God we trust" to be inscribed upon such coins as shall admit of such motto; and any one of the foregoing inscriptions may be on the rim of the gold and silver coins.

SEC. [20] 19. That at the option of the owner, gold or

13

silver may be cast into bars of fine metal, or of standard fineness, or unparted, as he may prefer, with a stamp upon the same designating the weight and fineness, and with such devices impressed thereon as may be deemed expedient to prevent fraudulent imitation, and no such bars shall be issued of a less weight than five ounces.

SEC. [21] 20. That any owner of gold bullion may deposit the same at any mint, to be formed into coin or bars for his benefit; but it shall be lawful to refuse any deposit of less

4 value than one hundred dollars, or any bullion so base as to
5 be unsuitable for the operations of the mint; and when gold
6 and silver are combined, if either metal be in such small
7 proportion that it can *not* be separated advantageously, no
8 allowance shall be made to the depositor for its value.
1 SEC. 22 [21]. That any owner of silver bullion may deposit
2 the same at any mint, to be formed into bars for his benefit;
3 no deposit for coinage into silver coin shall be received; but
4 silver bullion contained in gold deposits, and separated there-
5 from, may be paid for in silver coin, at such valuation as may
6 be, from time to time, established by the Director of the
AGREED
7 Mint: *Provided, That at the option of the owner, silver may*
8 *be cast into coins of standard fineness, and of the weight of*
9 *four hundred and twenty grains troy, designated in section*
10 *fifteen of this act as the trade-dollar.*
1 SEC. [23] 22. That when bullion is deposited in any of the

14

2 mints, it shall be weighed by the superintendent, and, when
3 practicable, in the presence of the depositor, to whom a re-
4 ceipt shall be given, which shall state the description and
5 weight of the bullion; but when the bullion is in such a
6 state as to require melting, or the removal of base metals,
7 before its value can be ascertained, the weight, after such
8 operation, shall be considered as the true weight of the
9 bullion deposited. The fitness of the bullion to be received
10 shall be determined by the assayer, and the mode of melting
11 by the melter and refiner.
1 SEC. [24] 23. That from every parcel of bullion deposited
2 for coinage or bars, the superintendent shall deliver to the assayer
3 a sufficient portion for the purpose of being assayed, but all
4 such bullion remaining from the operations of the assay shall
5 be returned to the superintendent by the assayer.
1 SEC. [25] 24. That the assayer shall report to the superin-
AGREED FINENESS
2 tendent the quality or [standard]∧ of the bullion assayed by
3 him, and such information as will enable him to compute the
4 amount of the charges hereinafter provided for, to be made
AGREED
5 to the depositor, [FOR THE COST OF CONVERTING THE BULLION INTO
6 BARS.]
1 SEC. [26] 25. That the charge for converting standard
AGREED Transfer to line 8, p. 15—insert after bullion:
2 gold bullion into coin, (*or for converting standard silver into*
3 *trade dollars,*) shall be one-fifth of one per centum; and
4 the charges for refining when the bullion is below standard,

15

5 for toughening when metals are contained in it which render
6 it unfit for coinage, for copper used for alloy when the bull-
7 ion is above standard, for separating the gold and silver when
AGREED
8 these metals exist together in the bullion, ∧ and for the
9 preparation of bars, shall be fixed, from time to time, by the
10 Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treas-
11 ury, so as to equal but not exceed, in their judgment, the
12 actual average cost to each mint and assay-office of the
13 material, labor, wastage, and use of machinery employed in
14 each of the cases aforementioned.
1 SEC. [27] 26. That the assayer shall verify all calculations
2 made by the superintendent of the value of deposits, and, if
3 satisfied by the correctness thereof, shall countersign the cer-
4 tificate required to be given by the superintendent to the
5 depositor.
1 SEC. [28] 27. That in order to procure bullion for the sil-
2 ver coinage authorized by this act, the superintendents, with
3 the approval of the Director of the Mint, as to price, terms, and
4 quantity, shall purchase such bullion with the bullion-fund.
5 The gain arising from the coinage of such silver bullion into
6 coin of a nominal value exceeding the cost thereof shall be
7 credited to a special fund denominated the silver-profit fund.
8 This fund shall be charged with the wastage incurred in the
9 silver coinage, and with the expense of distributing said
10 coins as hereinafter provided. The balance to the credit of

16

11 this fund shall be from time to time, and at least twice a year,
12 paid into the Treasury of the United States.
AGREED OTHER THAN THE TRADE DOLLAR
1 SEC. [29] 28. That silver coins∧shall be paid out at the
2 several mints, and at the assay-office in New York City, in
3 exchange for gold coins at par, in sums not less than one hun-
4 dred dollars; and it shall be lawful, also, to transmit parcels
5 of the same, from time to time, to the assistant treasurers,
6 depositaries, and other officers of the United States, under
7 general regulations proposed by the Director of the Mint, and
8 approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; but nothing herein
9 contained shall prevent the payment of silver coins, at their
10 nominal value, for silver parted from gold, as provided in
11 this act, or for change less than one dollar in settlement for
12 gold deposits: *Provided,* That for two years after the passage
13 of this act, silver coins shall be paid at the mint in Philadel-
14 phia and the assay-office in New York City for silver bull-
15 ion purchased for coinage, under such regulations as may be
16 prescribed by the Director of the Mint, and approved by the
17 Secretary of the Treasury.
1 SEC. [30] 29. That for the purchase of metal for the minor
2 coinage authorized by this act, a sum not exceeding fifty
3 thousand dollars in lawful money of the United States shall
4 be transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit
5 of the superintendent of the mint at Philadelphia, at which
6 establishment only, until otherwise provided by law, such

17

7 coinage shall be carried on. The superintendent, with the
8 approval of the Director of the Mint as to price, terms, and
9 quantity, shall purchase the metal required for such coinage
10 by public advertisement, and the lowest and best bid shall be
11 accepted, the fineness of the metals to be determined on the
12 mint assay. The gain arising from the coinage of such metals
13 into coin of a nominal value, exceeding the cost thereof, shall
14 be credited to the special fund denominated the minor-coinage
15 profit fund; and this fund shall be charged with the
16 wastage incurred in such coinage, and with the cost of dis-
17 tributing said coins as hereinafter provided. The balance
18 remaining to the credit of this fund, and any balance of profits
19 accrued from minor coinage under former acts, shall be, from
20 time to time, and at least twice a year, covered into the
21 Treasury of the United States.
1 SEC. [31] 30. That the minor coins authorized by this act
2 may, at the discretion of the Director of the Mint, be delivered
3 in any of the principal cities and towns of the United States,
4 at the cost of the mint, for transportation, and shall be
5 exchangeable at par at the mint in Philadelphia, at the dis-
6 cretion of the superintendent, for any other coins of copper,
7 bronze, or copper-nickel heretofore authorized by law; and
8 it shall be lawful for the Treasurer and the several assistant
9 treasurers and depositaries of the United States to redeem, in
10 lawful money, under such rules as may be prescribed by the

H. R. 2934——3

18

11 Secretary of the Treasury, all copper, bronze, and copper-
12 nickel coins authorized by law when presented in sums of not
13 less than twenty dollars; and whenever, under this authority,
14 these coins are presented for redemption in such quantity as
15 to show the amount outstanding to be redundant, the Secre-
16 tary of the Treasury is authorized and required to direct that
17 such coinage shall cease until otherwise ordered by him.
1 SEC. [32] 31. That parcels of bullion shall be, from time to
2 time, transferred by the superintendent to the melter and refiner;
3 a careful record of these transfers, noting the weight and character
4 of the bullion, shall be kept, and vouchers shall be taken for
5 the delivery of the same, duly receipted by the melter and
6 refiner, and the bullion thus placed in the hands of the melter
7 and refiner shall be subjected to the several processes which
8 may be necessary to form it into ingots of the legal standard,
9 and of a quality suitable for coinage.
1 SEC. [33] 32. That the ingots so prepared shall be assayed;
2 and if they prove to be within the limits allowed for devia-
3 tion from the standard, the assayer shall certify the fact to
4 the superintendent, who shall thereupon receipt for the same,
5 and transfer them to the coiner.
1 SEC. [34] 33. That no ingots shall be used for coinage
2 which differ from the legal standard more than the following
3 proportions, namely: In gold ingots, one-thousandth; in silver

19

AGREED THREE-THOUSANDTHS
4 ingots, [two-thousandths;]∧in minor-coinage alloys, twenty-
5 five-thousandths, in the proportion of nickel.
1 SEC. [35] 34. That the melter and refiner shall prepare all
2 bars required for the payment of deposits; but the fineness
3 thereof shall be ascertained and stamped thereon by the
4 assayer; and the melter and refiner shall deliver such bars to
5 the superintendent, who shall receipt for the same.
1 SEC. [36] 35. That the superintendent shall, from time to
2 time, deliver to the coiner ingots for the purpose of coinage;
3 a careful record of these transfers, noting the weight and
4 character of the bullion, shall be kept, and vouchers shall
5 be taken for the delivery of the same, duly receipted by the
6 coiner; and the ingots thus placed in the hands of the coiner
7 shall be subjected to the several processes necessary to make
8 from them coins in all respects conformable to law.
1 SEC. [37] 36. That in adjusting the weights of the gold
2 coins, the following deviations shall not be exceeded in any
3 single piece: In the double-eagle and the eagle, one-half of
4 a grain; in the half-eagle, the three-dollar piece, the quarter-
5 eagle, and the one-dollar piece, one-fourth of a grain. And

in weighing a number of pieces together, when delivered by the coiner to the superintendent, and by the superintendent to the depositor, the deviation from the standard weight shall not exceed one-hundredth of an ounce in five thousand dollars in double-eagles, eagles, half-eagles, or quarter-eagles,

20

in one thousand three-dollar pieces, and in one thousand one-dollar pieces.

SEC. [38] 37. That in adjusting the weight of the silver coins the following deviations shall not be exceeded in any single piece: In the dollar, the half and quarter dollar, and in the dime, one and one-half grains; and in weighing large numbers of pieces together, when delivered by the coiner to the superintendent, and by the superintendent to the depositor, the deviations from the standard weight shall not exceed two-hundredths of an ounce in one thousand dollars, half-dollars, or quarter-dollars, and one-hundredth of an ounce in one thousand dimes.

SEC. [39] 38. That in adjusting the weight of the minor coins provided by this act, there shall be no greater deviation allowed than three grains for the five-cent piece and two grains for the three and one cent pieces.

SEC. [40] 39. That the coiner shall, from time to time, as coins are prepared, deliver them to the superintendent, who shall receipt for the same, and who shall keep a careful record of their kind, number, and actual weight; and in receiving coins it shall be the duty of the superintendent to ascertain, by the trial of a number of single pieces separately, whether the coins of that delivery are within the legal limits of the standard weight; and if his trials for this purpose shall not prove satisfactory, he shall cause all the coins

21

of such delivery to be weighed separately, and such as are not of legal weight shall be defaced and delivered to the melter and refiner as standard bullion, to be again formed into ingots and recoined; or the whole delivery may, if more convenient, be remelted.

SEC. [41] 40. That at every delivery of coins made by the coiner to a superintendent, it shall be the duty of such superintendent, in the presence of the assayer, to take indiscriminately a certain number of pieces of each variety for the annual trial of coins, the number for gold coins being not less than one piece for each one thousand pieces or any fractional part of one thousand pieces delivered; and for silver coins one piece for each two thousand pieces or any fractional part of two thousand pieces delivered. The pieces so taken shall be carefully sealed up in an envelope, properly labeled, stating the date of the delivery, the number and denomination of the pieces inclosed, and the amount of the delivery from which they were taken. These sealed parcels containing the reserved pieces shall be deposited in a pyx, designated for the purpose at each mint, which shall be kept under the joint care of the superintendent and assayer, and be so secured that neither can have access to its contents without the presence of the other, and the reserved pieces in their sealed envelopes from the coinage of each mint shall be transmitted quarterly to the mint at Philadelphia. A record shall also

22

be kept at the same time of the number and denomination of the pieces so taken for the annual trial of coins, and of the number and denomination of the pieces represented by them and so delivered, a copy of which record shall be transmitted quarterly to the Director of the Mint. Other pieces may, at any time, be taken for such tests as the Director of the Mint shall prescribe.

SEC. [42] 41. That the coiner shall, from time to time, deliver to the superintendent the clippings and other portions of bullion remaining after the process of coining; and the superintendent shall receipt for the same and keep a careful record of their weight and character.

SEC. [43] 42. That the superintendent shall debit the coiner with the amount in weight of standard metal of all the bullion placed in his hands, and credit him with the amount in weight of all the coins, clippings, and other bullion returned by him to the superintendent. Once at least in every year, and at such time as the Director of the Mint shall appoint, there shall be an accurate and full settlement of the accounts of the coiner, and the melter and refiner, at which time the said officers shall deliver up to the superintendent all the coins, clippings, and other bullion in their possession, respectively, accompanied by statements of all the bullion delivered to them since the last annual settlement, and all the bullion

23

returned by them during the same period, including the amount returned for the purpose of settlement.

SEC. [44] 43. That when all the coins, clippings, and other bullion have been delivered to the superintendent, it shall be his duty to examine the accounts and statements rendered by the coiner and the melter and refiner, and the difference between the amount charged and credited to each officer shall be allowed as necessary wastage, if the superintendent shall be satisfied that there has been a bona-fide waste of the precious metals, and if the amount shall not exceed, in the case of the melter and refiner, one-thousandth of the whole amount of gold, and one and one-half thousandth of the whole amount of silver delivered to him since the last annual settlement, and in the case of the coiner, one-thousandth of the whole amount of silver, and one-half thousandth of the whole amount of gold that has been delivered to him by the superintendent; and all copper used in the alloy of gold and silver bullion shall be separately charged to the melter and refiner, and accounted for by him.

SEC. [45] 44. That it shall also be the duty of the superintendent to forward a correct statement of his balance-sheet, at the close of such settlement, to the Director of the Mint, who shall compare the total amount of gold and silver bullion and coin on hand with the total liabilities of the mint. At the same time a statement of the ordinary-expense account,

24

and the moneys therein, shall also be made by the superintendent.

SEC. [46] 45. That when the coins or bars which are equivalent to any deposit of bullion are ready for delivery, they shall be paid to the depositor, or his order, by the superintendent; and the payments shall be made, if demanded, in the order in which the bullion shall have been brought to the mint; but in cases where there is delay in manipulating a refractory deposit, or for any other unavoidable cause, the payment of subsequent deposits, the value of which is known, shall not be delayed thereby; and in the denominations of coin delivered, the superintendent shall comply with the wishes of the depositor, except when impracticable or inconvenient to do so.

SEC. [47] 46. That unparted bullion may be exchanged at any of the mints for fine bars, on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury; and the fineness, weight, and value of the bullion received and given in exchange shall in all cases be determined by the mint assay. The charge to the depositor for refining or parting shall not exceed that allowed and deducted for the same operation in the exchange of unrefined for refined bullion.

SEC. [48] 47. That for the purpose of enabling the mints and the assay-office in New York to make returns to depositors

25

with as little delay as possible, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to keep in the said mints and assay-office, when the state of the Treasury will admit thereof, such an amount of public money, or bullion procured for the purpose, as he shall judge convenient and necessary, out of which those who bring bullion to the said mints and assay-office may be paid the value thereof, in coin or bars, as soon as practicable after the value has been ascertained; and on payment thereof being made, the bullion so deposited shall become the property of the United States; but the Secretary of the Treasury may at any time withdraw the fund, or any portion thereof.

SEC. [49] 48. That to secure a due conformity in the gold and silver coins to their respective standards of fineness and weight, the judge of the district court of the United States for the east-

AGREED

ern district of Pennsylvania, *the Comptroller of the Currency*, the assayer of the assay-office at New York, and such other persons as the President shall, from time to time, designate, shall meet as assay-commissioners, at the mint in Philadelphia, to examine and test, in the presence of the Director of the Mint, the fineness and weight of the coins reserved by the several mints for this purpose, on the second Wednesday in February, annually, and may continue their meetings by adjournment, if necessary; if a majority of the commissioners shall fail to attend at any time appointed for their meeting, the

26

Director of the Mint shall call a meeting of the commissioners at such other time as he may deem convenient; and if it shall appear by such examination and test that these coins do not differ from the standard fineness and weight by a greater quantity than is allowed by law, the trial shall be considered and reported as satisfactory; but if any greater deviation from the legal standard or weight shall appear, this fact shall be certified to the President of the United States; and if, on a view of the circumstances of the case, he shall so decide, the officer or officers implicated in the error shall be

24 thenceforward disqualified from holding their respective
25 offices.
1 SEC. [50] 49. That for the purpose of securing a due con-
2 formity in weight of the coins of the United States to the
3 provisions of this act, the brass troy-pound weight procured
4 by the minister of the United States at London, in the year
5 eighteen hundred and twenty-seven, for the use of the mint,
6 and now in the custody of the mint at Philadelphia, shall be
7 the standard troy pound of the Mint of the United States,
8 conformably to which the coinage thereof shall be regulated.
1 SEC. [51] 50. That it shall be the duty of the Director of
2 the Mint to procure for each mint and assay-office, to be kept
3 safely thereat, a series of standard weights corresponding to
4 the aforesaid troy pound, consisting of a one-pound weight
5 and the requisite subdivisions and multiples thereof, from the

27

6 hundredth part of a grain to twenty-five pounds; and the
7 troy weights ordinarily employed in the transactions of such
8 mints and assay-offices shall be regulated according to the
9 above standards at least once in every year, under the
10 inspection of the superintendent and assayer; and the accu-
11 racy of those used at the mint at Philadelphia shall be tested
12 annually, in the presence of the assay-commissioners, at the
13 time of the annual examination and test of coins.
1 SEC. [52] 51. That the obverse working-dies at each mint
2 shall, at the end of each calendar year, be defaced and
3 destroyed by the coiner in the presence of the superintendent
4 and assayer.
1 SEC. [53] 52. That dies of a national character may be
2 executed by the engraver, and national and other medals
3 struck by the coiner of the mint at Philadelphia, under such
4 regulations as the superintendent, with the approval of the
5 Director of the Mint, may prescribe: *Provided*, That such
6 work shall not interfere with the regular coinage operations,
7 and that no private medal dies shall be prepared at said mint,
8 or the machinery or apparatus thereof be used for that
9 purpose.
1 SEC. [54] 53. That the moneys arising from all charges and
2 deductions on and from gold and silver bullion and the manu-
AGREED MEDALS
3 facture of [metals] ∧ and from all other sources, except as herein-
4 before provided, shall, from time to time, be covered into the

28

5 Treasury of the United States, and no part of such deduc-
6 tions or medal charges, or profit on silver or minor coinage,
7 shall be expended in salaries or wages; but all expenditures
8 of the mints and assay-offices, not herein otherwise provided
9 for, shall be paid from appropriations made by law on
10 estimates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury.
1 SEC. [55] 54. That the officers of the United States assay-
2 office at New York shall be a superintendent, an assayer, and
3 a melter and refiner, who shall be appointed by the President,
4 by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The
5 business of said assay-office shall be in all respects similar
6 to that of the mints, except that bars only, and not coin, shall
7 be manufactured therein; and no metals shall be purchased
8 for minor coinage. All bullion intended by the depositor to
9 be converted into coins of the United States, and silver bullion
10 purchased for coinage, when assayed, parted, and refined, and
11 its net value certified, shall be transferred to the mint at
12 Philadelphia, under such directions as shall be made by the
13 Secretary of the Treasury, at the expense of the contingent
14 fund of the mint, and shall be there coined, and the proceeds
15 returned to the assay-office. And the Secretary of the
16 Treasury is hereby authorized to make the necessary
17 arrangements for the adjustment of the accounts upon such
18 transfers between the respective offices.
1 SEC. [56] 55. That the duties of the superintendent, assay-

29

2 er, and melter and refiner of said office shall correspond to those
3 of superintendents, assayers, and melters and refiners of mints;
4 and all parts of this act relating to mints and their officers,
5 the duties and responsibilities of such officers, and others em-
6 ployed therein, the oath to be taken, and the bonds and sure-
7 ties to be given by them, (as far as the same may be appli-
8 cable,) shall extend to the assay-office at New York, and to
9 its officers, assistants, clerks, workmen, and others employed
10 therein.
1 SEC. [57] 56. That there shall be allowed to the officers of
2 the assay-office at New York City the following salaries per
3 annum: To the superintendent, four thousand five hundred
4 dollars; to the assayer, and to the melter and refiner, each,
5 three thousand dollars; and the salaries of assistants and
6 clerks, and wages to workmen, and their manner of appoint-
7 ment, shall be determined and regulated as herein directed in
8 regard to mints.
1 SEC. [58] 57. That the business of the branch mint at Den-
2 ver, while conducted as an assay-office, and of the assay-office at
3 Boisé City, Idaho, and all other assay-offices hereafter to be
4 established, shall be confined to the receipt of gold and silver
5 bullion, for melting and assaying, to be returned to depositors
6 of the same, in bars, with the weight and fineness stamped
7 thereon; and the officers of assay-offices, when their services
8 are necessary, shall consist of an assayer, who shall have

30

9 charge thereof, and a melter, to be appointed by the Presi-
10 dent, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and
11 the assayer may employ as many clerks, workmen, and
12 laborers, under the direction of the Director of the Mint, as
13 may be provided for by law. The salaries of said officers shall
14 not exceed the sum of two thousand five hundred dollars to the
15 assayer and melter, one thousand eight hundred dollars each
16 to the clerks, and the workmen and laborers shall receive
17 such wages as are customary, according to their respective
18 stations and occupations.
1 SEC. [59] 58. That each officer and clerk to be appointed
2 at such assay-offices, before entering upon the execution of his
3 office, shall take an oath or affirmation before some judge of
4 the United States, or of the Supreme Court, as prescribed by
AGREED SECOND
5 the act of July [twentieth,] ∧ eighteen hundred and sixty-two,
6 and each become bound to the United States of America,
7 with one or more sureties, to the satisfaction of the Director
8 of the Mint or of one of the judges of the supreme court of
9 the State or Territory in which the same may be located,
10 and of the Secretary of the Treasury, conditioned for the
11 faithful performance of the duties of their offices; and the
12 said assayers shall discharge the duties of disbursing agents
13 for the payment of the expenses of their respective assay-
14 offices.
1 SEC. [60] 59. That the general direction of the business of

31

2 assay-offices of the United States shall be under the control
3 and regulation of the Director of the Mint, subject to the
4 approbation of the Secretary of the Treasury; and for that
5 purpose it shall be the duty of the said Director to prescribe
6 such regulations and to require such returns, periodically and
7 occasionally, and to establish such charges for melting,
8 parting, assaying, and stamping bullion as shall appear to
9 him to be necessary for the purpose of carrying into effect
10 the intention of this act.
1 SEC. [61] 60. That all the provisions of this act for the
2 regulation of the mints of the United States, and for the
3 government of the officers and persons employed therein,
4 and for the punishment of all offenses connected with the
5 mints or coinage of the United States, shall be, and they are
6 hereby declared to be, in full force in relation to the assay-
7 offices, as far as the same may be applicable thereto.
1 SEC. [62] 61. That if any person or persons shall falsely
2 make, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely
3 made, forged, or counterfeited, or willingly aid or assist in
4 falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting, any coin or bars in
5 resemblance or similitude of the gold or silver coins or bars,
6 which have been, or hereafter may be coined or stamped
7 at the mints and assay-offices of the United States, or
8 in resemblance or similitude of any foreign gold or
9 silver coin which by law is, or hereafter may be made, cur-

32

10 rent in the United States, or are in actual use and circulation
11 as money within the United States, or shall pass, utter, pub-
12 lish, or sell, or attempt to pass, utter, publish, or sell, or bring
13 into the United States from any foreign place, or have in his
14 possession, any such false, forged, or counterfeited coin or
15 bars, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited,
16 every person so offending shall be deemed guilty of felony,
17 and shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by fine not ex-
18 ceeding five thousand dollars, and by imprisonment and confine-
19 ment at hard labor not exceeding ten years, according to the
20 aggravation of the offense.
1 SEC. [63] 62. That if any person or persons shall falsely
2 make, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely
3 made, forged, or counterfeited, or willingly aid or assist in
4 falsely making, forging, or counterfeiting, any coin in the
5 resemblance or similitude of any of the minor coinage which
6 has been, or hereafter may be, coined at the mints of the
7 United States; or shall pass, utter, publish, or sell, or bring
8 into the United States from any foreign place, or have in his
9 possession any such false, forged, or counterfeited coin, with
10 intent to defraud any body politic or corporation, or any
11 person or persons whatsoever, every person so offending shall
12 be deemed guilty of felony, and shall, on conviction thereof,
13 be punished by fine not exceeding one thousand dollars and

33

14 by imprisonment and confinement at hard labor not exceeding
15 three years.
1 SEC. [64] 63. That if any person shall fraudulently, by any
2 art, way, or means whatsoever, deface, mutilate, impair,
3 diminish, falsify, scale, or lighten the gold or silver coins
4 which have been, or which shall hereafter be, coined at the
5 mints of the United States, or any foreign gold or silver coins
6 which are by law made current, or are in actual use and cir-
7 culation as money within the United States, every person so
8 offending shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and
9 shall be imprisoned not exceeding two years, and fined not
10 exceeding two thousand dollars.
1 SEC. [65] 64. That if any of the gold or silver coins which
2 shall be struck or coined at any of the mints of the United
3 States shall be debased, or made worse as to the proportion
4 of fine gold or fine silver therein contained; or shall be of
5 less weight or value than the same ought to be, pursuant to
6 the several acts relative thereto; or if any of the weights
7 used at any of the mints or assay-offices of the
8 United States shall be defaced, increased or diminished
9 through the fault or connivance of any of the officers or
10 persons who shall be employed at the said mints or assay-
11 offices, with a fraudulent intent; and if any of the said offi-
12 cers or persons shall embezzle any of the metals which shall
13 at any time be committed to their charge for the purpose of

H. R. 2934——5

34

14 being coined, or any of the coins which shall be struck or
15 coined at the said mints, or any medals, coins, or other
16 moneys of said mints or assay-offices at any time committed
17 to their charge, or of which they may have assumed the
18 charge, every such officer or person who shall commit any or
19 either of the said offenses shall be deemed guilty of felony,
20 and shall be imprisoned at hard labor for a term not less
21 than one year nor more than ten years, and shall be fined in
22 a sum not exceeding ten thousand dollars.
1 SEC. [66] 65. That this act shall take effect on the first
AGREED APRIL SEVENTY-THREE
2 day of [July,] ∧ eighteen hundred and [seventy-two,] ∧ when
3 the offices of the treasurer of the mints in
4 Philadelphia, San Francisco, and New Orleans
5 shall be vacated, and the assistant treasurer at New York
6 shall cease to perform the duties of treasurer of the assay-
7 office. The other officers and employees of the mints and
8 assay-offices now appointed shall continue to hold their
9 respective offices, they having first given the necessary bonds
10 until further appointments may be required, the director of
11 the mint at Philadelphia being styled and acting as superin-
12 tendent thereof. The duties of the treasurers shall devolve
13 as herein provided upon the superintendents, and said treas-
14 urers shall act only as assistant treasurers of the United
15 States: *Provided*, That the salaries heretofore paid to the
16 treasurers of the mints at Philadelphia, San Francisco, and

35

17 New Orleans, acting as assistant treasurers, shall hereafter be
18 paid to them as "assistant treasurers of the United States",
19 and that the salary of the assistant treasurer at New York
20 shall not be diminished by the vacation of his office as treas-
21 urer of the assay-office.
1 SEC. [67] 66. That the different mints and assay-offices
2 authorized by this act shall be known as "the mint of
3 the United States at Philadelphia", "the mint of the United
4 States at San Francisco", "the mint of the United States at
5 Carson," "the mint of the United States at Denver," "the
6 United States assay-office at New York", and "the United
AGREED "THE U. S. ASSAY-OFFICE AT CHARLOTTE, N. CAROLINA"
7 States assay-office at Boisé City, Idaho;" ∧ and all unexpended
8 appropriations heretofore authorized by law for the use of the
9 mint of the United States at Philadelphia, the branch mint
10 of the United States in California, the branch mint of
11 the United States at Denver, the United States assay-office
12 in New York, and the United-States assay-office at Boisé
13 City, Idaho, are hereby authorized to be transferred for the
14 account and use of the institutions established and located
15 respectively at the places designated by this act.
1 SEC. [68] 67. That this act shall be known as the "Coinage
AGREED 1873
2 act of [eighteen hundred and seventy-two"] ∧; and all other
3 acts and parts of acts pertaining to the mints, assay-offices,
4 and coinage of the United States inconsistent with the pro-
5 visions of this act are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That this

36

6 act shall not be construed to affect any act done, right ac-
7 crued, or penalty incurred, under former acts, but every such
8 right is hereby saved; and all suits and prosecutions for acts
9 already done in violation of any former act or acts of Congress
10 relating to the subjects embraced in this act may be begun
11 or proceeded with in like manner as if this act had not been
12 passed; and all penal clauses and provisions in existing laws
13 relating to the subjects embraced in this act shall be deemed
14 applicable thereto: *And provided further*, That so much of the
15 first section of "An act making appropriations for sundry
16 civil expenses of the Government for the year ending June
17 thirty, eighteen hundred and seventy-one, and for other pur-
18 poses," approved July fifteen, eighteen hundred and seventy,
19 as provides that until after the completion and occupation
20 of the branch-mint building in San Francisco it shall be law-
21 ful to exchange, at any mint or branch-mint of the United
22 States, unrefined or unparted bullion whenever, in the opinion
23 of the Secretary of the Treasury, it can be done with advan-
24 tage to the Government, is hereby repealed.

Passed the House of Representatives May 27, 1872.
Attest: EDWARD McPHERSON,
Clerk.

[Indorsement on back of bill.]

42D CONGRESS, 3D SESSION. } H. R. 2934. 704

AN ACT

Revising and amending the laws relative to the mints, assay-offices, and coinage of the United States.

1872—MAY 29.—Read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance.
DECEMBER 16, 1872.—Reported with amendments.
1873—JANUARY 7.—Additional amendments reported, which were ordered to be printed with the bill.
JANUARY 17, C. W.—Amended, read the third time, and passed.
JAN. 17.
Amended.
PASSED.
No papers.

The following proceedings were had in the Senate on Friday, January 17, 1873, when the foregoing bill was under consideration:

MINT LAWS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Calendar under the Anthony rule is now in order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I rise for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Mint bill. I will state that this bill will not probably consume any more time than the time consumed in reading it. It passed the Senate two years ago after full debate. It was taken up again in the House during the present Congress, and passed there. It is a matter of vital interest to the Government, and I am informed by officers of the Government it is important it should pass promptly. The amendments reported by the Committee on Finance present the points of difference between the two Houses, and they can go to a committee of conference without having a controversy here in the Senate about them.

Mr. ANTHONY. I hope the Calendar will be laid aside informally, not postponed.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let it be passed over informally until we finish the reading of the Mint bill and dispose of it. The reading is about half through, I am informed by the Secretary.

Mr. CRAGIN. I shall not oppose this motion, but I wish to give notice that as soon as the Mint bill is disposed of I shall move to call up the bill (H. R. No. 3010) for the construction of six steam vessels of war, and for other purposes, which was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs. I hope that bill will be left as the unfinished business this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it is proposed that the Calendar be informally passed over.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am perfectly willing that that should be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will regarded as the sense of the Senate, if there is no objection, and the bill referred to by the Senator from Ohio is now before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 2934) revising and amending the laws relative to the mints, assay-offices, and coinage of the United States.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Committee on Finance report the bill, with amendments, which will now be read.

Mr. SHERMAN. I send to the clerk some amendments of a formal character from the Committee on Finance, adopted since the amendments first reported were printed. I will ask that they be acted upon with the others in their order.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 4, section 5, line 3, after the word "coins," to insert "or sample of bullion;" so that the clause will read:

"That the assayer shall assay all metals and bullion, whenever such assays are required in the operations of the Mint; he shall also make assays of coin or samples of bullion whenever required by the Superintendent."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, section 8, line 2, to strike out the word "wording," before the word "dies," and insert the word "working."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, section 9, line 1, before the word "office," at the end of the line, to insert the word "assay."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, section 14, to strike out the following words:

"And any gold coin of the United States, if reduced in weight by abrasion not more than one-half of 1 per cent. on the double-eagle and eagle, and 1 per cent. on the other coins, below the standard weight prescribed by law, shall be received at their nominal value by the United States Treasury and its offices, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe for the protection of the Government against fraudulent abrasion or other practices; and any gold

coins in the Treasury of the United States reduced in weight below this limit of abrasion shall be recoined."

Mr. COLE. I hope that amendment will not be agreed to. I think it is a very wise provision in the bill as it came from the House, and it ought to be allowed to remain. It merely provides that coins, when a little abraded by natural use and wear, shall be received at the Treasury of the United States, and the concluding portion of the clause proposed to be stricken out provides:

"And any gold coins in the Treasury of the United States reduced in weight below this limit of abrasion shall be recoined."

It is certainly the duty of the Government to provide the coins of the country and at its own expense, and this section seems to be well guarded. The language is:

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe for the protection of the Government against fraudulent abrasion or other practices."

It strikes me that this clause ought not to be stricken out. I remember at the last session of Congress we passed a law which contemplated the restoration of these coins. I will read it. It was passed at the earnest application of the Secretary of the Treasury, and I believe at the unanimous suggestion of the Committee on Finance of this body it was incorporated in an appropriation bill. It is as follows:

"For loss and expenses involved in the recoinage of gold coins in the Treasury which are below standard weight, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, $150,000."

The Government makes provision for the restoration of the coins when they have been reduced by natural wear, and I should think that this part of the section ought to be left in the bill. I see no reason why it should be stricken out.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can only say I have here a number of documents, not only from the Director of the Mint in Philadelphia, but from Professor Barnard and the Comptroller of the Currency, calling our attention to this very important feature of the bill, and the Committee on Finance, after a patient examination of the whole matter, decided that it was clearly inexpedient and wrong to put in this provision for the recoinage of all the present gold coins of the United States.

It is true, as the Senator says, we have provided for recoining the coin in the Treasury of the United States; but we go no further than that. No nation in the world has gone further than that. I do not wish to delay the Senate by reading these documents, but I suggest to the Senator whether he had not better let this proposition go to a committee of conference rather than undertake to discuss it here, because if we are compelled to discuss it here I shall be obliged to have these letters read, which entirely convinced the Committee on Finance that the United States dare not assume the loss of abrasion beyond the legal standard.

There is a legal standard within which the United States make the coin good, but when coin depreciates below the standard of abrasion, then neither the United States nor any other nation in the world undertakes to make the coins good except for their intrinsic value. The ways in which these coins might be abraded by fraud were shown to us, and it would be utterly impossible for any regulation of the Secretary to prevent great loss to the Government if we attempt to maintain these coins when they fall below the limit of abrasion and redeem them at the nominal instead of the real value. It is a delicate question, and it will only be necessary to read these papers in order to convince the Senator himself that it would not be wise for the United States to undertake to do what the House proposes.

Mr. COLE. I should like it better if the chairman of the Committee on Finance would give us some reasons why this amendment should be made. This clause protects the Government fully. The degree of abrasion is prescribed in this clause not to exceed one-half of 1 per cent. on double-eagles and eagles, and not to exceed 1 per cent. upon coins of lesser denominaton. If it would involve the Government in some expense to restore these coins after they had been received in the ordinary business of the country, received at the custom-houses and in the Treasury, it is very proper that the Government should bear that expense. And let me again remind the Senator that we have entered upon that business, and at the last session made an appropriation of $150,000 to do this very thing.

Mr. SHERMAN. That was for the coin belonging to the United States.

Mr. COLE. Exactly. This clause provides that when the coin reaches the Treasury it may be so treated, and that this coin shall be received by the United States at the Treasury and other offices.

Mr. CASSERLY. I had risen to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] which my colleague has anticipated. Authority is valuable only in proportion to the reason which goes with it. The names mentioned are of course names of authority in coinage and minting. But when it is said that we ought to strike out a provision such as that which we are now considering because the men of authority say it would be dangerous to enact it, we ought to know what reason they have for so saying.

In the first place, everybody knows that it is almost a mechanical impossibility to manufacture a coin that is exactly of the standard. The coin will be a little above or below the standard in weight, but generally it is below it. So that when you fix the limit of the abrasion as here at one-half of 1 per cent. on the double eagle and eagle and 1 per cent. on the other coins you make your limit exceedingly narrow. In addition to that, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such rules as he sees fit for the protection of the Government against fraud. Now, what danger can there be to the Treasury of the United States under such a provision? Why should any respectable Government consent to permit its gold coins to remain in circulation after they have suffered by abrasion so as to fall much below the legal standard? The loss by abrasion has to fall somewhere in the end, and it certainly ought to fall upon the whole people rather than upon the innocent holder who has taken the coin of the Government at its face, on the faith of the Government, without being aware of the reduction from its standard value.

I insist that it is the duty of the Government to make its coins of the standard value in the first place, and in the next place to keep them up to the standard value. The citizen is obliged by law to receive them for their full standard value, and as the loss must fall somewhere, it ought to fall on the Government, and not upon the citizen. It is hard enough that the innocent holder of a coin which has been fraudulently abraded, or reduced as by what they call "sweating," or by any other fraudulent process, must lose by the fraud to which he was no party. It is ever so much worse when you make him bear the loss of the natural and inevitable wear of the metal. Every such loss should be the loss of the Government, for it is the duty of the Government to keep its coin at the standard value at its own expense.

I do not understand the last two lines of this amendment as the Senator from Ohio understands them. If I understand them aright, he would not press his objection so strongly as he does. The language is:

"And any gold coins in the Treasury of the United States reduced in weight below this limit of abrasion shall be recoined."

Mr. SHERMAN. The reason that those words are proposed to be stricken out is that the coins in the Treasury have already been provided for. The law now provides for recoining abraded coin in the Treasury of the United States. There is no necessity, therefore, for putting it in here again. Indeed, when this clause was inserted in the House the law providing for that recoinage had not been passed. It was passed in an appropriation bill on my own motion, I think, at the last session of Congress. The Mint was authorized to recoin the abraded coins in the Treasury of the United States, some of which were taken at their reduced value.

Mr. CASSERLY. Of course, if the Senator says the clause is unnecessary because it is the law now, there is nothing more to be said.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator's colleague referred to the law a moment ago.

Mr. CASSERLY. I am content to take what the Senator from Ohio says on that point. But that only corroborates what I say, that the Government recognizes it as its duty to restore its coins to the standard value after they have fallen below a certain limit of abrasion. Now, all that is asked is that before they fall below the limit of abrasion and while passing current in the business transactions of the country they shall be received at their denominational value by the United States Treasury, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe. I fully recognize what the Senator from Ohio says, that the whole subject of specie coinage is one of great intricacy, so that what appears a very small matter in itself may have very wide-spread consequences. But this provision now under consideration is so plain, so reasonable, and so perfectly guarded that I had very strong hopes the Senator from Ohio would consent to allow it to remain.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think after a full explanation of this matter the Senators from California themselves would vote for this proposition. I do not desire to take up time, but will say a few words in explanation of the amendment proposed by the committee striking out this clause.

All nations retain the nominal value of abraded coin to a certain standard, but when it falls below that the loss falls on the individual who holds it. That has been the custom of all countries. The coin that is held by the Treasury of the United States is received at its nominal value if it is within the limits of abrasion fixed by the law, but if it falls below the limits the loss falls on the holder of the coin, and much of that which is now being recoined in the United States was taken at the abraded value, that is, the reduced value. It was not taken at the full nominal value, but at the reduced value. Consequently, when we issue it again, we issue it in the form of coin up to the standard. Therefore, the question as to whether we shall recoin our own coin and the question whether we shall recoin the coin in the hands of citizens are very different things. Upon this identical point I will read a letter of Mr. Comptroller Knox. I may say that this clause was put in in the House, I believe, without the consent of the committee, and upon some motion made in the House; at least I am so informed, although I have not looked at the Globe to ascertain the fact. Mr. Knox writes this to the committee:

"I inclose herewith copy of a portion of a letter recently received from him, (Professor Barnard,) in which you will be interested. I desire to call your especial attention to his criticisms upon sections 14 and 15 in reference to abrasion. So far as I can learn, no nation in the world has laws which offer inducements to wrong-doers to lighten the coins which are in circulation. If I had charge of the bill now before the Senate I should certainly much prefer its defeat to its passage, unless section 14 from line 20, and section 15, could be stricken from the bill."

That is what he says. Then I have here the letter of Professor Barnard, which is very interesting. I will read a paragraph from it:

"Section fourteen of the bill provides that any gold coin, if reduced in weight not more than one-half of 1 per cent. on the double-eagle and eagle, and 1 per cent. on the other coins, below the standard weight and limit of tolerance, shall be received at their denominational value by the United States Treasury and its officers, under such regulations, etc. This one-half of 1 per cent., with the tolerance, makes on the double-eagle about six-tenths of 1 per cent.; that is to say, 12 cents on every such double eagle, and on the eagle seven-tenths of 1 per cent., or 7 cents on every such eagle. This is an enormous sacrifice for the Government to propose to make, and one which will insure the return to the Treasury of a vast number of gold coins much reduced in weight by means which can not be proved to be fraudulent. A coin, or a lot of coins, which has been to some extent reduced by honest abrasion will be a Godsend to a rogue, for this may be still 'sweated' down to the limit named in this section, without sensibly altering its appearance. Coins may moreover be abraded by rubbing them with rouge powder or with prepared chalk, by hand or by mechanical means, so as seriously to reduce them without leaving any traces of violence. I am at a loss to know on what grounds the proposition is defended to receive 'at their nominal value' at all coins depreciated by abrasion below the limits of legal tolerance.

"It is true that this section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to 'prescribe regulations' under which such coins shall be received. If this authority extends so far as to permit him to refuse to receive them at all, 'at their denominational value,' it may prove a safeguard; otherwise the provision seems to me extremely dangerous."

Here is another and a later letter from Professor Barnard to the Comptroller of the Currency under date of December 24:

"MY DEAR SIR: Dr. Torrey has just told me a very important fact. There is a manufactory of watch-cases in Brooklyn. The workmen put the last polish on the cases with fine paper and rouge powder. Some time since the proprietor applied at the assay office for advice as to some method of burning these papers so as to prevent gold from being carried away mechanically in the smoke. He said their loss from this cause was serious, but that in spite of this they recovered $5,000 worth of gold from these papers per annum.

"The establishment is a large one, it is true; but, on the other hand, the workmen do not work with the design to polish off as much gold as they conveniently can, but just as little as the object in view will allow.

"I mention this to show you how easy it would be for a designing man to live off the coin of the country, setting up with a capital of a few thousand dollars. It is needless to say that the coins so abased could not be detectable by their brightness, for nothing is easier than to tarnish them."

Within a certain degree, one-thousandth per cent., a small degree, the Government maintains the coins at their nominal value even if abraded, but when they are abraded below that the loss falls on the holder, and every man who receives a coin must look to it that it has not been abraded beyond the legal amount. If it is so abraded, he can refuse to take it, or if he takes it at all he should take it for what it is intrinsically worth. The recoinage of the gold coin now in circulation, although not very large, would amount to one or two million dollars. As a matter of course, as soon as our attention was called to this fact we struck out this clause. I do not wish to go any further into the details of the matter. I think the action of the Committee on Finance was clearly right, and it would be very wrong indeed to undertake in this ambiguous way to make good all the coin now outstanding.

Mr. CASSERLY. I do not wish to be tenacious about this matter, still less pertinacious. I am very glad that the Senator from Ohio has read the letters on which he relies. I think they speak for themselves. The burden of them is that gold coin may be abraded or reduced fraudulently with such skill as to make it almost impossible of detection at the Treasury. The last letter from Professor Barnard conjures up a phantom to terrify Senators withal. It is that if this provision should become a law a man might with a capital of a few thousand dollars, by fraudulent abrasion, make a good living out of the Treasury. I ask the Senator from Ohio, what does such an argument amount to? If a man can make a good living out of the Treasury by fraudulent abrasion of the coin, so skillfully made as to defy the detection of the officers, how is it to be with the community?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will say to my friend from California that any citizen can at any time test it by weight.

Mr. CASSERLY. I was just coming to that. The Senator says any one can weigh each piece as he takes it. Just imagine a merchant in large business in the city of San Francisco going about with a pair of scales in his pocket to weigh gold coin hourly as he receives it! The Senator surely is not serious when he says so. We are legislating for the American people, a rapid if not a fast people in their enterprises; a people whose energies are impatient of pause, still less of de-

lay. To suppose that such a people are to go about with scales at their buttonholes to weigh coins is to suppose something which, wishing well to the Senator, I hope he may live long enough to see.

Mr. President, we can not carry on a great Government like this without running some risk. I am sure that nobody ought to put the whole risk of coinage upon the citizens. As I said, the citizen has no choice. He must take the lawful money of the country in the course of his lawful transactions, and at its denominational value. If there must be loss even by fraud, I am not sure that it ought not to be borne by the Government in the case of an innocent holder, but I do not wish to raise that question now.

The portion of the clause proposed to be stricken out for which I am contending is that which provides for the natural and lawful abrasion of the coins. I am surprised that these learned and scientific men make such objections as those which the Senator has read, although I think they pretty much answer themselves.

Before I take my seat I wish to observe to the Senator from Ohio that this appears to be a bill for the codification of all the laws on this subject. Consequently, the fact that there is another statute which covers the ground covered by lines twenty-eight, twenty-nine, and thirty of this clause would not be a good reason for striking them out. They should therefore be retained.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will say to the Senator from California that the amount heretofore appropriated will probably be sufficient to have that recoinage done before this bill will take effect; at all events there will be no trouble about that, and I do not care whether the clause is retained or stricken out. The thing is provided for already by an appropriation as a distinct matter.

Mr. CASSERLY. This is a codified law and repeals all other laws.

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator is willing to compromise on that I am perfectly willing to allow those lines to remain in the bill.

Mr. CASSERLY. I shall vote to retain the whole clause, but I shall not debate it any further.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection at all to the gold coin in the Treasury, that which has fallen below the standard, being recoined; but that will be done under the present law, under an appropriation which I moved myself.

Mr. CASSERLY. To save any question about that, probably the Senator will consent to let those words remain.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. COLE. I shall not detain the Senate from a vote on this question more than a minute or two.

By the Constitution of the United States it is the duty of the Government to furnish the circulating medium, the material which is the price of values in business transactions, the currency of the country. That they assume to do in one form or another. Gold is a legal tender for all debts, and it is presumed when the gold is presented with the stamp of the United States upon it, so indorsed by the Government of the United States, that it is of a certain value and weight. Now, what are the facts so far as the Pacific coast is concerned? There is a quantity of coin there that has been in circulation for more than a score of years, and of course it has become more or less abraded by natural wear. It has become so in its use in business, and the dates upon these coins will show that they have been in use a long time.

I hear it said about me, *sotto voce*, that we ought on that coast to have paper money, and in that way avoid this difficulty of having coins which are worn used in business transactions. What are the facts so far as this is concerned? Why, sir, in the first place, in California there never was any bank of issue, there never was a dollar of paper money issued by any bank in that State; but before the late rebellion gold and silver were the circulating mediums exclusively. When the nation adopted as a legal tender the United States notes, it was, as it will be well remembered, a long time before they were made to replace the bank notes that were in circulation throughout the various States. It occurred by slow degrees, and by the time you were ready to dispense with the State banking institutions the legal tenders had fallen in value below the value of gold. They were worth perhaps but 90, or 80, or 70 cents on the dollar, and before they had decreased in value there was no supply possible to be obtained in the community which I have the honor in part to represent. There was no possibility before that time to receive enough there to supply as circulating medium the place that was filled by gold and silver. California never resisted the acceptance of paper money, but from the force of circumstances it could not be adopted there.

In the States on the Atlantic side the United States notes very naturally came into use as money. They took the place of the bank notes at first circulated with them and at the same value, and from one description of paper money they very naturally fell into the use of another. Those circumstances never existed on the Pacific coast, and we never have had any banks of issue or paper money there. The United States notes or greenbacks never were furnished in sufficient numbers or quantity to supply the wants of the country, and they never could circulate as the money of the country. It is owing to these facts, and not to any unfriendly disposition on the part of the State of California or her people, that the United States notes have never come into general use there. It is owing to the fact that gold and silver were all the currency there before the issuance of United States notes. It is a great misfortune to us, and we realize it, that we have not the use of United States notes there the same as here. That fact is realized by our business community very generally. But we have never seen the time when we could use them or adopt them in place of gold and silver as the measure of value for the reasons I have mentioned. And now, since there is in use there this abraded coin, it is very proper that it should be received when not much abraded, when not abraded below the amount specified in this bill by the United States for the various uses for which they accept that sort of currency, and I think this bill ought not to be amended as proposed by the Finance Committee of this body.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand that the law has been for a course of years that the Government would always receive at the nominal value coin that was not abraded more than one-half of 1 per cent. So I do not see the hardship which the Senator from California complains of. The people of that State and of that community that use coin could under that law at any time have had the abraded coin redeemed.

Mr. COLE. Let me correct the Senator. I do not understand, at all events, that the coin is receivable now when abraded, as specified in this section, to the amount of one-half of 1 per cent. upon eagles and double eagles, and 1 per cent. upon coins of lesser denomination. I do not understand that that is the case.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand that the law has been for a course of years that if the coin was not abraded more than the rate fixed by the law, such a law as existed, the Government received it at its nominal and not at its actual value. Therefore I do not see the difficulty.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will read the Senator a paragraph on that subject in this very bill. These coins are receivable now. The language is:

"Which coins shall be a legal tender in all payments at their nominal value when not below the standard weight and limit of tolerance."

Mr. COLE. What is that?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is one-thousandth per cent. And another section provides that when they do fall below the limit of tolerance they shall be received at their actual value.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. And that is only a re-enactment of a pre-existing statute.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly; it is the law now.

Mr. FREYLINGHUYSEN. Therefore I do not see that there is any hardship on the community that the Senator represents, inasmuch as they have had the right at any time to have that coin received at its nominal value within the limit fixed by the existing law, and it is absolutely necessary that the Government should have such a law. If this Government is to receive at its nominal value coin that has been reduced, abraded, it is a premium on fraud at once. Men will go to work with this process of sweating, and make money by it, and come and get the nominal value for the coin. This provision seems to me to be a very essential feature in our laws. The Government will of course receive the coin at its actual value; but if we should now pass a law that the Government would receive at its nominal value abraded coin, this coin that is in circulation in California, for instance——

Mr. COLE. How much abraded?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not remember the limit.

Mr. COLE. One-tenth of 1 per cent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The rate now is one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. COLE. No, sir, one-tenth of 1 per cent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Very well. It is altogether immaterial what the rate is. The point of difference is that which is insisted on as covering the coin in California and that which is provided by this bill, and that is the point to which I am directing my remarks. They could have gone and had that coin made anew, but they did not do so. Now they want the rate increased, so as to cover the abrasion which has taken place there, and that very provision any person who was disposed to commit a fraud upon the Treasury could avail himself of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance, striking out the words which have been read.

The question being put, it was declared that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CASSERLY. I should like to have a decision on that.

Mr. SHERMAN. We have not got a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator call for a division?

Mr. CASSERLY. Yes, sir, or the yeas and nays in order that we may have the sense of the Senate on the question. By the sound the noes had it, I think.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think no one voted but the Senators from California. I suppose if the question is put again and the Senators respond "ay" or "no," there will be no difficulty in deciding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put the question again on striking out the words which have been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASSERLY. I understood the Senator from Ohio was willing to permit the last two lines to remain.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to that clause, because it is in accordance with existing law.

"And any gold coins in the Treasury of the United States reduced in weight below this limit of abrasion shall be recoined."

That is the law now, and I have no objection to retaining those words if it is desired.

Mr. CASSERLY. That means, abraded below this limit of one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, no; we struck out all about that.

Mr. CASSERLY. The meaning of the language is to be taken according to the place in which it is put.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is fixed above. If we strike out all between lines 19 and 27, then this clause will relate to the language before line 19, which reads:

"Which coins shall be a legal tender in all payments at their nominal value when not below the standard weight and limit of tolerance provided by this act for the single piece, and, when reduced in weight below said standard and tolerance, shall be a legal tender at valuation in proportion to their actual weight."

Mr. CASSERLY. I understood the Senator to be willing to keep those words in the last clause of the section just in the meaning they had in that place; but of course if he has a different view of it I shall not contest it with him, because it is evident very few Senators are paying attention to this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment will be read.

The next amendment was to strike out the fifteenth section of the bill in the following words:

"SEC. 15. That any gold coin now in circulation the weight of which is below the limit of abrasion prescribed in this act may be received at the mints in Philadelphia and San Francisco at par in exchange for silver coins: *Provided*, That the circulation of such gold coin, as shown by the date of coinage, has been sufficient to produce such loss by natural abrasion; and the coins so received shall be recoined; but no gold coins which appear to have been artificially reduced shall come within the provisions of this section."

Mr. CASSERLY. It seems to me that section is a section which should be retained not only for the general reasons applicable to the other section which I stated, but for the further reason that there is a protection provided by the express language of this section which it seems to me is absolutely sufficient. The language is:

"That any gold coin now in circulation the weight of which is below the limit of abrasion prescribed in this act may be received at the mints in Philadelphia and San Francisco at par in exchange for silver coins: *Provided*, That the circulation of such gold coin, as shown by the date of coinage, has been sufficient to produce such loss by natural abrasion; and the coins so received shall be recoined; but no gold coins which appear to have been artificially reduced shall come within the provisions of this section."

Of course that section, if it is to remain in the sense in which I desire it to remain, should be modified so as to refer to the limit of abrasion just stricken out, that is, not more than one-half of 1 per cent. on the double-eagle and eagle, and 1 per cent. on other coins. I presumed, after the amendment the Senate has just adopted, the Senator from Ohio would be willing to retain the fifteenth section.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; the fifteenth section is the one I have been debating all the time.

Mr. CASSERLY. Then I must have the wrong bill before me.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is the same bill that the Senator has before him; but the two amendments go together. If one falls the other falls. Is it right, is it just that the people of the United States should maintain the gold in circulation in California against the abrasion of honest people, as well as the abrasion of rogues, when it refuses to maintain its own paper currency against the abrasion of accident? When our paper currency is reduced in value by being mutilated to the amount of one-sixteenth, the holder of the bill loses to the extent of that mutilation, and the Treasury redeems the paper at so much less, in proportion to the loss of the bill. A mutilated bill presented to the Treasury is not redeemed at its nominal value. It is reduced in proportion to the amount presented. In order to avoid fraud, it is indispensably necessary to have such a provision. Indeed the Senators from California and their constituents are much more interested in the passage of this bill than the people of Ohio; and I hope, therefore, if they want the sense of the Senate on this question they will take it by yeas and nays, and let us go on with the bill. I believe this is the only controverted point in the bill. I think the people of the Pacific coast, who persist in circulating gold coin rather than paper money, should not seek to get the people of the United States at large to make good their abraded coin, not only against honest abrasion, but against dishonest abrasion; and, as Professor Barnard has told us, it is utterly impossible to distinguish between honest ahd dishonest abrasion.

Mr. COLE. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him who pays for printing the United States notes? Do not the people of the United States at large pay for it, the people of California as well as the people everywhere else? And as to this other point about the notes being torn, what we are providing for is equivalent to furnishing notes that have been effaced without being torn. It is provided here that if the coin is not abraded beyond a certain extent it shall be re-

coined at the expense of the United States. That is the effect of the proposition; but if it is reduced beyond that, as if a bill were torn one-sixteenth or one-fourth, then there shall be no relief for the party holding it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on striking out the fifteenth section.

Mr. CASSERLY. I do not propose to debate this bill at any length; but it is quite impossible for me to do my duty, as I understand it, to the people of California, or indeed of the United States who use gold coin, without suggesting the objections to it that occur to me. I understand the natural desire of the Senator from Ohio to get the bill passed with expedition. At the same time, each one of us here has to do his duty according to his lights.

I see no kind of analogy in the comparison which the Senator makes between gold coin that is abraded and a legal-tender note which is reduced in size to the extent of one-sixteenth. In the case of the note the reduction is visible, it is easily ascertained. In the case of the coin it not only is not easily ascertainable, but the whole argument of the Senator is it is so difficult to be ascertained as to make it dangerous to receive them at the Treasury.

The Senator aims to make some point in what he says of the people of California, namely, that they insisted on retaining a specie currency. Why, Mr. President, the people there had no choice about it. There never was a period of time between the going out of gold coin in the country at large and the coming in of paper as the sole currency when we could have made any such change in California. Our whole system of values was based upon gold coin. We could not have changed it if we had tried without such a disturbance as would have been a calamity to the State, from which, perhaps, she would not have recovered for years. We never have discredited the paper of the country. On the contrary, we have always given from three-fourths of one per cent. to one and a half per cent. more for it than was paid for it in the State of the Senator from Ohio. The greenbacks of the Government, in reference to which so much is thrown out here against California, are now and always have been in better credit to-day in the city of San Francisco than in any city this side of the Rocky Mountains. You can get fewer of them for the same amount in gold in San Francisco than you can in Philadelphia, New York, Cincinnati, or Chicago. Yet we are constantly met when we seek to do anything to relieve the people of California in reference to the condition of the coinage there by the reproach that we insisted on keeping in California the gold coin of the country. Why, Mr. President, was it wrong for a State, when she had the right to choose between two kinds of lawful money, to choose that kind which formed her currency, and more than that, which formed her entire standard and basis of value?

Our situation in California in regard to our gold currency is one of very considerable difficulty and may become one of danger at any time. By the practice of the Federal officers there, all the new coin is systematically sent out of the country and the old coin is retained. The miner who takes his bullion to the mint in San Francisco to have it coined is, in nine cases out of ten, paid for it in the old coin of the country, abraded and reduced in value as it is. The result is that the old worn coin, instead of being taken up by the officers of the Government, as in the custom-house, and sent on here to the Treasury, is returned into the circulation of the State, to be more and more abraded and reduced, and the new twenty-dollar coins are sent forward to the Treasury at this side. It is not hard to see what must one day be the result of this state of things.

It seems to me, sir, that when we provide as we do in this section for the redemption of gold coins when the abrasion is no more than might honestly have taken place in the time during which, as the figures on their face show, they must have been in circulation, and when the section is further guarded for the protection of the Government against any sort of fraudulent or wrongful abrasion, there ought to be no unwillingness to retain the section as it came from the House.

I have proceeded all through upon the theory that these fraudulent abrasions were very difficult of detection, because that is the argument of the Senator from Ohio. My recollection of a number of criminal cases in England on the subject of sweating coin and similar offenses in the nature of fraudulent abrasions is that the crime is not so very difficult of detection, and that the condition of the coin will exhibit it to any person who inspects it closely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment striking out the fifteenth section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section [17] 16, in the following words:

"SEC. [17] 16. That the minor coins of the United States shall be a five-cent piece, a three-cent piece, and a one-cent piece; and the alloy for minor coinage shall be copper and nickel, to be composed of three-fourths copper and one-fourth nickel; the weight of the piece of five cents shall be five grams, or seventy-seven and sixteen-hundredths grains troy; of the three-cent piece, three grams, or forty-six and thirty-hundredths grains; and of the one-cent piece, one and one-half grams, or twenty-three and fifteen-hundredths grains; which coins shall be legal tender, at their nominal value, for any amount not exceeding twenty-five cents in any one payment."

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the minor coins of the United States shall be a five-cent piece, a three-cent piece, and a one-cent piece; and the alloy for the five and three cent pieces shall be of copper and nickel, to be composed of three-fourths copper and one-fourth nickel; and the alloy of the one-cent piece shall be ninety-five per cent. of copper and five per cent. of tin and zinc, in such proportions as shall be determined by the Director of the Mint. The weight of the piece of five cents shall be seventy-seven and sixteen-hundredths grains troy; of the three-cent piece, thirty grains; and of the one-cent piece, forty-eight grains; which coins shall be a legal tender, at their nominal value, for any amount not exceeding twenty-five cents in any one payment."

Mr. SHERMAN. There is an omission in the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee. I move to insert in line eleven, after the words "twenty-five cent piece," the words "and a dime or ten-cent piece."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was adopted.

The next amendment was in section [18] 19, line 9, to insert, after the words "three-dollar piece," the words "the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar," and also to insert in line 11, after the word "omitted," the words "and on the reverse of the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed the weight and the fineness of the coin;" so that the section will read:

"SEC. [19] 18. That upon the coins of the United States there shall be the following devices and legends: Upon one side there shall be an impression emblematic of liberty, with an inscription of the word "Liberty" and the year of the coinage, and upon the reverse shall be the figure or representation of an eagle, with the inscriptions "United States of America" and "E Pluribus Unum," and a designation of the value of the coin; but on the gold dollar and three-dollar piece, the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, the dime, five, three and one cent piece the figure of the eagle shall be omitted, and on the reverse side of the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed the weight and fineness of the coin; and the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may cause the motto "In God we trust" to be inscribed upon such coins as shall admit of such motto; and any one of the foregoing inscriptions may be on the rim of the gold and silver coins."

Mr. CASSERLY. It may be a matter of sentiment, but sentiment sometimes goes a great way, especially in those cases where it is difficult to reduce the action of men to a mathematical standard. I regret that the eagle is to disappear from the dollar, half-dollar, and quarter-dollar of our coinage. It will hardly be possible to think of a half-dollar or a quarter-dollar as being such a coin without the eagle upon it.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator will see that the reason is because it is necessary to describe the weight and fineness of the coin. This amendment has been proposed by the officers of the mint. They have adopted a plan of describing on each coin its weight and fineness.

Mr. CASSERLY. What is the use of that when we know that the weight of the coin is constantly being reduced?

Mr. SHERMAN. The reason given to us is because it has been adopted as a mode of international coinage. This method has been adopted in the corresponding coins of France and all the countries of Europe, pretty much, of describing upon the face of the coin its intrinsic weight and fineness.

Mr. CASSERLY. I must say I never saw a coin marked in that way.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the reason the officers of the mint give for this change.

Mr. CASSERLY. I ask the Senator whether he is very strenuous in his advocacy of this amendment. I should like to save the American eagle on the half-dollar and quarter-dollar.

Mr. SHERMAN. The eagle is preserved on all the gold coins in a size large enough to be caged. [Laughter.]

Mr. CASSERLY. But the half-dollar and quarter-dollar are the money of the people and they are the leading coins of our entire silver coinage. I do not think it is of so much importance to put the fineness or the weight upon a half-dollar or a quarter-dollar as it might be upon a gold coin. I have never seen any foreign coin, and of course no American coin, marked in that way. To have the weight of the coin upon gold coin may be a useful thing because of the great preciousness of the metal; but what is the importance of having the weight inscribed upon the half-dollar or quarter-dollar? Does anybody ever weigh half-dollars or quarter-dollars in business?

Mr. SHERMAN. If the Senator will allow me, he will see that the preceding section provides for coin which is exactly interchangeable with the English shilling and the five-franc piece of France; that is, a five-franc piece of France will be the exact equivalent of a dollar of the United States in our silver coinage; and in order to show this wherever our silver coin shall float—and we are providing that it shall float all over the world—we propose to stamp upon it, instead of our eagle, which foreigners may not understand, and which they may not distinguish from a buzzard or some other bird, the intrinsic fineness and weight of the coin. In this practical, utilitarian age the officers of the Mint seemed to think it would be better to do that than to put the eagle on our silver coins. I must confess I do not think it is very important; but I think the Senator ought to be willing to defer in these matters to the practical knowledge of the officers who have charge of this branch of the Government service. I will say that Mr. Linderman, whom the Senator must know, has suggested this as being a convenient mode of promoting international coinage.

Mr. CASSERLY. We can not have an international coinage on the basis of our silver coin unless our silver coin is up to the standard of all the nations with which we expect to have relations. Now, I ask the Senator whether this bill proposes a silver coinage of that character.

Mr. SHERMAN. This bill proposes a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar provided for by this bill is the precise equivalent of the five-franc piece. It contains the same number of grams of silver; and we have adopted the international gram instead of the grain for the standard of our silver coinage. The "trade-dollar" has been adopted mainly for the benefit of the people of California, and others engaged in trade with China. That is the only coin measured by the grain instead of by the gram. The intrinsic value of each is to be stamped upon the coin.

Mr. CASSERLY. Do I understand the Senator to say then that the intrinsic value of the dollar, half-dollar, and quarter-dollar is raised by this bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. There is a difference of about one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. CASSERLY. I suppose it must be raised to the basis of international exchange.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it is slightly raised, so as to conform with foreign coins. The Chamber of Commerce of New York first recommended this change, and it has been adopted, I believe, by all the learned societies who have given attention to coinage, and has been recommended to us I believe as the general desire. That is embodied in these three or four sections of amendment, to make our silver coinage correspond in exact form and dimensions, and shape and stamp, with the coinage of the associated nations of Europe, who have adopted an international silver coinage. I do not like myself to break in upon this plan or to change it in the slightest degree, but prefer to leave it to the proper officers of the Mint. Indeed, I would be perfectly willing to leave the whole thing to the officers of the Mint rather than to fix it by law. That was not deemed convenient, and therefore we had to drop the American eagle from these minor silver coins.

Mr. CASSERLY. I am not prepared to go as far as that. I would not leave it to anybody to remove from the eyes and the thoughts of the people those symbols of nationality which have stood this country in such good stead in many a hard-fought field by land and sea; and which may have to do the same service in the same way for many generations to come. While we laugh a good deal about the American eagle and the uses to which he is put by orators, political and otherwise, on the Fourth of July and other days, we must all feel that the associations that cluster around the American eagle are associations that make him a symbol of power, and I am not at all satisfied, because we desire to put the weight and fineness upon our half dollar and our quarter-dollar, that therefore it is necessary to abolish the American eagle. The eagle, it is said, suffers little birds to sing, and the eagle will not object to having his value in the countries of the world put under his wing on the coin. I say retain the eagle and put whatever marks you like upon the face of your coin to indicate its weight and fineness. I do not think it will be of any value in regard to the simple coins of the denomination of half-dollar and quarter-dollar; but if the Senator is strongly of opinion that they ought to be there, let them be there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CASSERLY. I propose to strike out the words in italics in line nine of section [19] 18, "the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California can accomplish his object by voting against the amendment of the committee inserting those words.

Mr. NYE. I should like to hear the amendment of the committee read.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, which was in section [19] 18, line 9, to insert, after the words "three-dollar piece," the words "the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar;" and in line 11, after the word "omitted," to insert "and on the reverse of the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed the weight and the fineness of the coin;" so that that portion of the section will read:

"But on the gold dollar and three-dollar piece, the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, the dime, five, three, and one cent piece the figure of the eagle shall be omitted; and on the reverse of the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed the weight and the fineness of the coin."

Mr. CASSERLY. I think the question is not understood by the Senate generally. As I understand, to vote for the amendment of the committee is to abolish the American eagle on the silver dollar, half-dollar, and quarter-dollar, and to vote against it is to keep him there. The subsequent amendment, in line 11, to which there is no objection, will allow the mark of weight and fineness to be put upon the coin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California desire a separate vote on the two branches of the amendment?

Mr. SHERMAN. I suppose the Senator has no objection to the last one.

Mr. CASSERLY. None at all to the last one. The only point is that I wish to retain the American eagle on the silver dollar, half-dollar and quarter-dollar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question will then be taken on the amendment in line nine, which is to insert the words "the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar."

The amendment was rejected; there being on a division—ayes 24, noes 26.

Mr. SHERMAN. As the Senate are so patriotic that they will not abolish the eagle, I hope they will be perfectly willing now to hurry along with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other part of the amendment will be considered as agreed to, if there be no objection.

The next amendment was on page 13, section 22 [21], to add at the end of the section the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That at the option of the owner silver may be cast into coins of standard fineness, and of the weight of four hundred and twenty grains troy, designated in section 15 of this act as the trade-dollar."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in section [25] 24, line two, to strike out the word "standard" and insert "fineness;" so as to read:

"That the assayer shall report to the superintendent the quality or fineness of the bullion assayed by him, etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in section [25] 24, lines 5 and 6, to strike out the words "for the cost of converting the bullion into bars;" so as to read:

"*Provided*, That the assayer shall report to the superintendent the quality or fineness of the bullion assayed by him, and such information as will enable him to compute the amount of the charges hereinafter provided for, to be made to the depositor."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. The next amendment is on page 14, in section [26] 25, line 2, to insert the words "or for converting standard silver into trade-dollars." They should be transposed to line 7 of the same section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is suggested by the Clerk that the words ought to be inserted in line 8, after the word "bullion."

Mr. SHERMAN. At any convenient place, either after the word "bullion" in line 8, or after the word "standard" in line 7.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment of the committee is section [26] 25, line 8, after the word "bullion" to insert the words "or for converting standard silver into trade-dollars;" so that the section will read:

"That the charge for converting standard gold bullion into coin shall be one-fifth of 1 per cent.; and the charges for refining when the bullion is below standard, for toughening when metals are contained in it which render it unfit for coinage, for copper used for alloy when the bullion is above standard, for separating the gold and silver when these metals exist together in the bullion, or for converting standard silver into trade-dollars, and for the preparation of bars, shall be fixed, from time to time by the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, so as to equal but not exceed, in their judgment, the actual average cost to each mint and assay office of the material, labor, wastage, and use of machinery employed in each of the cases aforementioned."

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senate will see that the charge for converting standard silver into trade-dollars, instead of being fixed at one-fifth of 1 per cent., is fixed at the actual cost. It is provided that the price for this work done at the Mint shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, but not in any case to exceed the actual cost of the operation.

Mr. CASSERLY. I did not suppose that the amendment to section [26] 25 had been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the question now pending.

Mr. CASSERLY. I supposed that the charge there of one-fifth of 1 per cent. for silver coinage was a clerical error.

Mr. SHERMAN. The words "or for converting standard silver into trade-dollars" were intended to come in after the word "standard" in line 7. The Committee on Finance observing that it was printed at the wrong place corrected it, and I gave the Secretary the correct place where it should be inserted. It is only to be the actual cost of the operation, whatever that may be.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 16, section [29] 30, line 1, after the word "coins" to insert "other than the trade-dollar;" so that the clause will read:

"That silver coins other than the trade-dollar shall be paid out at the several mints and at the assay office in New York city, in exchange for gold coins at par, etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASSERLY. I wish to ask what has become of the amendment to section 26. I did not know that it had been passed upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been adopted.

Mr. CASSERLY. I presume it will still be in order to offer an amendment to that section after the amendments of the committee have been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be.

The next amendment was, on page 19, section [34] 35, line 4, to strike out "two-thousandths" and insert "three-thousandths;" so that the clause will read:

"That no ingots shall be used for coinage which differ from the legal standard more than the following proportions, namely: in gold ingots, one-thousandth; in silver ingots, three-thousandths; in minor-coinage alloys, twenty-five-thousandths, in the proportion of nickel."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, section [49] 48, line 4, after the word "Pennsylvania," to insert "the Comptroller of the Currency;" so that the clause will read:

"That to secure a due conformity in the gold and silver coins to their respective standards of fineness and weight, the judge of the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, the Comptroller of the Currency, the assayer of the assay office at New York, etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, section [54] 53, line 3, to strike out "metals" and insert "medals."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, section [59] 58, line 5, to strike out "twentieth" and insert "second;" so as to read: "as prescribed by the act of July 2, 1862."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, section [66] 65, line 2, to strike out "July" and insert "April," and strike out "1872" and insert "1873;" so that the clause will read: "that this act shall take effect on the 1st day of April, 1873," etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, section [68] 67, line 2, to strike out "1872," and insert "1873;" so that the clause will read: "that this act shall be known as the coinage act of 1873," etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This concludes the amendments proposed by the Committee on Finance. The bill is open to further amendments.

Mr. COLE. I offer the following amendment, to come in on page 13, at the end of section [21] 20:

"And the Secretary of the Treasury may issue through the Director of the Mint certificates for gold bullion deposited at any of the mints or assay office at New York, which certificates shall state the value of the bullion less the coinage and other mint charges, and be payable to bearer on presentation at the mint or assay office at which the bullion was deposited, either in bullion or coin, at the option of the superintendent of the mint or assay office, or in such proportion of bullion or coin as the superintendent may prefer: *Provided*, That if any holder of a certificate demands to be paid in coin a certificate may be issued stating the time when such coin will be ready for delivery."

Mr. NYE. That is a thing that is already provided for by existing law. Each one of our mints has a bullion fund provided from which the depositor gets his pay in coin for the value of the bullion as soon as it is ascertained. There is no delay now or waiting for coinage at the Mint.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from California showed me this amendment. As it had never been considered by the committee, I hesitated to give my consent to it, but I could not see any objection to depositing bullion with the Treasury or the mints or assay offices and allow certificates to be issued, and therefore I had no objection to allowing the amendment to be made. If there seems to be any objection to it we can abandon it in a committee of conference, although if there is any doubt about it I think it had better not go on the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POOL. In section [67] 66, line 7, after the word "Idaho," I move to insert the words "and the United States assay office at Charlotte, North Carolina." The chairman of the Committee on Finance I believe agrees to accept this amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. That depends upon the fact whether there is a legal assay office in North Carolina. If the Senator says there is, I shall not object; but I have the impression it has been abolished.

Mr. POOL. No, sir; it has not been abolished.

Mr. SHERMAN. If there is still a legal assay office there it ought to be named in this bill.

Mr. POOL. There is no question about its being such.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NYE. With the consent of the Senate I should like to have the vote reconsidered by which the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. Cole] regarding certificates for gold bullion was adopted.

Mr. COLE. The bill has not yet been reported to the Senate. The Senator can have it reserved.

Mr. NYE. Then I shall reserve it in the Senate. I do not think the Senator himself will insist upon it.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Nevada wished to reserve the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. Cole].

Mr. NYE. I ask to have that amendment reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Chair will put the question on concurring in all the amendments together except the one indicated by the Senator from Nevada.

The remaining amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on concurring in the amendment proposed by the Senator from California, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, which was to add to section [21] 20, the following:

"And the Secretary of the Treasury may issue through the Director of the Mint certificates for gold bullion deposited at any of the mints or assay office at New York, which certificates shall state the value of the bullion less the coinage and other mint charges, and be payable to bearer on presentation at the mint or assay office at which the bullion was deposited, either in bullion or coin, at the option of the superintendent of the mint or assay office, or in such proportions of bullion or coin as the superintendent may prefer: *Provided*, That if any holder of a certificate demands to be paid in coin a certificate may be issued stating the time when such coin will be ready for delivery."

Mr. NYE. I do not understand that this amendment is insisted upon. The Senate will perceive at once that it is putting another currency into circulation, and one by which the superintendents of mints would be very likely to be injured and defrauded. I hope, therefore, it will not be adopted. They get their coin whenever they present their bullion now.

Mr. STEWART. There is a bullion fund provided for the purpose.

Mr. NYE. There is a bullion fund for that very purpose.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Mr. CASSERLY. I wish to move an amendment to section [26] 25. As it now stands it reads:

"That the charge of converting standard gold bullion into coin shall be one-fifth of 1 per cent."

I move to amend it so that it will read, "that there shall be no charge for converting standard gold bullion into coin."

The question raised by this amendment is not a new one in the Senate, nor indeed is it new in Congress. As I understand it has happened at least once that the Senate adopted the principle of my amendment, and that the House also adopted it; but neither of them adopted it upon the same bill. So that the amendment has the sense of each House of Congress in its favor. The principle of it is obvious.

I wish to say but this word in reference to it, that the only ground upon which the coinage charge has ever been supported was that the person depositing bullion for coinage ought to pay the Government for turning his bullion into the current coin of the country. I think it only requires a statement of that proposition to enable any of us to see its fallacy.

The person who furnishes the Government with the means to coin money for the necessary uses of its own citizens never should be taxed to pay for that which really is a great advantage to the Government. Why, sir, governments would be forced, if they could not get bullion without charge, to pay for it in order to manufacture their coins. It is contrary to the first principles of government, it seems to me, especially as applicable to this subject, that coinage charge should be continued. It is one which is evil in its results. It keeps up a discrimination which is always against us; and the reason to-day why the American man of business loses, at the rate of two cents and a fraction of a cent upon every pound sterling of exchange, all of which goes to the benefit either of the banker on this side or the payer of the exchange on the other, rests precisely in the maintenance of this extraordinary charge. But for this charge there would be no such discrimination in the rate of exchange against us.

A great many other grounds might be given, but I hope the Senator from Ohio will be willing to concede this amendment at this time, and that what the two Houses have both indorsed may now be embodied in this bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I must confess my regret that the Senator from California should raise this disputed question at this stage of the bill, just as it was about on its passage. The Senate of the United States deliberately, after full discussion, after hearing the Senator at length and other Senators who maintain his view of this question, decided to retain the charge for coinage at one-fifth of 1 per cent. It is now one-half of 1 per cent. The Senate, by a very decided vote, after a

full debate, settled that question. The bill went to the House of Representatives, and there there was another effort made by the members from the Pacific coast to repeal the coinage charge, and there, after full debate, it was settled by an overwhelming majority to retain the charge of one-fifth of 1 per cent. The Senator says both Houses have at some time or other passed a bill abolishing the coinage charge. I am quite sure a proposition of that kind has never passed either House after debate and with full consideration.

If this question about the coinage charge is to be opened and pressed, it will compel those of us who are in favor of retaining the coinage charge to enter into an elaborate debate. I did so when it was here before. The Senator now in the chair [Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont] and many other Senators participated in that discussion. The question has been settled, and this bill has now gone to its last stage. This bill once passed the Senate a few years ago, and was fully discussed, and the charge of one-fifth of 1 per cent. was retained. I trust, therefore, that the Senator will not now seek to reverse the decision taken first by the Senate, and afterward agreed to by the House. This point is beyond our consideration practically. We ought not undertake, at this period of the session, to review that decision.

The people of California are very largely interested in the revision of the mint laws. Indeed I have received more letters from that State about this coinage bill, desiring it to pass, than from any other portion of the country. I can see the great importance of it to them, and I believe it to be one of great importance to the whole people of the United States. Therefore I do not wish to enter into a discussion in regard to this coinage charge that may probably weary the Senate and delay the passage of the bill. I promised that the bill would not take more than an hour, and when I made that promise I supposed these amendments which have been acted upon would be acted upon *sub silentio*, and that other questions which had been settled would not be revived.

I therefore will not undertake to answer the argument of the Senator from California except to say that the question is *res adjudicata* so far as this bill is concerned. If, however, it is to be opened, as the Senator has a right to open it, it will lead to a long debate. I therefore prefer not to say anything on the question except that the coinage charge has not been and ought not to be repealed entirely. We have reduced it now to the lowest rate of any nation in the world except only Great Britain.

Mr. CASSERLY. If I have made a mistake as to the fact of the adoption in each House of the principle of this amendment, of course I desire to withdraw what I said.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not deny that if the Senator says it is so; but I do not remember it ever passing the Senate.

Mr. CASSERLY. I was so informed, and I have the impression that among the gentlemen so informing me was the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. CASSERLY. I understand fully the objection to protracting debate at this late hour of the day, and I was very reluctant to say a word, even so much as was necessary to propose this amendment. I felt it to be my duty, however, to do so. I desire now to say that the continuance of this coinage charge repels from San Francisco, and of course from this country, almost the entire gold bullion product of Australia. We refine so much more cheaply in San Francisco than they do in London that but for this coinage charge the whole gold bullion of Australia would come to San Francisco to be refined.

Mr. SHERMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. CASSERLY. Perhaps the Senator does not understand me. I say the cost of refining in London is so much more than it is in San Francisco that but for this coinage charge the gold bullion product of Australia would come to us. Why? Because what they want in England all the while is silver for their Asiatic exchanges with India and China. We have more silver than we want. Nevada appears to be getting ready to deluge the world with silver. I see that her silver product last year was probably over $20,000,000.

Now, sir, there could not be a better basis for exchange, nor a more profitable operation for the American people, than to take the gold bullion of Australia and coin it in San Francisco and diffuse that much more specie through all the arteries of business, getting ready for the resumption of specie payments, of which the Senator spoke so well and so truly the other day, and to give them in return for their bullion this silver which we do not want and which before a great while may be at an absolute discount on our hands. I wish to say that much. I feel very earnest about this matter, because I think I understand the financial and commercial bearing of the great blunder we make in continuing this obsolete coinage tax. Having said so much, I leave the question to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.—(*Congressional Globe*, parts 1 and 2, third session, Forty-second Congress, 1872-'73, pages 668 to 674.)

The amendments were engrossed and reported to the House of Representatives as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, *January* 17, 1873.

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 2934) entitled "An act revising and amending the laws relative to the mints, assay offices, and coinage of the United States" do pass with the following amendments:

1. Page 4, line 21, after "coins" insert or samples of bullion.
2. Page 5, line 20, strike out [wording] and insert working
3. Page 6, line 4, after "or" insert assay.
4. Page 9, strike out all after "weight" in line 14 down to and including line 27.
5. Page 11 strike out Sec. 15.
6. Page 11 strike out Sec. 16 and insert the following:

SEC. 15. That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade dollar shall be four hundred and twenty grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar shall be twelve grains and one-half of a grain; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half dollar; and said coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding five dollars in any one payment.

7. Page 11 strike out Sec. 17 and insert the following:

SEC. 16. That the minor coins of the United States shall be a five-cent piece, a three-cent piece, and a one-cent piece, and the alloy for the five and three cent pieces shall be of copper and nickel, to be composed of three-fourths copper and one-fourth nickel, and the alloy of the one-cent piece shall be ninety-five per centum of copper and five per centum of tin and zinc, in such proportions as shall be determined by the Director of the Mint. The weight of the piece of five cents shall be seventy-seven and sixteen-hundredths grains troy; of the three-cent piece, thirty grains; and of the one-cent piece, forty-eight grains; which coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding twenty-five cents in any one payment.

8. Page 12, line 11, after "omitted" insert: and on the reverse of the silver dollar, half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed the weight and the fineness of the coin.
9. Page 13, at the end of line 8, insert the following:
Provided, That at the option of the owner silver may be cast into coins of standard fineness, and of the weight of four hundred and twenty grains troy, designated in section fifteen of this act as the trade dollar.
10. Page 13, line 24, strike out [standard] and insert: fineness.
11. Page 13, strike out all after "depositor," in line 26, down to and including line 27.
12. Page 14, line 6, after "bullion" insert: or for converting standard silver into trade dollars.
13. Page 14, line 27, after "coins" insert: other than the trade dollar.
14. Page 17, line 20, strike out [two-thousandths] and insert: three-thousandths.
15. Page 24, line 4, after "Pennsylvania," insert: the Comptroller of the Currency.
16. Page 30, line 12, strike out [twentieth] and insert: second.
17. Page 34, line 23, strike out [July] and insert: April.
18. Page 34, line 24, strike out [seventy-two] and insert: seventy-three.
19. Page 36, at the end of line 2, insert: the "United States assay-office at Charlotte, North Carolina."
20. Page 36, line 14, strike out [1872] and insert 1873.

Attest:

GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary*.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *January* 25, 1873.

Resolved, That the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2934) revising and amending the laws relative to the mints, assay offices, and coinage of the United States, and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. Samuel Hooper, Mr. Stoughton, and Mr. McNeely be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Attest: EDWARD McPHERSON, *Clerk*.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES *January* 27, 1873.

Resolved, That the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2934) revising and amending the laws relative to the mints, assay offices, and coinage of the United States, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. Sherman, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Bayard be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Attest: GEO. C. GORHAM, *Secretary*.

CONFERENCE REPORT.

IN SENATE.

Thursday, February 6, 1873.

MINT LAWS.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. No. 2934) revising and amending the laws relative to the mints and assay-offices and coinage of the United States, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 20; and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its fourth amendment, and agree to the words proposed to be stricken out, with the following amendments: after the word "by," in line 16, insert "natural;" in lines 17 and 18 strike out the words "on the double-eagle and eagle, and 1 per cent. on the other coins;" and in line 19, after "law," insert the words "after a circulation of twenty years, as shown by its date of coinage, and at a ratable proportion for any period less than twenty years;" and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the sixth amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with the following amendments: in line 5 strike out the word "grains" at the end of the line, and insert in lieu thereof "grams (grammes;") and in line 6 strike out "grain" and insert "gram (gramme;") and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the eighth amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with the following amendments: after "silver" insert "trade;" strike out the words "half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime, respectively, there shall be inscribed," and the word "the" before "fineness;" and after "coin," at the end of the amendment, insert the words "shall be inscribed;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the ninth amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: strike out the words proposed to be inserted, together with the remainder of the section, and in lieu thereof insert the following: "that any owner of silver bullion may deposit the same at any mint to be formed into bars or into dollars of the weight of four hundred and twenty grains troy, designated in this act as trade-dollars, and no deposit of silver for other coinage shall be received; but silver bullion contained in gold deposits, and separated therefrom, may be paid for in silver coin at such valuation as may be from time to time established by the Director of the Mint;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the twelfth amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with amendments as follows: strike out the words proposed to be inserted and insert after "for," in line 3, section 26, the words "converting standard silver into trade-dollars, for melting and;" and in line 3, strike out "the;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the nineteenth amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: insert after "New York," in line eight, page 36 of the bill, the words "the United States assay-office at Charlotte, North Carolina;" and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN SHERMAN,
JOHN SCOTT,
T. F. BAYARD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. HOOPER,
WM. M. STOUGHTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.—(*Congressional Globe*, part 2, third session, Forty-second Congress, 1872-'73, page 1150.)

Mr. President, I have now laid before the Senate all the record information that exists as to the passage of the bill through the Senate

which demonetized silver. The use made by the gold monometallists of the fact that I was a member of the Senate at the time this legislation took place has compelled me to do this to exonerate myself. In common with all of the members of the two Houses of Congress who have spoken on the subject, with the exception of the Senator from Ohio, so far as I am informed, I was ignorant of the fact that silver was

DEMONETIZED IN THE ACT CODIFYING THE MINT LAWS.

The Senator from Ohio alone, so far as I am advised, contends that this unfortunate legislation was the result of public discussion, careful consideration, and was in pursuance of the enlightened judgment of Congress.

I now submit to him in all candor two questions: First, did he comprehend the consequences which have resulted from the demonetization of silver? Second, if so, did he desire to produce the results which have followed that demonetization?

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] a few days ago interrupted the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] in the course of his speech on silver, and the following running debate took place:

Mr. SHERMAN. I know the Senator from Virginia does not wish to mislead upon a fact of that kind; and if I do not interrupt him, for I never choose to interrupt a Senator in the midst of a speech, I remember that in a debate between the late Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Beck, whose death we mourn, he made this same statement, that has been made over and over again in the Senate and House, that the silver dollar was surreptitiously dropped from the coinage. I then got the original files and showed the original letter of April 25, 1870, had it read, and showed every stage of that bill. It was printed at least eight or ten times, circulated widely all over the country, and sent to everybody who was supposed to know anything about the bill, and attention was especially called to the fact that the silver dollar was dropped from the coinage. The bill was debated in both Houses. The fact was brought out here only the other day by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH]. The Senator from Kentucky, with the manly generosity that distinguished him, because, although he was very strong in his opinions, he was always willing to be corrected, at once acknowledged his error; and there are Senators here within the hearing of my voice who probably remember the circumstance.

That dollar was never surreptitiously dropped. It may have been foolishly done, but it was done after debate. The circumstances connected with it, the why and the wherefore, were given in both Houses of Congress and stated by the Secretary of the Treasury. I have no objection to any comment being made upon that fact. It may have been very unwise; I will not interrupt the Senator here to debate that; but the fact is that it was known to every member of Congress. It is true General Grant said he did not know the effect of the measure, and many other outsiders did not; but no man could have been present here in the Senate Chamber as a member or in the other House of Congress and attended to his duties and not have known it.

Mr. HOAR. How many times was the bill printed?

Mr. SHERMAN. It was printed some eight or ten times, perhaps more than that, from the beginning to the end for three years during two Congresses, from April 25, 1870, to February, 1873, and the fact that that dollar was dropped from that bill was as bold and palpable a fact as any fact of legislation in the history of our country.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio was entirely right to interrupt me, or at least to make his explanation, and he but does me simple justice in saying that he knows I would be glad to allow any explanation of that kind.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suppose the Senator knew that, but I was greatly surprised when another Senator made the same declaration about the silver dollar being surreptitiously dropped who was present here as a member of the Senate, and I can show over and over again he refers to it here. I knew the Senator did not intend to mislead.

Mr. DANIEL. But, Mr. President, the fact is very little short of the statement made. So far as this movement to demonetize the silver dollar was concerned, it was a matter unknown to Congress and unknown to the people of the United States when it was done. Speaker Blaine did not know it when the act passed. Senator STEWART, of Nevada, representing that great silver community, who was a member of the body, did not know it. The Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], who has always had an eye on silver, did not know it.

Mr. SHERMAN. He was not here.

Mr. DANIEL. Was he not then a member of the other House?

Several SENATORS. No.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to say that the Senator from Nevada, who also has his eye always upon silver, was here and voted for the bill.

Mr. TELLER. He did not know it.

Mr. STEWART. I did not know it, and I will give the Senator, if he wants it, the entire discussion. It was not stated in the discussion that there was any intention to leave the dollar out. On the contrary, the very last thing that was done was an amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio providing for the inscription on the silver dollar. I will get it in a moment and show it. That was adopted.

Mr. SHERMAN. The trade-dollar.

Mr. STEWART. No, the silver dollar and the trade-dollar both.

Mr. SHERMAN. In the bill as it came to us—I will get the original files again and introduce the same evidence I did here before. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Fifty-first Congress, first session, May 24, 1890, page 5438.)

The Senator from Ohio stated that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] intimated that he had taken back his charge and I will read what the Senator from Kentucky said after the colloquy between him and the Senator from Ohio on the occasion referred to in my remarks in regard to this bill. The Senator from Ohio failed to satisfy the Senator from Kentucky on the occasion to which he alluded in the foregoing debate with Mr. DANIEL. After the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Kentucky, to which the Senator from Ohio alluded in the foregoing quotation, the Senator from Kentucky proceeded as follows:

WHAT SENATOR BECK SAID.

Mr. BECK. What I complain of, and what I think I have proved, is that the House never knew what was in that bill.

* * * * * * *

I need not waste time in regard to what took place when the House bill reached the Senate. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] has shown very fully what took place there. If the Senator from Ohio is content with that statement I am. Mr. Casserly, of California, was in the Senate and other able and distinguished representatives of silver-producing States. Mr. Corbett, of Oregon, and others took part in the debate. Will any sane man believe that they deliberately consented to strike down silver coinage? Mr. SHERMAN says they all did. I do not believe him. When the House bill was brought up by Mr. SHERMAN the record shows that he used this language:

"Mr. SHERMAN. I rise for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Mint bill. I will state that this bill will not probably consume any more time than the time consumed in reading it. It passed the Senate two years ago after full debate. It was taken up again in the House during the present Congress and passed there. It is a matter of vital interest to the Government, and I am informed by officers of the Government it is important it should pass promptly. The amendments reported by the Committee on Finance present the points of difference between the two Houses, and they can go to a committee of conference without having a controversy here in the Senate about them."

Again he said:

"If the Senator will allow me, he will see that the preceding section provides for coin which is exactly interchangeable with the English shilling and the five-franc piece of France; that is, a five-franc piece of France will be the exact equivalent of a dollar of the United States in our silver coinage."

That was stricken out, and there was no such thing left in the bill.

"And in order to show this wherever our silver coin shall float—and we are providing that it shall float all over the world—we propose to stamp upon it, instead of our eagle, which foreigners may not understand, and which they may not distinguish from a buzzard or some other bird, the intrinsic fineness and weight of the coin. In this practical, utilitarian age the officers of the Mint seemed to think it would be better to do that than to put the eagle on our silver coins. I must confess I do not think it is very important, but I think the Senator ought to be willing to defer in these matters to the practical knowledge of the officers who have charge of this branch of the Government service. I will say that Mr. Linderman, whom the Senator must know, has suggested this as being a convenient mode of promoting international coinage."

Did not every word of that indicate the continuance of silver coinage with full legal-tender quality as it had always had?

International coinage in a trade-dollar, with a legal-tender quality of only $5, and even that poor quality was stricken out in 1875, so as to make it simply merchandise. That was the coin the Senator from Ohio said was to float, and they were providing it should float, all over the world, wherever our flag floated, and that it should be international coinage equivalent to the coins of other nations. Little wonder the Senator from Nevada said to him: "Whatever may be your construction of the meaning now, the words used then induced me to vote with you, because you made me believe that you were sending out a bona fide silver dollar as good as any in the world." The Senate so believed. The debate showed that Mr. Casserly announced that Nevada alone was then producing $20,000,000 of silver, and the question was, as to whether silver-owners should pay the coinage charge of half, a quarter, or one-eighth per cent.; nothing was suggested anywhere that the silver dollar was to be stricken down. The Senator from Ohio was as silent as the grave on that subject.

But that was all. To show that whenever things are not done as they ought to be the track can be followed, and it will be in the same direction, the Revised Statutes were adopted shortly afterwards. When it is said that we had coined no silver dollars, practically, up to that time, that is not the fact. We had coined in the month of January, 1873, and in the first twelve days of February, 1873, nearly two million standard silver dollars of 412½ grains, nearly one-fourth of all we ever had coined. By the way, if Senators will turn to Dr. Linderman's work on Money and Legal Tender, which you will find in the Library, you will see that we never had coined a gold dollar from the foundation of the Government until long after the discovery of gold in California, and that we had up to 1848 about as much silver as we had gold coin of all sorts. At the time we fought the war of 1812 and the war with Mexico, and acquired Louisiana, we were upon a silver basis, if that is worth suggesting. All our acquisitions were obtained with silver coin, the Mexican dollar being the legal tender, as well as toher foreign coins, most of the time. The table furnished by Dr. Linderman shows it all, and the fact is proved by his tables that we had coined nearly two million standard dollars in less than six weeks before this act of 1873 was passed.

I think I can guess the reason why the bankers of Europe were pushing the act of 1873. The Rothschilds, who held our bonds, and the great bankers of the Rhine, at Frankfort and elsewhere, were, of course, all anxious for it to pass. Mr. Hooper and the other bankers knew why. How much the Senator from Ohio was allowed to know I can not state; but Dr. Linderman showed in November, 1872, that silver was falling, and falling rapidly; it had fallen from 3 per cent. premium down to par with gold when the act was passed demonetizing it, and that it was sure to fall still more rapidly. All their bonds were payable in it while it was being stricken down in their countries. Dr. Linderman tells the whole story in a report made the fall of 1872, after the bill had passed the House. He takes credit for the trade-dollar as having been first suggested in his report. He says we discovered very soon after the bill passed the House—as early as September or October, 1872—that Germany was going to sell her silver. The House had passed the bill, recollect, in May, 1872; it came to the Senate practically in December.

Dr. Linderman in his book states what he said in the fall of 1872:

"The amount of silver bullion annually produced from the mines of the United States has been increased during the last three years, and now amounts to about $20,000,000 per annum, exclusive of the gold it contains; and a further increase in this product being quite certain, the future value of silver as compared with gold is a matter of national importance.

"The fluctuations in the relative value of gold and silver during the last hundred years have not been very great, but several causes are now at work, all tending to an excess of supply over demand for silver, and its consequent depreciation. Among these causes may be stated the increasing production, its demonetization by the German Empire, and continued disuse in this country, except to a limited extent, as a part of the circulating medium.

"It has also been demonetized by Japan, while in some other countries silver coin has been wholly or partially expelled from circulation by paper money, the effect of which will be to bring to market as bullion large amounts hitherto used as coin. The amount of silver coin in the German Empire at the date of the enactment of the recent coinage law (December, 1871), which changed the standard from silver to gold, is estimated by competent authority at $350,000,000, being equal to five years' total production of the globe.

"Even if silver should be adopted by Germany for subsidiary coinage, not more than $50,000,000 will be required for that purpose, which will leave $300,000,000, or about 9,000 tons, to be disposed of as bullion. A market for this immense supply of silver can only be found in such of the European states as maintain the single standard of silver or the double standard of gold and silver and in China and the Indies.

"The facts above stated indicate the gradual but eventually certain adoption of the gold standard and consequent demonetization of silver by all commercial countries. Not only is the tendency to adopt gold as the sole standard and measure of value, but to use paper money redeemable in gold as the bulk of the circulating medium."

Then he proceeds to show that gold would necessarily appreciate, which he said meant the same thing as depreciation of property by reason of silver being stricken down. I may refer to his table giving the amount of silver and gold we had then coined and the relation they bore to each other in 1873, showing that the pretense that silver was demonetized because it was either not a coin that the people wanted or because it was more valuable than gold is not true. It was stricken down be-

cause the great gold brokers, foreign and domestic, saw that gold was becoming more and more valuable every day, and silver would necessarily fall because of the action of Germany. The production of gold had fallen off in this country from $66,000,000 in 1856 to $32,000,000 in 1873. Silver production had gone up from less than $14,000,000 four years before to thirty-odd million dollars in 1873. That was the real cause of its being stricken down in the interest of the bondholders and the bankers and the usurers of Europe and America.—(*Congressional Record*, volume 19, part 3, 50th Congress, 1st session, pages 2001-2002.)

I have gathered quotations from members of Congress and from the President, showing their utter ignorance on the bill; these I will also print. I will not take time to read them, but they are from quite a number of members, and from these quotations it will appear what each has said about it, so far as I have been able to determine, and from the evidence of these men who participated they were all in the same boat with me, I believe, and no one has come out and said that he understood it.

CERTAINLY IT WAS NOT READ AT THE DESK.

It can not be supposed that Senators here should understand what is contained in every bill, especially when its contents are not stated. Certainly if this change had been discussed it is so important that it would have occurred to somebody to ask to have it read at the desk, or something would have been said about it if it was going to be deliberately considered.

SOME OF THOSE WHO KNEW NOT.

The persons from whom I make quotations who were oblivious of this subject are:

Senator Bogy, Senator Conkling, Senator ALLISON, Senator Blaine, Senator VOORHEES, Senator Beck, Senator Hereford, Senator Howe, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. Kelley, Mr. Burchard, General Garfield, and General Grant.

These are some of the persons who were ignorant of what occurred, as will be shown by the extracts when they are printed in my remarks.

I will now submit what these Senators and Members of Congress have from time to time, in debate, said with regard to the passage of the act demonetizing silver:

A CONSENSUS OF DENIALS.

Mr. HOLMAN, in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives July 13, 1876, said:

I have before me the record of the proceedings of this House on the passage of that measure, a record which no man can read without being convinced that the measure and the method of its passage through this House was a "colossal swindle." I assert that the measure never had the sanction of this House, and it does not possess the moral force of law. (Congressional Record, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, appendix, page 193.

Again on August 5, 1876, he said:

The original bill was simply a bill to organize a bureau of mines and coinage. The bill which finally passed the House and which ultimately became a law was certainly not read in this House.

* * * * * * *

It was never considered before the House as it was passed. Up to the time the bill came before this House for final passage the measure had simply been one to establish a bureau of mines; I believe I use the term correctly now. It came from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. The substitute which finally became a law was never read, and is subject to the charge made against it by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], that it was passed by the House without a knowledge of its provisions, especially upon that of coinage.

I myself asked the question of Mr. Hooper, who stood near where I am now standing, whether it changed the law in regard to coinage. And the answer of Mr. Hooper certainly left the impression upon the whole House that the subject of the coinage was not affected by that bill.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, page 5237).

Mr. CANNON, of Illinois, in a speech made in the House on July 13, 1876, said:

This legislation was had in the Forty-second Congress, February 12, 1873, by a bill to regulate the mints of the United States, and practically abolished silver as money by failing to provide for the coinage of the silver dollar. It was not discussed, as shown by the RECORD, and neither members of Congress nor the people understood the scope of the legislation. (Ibid, appendix, page 197.)

Senator Bogy, of Missouri, uttered the following words in a speech made in the Senate June 27, 1876:

Why the act of 1873, which forbids the coinage of the silver dollar, was passed, no one at this day can give a good reason.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 5, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, page 4178.)

Mr. Burchard, of Illinois, in a speech made in the House of Representatives on July 13, 1876, said:

The coinage act of 1873, unaccompanied by any written report upon the subject from any committee, and unknown to the members of Congress, who without opposition allowed it to pass under the belief, if not assurance, that it made no alteration in the value of the current coins, changed the unit of value from silver to gold.—*Ibid.*, page 4560.

Senator Conkling, in the Senate on March 30, 1876, during the remarks of Senator Bogy on the bill (S. 263) to amend the laws relating to legal tender of silver coin, in surprise, inquired:

Will the Senator allow me to ask him or some other Senator a question? Is it true that there is now by law no American dollar? And, if so, is it true that the effect of this bill is to be to make half-dollars and quarter-dollars the only silver coin which can be used as a legal tender?—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 3, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, page 2062.)

General Garfield, in a speech made at Springfield, Ohio, during the fall of 1877, said:

Perhaps I ought to be ashamed to say so, but it is the truth to say that, I at that time being chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and having my hands overfull during all that time with work, I never read the bill. I took it upon the faith of a prominent Democrat and a prominent Republican, and I do not know that I voted at all. There was no call of the yeas and nays, and nobody opposed that bill that I know of. It was put through as dozens of bills are, as my friend and I know, in Congress, on the faith of the report of the chairman of the committee; therefore I tell you, because it is the truth, that I have no knowledge about it.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 989.)

Senator ALLISON, on February 15, 1878, when the bill (H. R. 1093) to authorize the free coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character was under consideration, observed:

But when the secret history of this bill of 1873 comes to be told, it will disclose the fact that the House of Representatives intended to coin both gold and silver, and intended to place both metals upon the French relation instead of on our own, which was the true scientific position with reference to this subject in 1873, but that the bill afterward was doctored, if I may use that term, and I use it in no offensive sense of course——

Mr. Sargent interrupted him and asked him what he meant by the word "doctored."

Mr. ALLISON said:

I said I used the word in no offensive sense. It was changed after discussion, and the dollar of 420 grains was substituted for it.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1058.)

On February 15, 1878, during the consideration of the bill above referred to, the following colloquy between Senator Blaine and Senator VOORHEES took place:

Mr. VOORHEES. I want to ask my friend from Maine, whom I am glad to designate in that way, whether I may call him as one more witness to the fact that it was not generally known whether silver was demonetized. Did he know, as Speaker of the House, presiding at that time, that the silver dollar was demonetized in the bill to which he alludes?

Mr. BLAINE. I did not know anything that was in the bill at all. As I have before said, little was known or cared on the subject. [Laughter.] And now I should like to exchange questions with the Senator from Indiana, who was then on the floor and whose business it was, far more than mine, to know, because by the designation of the House I was to put questions; the Senator from Indiana, then on the floor of the House, with his power as a debater, was to unfold them to the House. Did he know?

Mr. VOORHEES. I very frankly say that I did not.

(*Ibid.*, page 1063.)

Senator Beck, in a speech made in the Senate January 10, 1878, said:

It [the bill demonetizing silver] never was understood by either House of Congress. I say that with full knowledge of the facts. No newspaper reporter—and they are the most vigilant men I ever saw in obtaining information—discovered that it had been done.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 260.)

Senator Hereford, in the Senate, on February 13, 1878, in discussing the demonetization of silver, said:

So that I say that beyond the possibility of a doubt (and there is no disputing it) that bill which demonetized silver, as it passed, never was read, never was discussed, and that the chairman of the committee who reported it, who offered the substitute, said to Mr. HOLMAN, when inquired of, that it did not affect the coinage in any way whatever.—*Ibid.*, page 989.

Mr. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, who had charge of the bill, in a speech made in the House of Representatives on March 9, 1878, said:

In connection with the charge that I advocated the bill which demonetized the standard silver dollar, I say that, though the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, I was as ignorant of the fact that it would demonetize the silver dollar or of its dropping the silver dollar from our system of coins as were those distinguished Senators Messrs. Blaine and VOORHEES, who were then members of the House, and each of whom a few days since interrogated the other: "Did you know it was dropped when the bill passed?" "No," said Mr. Blaine; "did you?" "No," said Mr. VOORHEES. I do not think that there were three members in the House that knew it. I doubt whether Mr. Hooper, who, in my absence from the Committee on Coinage and attendance on the Committee of Ways and Means, managed the bill, knew it. I say this in justice to him.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1605.)

Again on May 10, 1879, Mr. Kelley said:

All I can say is that the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, who reported the original bill, were faithful and able, and scanned its provisions closely; that as their organ I reported it; that it contained provision for both the standard silver dollar and the trade-dollar. Never having heard until a long time after its enactment into law of the substitution in the Senate of the section which dropped the standard dollar, I profess to know nothing of its history; but I am prepared to say that in all the legislation of this country there is no mystery equal to the demonetization of the standard silver dollar of the United States. I have never found a man who could tell just how it came about or why.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 9, part 1, Forty-sixth Congress, first session, page 1231.)

Senator Howe, in a speech delivered in the Senate on February 5, 1878, said:

Mr. President, I do not regard the demonetization of silver as an attempt to wrench from the people more than they agreed to pay. That is not the crime of which I accuse the act of 1873. I charge it with guilt compared with which the robbery of two hundred millions is venial.—(CONGRESSIONAL RECORD volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 764.)

President Grant was also ignorant of the demonetization of silver. Eight months after the passage of the bill he wrote a letter to Mr. Cowdrey, from which the following extract is taken:

The panic has brought greenbacks about to a par with silver. I wonder that silver is not already coming into the market to supply the deficiency in the circulating medium. When it does come, and I predict that it will soon, we will have made a rapid stride towards specie payments. Currency will never go below silver after that. The circulation of silver will have other beneficial effects. Experience has proved that it takes about forty millions of fractional currency to make small change necessary for the transaction of the business of the country. Silver will gradually take the place of this currency, and, further, will become the standard of values which will be hoarded in a small way. I estimate that this will consume from two to three hundred millions, in time, of this species of our circulating medium. It will leave the paper currency free to perform the legitimate functions of trade and will tend to bring us back where we must come at last, to a specie basis. I confess to a desire to see a limited hoarding of money.

It insures a firm foundation in time of need. But I want to see the hoarding of something that has a standard of value the world over. Silver has this, and if we once get back to that our strides toward a higher appreciation of our currency will be rapid. Our mines are now producing almost unlimited amounts of silver, and it is becoming a question, "What shall we do with it?" I suggest here a solution that will answer for some years, and suggest to you bankers whether you may not imitate it: To put it in circulation now; keep it there until it is fixed, and then we will find other markets.—(*McPherson's Hand-Book of Politics for* 1874, pages 134 and 135.)

On January 14, 1875, the same date that he signed the resumption act, President Grant sent a special message to Congress advising the establishment of two or more mints at Chicago, St. Louis, and Omaha to coin silver dollars to provide for resumption, when by law, signed by himself, it was provided

THAT NO MORE SILVER DOLLARS SHOULD BE COINED.

I submit that it is unfair for the Senator from Ohio, in view of the facts which I have presented, to claim that the question of demonetizing silver was discussed and understood, and that Senators who were present and voted for the bill knew that the silver dollar was omitted.

HE UNDOUBTEDLY KNEW WHAT THE BILL CONTAINED,

because it was in harmony with the views which he had entertained and often expressed. It is quite probable that he did not realize the consequences of the great change in the standard money of the world which the law he framed would produce, and that he was mistaken in the consequences which would follow the demonetization of silver. If the law was a mistake he should in all fairness have been the first one to rectify that mistake and aid in the restoration of the money of the Constitution. Has he done so? On the contrary, he has during all the years that have passed since 1873 persisted in his advocacy of the single gold standard, and he is not now willing to restore silver to the place it occupied before it was demonetized in the manner I have described. If the Senator from Ohio to-day would advocate the unlimited coinage of silver, a law for that purpose would speedily be placed upon the statute-book. He is the author of the demonetization of silver and the great leader in the advocacy of the gold standard. If he should change his views the battle would be won and the money of the Constitution restored.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I have but a very few words to say in conclusion. The dollar that the Senator from Nevada is talking about—and he seems to have gotten into a mare's nest about it—is the subsidiary dollar that was put on in the House containing 385 grains, 26½ grains less than the old silver dollar. It was the French five-franc piece. Perhaps the Senator is not aware, and I will now tell him so that he can not be mistaken, that he is in error in supposing that the French silver coinage is upon the basis of 15½ to 1. That is a mistake. The French people, like all the people of Europe, have adopted silver as a subsidiary coin. It is true they maintain a standard of 15½ to 1, but when they coin it at all they coin upon that standard, and the French silver to-day is like other coins, it is a subsidiary coin, but they found they would not have any silver during the time when gold was at a premium.

Another thing; in all the remarks that have been made, I call attention to the fact that the dollar in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives here, about which the discussion arose, was the French dollar, a dollar of 385 grains. That was stricken out by the action of the Senate. That was not the 412½-grain dollar at all. The dollar that was stricken out was the dollar of 385 grains which was legal tender for only $1.

Mr. STEWART. All right; let me go on.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. STEWART. No; I beg your pardon; I am not. The Senator is right in saying that as it came from the House the silver dollar was equivalent to the five-franc piece. He says that was only a subsidiary coin. He is mistaken about that. That was an international coin at the time of the international convention, and it was circulating as the standard at that time. It was the unit of value in all of

THE ASSOCIATED NATIONS OF EUROPE

and it was regarded as better than gold. They had not given up the idea of demonetizing gold then, and our silver dollar was at a premium of 3 per cent., and it was stated by the Senator that this dollar was going to circulate all over the world, this five-franc-piece dollar. It was the five-franc-piece dollar that his argument referred to, for that was still in the bill and did not go out of the bill until the engrossment, when it gave place to the provisions that demonetized silver. It went out of the bill

OUTSIDE OF THE SENATE

to give place to the trade-dollar of 420 grains; but I say the section in the law which demonetized silver was never read in either House of Congress.

With what grace men get up here and charge me with dereliction of duty in not protesting, when it was never read or discussed or brought to the attention of Congress other than by number 6 in the report of the conference committee is amazing to me! Perhaps we ought to understand all the amendments which are reported, but we do not all the time do our duty in that respect.

There are a great many bills passing every day that other people have charge of where we do not know of the amendments which are reported. It is only those that are acted upon and discussed, and the important measures that are brought before the Senate and discussed, that we know about. But the responsibility of demonetizing silver without calling the attention of the Senate to the fact rests upon the then chairman of the Committee on Finance. If it had been discussed it would have been in the Globe. These discussions about outside matters amount to nothing, but here is a crowd of witnesses who were present and all come forward and say they did not know it. The House did not know it. They did not know what amendment No. 6 meant; the Senate did not know what No. 6 meant when it was read.

SILVER WAS DEMONETIZED IN THE CONFERENCE REPORT

by amendment No. 6; it was never read in either House!

CONFUSING THE ISSUE.

The Senator from Ohio, in discussing this question, constantly dwells upon the value of gold and the value of silver, as if it had inherent value which could not be affected. How was the value of silver put down? It remained at par with gold for nearly a century. It did not vary one-half of 1 per cent. for more than a century until silver was rejected as money, and the Old World admits that fact now and the Royal Commission admitted that fact. It was put down because of the want of demand, because it could not be coined. It is the demand that puts up the price. Value consists of two things: limitation of quantity and the desire of man as manifested by demand.

Now, he pretends to say that if we would demand all the silver by free coinage that would not put up the price, and he tells us that there would be a gap of from 20 to 30 per cent. between silver and gold. The gap was made by rejecting silver. Silver has little value without the demand as money. It would be very poor security but for its money value, and if we demand it for money we make a demand for six or eight hundred millions, and we take it all. If we make a demand for $300,000,000 we take it all, and I believe a demand for $200,000,000, or much less, would put it to par. It takes but a slight demand, because there is more coin, as shown by the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade, by 18 per cent. than has been produced, and has been for many years; and we can only account for it by the recoinage of old coins. There is no surplus production of silver. The want of coinage demand in Europe and the United States has depressed its value, nothing else Before the United States could be supplied enough would be absorbed to raise silver to par.

And why should there be a departure from established custom? Why should the sacred usages of the people for centuries be assailed? Why should not the coin of the Constitution be restored, when it was rejected without even the reading of a fatal amendment? It was rejected, I say, without reading the amendment. If it be restored, will there be too much money if we have both gold and silver? Why was it rejected at all? I deny that it was done by discussion.

NOBODY UNDERSTOOD IT.

I do not believe the Senator from Ohio understood its far-reaching and its terrible effects. I do not believe he did, and if he had come out and said it was by mistake, and he had not fully understood its effects, nobody would have blamed him, because at that time the question of coinage was not being discussed. We were under coin suspension, very little money was being coined, and it was very easy for a mistake to be made by the Senator from Ohio or anybody. But, having been made, the people having lost their money of the Constitution through a mistake, to which nobody's attention was called, what I say is that those engaged in that should rectify it, and should not have kept the country in these seventeen years of depression. They should not have robbed the country of its money all this time.

Talk about the value of gold remaining stationary!

WHAT HAS PUT UP THE VALUE OF GOLD?

The purchase of it by our people with their produce, the sacrifice of their property. The farmers and producers of this country have been compelled to sell their property at a discount of from 30 to 40 per cent. to buy gold to pay debts because the Government of the United States would not allow them to be paid in the money of the Constitution, because by an amendment that was never read silver was demonetized, and they could not pay in silver as well as gold, and so they were compelled then to get money at all hazards; and they have done it nobly, but they have done it at the expense of the prosperity of the country.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to see the original bill of 1873, which the Senator has, in order that I may reply to him.

Mr. STEWART. I was pretty nearly through with that subject. Perhaps I had better let the Senator make his statement here.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Both Senators are inaudible at the desk.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have lost my voice and therefore I am excusable, but the Senator from Nevada has not lost his voice and is not excusable.

The Senator from Nevada certainly does not want to misstate or mislead, and his statements are now misleading except to a person who would examine the papers and know and see the exact facts. He will see that he is mistaken. The amendment referred to by

him is No. 6. I will read it and then show you that that very amendment was adopted, but probably the Reporter, in the confusion there may have been, dropped it out.

Mr. President, here is the bill of the House with Senate amendments, the same that went to a conference, the last, final papers [exhibiting]. Here is section 16 of the House bill changed to 15, and now I will read it:

SEC. [16] 15. [That the silver coins of the United States shall be a dollar, a half-dollar, and a dime or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the dollar shall be 384 grains; the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the weight of said dollar; which coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment.

The amendment proposed by the Senate, printed in italics, provides—

That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade-dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece; and the weight of the trade-dollar shall be 420 grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar shall be twelve grams and one-half of a gram; the quarter-dollar and the dime shall be, respectively, one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half dollar; and such coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment.

The amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance being to strike out the words in the House bill between brackets [ ] and insert those printed in *italics*.

Here, then, is the House proposition, with the Senate committee's amendment, as reported from the Committee on Finance, printed in italics, which must have been open before every Senator and could not be mistaken. On the margin of this Senate amendment, in the handwriting of the Clerk, is plainly written "Agreed to." Not only this, but I will show that another amendment was made to this Senate amendment.

The difference between the two was in respect to the dollar. The House proposed the subsidiary dollar of 385 grains. The Senate Finance Committee, at the request of the people of California, proposed the trade-dollar of 420 grains, and the Senate agreed to that. Here is the official record, kept by Mr. McDonald, whom we all remember with great pleasure. Here it is in his own handwriting, but the Senator says it is not in the Globe. Suppose it is not. It was probably dropped out there by the Reporter. Is there any other evidence of this? The highest evidence is this very paper. It is the bill under consideration before the Senate. Others just like it had been printed for the benefit of all, and here it is marked "Agreed to."

Now, to show that it was agreed to, as appears by the Globe, there was an amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 6, which I offered, and I called attention to the fact that that amendment had not been adopted, had not been acted upon as an amendment to the amendment numbered 6, and here is the conversation called to my attention by the officers of the Senate; and here I show, on the same page of the Globe that the Senator read from, and he would have found if he had gone a step further. I said:

Mr. SHERMAN. There is an omission in the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee. I move to insert in line 11, after the words "twenty-five-cent piece," the words "and a dime or ten-cent piece."

Here the words are inserted in the copy kept by Mr. McDonald in his handwriting, agreed to on my motion; and this is the amendment which the Senator says was never read. It must have been read because here it is amended by an amendment and that amendment went to the committee of conference. If the Senator will not believe upon an exhibition of this kind, then I do not know what will convince him.

Then it must be remembered that that amendment was again amended by the conference committee, and here the report is signed by all of them, Messrs. Hooper, Stoughton, and McNeely, of the House; SHERMAN, Scott, and Bayard, of the Senate. Here is an amendment to that sixth amendment which was itself acted upon in conference, and this amendment which passed the Senate as an amendment to the House bill was acted upon in the committee of conference and amended, and here it is:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the sixth amendment of the Senate——

Mr. TELLER. That is the one.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes—

and agree to the same with the following amendments: In line 5 strike out the word "grains," at the end of the line, and insert in lieu thereof "grams (grammes);" and in line 6 strike out "grain," and insert "gram (gramme);" and the Senate agree to the same.

Here it is "gramme." So not only must this amendment have been read here, but it was amended in the Senate. It was printed in italics, laid before the Senator himself, and sent to the committee of conference, and there again amended.

Mr. TELLER. What amendment is that?

Mr. SHERMAN. The sixth amendment amended in conference by inserting the word "grammes" instead of "grains." It was originally "grains" and they inserted here "grammes," and the word "grammes" was properly inserted in the amendment.

Mr. TELLER. What I wanted to call the attention of the Senator to is whether that is the amendment which dropped out the silver dollar.

Mr. SHERMAN. This was the amendment that dropped out the silver dollar. The silver dollar was dropped out by both Houses. The silver dollar was never proposed by mortal man in either House at that time.

Mr. TELLER. Not the silver dollar, but a silver dollar.

Mr. SHERMAN. A silver dollar. That subsidiary French dollar was proposed by the House and sent to the Senate, and we substituted the trade-dollar, and no mortal man in either House during those three years of controversy ever thought of or ever proposed the old silver dollar. It was conjured up afterward for the purpose of misleading, and I say, sir, that there it is, and the man who does not believe that testimony of men now dead would not believe anything.

Mr. STEWART. If any man will read this record and find that section mentioned——

Mr. SHERMAN. I have done it. Here it is. I showed it to the Senator.

Mr. STEWART. That was when there was another amendment under consideration.

Mr. SHERMAN. This amendment is amended, inserted in writing.

Mr. STEWART. Then there was no action upon the sixth amendment at all. It was when the other amendment was under consideration. Anybody can study it for himself.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have not examined the record critically, but the Senator says that the Reporters of the Globe failed to record the adoption of the sixth amendment. I say that here is the sixth amendment printed in italics in the bill before him, marked "agreed to" by Mr. McDonald, and not only "agreed to," but amended, and the amendment is shown in the very paper the Senator read from.

Mr. STEWART. Then the next amendment considered was in section 17. I can read this right along.

Mr. SHERMAN. Show me the place where you say it was omitted and not read.

Mr. STEWART. Here is section 15; that is the section that was struck out. Here is the discussion in regard to it [exhibiting]. Then here is the next amendment marked "amendment agreed to." The next amendment was to strike out section 17 (16 in the amended bill) "in the following words:"

SEC. [17] 16. That the minor coins of the United States shall be a five-cent piece, a three-cent piece, and a one-cent piece—

And so on.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following.

Then Mr. SHERMAN said:

Mr. SHERMAN. There is an omission in the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee. I move to insert in line 11, after the words "twenty-five-cent piece," the words "and a dime or ten-cent piece."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

That was when the next amendment was under consideration——

Mr. SHERMAN. Now, Mr. President, if the Senator has completed that statement, I say the amendment referred to by "Mr. SHERMAN" here is this identical amendment which the Senator says was never read or adopted, and here it is in the handwriting of Mr. McDonald.

Mr. STEWART. Let anybody take it and study it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not want any doubt about it. I say that any one who can not under these circumstances see this must be willfully blind. I say that I myself called attention to the fact that a certain amendment to the amendment proposed by the committee had not been agreed to, and the amendment was read, and here it is written, "a dime or ten-cent piece," the very amendment which the Senator says was not read.

Mr. STEWART. I do say it was not read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Here it was all the time before the Senator, and how could it be otherwise than read?

Mr. STEWART. Will you find where it was read?

Mr. SHERMAN. Because the Reporter does not happen in the hurry of business to catch every amendment in the precise order in which it was presented, the Senator would therefore convict some one of some grave wrong. There is no justice in it; and I was going to say worse than that.

Mr. STEWART. It was not only not read, but the subsequent discussion shows that the omission of the old dollar was not there.

Mr. SHERMAN. No dollar was there.

Mr. STEWART. The subsequent discussion shows that it had not been adopted, because you describe in your reply to Mr. Casserly that it was equivalent to the five-franc piece, and if the amendment had been adopted there would not have been any five-franc piece there at all, any more than the dollar of 412½ grains.

Mr. SHERMAN. The dollar of 412½ grains was never in any bill whatever during the whole discussion. It was lost to sight. The dollar in that bill was the French dollar.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly it was, but you stated that it was in there, and you called attention to it; whereas, if the amendment had been adopted there would not have been any French dollar there, but the trade-dollar, and consequently your argument shows that it was not acted upon.

Mr. SHERMAN. The French dollar was in the House bill, not in the Senate proposition. The Senate proposition was the trade-dollar. Can not the Senator understand that?

Mr. STEWART. Can not the Senator understand this, that after the bill was passed and there was a discussion as to the inscription on the coin he stated that the reason for it was because he wanted

the weight and the fineness stamped upon it, and that that was equivalent to the five-franc piece? That was the reason he assigned. If the amendment had been adopted, as he says it was, he could not have assigned that reason, because there would have been no five-franc piece there. Can you understand that?

Mr. SHERMAN. I can understand that perfectly. We were talking about these coins and devices, and I spoke of the half-dollar and the quarter-dollar, and all of them. It is perfectly clear the two propositions were there, and the only difference between them was not the old dollar, but whether the French dollar of 384 grains or the trade-dollar of 420 grains should be inserted; and the question was put, and it could not be otherwise. It would not be possible in the nature of things for an amendment of that kind to be overlooked, and it was not overlooked, and you will find that the amendment was amended in the way I proposed, and in the very words which it appears by the Globe are in the amendment which I offered. It appears from the Globe, and is recorded in this paper in the record in the handwriting of Mr. McDonald.

Mr. STEWART. There will be no trouble about this hereafter, because before we conclude this matter I will put all these papers in their order in the RECORD, so that anybody who has curiosity about the subject can study it. I repeat again, he will find that the section which demonetized silver

WAS NEVER READ IN EITHER HOUSE,

and any one who examines it will find it was never read in either House.

Mr. SHERMAN. It was never mentioned or spoken of.

Mr. STEWART. Then I shall be exonerated for having been here and having voted for this bill, and my excuse will be taken. If the provision was read in my hearing and I did not object to it I might stand convicted, but I have shown that it was not read, and I repeat again, the record will be before the world now because I have put it in methodical order.

I repeat again, the legislation contained in this bill which changed one of the standards of money, which revolutionized the financial history of the world, ought to be corrected without a word. We ought to put it back where it was before. The people of the United States ought to have a new trial for mistake, if not for fraud. When this was discovered and brought to the attention of the country, whatever the policy might thereafter have been, it was, in all good conscience and all justice and honor, the duty of everybody who had anything to do with it, to say "The people have not had a hearing; the money of the Constitution has been taken away from them without a hearing, and we will undo the wrong." Now, we come here again and ask that the wrong be undone at this late day.

WE ASK FOR THE RESTORATION OF SILVER,

and we are told that we are disturbing the finances of the country, the settled policy of the world. A "settled policy," established as this was, ought to be disturbed. It ought not to stand. It has no place upon the statute-book. I have brought a crowd of witnesses who have proved that they did not know what it was.

I do not stand alone. I stand with Presidents and ex-Presidents,

THE LIVING AND THE DEAD,

who have borne the testimony which I print in my remarks that they did not know of this transaction. Suppose it had been known that we were to change the standard, there would have been a lively discussion about it in the Senate. Do you suppose we should have been discussing immaterial things if a great question of that kind were pending? Was it proper for the chairman of the Committee on Finance to fail in calling the attention of the Senate to what was being done? If he was proposing to fairly make this great change, which he perfectly understood and which had been recommended, it would have been the first thing that he would have called to the attention of the Senate for discussion. That is usual. That is done every day.

If it was done accidentally and nobody knew about it and the Senator was mistaken as to its consequences, then nobody would ever blame him, because, as I said before, we were in suspension at that time,

NOT USING GOLD OR SILVER,

and a mistake of that kind might very well happen. We knew very little about finance at that time. As the Englishmen used to say laughingly, "We were blundering along in the dark, using paper money," and a mistake at that time might naturally occur. But when a mistake so fundamental as that occurred it should be corrected at the first demand that the money of the Constitution be restored,

THAT CONTRACTION STOP;

and when we remonetize silver I predict we shall put it at par, for remonetization will create a demand for it. There is no excess of supply. The only fear is that we shall not get enough of it. The world has not enough of gold and silver, as is evidenced by the fact that to-day more than one-third of the money of the world is paper, and as long as we have more than one-third paper to do the business of the world it can not be said that

THERE IS DANGER OF TOO MUCH GOLD AND SILVER.

There is, in round numbers, $3,900,000,000 of paper, about $3,700,000,000 of gold, and about $3,800,000,000 of silver, according to the report made up for me in the Treasury Department, and as long as you have more than one-third of the world's money in paper is there any danger of there being too much gold and silver? No, the world never did have too much gold and silver in any age, and it never had any prosperity in any age when the mines were not productive. We have gone through depression time and again. Our race is only in danger of barbarism from the failure of the mines. The productive mines in the different epochs stand out as mile-posts showing when the people prosper. Show me when the people of any country advanced in civilization, and I will show you that at that time they were securing large supplies of the precious metals, gold and silver. Show me when they were in decay and poverty, and I will show you that the mines failed every time in all the history of the world. In the first part of this century, after the wars in Mexico, South America, and Spain, we had hard times up to 1850, when the great boom came by the discovery of gold in California and Australia, which revivified the commerce of the world and put it onward in progress, and the whole world rejoiced, and more progress was made in twenty-three years than had been made in any century since the beginning of recorded history.

But then the hand of the misers, the usurers, who manipulated individual contracts previous to that time, who were hated by all mankind, despised as the most wicked of wretches—the usurers combined not to change individual contracts, but to change the contracts of the world, all contracts. First, they proposed to enhance the value of bonds and obligations by the demonetization of gold. These combined usurers against the producers commenced this discussion in 1853, and they have continued it ever since.

THEY FAILED IN DEMONETIZING GOLD.

Then they started in to demonetize silver and produce a revolution in the money of the world. They did it to enhance the value of bonds. They stated that as the reason, We were as lambs dumb before the shearers. We uttered not a word. The American people had no opportunity to utter a word. We joined the army of usurers to enhance the obligations of contracts. We have doubled the indebtedness of the world and we have transferred from the masses thousands of millions of their hard earnings to the hands of the few by this usurious legislation. We have made millionaires and

WE HAVE CREATED SERFS

and slaves of the producers. Do we propose to continue that process indefinitely? Do we propose to adhere to the gold standard?

Do we propose to chain the people to the gold standard of Europe? Do we propose to make them sell their property at 50, 60, or nearly 100 per cent. discount to buy gold to pay debts contracted when money was plenty and gold was cheap, before it was hoarded, and when bonds were cheap and greenbacks plenty?

There was as large a circulation in 1865 in the North alone, before the rebellion was conquered, as there is now in the whole country. Why did not the Secretary of the Treasury take those figures? There was as much then as there is to-day. Since that time there has been one-third increase in the population by the reacquisition of the South; at least we have to-day the growth of thirty years. Yet there has been no increase in circulation. We have gone, however, into a pool with Europe to corner gold. We have been buying gold. Austria and Italy have been buying gold. Germany was on a silver basis. She retired her silver and commenced buying gold, and thus we put gold up. Although we have been strong, although we have sustained our credit, we have done it at the expense of the producing classes. Cotton and wheat have had to be sold to buy gold, because the Government of the United States denied us the right to use silver and denied it by legislation which was never discussed, and

BY AN AMENDMENT THAT WAS NEVER READ IN THE HALLS OF CONGRESS.

I say it is time to right that wrong and give us back the money of the Constitution.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, in a document that my attention has been called to within a few minutes, I find a matter that I should like to have the Senator from Nevada explain, for I have no doubt he then felt exactly as Mr. Casserly did about silver. A great deal is said about silver being wonderfully productive. The last words of the debate in the passage of the bill referred to were in the following statement of Mr. Casserly, who was then a Democratic Senator from California:

> I say the cost of refining in London is so much more than it is in San Francisco that but for this coinage charge the gold bullion product of Australia would come to us. Why? Because what they want in England all the while is silver for their Asiatic exchanges for India and China. *We have more silver than we want. Nevada appears to be getting ready to deluge the world with silver. I see that her silver product last year was probably over* $20,000,000.
>
> Now, sir, there could not be a better basis for exchange, nor a more profitable operation for the American people, than to take the gold bullion of Australia and coin it in San Francisco and diffuse that much more specie through all the arteries of circulation, getting ready for the resumption of specie payments, of which the Senator spoke so well and so truly the other day, and to give them in return for their bullion this silver which we do not want and which before a great while may be at an absolute discount on our hands. I wish to say that much. I feel very earnest about this matter, because I think I understand the financial and commercial bearing of the blunder we make in continuing this obsolete coinage tax. Having said so much, I leave the question to the Senate.

That was the very idea of the silver men, that they were getting too much of it, and they wanted it to go away and the gold from Aus-

tralia to come to us. That is what they wanted because we had so much silver, and yet, forsooth, it is alleged because somebody demonetized silver all this fuss is made!

Now, Mr. President, any man who will take that paper [exhibiting] will find that it contains testimony that can not be denied, a paper old with age, and here is the amendment which the Senator from Nevada upon the face of that paper dares to say was never read in the Senate, simply because the Reporter did not catch the amendment. It seems to me that is going far beyond what has ever been done before, especially when you have the fact that that amendment was itself amended according to the testimony of the Globe itself, so that it must have been considered and read more than once.

That amendment was to strike out the House proposition containing a dollar of 384 grains and insert upon the motion of the people of California a dollar of 420 grains, and it never appears in all these three long years of debate that, while that bill was pending, any man proposed to retain and continue the silver dollar of 412½ grains. It had no place. The last word said in this debate by a gentleman from California was that they had too much silver and that they wanted the gold of Australia, and were willing to have the silver of Nevada go to India or wherever else it would go.

Mr. President, I confess I am somewhat disappointed that the Senator from Nevada, when he saw this evidence, did not frankly state that he had been misled and relieve the imputation which would rest otherwise upon every man connected with that legislation, and especially upon the members of the conference committee before whom these amendments were brought, were read, and by whom they were acted upon in their report here made known to the Senate, and voted upon with full knowledge of every amendment stated in the conference report. I supposed the Senator from Nevada to be a frank man, and I expected he would state frankly and fairly, especially where he saw that there was a feeling manifested, and my honorable friend from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] and myself feel the same way in regard to this matter. When this imputation is made by any man we resent it, and I resent it now, and express my profound regret that a Senator of the United States, when convinced on the testimony before him, does not say, "I withdraw any charge of impropriety from gentlemen on this account."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, again I have been charged with being present when this discussion took place, and I am denied the right of exonerating myself by giving the printed record here. I have been very fair, for I have printed in my remarks the entire record, and everything connected with it, and I can not be responsible if the record condemns the Senator from Ohio.

THERE WILL BE NOTHING BUT THE RECORD,

and the people will examine it. I print it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because these papers are not accessible, and this one is the only copy of the original bill. The engrossed amendment can not be found, except in this file copy of the Senate. I put them all in together, *seriatim*, so that the Senator from Ohio will be able to have the complete record by which to defend himself, and it will enable me to place the record before my constituents to show what occurred when I was here, for I have had it charged upon me repeatedly by gold bugs, and it was also charged by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH],

VERY GLEEFULLY AND BOASTFULLY,

that I was in my seat in the Senate when this action was had and that I voted for this bill.

If I had been here and voted for the bill knowingly, I would not come up and say that I did so ignorantly; but the man who voted for it knowingly and not ignorantly is responsible for changing the values of this country. He is responsible for changing every contract in the world after it was made; he is responsible for all the gain that the miser extracted from the laboring classes by usurious interest, acquired by changing contracts after they were made—a charge that I would not like to have lie at my door. If he did it ignorantly he is excused, because men can not know everything, and that I may do exact justice to the Senator from Ohio I put it in the RECORD. I stand by the record, and say I did not know it, and I further say that I did not have a reasonable opportunity to know it, such an opportunity as Senators usually have.

I STAND WITH GARFIELD AND GRANT AND CONKLING

and others who defended themselves by pleading ignorance of this transaction. If the great men whose names I have read could plead ignorance of this matter, why should not an obscure individual like myself make the same defense? If in making that defense I have reflected upon the Senator, I can not help it. It was not to reflect upon him that I did it, but it was to defend myself. Let him defend himself as chairman of the Committee on Finance for not calling the attention of the Senate to his amendment demonetizing silver before he charges others with being parties to that unfortunate transaction.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question, if the Senator from Rhode Island will allow me.

Mr. ALDRICH. I yield if it will not take long. I should like to make a few remarks in answer to the suggestions of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. TELLER. I merely wish to ask a question, but I will wait.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, it is true that in the course of the discussion I made the suggestion that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] was present and voted for the bill which demonetized silver in 1871.

Mr. STEWART. That is not the one.

Mr. ALDRICH. The one that passed the Senate. The Senator was present and voted for that bill upon the yeas and nays. I now understand him to say that he was ignorant of its provisions, that he did not know what he was voting for. The Senator from Nevada took quite an important part in the discussion of that bill in the Senate, and he discussed the twenty-fifth section, and stated in the course of that discussion:

I have been unfortunate enough to be engaged in mining enterprises and to have bullion for sale, and I know that the coinage charge is deducted.

That was in regard to a provision of the twenty-fifth section of the bill. Now, I want to call the attention of the Senate and of the country to the provisions of three sections of that bill which were under consideration, and then the Senate can judge. The twenty-first section provided in terms—not by indirection, mind you, or by implication, but provided in terms—that any owner of silver and gold bullion might deposit the same at the mints. I will read section 15 first in order to get them in the logical sequence in which they should be stated:

SEC. 15. That of the silver coins the weight of the half-dollar or piece of 50 cents shall be 192 grains; and that of the quarter-dollar and dime shall be respectively one-half and one-fifth of the weight of said half-dollar. That the silver coin issued in conformity with the above section shall be a legal tender in any one payment of debts for all sums less than $1.

The eighteenth section provided:

SEC. 18. That no coins, either of gold, silver, or minor coinage, shall hereafter be issued from the mint other than those of the denominations, standards, and weights herein set forth.

A distinct and positive prohibition upon the mints of the United States to coin anything but the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and dime, which were set forth in the provisions of the bill.

If the Senator from Nevada did not know what the bill contained, and was familiar with bullion, and represented a State that was of the first importance in its mining interests of any State in the United States, all that I can say to him is that he has grown immensely in zeal and in intelligence in representing his constituents since 1871.

Mr. STEWART. When that bill was under consideration the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] offered an amendment, which will be found on page 396, part 1 of the Congressional Globe, of the third session, Forty-first Congress. That amendment was in these words:

For coinage, whether the gold and silver deposited be coined or cast into bars, or ingots, in addition to the charge for refining or parting the metals, three-tenths of 1 per cent.

That was the matter which was read and brought to the attention of the Senate and that was all. The whole Pacific coast delegation said

THAT THIS WAS AN UNJUST CHARGE,

and they voted against it, and made a fight on it. They supposed, and everybody supposed, that this was an ordinary codification of the Mint laws, and it went through as many other bills go through, and, whether I was remiss in my duty or not, I say it was never called to my attention, and I repeat again that the parties having it in charge, if they knew that it contained a thing of that kind, under the pretense of being a bill to codify the Mint laws, should never have attempted to change the coinage of the world without notifying the Senate; and everybody connected with the committee failed to do that. If we voted for the bill we did not know that it contained any such provision. I was not familiar with Mint arrangements, and it being a bill to codify the Mint laws, I did not examine its provisions with any particular care. Can any Senator say that he reads every bill which comes before the Senate and knows everything that is contained in the same? Under no circumstances would I ever at any time have voted to demonetize silver.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is one other section which I omitted, which I want to read for the benefit of the Senator from Nevada. The twenty-seventh section, two sections from the section which he discussed so long and so ably in the Senate, contained this provision in terms:

That silver bullion, deposited by private holders, shall be paid for in silver bars or disks only, and that no deposit for coinage into silver coin shall be received.

Who will say that that was put there by implication, and what sort of a plea is it for a man who represented a mining State and who was interested in bullion to say he did not know what the provisions of the bill were?

Mr. STEWART. I saw, as I said, that you had a bill codifying the mint laws, and I, in common with nearly all the members of both Houses, was ignorant of the fact that you were changing the coinage of the country. The section was not read. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio was not discussed then, and I repeat that silver was demonetized without discussion in either House of Congress; it was demonetized without warning to the people, and

IT WAS EITHER A MISTAKE OR SOMETHING WORSE.

So far as I am concerned, I was ignorant of it, and others say the same thing; and I am ready, and have been ever since I discovered

it, to do all in my power to right the wrong. The fact that I was here when this great wrong was perpetrated has been one of the reasons why I have worked for the last sixteen years in this cause. I believe no one will charge me with having missed an opportunity to do whatever was in my power to right this wrong. One of my great objects in life is to see the people's money restored to the place where it was before this bill was passed through Congress in the manner in which it was.

I wish the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Rhode Island were as willing to give back to the people the money of the Constitution as I am. If they were willing to right the wrong it would be sooner remedied. If those who are

IN FAVOR OF FREE COINAGE,

in favor of restoring the silver dollar, had their way, the people would have back the dollar of the Constitution in two weeks. Those in favor of the gold standard have the advantage by this legislation without giving the people a hearing. The people say they had not a fair trial, and they are asking for a new trial; and if those gentlemen think that the people will not press their case until they get a fair hearing they mistake the temper of the people of the United States.

HARRIET E. DONALDSON.

Mr. GORMAN. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a small pension bill, Order of Business 1320, being the bill (S. 3874) granting a pension to Harriet E. Donaldson.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside for the purpose of taking up the bill indicated by him.

There being no objection, the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Harriet E. Donaldson, widow of Edward Donaldson, late rear-admiral in the United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 3795) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Oregon Railway Extensions Company.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McPHERSON, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution instructing the Clerk of the House to re-enroll the bill (H. R. 380) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct bridges across the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers," approved January 8, 1889, and where it reads "section 4, line 3," make it read "section 4, line 2," and where it reads "line 16, section 4," make it read "lines 14 and 15, section 4," and where it reads "section 6, line 3," make it read "section 6, lines 2 and 3," and leave out the word "reasonable" in lines 10 and 11.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of pension cases unobjected to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside for the purpose of considering unobjected pension cases on the Calendar.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I ask the Senator to yield to me to move the consideration of Order of Business 994.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the title of the bill?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. It is a bill reported by the Committee on Territories to authorize the board of supervisors of Maricopa County, Arizona, to issue certain bonds in aid of the construction of a certain railroad.

Mr. DAVIS. Will it produce debate?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. It may possibly, but not to delay very long. It has been on the Calendar for some time and it ought to be passed. It has passed the House of Representatives and is an important bill.

Mr. DAVIS. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. TELLER. That bill will give rise to considerable discussion. I hope the Senator from Arkansas will not attempt to call it up now. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] particularly wants to be heard on it, and he has, I think, just stepped out of the Chamber.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I have given way on two or three occasions, on one occasion particularly, a day or two since, when the bill should have been taken up, on account of the convenience of the Senator from Nevada, and I told him that I would call it up the first opportunity. I hope there will be no objection to the bill being considered now.

Mr. TELLER. I do not think it ought to be considered in the absence of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I presume he is near, and can come in.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will wait and see whether he will be here I shall take no further interest in it, but I can not be willing to have it called up in his absence.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I was in hopes that the Senator from Nevada would be present when I called up the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Colorado object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. TELLER. I object for the present, until I can send and find where the Senator from Nevada is. I think he has gone to his committee-room.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection is made to the request of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. TELLER. I will withdraw the objection when the Senator from Nevada comes in.

MARY J. EADIE.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 848) granting a pension to Mary J. Eadie.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary J. Eadie, sister of John Eadie, first lieutenant Company C, One hundred and fifteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM R. AREY.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7330) granting a pension to William R. Arey.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William R. Arey, late an acting ensign on the United States steam-ship Mahaska.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY C. WINSLOW.

Mr. DAVIS. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3608) granting a pension to Mary C. Winslow.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] is now here.

Mr. DAVIS. I will yield to the Senator from Arkansas after this bill is considered.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to Mary C. Winslow, daughter of John A. Winslow, late commander of the United States steamer Kearsarge, a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DAVIS. I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

MARICOPA COUNTY (ARIZONA) RAILROAD BONDS.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3934) to authorize the board of supervisors of Maricopa County, Arizona, to issue certain bonds in aid of the construction of a certain railroad.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. STEWART. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas has a right to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Then let him move it.

Mr. PLUMB. Does that motion displace the regular order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It displaces the regular order if agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. It will only make a delay, for there is a thin Senate and I shall call for the yeas and nays. I want it understood that when the bill comes up it must be done by a vote on the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nevada asks that on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to proceed to the consideration of the bill the yeas and nays may be entered on the Journal.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TELLER. I wish the Senator from Arkansas would withdraw his motion. It will displace the regular order. I do not think we shall be able to pass the bill if it is taken up this late in the day. There will be no quorum here.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I have been very patient about calling up the bill. It is a matter that very seriously affects a large number of people, and I should be glad to have the Senate consider the bill. Of course I do not want to delay the time of the Senate, but if gentlemen on the other side insist on calling for the yeas and nays the call will have to be had when the bill is considered, I presume, and it may as well be had now. I hope we shall have a vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the roll will be called.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. HIGGINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON].

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], who is away from the Senate under its order.

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BARBOUR]. If it should so happen that my vote would make a quorum, I will vote; otherwise I withhold it.

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. BATE. My colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. DOLPH. I will transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FAULKNER. I vote "yea."

Mr. PLATT. Inasmuch as my vote is needed to make a quorum, and the way in which I shall vote will make no difference in the result, I vote "yea."

Mr. MANDERSON. In order to make a quorum I will vote. I vote "nay." My vote will not change the result.

Mr. WALTHALL. In order to make a quorum I will vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 11; as follows:

YEAS—34.

Aldrich,	Dawes,	McMillan,	Reagan,
Allen,	Farwell,	Morgan,	Sherman,
Bate,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	Squire,
Berry,	George,	Payne,	Stockbridge,
Call,	Gibson,	Pierce,	Vest,
Coke,	Gorman,	Platt,	Walthall,
Colquitt,	Hiscock,	Plumb,	Washburn.
Cullom,	Hoar,	Power,	
Davis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Pugh,	

NAYS—11.

Blair,	Frye,	Manderson,	Stewart,
Dolph,	Hearst,	Mitchell,	Teller.
Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Moody,	

ABSENT—39.

Allison,	Cockrell,	Higgins,	Sawyer,
Barbour,	Daniel,	Jones of Nevada,	Spooner,
Blackburn,	Dixon,	Kenna,	Stanford,
Blodgett,	Eustis,	McPherson,	Turpie,
Brown,	Evarts,	Morrill,	Vance,
Butler,	Gray,	Paddock,	Voorhees,
Cameron,	Hale,	Pettigrew,	Wilson of Iowa,
Carlisle,	Hampton,	Quay,	Wilson of Md.
Casey,	Harris,	Ransom,	Wolcott.
Chandler,	Hawley,	Sanders,	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3934) to authorize the board of supervisors of Maricopa County, Arizona, to issue certain bonds in aid of the construction of a certain railroad.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Mr. President, in a word, this bill is intended to authorize the people of Maricopa County, Arizona, to take stock in a certain local railroad within the county and to pay for the stock by issuing their bonds. There is a line of railroad crossing Arizona south of their town, the Southern Pacific. There is a line crossing it perhaps 200 miles north of that town, the Santa Fé system. From the Santa Fé road there is a road built south to the town of Prescott, and from the Southern Pacific there is a branch road built to Phœnix, the county seat of the county of Maricopa.

This branch road was assisted by this county, as I understand, in exactly the same way that it is proposed now to assist this railroad. It is found, by reason of the fact that all of their produce and all of their travel must go by the Southern Pacific, this branch road going down to their town being a mere tributary and branch of that road, they have no railroad competition. They are anxious to have a railroad connection with the route north of them. There are large mining interests in the country north and there are large tracts of timber north. If they can secure a railroad connection from the town of Phœnix to the town of Prescott they will have a continuous railroad connection from the Santa Fé system on the north to the Southern Pacific on the south; they will have direct connection with the timber on the Santa Fé road and an outlet both ways, and have the benefit of competition.

North of the town of Phœnix there are said to be 400,000 acres of arable land; 200,000 acres of that land are now under ditch; and citizens of that county who own this property, business men, live, energetic, wide-awake men who have gone there and have engaged in business, believe that the increased value of their land in twelve months will more than pay all the expenses that the county will incur in building this road. They ask simply for the poor privilege of being allowed to tax their own property for the purpose of increasing its valuation.

This bill has passed the House of Representatives and received the cordial indorsement of the Democratic Delegate from the Territory of Arizona. It is advocated also by gentlemen who belong to the other party. The present secretary of the Territory has been here while this bill has been under consideration, and he made a statement to the Committee on Territories, all sides stating that everybody is in favor of the passage of this bill. Last August an election was held in the county, in which, as has been stated by a gentleman who was accredited here as the chairman of a citizens' committee of the county, more than 95 per cent. of the citizens of the county voted in favor of this proposition.

Now, I believe that a community that have accumulated from $14,000,000 to $15,000,000 worth of property can be trusted to manage their own affairs, and if they with singular unanimity are anxious to subscribe for this stock and to pay for it with their bonds I do not understand why any man here should undertake to oppose it. I understand that there is no opposition to it whatever in that locality except by the Southern Pacific Railroad. That railroad now controls the trade and the travel and the traffic of Maricopa County absolutely. Everything that goes into and out of that county must go by that railroad. That railroad is opposed to this proposition to have competition; and that alone, as I understand, is the opposition.

Mr. DAWES. I am not very familiar with the proceedings of counties proposing to make lines of railroad, and I should like to inquire of the Senator what is the need of legislation here with reference to the matter?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I am glad the Senator has made the suggestion. It is an entirely pertinent question and a point that perhaps I might have omitted but for his question.

We passed some years ago what is familiarly called the Harrison act, limiting the amount of indebtedness that the Territories and the counties in the Territories can put upon themselves. There is now upon that county a debt of $272,000. Two hundred thousand dollars of that debt was incurred in subscribing stock to the railroad running from Phœnix to the line of this proposed railroad. Seventy-two thousand dollars of it was for the purpose of building the public buildings. This proposed railroad is about 40 miles long. If they are authorized to subscribe this stock at $4,000 a mile and pay for it in their bonds it will involve about $160,000 additional. That $160,000 added to the $272,000 now outstanding will make a debt greater than is authorized by the Harrison act upon the assessed valuation of their property. The assessed valuation of their property is only about one-fifth or one-sixth of its real and actual value, as is stated by citizens of the Territory.

Men of property and men of means, representing both political parties and representing every interest, have been here before the Committee on Territories and have stated that everybody is in favor of this proposition. As I said awhile ago, in an election held last August upon this question more than 95 per cent. of the voters and almost every single individual among the property-holders of the county voted in favor of this proposition. It is simply a proposition to allow these people to manage their own affairs in their own way, nothing more and nothing less, and I imagine that people who are capable of accomplishing the great works that these people have accomplished out there are able to take care of their own affairs without the guardianship of anybody here to look after their private interests.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not wish to offer any captious opposition to this bill, but I do not want it to be acted upon without being understood. The county of Maricopa is not the only county involved. I do not think that the county of Maricopa is in any condition itself, I will say before I speak of the other counties, to bear such a burden. I know the condition of the people there pretty well.

A year ago last October in an appropriation act the laws for the acquisition of title to the lands were all suspended. They have dug some ditches perhaps, but very few of them have title to the lands and the county is poor. The debt is already large. The debt of the Territory is about $3,000,000, and they have very little to show for it.

The excuse for passing this bill is that they want railroad competition. That is the very excuse that is always made for all counties to subscribe bonds. It is always the case that they want to get another railroad for competition, and when they get the railroad then they commence fighting as a matter of course. The probabilities are if they get a railroad built they will go to work and cut each other's throats, and then the two railroads will combine, and they will have the benefit, because generally the railroads do not continue to fight each other, but they combine. That has been the history of all of them.

Some years ago a bill was passed authorizing the construction of a road through Yavapai County. Yavapai County lies directly north of Maricopa. There was a provision in the law that the company might go on and build to the southern line of the county. It has been hanging there for some time. I have forgotten whether there is any mortgage upon it. The cost is the same amount, $4,000 a mile, and it is a much longer distance in that county than in Maricopa County. I do not know the exact distance, but it is something over 70 miles. That would create an indebtedness of about $300,000, and the indebtedness of Yavapai County if this scheme is carried out will be something over

$500,000. The assessed value of the property is about $5,000,000. In other words, the indebtedness is over 20 per cent. If this bill should pass the indebtedness of Maricopa County would be 18 per cent.

There were various protests that came in from Yavapai County. I am not aware that any petitions were presented from that county in favor of it. They have not come to me, but I have received several letters protesting that the county was not able to bear the burden; and if this scheme is not carried out they would not have the bonds issued, and they would not be under the necessity of being encumbered with the indebtedness.

It must be remembered that the Territory of Arizona is in a very embarrassed condition, with an indebtedness of $3,000,000 and a small population. The land laws being suspended, people are not acquiring titles and can not acquire them until some further legislation is had. To saddle upon them now this debt, which would be in the neighborhood probably of $500,000—we can not tell exactly the distance on the line of the road, but it would make it something over $500,000—to add that to the debt of these two counties would entirely submerge them.

I desire to offer an amendment to come in after the proviso in section 6 as a further proviso. I think it but fair, as Yavapai County is protesting, to liberate its people from any obligations. They can not stand an indebtedness. The Harrison law, as I said, limited the indebtedness to 4 per cent. of the assessed value.

Mr. HOAR. The value of the property is increasing.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think the value is increasing much now. I think it very doubtful whether it will increase.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of section 6 the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the county of Yavapai shall not hereafter issue bonds or furnish aid for the construction of any railroad which will create an indebtedness in excess of 4 per cent. of the assessed value of the property of the county.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. As this bill relates to Maricopa County pure and simple and does not affect a particle of property outside of the county and does not affect a man living outside of Maricopa County, the amendment has no relevancy whatever to the bill, and I suggest that it is amenable to a point of order. If not, I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, as the fate of the bill may depend to some extent upon the action on the amendment I desire to say a few words upon the subject of the bill itself.

During last summer, with the Select Committee on Irrigation, I visited Phœnix and found the people there greatly interested in being enabled to secure the construction of a railroad from that city northward in the direction of Prescott. Phœnix is a beautiful little city and neighborhood, in the desert. The people there have shown very great enterprise, and they had made ditches for irrigation from the waters of Salt River through a country about 20 miles long and about 15 miles wide, as they stated to me. We were there the latter part of August or the first of September. The crops upon the land were very abundant, but they stated that notwithstanding the abundance of their crops they were unable to market them and get the benefit of what they could raise on their rich irrigated lands. They stated that if they were permitted to vote these bonds, to be given for stock in the railroad which they ask shall be built, it would enable them to market their produce and bring them in contact with the timber country to the north of them, and that it would augment the value of their lands and be of very great benefit to them.

They stated then that in an election which they had held about 95 per cent. of the voters had voted for the privilege of taxing themselves, or rather of issuing bonds for which they were to receive stock in the railroad company if the contract is made.

I do not feel that I should go at this time of the day extensively into this discussion except to say that they certainly present a very strong appeal to our sense of justice and reason. As they present the case, the Southern Pacific Railroad south of them has a branch coming to their city, the capital of Arizona, from the south. That company has command of their trade and transportation, and the rates of transportation levied upon their produce are such that they are unable to realize a profit upon the fruits of their labor.

I am very much in hopes that the Senate may vote down the amendment, which can only embarrass the bill, as it does not relate to this county, and that the bill may receive the approval of the Senate, having already been passed in the House of Representatives.

Mr. STEWART. In order that the amendment I have offered may be understood in its application, I ask for the reading of the letter I send to the desk, so as to explain the situation in Yavapai County in connection with this matter. If they are going to be saddled with a debt of that kind the situation ought to be explained.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter will be read, if there be no objection.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the letter, as follows:

FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., *March* 18, 1890.

MY DEAR SIR: I have just returned from a trip East and find on my desk a letter from Senator COCKRELL inclosing Senate bill 2247, in regard to which I wrote him before. I see it has been reported by the committee and am informed it will soon be reached.

There is one feature of this bill of vital importance to the tax-payers of our (Yavapai) County, to which I am sure the committee's attention has not been called, and in order to give you a more clear understanding of the matter I beg your indulgence while I give a little history of our situation. In 1885 the thirteenth Territorial Legislative Assembly passed an act authorizing and directing the supervisors of Yavapai County to issue to the railroad company which should build a railroad from the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad south through Prescott to the southern boundary of Yavapai County, in the bonds of said county, a subsidy of $4,000 per mile. (See Laws of Arizona, 1885, pages 193 to 199.)

This road was built from the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad to Prescott, a distance of 70 miles, and the bonds ($280,000) issued. The bill provided no time within which said road should be completed, and it is now proposed to complete the same in connection with the road referred to in Senate bill 1654, by means of which you will see they aim to get $4,000 per mile for the whole distance, and give Mr. Joseph Renzolds an outlet for his several mines, of which the Congress mine is one. S. 2247 provides for the ratification of the acts of the last Assembly after the expiration of the sixty-day limit, a measure being pushed by Governor Wolfley and in which there is more politics or partisanism than anything else. But injected into that bill and covered up by other matters is the provision to "approve," "confirm," and "legalize" the acts of the "Thirteenth Legislative Assembly," including this subsidy act, which we believe to be illegal.

The people of this county, so far as I have been able to learn, and I have made it my business to inquire, are a unit in the determination to resist the further issuance of bonds under said subsidy act, and do not wish Congress to pass any bill which will directly or indirectly sanction, ratify, or give additional prestige to this unjust subsidy act of the Thirteenth Legislative Assembly. It was saddled upon the people of our country without their sanction or consent; and now by this bill (S. 2247) it is proposed——

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Nevada allow me to inquire of him if this letter does not refer to another bill which is pending in the Senate?

Mr. STEWART. It may refer to another bill, but it states how Yavapai County is situated; and if this bill passes, as there is no time fixed for the completion of that road, then the plan is, I understand, to issue bonds on that already made.

Mr. CULLOM. That is a matter for Yavapai, and not for Maricopa at all.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I should like to say in this connection that there is no bill pending relating to the building of a railroad in Yavapai County.

Mr. STEWART. Let the remainder of the letter be read for the information that is in it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading will be resumed.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the letter, as follows:

it is proposed to have Congress unintentionally ratify it before the people who bear the burden are aware of what is going on.

We have a large county, but few inhabitants. Our property at full valuation amounts to less than $6,000,000, and our tax for several years past has been 3 per cent. If this additional subsidy is put upon us, it will raise our taxation to 5 per cent., and many of us will simply have to quit the country. The proposed extension of the railroad from Prescott to the southern line of Yavapai County is, I am told, nearly 100 miles. If memorials are desired we can furnish them in abundance, if given time to bring the matter before the people. Asking your aid in behalf of an already tax-ridden people,

I am, truly yours,

E. S. GOSNEY.

Hon. M. C. BUTLER, *United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

Mr. STEWART. It is manifest that that county ought not to be saddled with this additional subsidy. There were several protests on the subject. I asked the chairman of the committee for them; he said that they had been laid aside; but the substance of the protests he said was explained by that letter. I know there were such protests, and now it is proposed to pass a law whereby a county situated as that is is to be saddled with an additional debt of $400,000, with but few people in it.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator permit me to ask him whether the effect of this bill will be to add to the indebtedness of Yavapai County?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. How?

Mr. STEWART. I will explain it.

Mr. SPOONER. The bill relates only to Maricopa.

Mr. STEWART. There is where the nigger is in the fence.

Mr. SPOONER. Let us see the "nigger."

Mr. STEWART. I will show the nigger and the fence too.

Some years ago, as I understand, an improvident railroad bill was passed to require the county of Yavapai to issue its bonds for a railroad commencing at the Atlantic and Pacific and extending to Prescott and thence to the southern line.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. It authorized it; it did not require it.

Mr. STEWART. It authorized it. Well, the bill required them to do it. Then they built on that line to Prescott. There was no time limited in the bill when they should complete the road. I do not know what the distance is, but, as the letter states, they built in the neighborhood of 100 miles to the county line of Maricopa County. Maricopa County made some effort to pass a law, that was declared unconstitutional or something, to give a subsidy on that, and that subsidy could

not be got. Consequently the rest of the road in Yavapai County has not been built, and will not be built unless they can give a subsidy in Maricopa County to come to the county line. If they get a subsidy in Maricopa County to come to the line these additional bonds will be saddled upon Yavapai County unless my amendment is adopted.

We have only heard from Maricopa County in favor of the bill; and all we have heard from Yavapai County have been protests. I say we ought not to pass a law whereby Yavapai County will be compelled to issue these bonds. That is what the amendment has to do with it. If it has not anything to do with it, the amendment will do no harm, but it is manifest that it has. There is not a Senator here who would want to saddle this upon that county, which is now taxed 3 per cent., and it is in debt over 10 per cent. of its taxable property. This measure would put up the indebtedness of the county to 18 per cent. of the taxable property, it may be to 20 per cent., if they are compelled to issue those bonds.

Now, I want to let them have it in Maricopa County, but to relieve the friction occasioned by the scheme to get the bonds of Yavapai County, because the county can not stand it. I do not believe Maricopa County can stand it; but before that is passed upon, if this amendment is defeated, we shall have to examine the whole question first and have a report as to Maricopa County.

I shall ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to my amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Territories, I gave with my associates particular attention to this question, and the more particular as I am in general very much opposed to this method of aiding railroads by counties or quasi-municipalities. But the circumstances of the case were so exceptionally meritorious in support of this bill that it has my most hearty approval. A little matter of history that has not been clearly stated here perhaps may elucidate these equities.

Up to 1885 the country intervening between the Southern Pacific and the Atlantic and Pacific roads had no line of railroad except a short spur line from Maricopa Junction on the Southern Pacific up to Phœnix. The need of this railroad connection, so far as Phœnix was concerned, and the intervening country between Phœnix and Prescott on the Atlantic and Pacific, was so deeply felt by the people of that region that, as a matter of consistent legislation to aid one scheme, the citizens of these two counties, Maricopa and Yavapai, by two acts passed for the same purpose in 1885, were authorized to issue their bonds for stock to aid in the construction of this road upon the lines of the bill which we have under present consideration.

Yavapai County, being exceedingly interested in having a road from the Atlantic and Pacific down to Prescott, was diligent and took advantage of the act of 1885 so far as it authorized that county to proceed. It issued its bonds on the line of that act, which contemplated a road far south of Prescott and covering the lines advocated by this bill. But the people of Maricopa County did not proceed so quickly, and they need not have done so, because there was no limit of time in the act that was intercepted in this matter by the terms of the Harrison act, which makes necessary this legislation.

So we have a line of railroad from Prescott Junction to Prescott, a line of railroad from Maricopa Junction up to Phœnix, which previously existed, and the intervening section of country, about one-third of the entire line which was intended to be benefited by the legislation of 1885, enacted as to these two counties, intercepted and cut off by the Harrison act—a situation which if it had been perceived when the Harrison act was passed would undoubtedly have been saved to these counties then in the process of reaping these great benefits, by a saving clause.

Now, the Committee on Territories very carefully considered remonstrances in the nature of the one which has been read from the desk. They all come from a place called Flagstaff, about 75 miles east of the point whence this railroad departs, south from the Atlantic and Pacific, to Phœnix. In that country of magnificent distances those people at that remote distance can have no particular interest, certainly no sympathy, in a line of road running south on the lines of the Atlantic and Pacific road whence this road departs to Phœnix.

In regard to the indebtedness of Arizona Territory and of this county, the Senator from Nevada is simply laboring under a mistake. The bonded debt of Arizona Territory is $631,000. The floating debt is $84,000. The bonded debt of Maricopa County is $272,000. The assessed value of the taxable property of Maricopa County is about $500,000, as stated by Governor Wolfley in a recent report.

There has gone into that intervening country, entirely without a railroad and entirely dependent upon the construction of one, a body of intelligent and enterprising citizens who have opened it up in anticipation that the benefits to be brought about by legislation of this character would eventually inure to them; and if we pause in granting these people the relief it simply means that an enterprise which two counties were jointly authorized to enter into shall be perfected so far as one county can reap its benefits and the other county shall be left entirely out in the cold in regard to the consummation of desires which both of them in the beginning intended to realize.

I repeat that if this situation had been called to the attention of Congress when the act was passed limiting the power of the Territories in this respect, all these rights would undoubtedly have been saved by a saving clause.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. In what relation geographically is Yavapai County to Maricopa?

Mr. DAVIS. Yavapai County is north of Maricopa.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then this railroad can not be completed as contemplated in the bill without running through Yavapai County?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. The contemplation is to build this road from the county seat of Maricopa County to the boundary of Maricopa County—not to touch any other county. I have no doubt——

Mr. COCKRELL. Wait one moment. Then that gives no connection that they do not now have unless the road goes farther?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. They expect to build a road from Prescott down through Maricopa County to Yavapai County, to make connection; but there is no proposition in Congress to report any bill to build a road in Yavapai County.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is Senate bill 2247, now reported from the Committee on Territories?

Mr. CULLOM. That bill has no connection with this.

Mr. REAGAN. I think that is a bill to ratify certain legislation on account of the fact that the Legislature held over the time prescribed, and it was doubtful whether the laws were valid. The object of that bill is to ratify that legislation.

Mr. COCKRELL. And that is also the legislation in dispute here?

Mr. CULLOM. It has no connection with it.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. It has no connection whatever.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not with Yavapai County?

Mr. REAGAN. It has no connection with either of them.

Mr. CULLOM. There is no other bill that in any way affects the now proposed legislation except the one we are considering.

The history of the matter is this, to repeat it, as it has already been stated by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] pretty correctly: Under the legislation of the Territory about 75 miles of road running from the Atlantic and Pacific road south towards Phœnix have been built. There are 74 miles yet to be built in Yavapai County going south where the proposed line strikes Maricopa County. Then, when you get into Maricopa County, that we are discussing here to-day, there are about 50 miles, probably 49 miles, to be built of that proposed line before it strikes the city of Phœnix in Maricopa County.

This proposed legislation is simply to authorize the people of Maricopa to build those 49 or 50 miles of road from Phœnix north towards the line of road that starts and is built from the Atlantic and Pacific road down to the city of Prescott.

This bill has nothing whatever to do with Yavapai County or the building of any road in Yavapai County. The people of Maricopa are trying to get out some way without having to rely upon the Southern Pacific, which they say is extorting from them terrifically in charges, not only for produce, but in every other way. The people of Maricopa are trying to make a connection north with the Atlantic and Pacific, so that they will have two ways to get out, one by going south to the Southern Pacific and then going east or west, and, if they prefer it, to go north and strike the Atlantic and Pacific, if the connection is ever made between the portion that is already built and the portion we are proposing to build in Maricopa County.

Mr. COCKRELL. But going north of that?

Mr. CULLOM. Going north we strike the line of the road at the southern boundary of Yavapai County and there we stop, unless the people of Yavapai County or somebody else see proper to build that connection between the northern line of Maricopa and the city of Prescott, the southern end of the road that is already built.

Mr. STEWART. What is the objection to my amendment, then?

Mr. CULLOM. The objection is that it does not belong to this bill and ought not to be put upon it at all, and I hope the Senate will not put it upon the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Let me ask another question. Does the company that is going to build this road propose to get bonds from Yavapai County?

Mr. CULLOM. The company that propose to build this road are not consulting with me or anybody else as to what they propose. I do not know that they propose anything. They are simply asking Congress to grant this relief under the circumstances, with the facts before the country, they being, to use a common expression, "in a hole" there, having no other way out except by the Southern Pacific, and the Southern Pacific, as it is alleged, extorting from them in bringing lumber to them and in taking their products out, so far as they are taken out at all. The fact is they can not get them out and get anything for them after they pay the charges on this road.

I wish to say, without taking up the time of the Senate, that I am not disposed to favor this kind of legislation ordinarily, and I was a little disposed against this bill, but when I came to read the facts and ascertain the condition that those people are in, I came to the conclusion that if any people were justified in having an appropriation to get a railroad through, so as to give them relief, the people there in Maricopa County are justified in doing what they are asking us to allow them to do.

Now, that is the whole case, Mr. President. Take, for instance, the article of lumber. They pay from forty-five to sixty dollars a thousand for lumber, and a hundred or two miles away they can get it for twelve or twelve and a half. That is the situation. They can not get their products out nor lumber or anything else in at living rates. So if there is any state of facts that will justify any community anywhere in making an appropriation or voting stock to build a little piece of railroad, it seems to me these people are the very ones who are entitled to the relief.

I hope that the Senator from Nevada will withdraw any further opposition to this bill and let it go through.

Mr. STEWART. I could not possibly do that.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Will the Senator yield to me? I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Presiding Officer if the Senator will yield.

Mr. STEWART. I was about to make some remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator is entitled to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I will wait for that.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I prefer to take my own time.

Mr. STEWART. It is all very well to talk of relieving the people of Maricopa County, but when you come to make others who have no interest in the road pay for it——

Mr. CULLOM. Who are they?

Mr. STEWART. Yavapai County.

Mr. CULLOM. Yavapai County is not paying for this road at all.

Mr. STEWART. They will not pay for it if my amendment is adopted. Otherwise they will pay a good deal more than Maricopa County.

Mr. CULLOM. That does not make any difference——

Mr. STEWART. It does make a difference.

Mr. CULLOM. We are not undertaking to interfere with Yavapai at all. That is a matter for Yavapai to determine when we get there.

Mr. FARWELL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FARWELL. I desire to know if I should make a motion to adjourn whether the pending bill would have the right of way to-morrow? Would this bill be the unfinished business for to-morrow?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill having been taken up by a vote of the Senate on motion of the Senator from Arkansas it remains until disposed of by the Senate as the unfinished business.

Mr. FARWELL. There evidently is no quorum here now.

Mr. STEWART. I would rather that there should be a quorum present to hear the matter discussed.

Mr. FARWELL. If my friend will give way I will move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FARWELL. I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 6, 1890, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *June* 5, 1890.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Pacific Railroads have to-day filed a report upon the funding bills referred to it, and I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have leave hereafter to present their views.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, leave will be granted.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Rules to report back a substitute for the resolution referred to that committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the accompanying House resolution of March 31, 1890, in relation to the bill H. R. 5381, have considered the same and beg leave to report the following substitute:

Resolved, That upon the passage of this resolution the House proceed to consider House bill 5381, and said consideration shall continue until Saturday, June 7, when the previous question shall be considered as ordered at 3 o'clock p. m. on the bill and pending amendments, and that the House meet at 11 o'clock on Friday and Saturday next.

Mr. McKINLEY. Upon that I demand the previous question.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will allow me to offer an amendment.

Mr. PETERS. What is the bill?

Mr. McKINLEY. It is the silver bill.

Mr. BLAND. What is the number of the bill? There are several.

Mr. McKINLEY. The bill reported by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. BLAND. Which one? There are two. There is the bill 5381 and the bill 9678.

Mr. McKINLEY. It is the bill mentioned in the resolution, 5381.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, give his attention?

Mr. CONGER. It is the bill H. R. 5381.

Mr. BLAND. That is the original bill.

Mr. CONGER. That is the original bill on the Calendar.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio allow my amendment to be offered?

Mr. McKINLEY. I can not yield to have an amendment offered.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to have the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia read for information.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope the gentleman will consent to have it read.

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask for the previous question.

The question was put; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND. Division. We ought to have an amendment to that resolution.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 79, noes 65.

Mr. BLAND. Tellers. [After a pause.] I withdraw the demand for tellers.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Tellers were demanded.

Mr. BLOUNT. The demand for tellers was withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, there are forty minutes under the rule for debate, and I want to use twenty minutes on this side. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to occupy the time now?

Mr. McKINLEY. Not at this time.

Mr. BLOUNT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. McCOMAS. I ask, in respect to Friday's business, that the gentleman yield to me before that time is taken. I think this is the seventh or eighth time that the Friday's session has been taken for the consideration of other business than that set apart for that day, and the bill H. R. 7616, a bill providing——

Mr. BLOUNT. I submit that this is not in order.

The SPEAKER. It is not in order, and the gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. McCOMAS. I want to make an inquiry here, and I want to ask consent that next Friday may be set apart for the consideration of this war-claims bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this will not be taken out of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, the proposition now offered is——

I hope we shall have order before I am required to proceed, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend and the Chair will endeavor to secure order.

After order was restored,

Mr. BLOUNT said: Mr. Speaker, the proposition in this order as reported from the Committee on Rules provides that the previous question shall be ordered at 3 o'clock on Saturday, and that the sessions of the House on to-morrow and next day shall begin at 11 o'clock, which is equivalent to three days' discussion, assuming the day to end at 5 o'clock. To that I have no complaint to make. I think this side of the House, if this were all, would accept it as the best arrangement possibly they could make; but it goes further. I am informed that the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures will be allowed to offer all the amendments which are admissible under the rules of the House; that when these are made there will be left no opportunity on the part of the minority to offer any amendment on any proposition. There will be left to the minority side of the House no opportunity to ask this House to vote on free coinage.

The Committee on Rules, and the House of Representatives if it shall adopt this order, deliberately determine that this House shall not have any vote on free coinage except such as they may have after the previous question shall have been ordered when the bill shall have been considered and almost disposed of. On a motion to recommit, when the House is anxious to dispose of this question and has reached the hour at which it is to be disposed of, we may offer this amendment for free coinage, but not before. But, Mr. Speaker, this question is one of immense moment. The Secretary of the Treasury has made his suggestion. The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures reported

it to this House, and the majority side of this House determined adversely to it. They agreed on another proposition in caucus—I do not speak officially. [Laughter.] In the Senate of the United States the same situation obtains amongst Republican Senators. They are not agreed.

Why, Mr. Speaker, if it was permissible for me to state what occurred in the Republican caucus last night, I could show an infinite amount of division; I could show just such a division on the other side of the House as makes it necessary to put the whip of this order upon them to save them from such a record as would be terrible to them. You have these propositions here, one of the Secretary of the Treasury and one of the Republican caucus. All of them, sir, contemplate not only the avoidance of the coinage of silver, but the repeal of what little coinage of silver is permissible now under the act of 1878. They all contemplate the proposition that the Treasury notes to be issued shall be redeemable, not in something which is a standard of value, like gold and silver and which has always been regarded as the proper basis for a paper currency, but they propose that these notes shall be issued and given to the people based upon a commodity variable in value from day to day.

Now, sir, I shall not undertake to discuss these various propositions in this twenty minutes. I hope hereafter to go into the question in detail. But these are the issues: Your Republican platform declared for silver coinage. In your secret councils many of you have recognized the importance of some sort of coinage of silver; yet here is an order changing the rules of this House to escape that issue in the Congress of the United States. Sir, it is well worthy of the previous policy of the majority. You cut off the usual debate on the tariff question. You prohibited this House from voting on hundreds of amendments to the tariff bill in the interest of the people; and now when this question comes up, a question which is pressing upon every one, in relation to the use of silver as money in this land, you meet us with a proposition which denies to the minority the right to make any amendment to these bills.

I submit that that is not fair, that it is a wicked and shameless outrage on the minority, on fair discussion, on fair debate, on proper deliberation. It takes from this body the bare right to even vote upon a great question like that of the free coinage of silver. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And, sir, I trust that those on the majority side of the House who seem to fear the veto of the President of the United States and who would join us in voting for free coinage and making it the law of the land if it were not for the President of the United States realize that they are in a pitiable situation. The Secretary of the Treasury is denouncing in official reports the "72-cent dollar," the silver dollar, the President of the United States is in accord with him, and both are in accord with Wall street. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ay, sir, in the presence of the President, in the presence of the enemies of free coinage, many on the majority side of this body quail, tremble, are powerless, are driven to trample down the rules of this House, the right of debate, and the right of amendment. Mr. Speaker, it is a humiliating sight for an American citizen. It is a humiliating situation in the eyes of any man born and bred under the teachings of English and American law. I know not what other record we shall make here, but, thank God, our terms of office are not eternal. If the legislative department of the Government, if the Executive of the United States, are yielding to the influence of the money power, there is amongst the masses of the people a power, and a consciousness of power, to dictate and enforce legislation in their interest. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And you gentlemen on the other side of the House who propose to adopt this rule and to force it upon us, think not that this screen which has been put about you to conceal your action from the people whom you are falsely representing here will suffice.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has nine minutes left.

Mr. BLOUNT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have no question whatever in my mind that if there was a fair opportunity for debate and amendment of this bill a large majority of this House would be found in favor of the unlimited coinage of silver. I suppose there is no doubt in the House or in the mind of any member of it that that is the fact. In order to prevent that fact from appearing upon the records of this House it is proposed, by a gag rule, not only to gag the Republican members of this body who are in favor of free coinage, but also nearly the whole Democratic party here, because, with about fifteen or twenty exceptions, all of us on this side of the House are in favor of free coinage.

Mr. Speaker, it was agreed in the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, it was the understanding in that committee when the bills were reported, that the free-coinage bill, the substitute that has been reported here by the minority, should be voted upon in this House. That would have given fair play, a fair opportunity for intelligent legislation. But now, sir, I am informed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] that this order prevents not only the offering of an amendment like the proposition for free coinage, but any other amendment that may be required to perfect the bill, unless it comes from the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, who, up to this hour, has shown his hostility to every other bill than a measure coupling with it the demonetization of silver by permitting bullion to go out of the Treasury as fast as it comes in.

Now, gentlemen who are in favor of free coinage can have a vote on that question by voting down this order, and I want the country and this House to understand, and I want it to go into the record here, that every gentleman who votes for this order votes against free coinage, votes to gag this House and prevent it from passing upon the question of free coinage, and I dare gentlemen to face their constituents on that proposition. You gentlemen from the mining States, you gentlemen from the West, whose people are demanding the free coinage of silver, I appeal to you. You know that a vote to pass this order gags your own voices and your own votes upon this question, and your constituents shall know it.

Now go on the record if you dare to do it.

Here is an order that cuts off all amendments of that sort, that gags this House; and every gentleman representing a free-coinage constituency who votes for this order votes to gag himself, votes against free coinage, and he ought to stand condemned as utterly unfit to represent a people who favor that measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And the people will remember him. A man who has not the manhood and the independence to stand up against this gag rule is an unfit representative for intelligent people who want free coinage. [Applause.]

I speak of those Representatives who while they have declared themselves in favor of free coinage are willing to gag themselves against it on this floor. [Renewed applause.] Their record will be made on this roll-call. Gentlemen, you can not escape a vote for or against free coinage by this gag order, because a vote for it is a vote against free coinage; and we shall ascertain when that vote is announced who it is that is willing to deny this House a vote on this question after his people have sent him here with the expectation that he would vote for free coinage, and while his constituents are petitioning him to-day to vote for it. For the people hold this question, as I have always held it, far above party or party considerations, and they expect you to act independently upon it; for it is not a party measure except as you undertake to make it a party measure by gagging members on this side of the House against debate and against fair amendment.

Now, as I stated in the beginning, it was the understanding of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures when these bills were reported that when this measure should come up in the House a free-coinage bill should be pending and should be voted upon.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT. I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentlemen on the other side will now occupy a portion of their time as we have only four minutes left I believe on this side. I desire to reserve those four minutes, if some gentleman on the other side will proceed now.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this matter of proposed legislation touching the currency, like all others, is now to be considered by the House as it decides to consider it. Much has been said by way of declamation by my usually calm friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] and much by way of fiery denunciation by my friend from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], who, upon all questions of the currency on the floor of this House, in mere words, like hope, "springs eternal." [Applause.]

Now, what is this proposition? It is a proposition that under the rules of this House—the general rules of the House covering debate and amendments—we shall proceed at once on the adoption of this order to the consideration of the bill reported from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures——

Mr. BLAND. Do I understand——

Mr. CANNON. I can not yield; I have but five minutes. The proposition is that this measure shall be considered for three whole days.

Mr. BLAND. Can we offer a free-coinage amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri must not interrupt the gentleman from Illinois without his consent.

Mr. CANNON. You can offer every amendment to this bill that you can offer to any other bill under the rules of this House. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen may laugh; but they can not laugh away the truth. We are to meet at the hour of 11 on two days, extending the time an hour on each day; and at 3 o'clock on Saturday, after full consideration, we vote. And, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] has stated, a motion to recommit will be in order under the rules of the House.

Now, I want to say that this is an important question and requires consideration by the House. We propose to consider it; and in my opinion it will be the sense of a majority of the members of the House to pass some bill upon this subject. We will discuss the merits of the bill a little further on.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. Will my colleague allow a question?

Mr. CANNON. I have but five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. OUTHWAITE (to Mr. CANNON). You are giving information, are you not?

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me a moment?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield a moment for a question.

Mr. OATES. Do I understand the gentleman to say that if we desire to offer by way of amendment a substitute providing for free coinage the previous question will be permitted to operate on that and the amendment be voted upon?

Mr. CANNON. I said that this bill, if this order be adopted, will be open to amendment under the ordinary rules of this House, just as any other bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BLAND. But who will be recognized to offer amendments?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has the floor.

Mr. CANNON. Now, one word in reply to my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]. In the light of your political history during the last four years, is your declamation of much account? After the course of Grover Cleveland as President on this subject—his famous silver letter and his hunting silver from every standpoint, as Herod hunted the infant children in Judea [laughter], and his subsequent renomination to the Presidency and the agony of the other side of the House and of the Democracy of the country to re-elect him, you now come here and make great professions; and you do this in the face of the further fact that in the Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Congresses, when the honorable gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] was chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, no bill was ever passed by either of those Democratic Houses for free coinage. Why, gentlemen, you can not fool the country; you can not even fool yourselves by your fury and declamation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague [Mr. CANNON] states that during the time that the Democratic party had possession and control of legislation in the House of Representatives no bill remonetizing silver and granting the free coinage of silver had passed. In this he is entirely mistaken. The House did pass a free-coinage bill, in the Forty-fifth Congress (November 5, 1877), which went to the Senate, and there the amendment was put upon it by a Republican Senate which limited the coinage to not exceeding four millions, or less than two millions a month, and we were forced to accept that as a compromise measure on the demand of the Republicans. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That bill was vetoed by a Republican President and was passed over the veto. The bill then passed is the existing law.

But I wish to call the attention of the House to the effect of the resolution now offered by the Committee on Rules, in view of the recognition which the Speaker has in his power under it. The parliamentary situation amounts to this simply, that no amendment can be offered, no recognition will be given to those favoring the free coinage of silver, and no opportunity will be given of presenting that question fairly before the House. Under the resolution as presented, no amendments except those suggested by the chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures will be entertained by the Chair or be in order for consideration. This resolution is so framed as to prevent this side of the House, as well as the minority on the other side of the House—for, gentlemen, you will have to take the "gag law" yourselves, as well as this side, on this question, if you adopt this proposition—it is so framed that no amendment is to be allowed in which the friends of the free coinage of silver can present their views for a fair vote in this House, and the members on this side, as well as the members from the Northwestern States on the other side of the House, are completely gagged and cut off from that opportunity.

Against this I enter my solemn protest and denunciation. This action is intended to prevent the representatives of the people from carrying out the demands of the people on this question, and the constituents of those who vote for this resolution will repudiate them at the polls for their action. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I now yield the remainder of the time to my colleague [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this session we adopted rules, or rather the majority of the House adopted rules, by which it was said that the majority of the House would be enabled to legislate. But now it is proposed, by a Republican caucus, to prevent a majority of this House from legislating. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The people of this country had a little of this experience in 1873, when silver was demonetized, and they are tired of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is a question in which the people of the country are vitally interested from one end of the Union to the other, and the Representatives on this floor, a majority of them in this House, are in favor of the free coinage of silver. The very fact that you refuse to allow a vote on that question is convincing proof before the House and the country that you know they are in favor of free coinage, and you dare not allow them to go on record on that question. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Otherwise why do you fear a vote upon it? Why not allow the question to come fairly before the House?

The gentleman from Illinois, my colleague [Mr. CANNON], would try to have the country believe that everything is to be fair and just under this order. He seeks to convince the House and the country that that is its meaning; and yet he knows that every substitute that can be offered under the rules will be presented by the majority of the Committee on Coinage, and the minority, who represent the free coinage of silver in the House, will have no opportunity to get a vote upon that question. It is well known that, by the aid of the gentlemen from Kansas and from other Western States and the Democrats on this side of the House in favor of free coinage, that kind of a bill would pass the House and the Senate and become a law if not vetoed by the President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, sir, I appeal to the members on the other side of the House against this. I appeal to men who represent districts here—who represent people like mine, who are demanding free coinage of silver—I appeal to you to stand by the interests of your constituents and your people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Read your Republican platform. There is nothing in it that requires you to disregard their interests in order to follow the dictates of a Republican machine. You will have no opportunity, if you vote for this order, to consider a free-coinage amendment in this House, and I want your constituents to know it, I want the people to know it, and you will know it yourselves by the time the polls close in next November. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, all we ask is fair, simply fair, play. That is all. This is a great question, in which the people are deeply interested. It was settled once, for a time, in this country without discussion, without debate, without amendment, and you know how dissatisfied the people were with the verdict. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is necessary after the storm of denunciation that we have heard from the other side of the House to return for a moment to the proposition that is really before us, and the meaning, and purpose, and effect of that proposition, if it shall be adopted by a majority of this House. It is a resolution, Mr. Speaker, to give to the House of Representatives an opportunity to pass some silver legislation, and to give to the country a silver bill which the majority of this House believe will be fully responsive to the general sentiment of the country. [Applause on Republican side]. It is, Mr. Speaker, to give to the House of Representatives an opportunity to pass a bill which shall take all of the silver bullion of the United States—all of the silver product of the United States—and utilize that silver bullion for monetary purposes and put it in circulation for the movement of the business of the country. It is to give to the people of the country, not $2,000,000 monthly, but to give them four and one-half millions monthly, or two and one-half millions more than what is now provided by the existing law.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. McKINLEY. I have no time to yield.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I only wanted some information as to the order under this rule.

Mr. McKINLEY. Very well, I am pursuing my own course in discussing it; and I have no doubt the gentleman will be fully informed when I conclude.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I wanted to know whether the minority would have an opportunity to offer an amendment and to have a vote upon it——

Mr. McKINLEY. I want to say to my colleague from Ohio that gentlemen on the other side of the House, as will gentlemen on this side of the House, will have opportunities to offer amendments, under the rules of the House. [Derisive applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Amendments to be voted upon?

Mr. McKINLEY. And further to my colleague I will say—for he is undoubtedly seeking information—that if he wants a vote on the question of free coinage, if that is what he is after here, he will have complete and full opportunity by moving to recommit any bill that the House shall agree upon, with instructions to report it back with a free-coinage clause incorporated. [Derisive applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Is that the only opportunity to present such an important amendment?

Mr. BLAND. I understand the gentleman from Ohio to concede that that is the only opportunity we will have.

Mr. McKINLEY. I have no desire, so far as I am concerned, I will state to my friend from Missouri, to mislead any gentleman on the other side of the Chamber. You will have an opportunity—gentlemen on both sides will have an opportunity to present and have a vote upon any amendments that they would have a right to offer on any proposition under the rules of the House.

Mr. BLAND. Well, we understand what that means.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to ask if it was not agreed upon and understood in the Committee on Rules that the gentleman from Iowa, the

chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, had propositions which would exhaust all the motions that were permissible under the rules of the House and that there would be no opportunity left to this side of the House to offer any amendment, more especially the single amendment to which reference has been made in this debate.

Mr. McKINLEY. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] that I heard no such statement before the Committee on Rules. I heard the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER] say outside of the meeting of the Committee on Rules that he wanted to offer one or two amendments.

Mr. BLOUNT. Then why should not my friend consent to a single amendment on the single proposition, that of free coinage, and have a vote upon it?

Mr. McKINLEY. The gentleman can not drive me from my position. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] The House of Representatives are here to do public business. And you gentlemen on the other side of the House could not have been very anxious for free coinage when for four long years, when you had control of the House of Representatives, you never were able to pass a bill upon that subject. [Applause on the Republican side of the House.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. We are ready to do it now.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, talk about throttling the will of the minority by the majority in the House of Representatives. Why, one man up at the White House a few years ago silenced the majority in the Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Congresses. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman allow me to correct——

Mr. McKINLEY. A single voice, a single man, elected to execute the laws, not to make them, commanded the majority on that side of the House to be silent, and they were silent. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. BLAND. I wish to say to the gentleman that he is entirely mistaken. Will he allow me to correct him?

Mr. McKINLEY. Your party, for four long years, with all the power to give us free coinage, failed to give it to us, yet all at once and suddenly you are in favor of free coinage.

Mr. CRISP. I desire to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKINLEY] a question in reference to this rule.

Mr. McKINLEY. The gentleman from Georgia understands the rule just as well as I do.

Mr. CRISP. I want to ask the gentleman one question about this rule. May I do so?

Mr. McKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. I want to know, under unwritten parliamentary law and the uniform custom of this House, even should this rule be adopted, if it would not be the duty of an impartial Speaker to give the minority of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures an opportunity to offer a substitute.

Mr. McKINLEY. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that in my fourteen years' experience in this House the matter of recognition has always been left to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and he has exercised that discretion in his own way.

Mr. CRISP. Does the gentleman mean that where the minority of a committee submit their views and propose a substitute to the bill offered by their committee the Speaker may justly deprive them of the right to have that substitute voted on?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has not the floor; the gentleman from Ohio has the floor, or ought to have, under the rules of the House.

Mr. McKINLEY. The gentleman's anxiety for free coinage and the right to offer an amendment is most marvelous just at this moment——

Mr. CRISP. I am speaking about the rule that you are imposing on this House——

Mr. McKINLEY. As I said a moment ago, we are after practical results. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side of the House.] We propose to give to this country what gentlemen upon the other side of the House could not do, what you did not dare do for four years. We propose to give to the country a silver bill that will take all the silver practically of the United States and make it available for the uses of the people.

Mr. SKINNER. Uncoined silver?

Mr. McKINLEY. Why, the gentleman's own President, in his first message to Congress, even before he became President, declared that the continuance of the coinage of two millions of silver per month was threatening the business and financial honor of the United States, and he was careful that only the minimum should be coined during his administration.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield for the purpose of allowing me to make a correction?

Mr. McKINLEY. Even my friend from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], who presided over the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, a free-silver man as we know him to be, compelled by the dictation of the President, was powerless to pass a free-coinage bill and sat silent.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman is mistaken. Will he permit me to correct him? I did report a free-coinage bill.

Mr. McCOMAS. I want, in the little time that is accorded me, to correct the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER]. He made a statement here as to the vote. Now, in the Forty-sixth Congress, where there were forty-two Democratic Senators and thirty-three Republican Senators, free coinage was reported adversely from the Committee on Finance by Mr. Bayard on February 3, 1880; that the bill for free coinage ought not to pass. [Applause on the Republican side.] Again, in the Forty-ninth Congress, under Mr. Cleveland's Administration, there was an immense Democratic majority in this House. I hold in my hand the vote of that tremendous Democratic majority upon the proposition in a bill which was submitted for free coinage; and when (with almost two-thirds your way) you had a chance to pass it in this House—the vote, when it came up on the 28th of April, 1886, was 126 for free coinage and 163 against free coinage, and 68 Democrats voted dead against free coinage.

Mr. BLAND. And 100 voted for it.

Mr. McKINLEY. I demand a vote.

Mr. BLAND. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question.

The question was put on the passage of the resolution; when the Speaker announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BLAND, Mr. SPRINGER, and others. Yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was put; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 120, nays 117, not voting 90; as follows:

YEAS—120.

Adams,	Craig,	La Follette,	Reyburn,
Allen, Mich.	Dalzell,	Laws,	Rife,
Atkinson, Pa.	Darlington,	Lind,	Rockwell,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Dingley,	Lodge,	Rowell,
Baker,	Dolliver,	Mason,	Russell,
Bayne,	Dorsey,	McComas,	Scull,
Beckwith,	Dunnell,	McCord,	Simonds,
Belden,	Evans,	McCormick,	Smith, W. Va.
Belknap,	Farquhar,	McDuffie,	Smyser,
Bergen,	Finley,	McKinley,	Snider,
Bingham,	Flick,	Miles,	Stephenson,
Bliss,	Flood,	Milliken,	Stivers,
Blount,	Frank,	Moffitt,	Stockbridge,
Brewer,	Gear,	Moore, N. H.	Struble,
Brosius,	Gifford,	Morey,	Sweney,
Brower,	Greenhalge,	Morrill,	Taylor, E. B.
Browne, Va.	Hall,	Morse,	Taylor, Ill.
Buchanan, N. J.	Hansbrough,	Mudd,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burrows,	Harmer,	O'Donnell,	Thomas,
Burton,	Haugen,	O'Neill, Pa.	Thompson,
Butterworth,	Henderson, Ill.	Osborne,	Turner, Kans.
Caldwell,	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Van Schaick,
Cannon,	Hitt,	Payson,	Wade,
Caswell,	Hopkins,	Perkins,	Walker, Mass.
Cheadle,	Houk,	Pickler,	Wickham,
Clark, Wis.	Kennedy,	Post,	Williams, Ohio
Cogswell,	Kerr, Iowa	Raines,	Wilson, Ky.
Coleman,	Ketcham,	Randall,	Wilson, Wash.
Comstock,	Kinsey,	Ray,	Wright,
Conger,	Lacey,	Reed, Iowa	Yardley.

NAYS—117.

Abbott,	Dargan,	Lester, Ga.	Robertson,
Alderson,	Davidson,	Lewis,	Rogers,
Anderson, Kans.	De Haven,	Magner,	Rowland,
Bankhead,	Dockery,	Mansur,	Sayers,
Barnes,	Dunphy,	Martin, Ind.	Seney,
Bartine,	Edmunds,	McAdoo,	Shively,
Barwig,	Elliott,	McCarthy,	Skinner,
Biggs,	Ellis,	McClammy,	Springer,
Blanchard,	Enloe,	McClellan,	Stewart, Tex.
Bland,	Featherston,	McCreary,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fitch,	McRae,	Stone, Ky.
Brickner,	Flower,	Montgomery,	Stone, Mo.
Brookshire,	Forney,	Moore, Tex.	Tarsney,
Brown, J. B.	Fowler,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Brunner,	Funston,	Morrow,	Townsend, Colo.
Buchanan, Va.	Goodnight,	Mutchler,	Tracey,
Buckalew,	Grimes,	Oates,	Tucker,
Bynum,	Hatch,	O'Ferrall,	Turner, Ga.
Candler, Ga.	Hayes,	O'Neall, Ind.	Vandever,
Caruth,	Haynes,	O'Neil, Mass.	Vaux,
Chipman,	Heard,	Outhwaite,	Walker, Mo.
Clancy,	Hemphill,	Owens, Ohio	Washington,
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, N. C.	Parrett,	Whitthorne,
Clunie,	Herbert,	Paynter,	Wike,
Cobb,	Hermann,	Peel,	Willcox,
Connell,	Holman,	Perry,	Williams, Ill.
Cooper, Ind.	Kelley,	Pierce,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cowles,	Kilgore,	Quinn,	
Crisp,	Lane,	Reilly,	
Culberson, Tex.	Lanham,	Richardson,	

NOT VOTING—90.

Allen, Miss.	Cheatham,	Grout,	Norton,
Anderson, Miss.	Clements,	Hare,	Nute,
Andrew,	Cooper, Ohio	Hill,	Owen, Ind.
Arnold,	Cothran,	Hooker,	Penington,
Banks,	Covert,	Kerr, Pa.	Peters,
Boatner,	Crain,	Knapp,	Phelan,
Boothman,	Culbertson, Pa.	Laidlaw,	Price,
Boutelle,	Cummings,	Lansing,	Pugsley,
Bowden,	Cutcheon,	Lawler,	Quackenbush,
Breckinridge, Ky.	De Lano,	Lee,	Rusk,
Browne, T. M.	Dibble,	Lehlbach,	Sanford,
Bullock,	Ewart,	Lester, Va.	Sawyer,
Bunn,	Fithian,	Maish,	Scranton,
Campbell,	Forman,	Martin, Tex.	Sherman,
Candler, Mass.	Geissenhainer,	McKenna,	Smith, Ill.
Carlton,	Gest,	McMillin,	Spinola,
Carter,	Gibson,	Mills,	Spooner,
Catchings,	Grosvenor,	Niedringhaus,	Stahlnecker,

Stewart, Ga.	Turner, N. Y.	Watson,	Wilkinson,
Stewart, Vt.	Venable,	Wheeler, Ala.	Wilson, Mo.
Stump,	Waddill,	Wheeler, Mich.	Yoder.
Taylor, J. D.	Wallace, Mass.	Whiting,	
Townsend, Pa.	Wallace, N. Y.	Wiley,	

So the resolution was adopted.

Mr. BANKS. I am paired with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PRICE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I would vote "yea."

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BOWDEN with Mr. LESTER, of Virginia.

Mr. CULBERTSON, of Pennsylvania, with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. ARNOLD with Mr. LAWLER.

Mr. SPOONER with Mr. WALKER, of Missouri.

Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. MAISH.

Mr. WALLACE, of New York, with Mr. RUSK.

Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts, with Mr. MCMILLIN.

Mr. MCKENNA with Mr. HARE.

Mr. NUTE with Mr. TURNER, of New York.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. STUMP.

Mr. CUTCHEON with Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. HOOKER.

Mr. DE LANO with Mr. SPINOLA.

Mr. COOPER, of Ohio, with Mr. FORMAN.

Mr. SMITH, of Illinois, with Mr. BUNN.

Mr. KNAPP with Mr. COVERT.

Mr. GROUT with Mr. ANDERSON, of Mississippi.

Mr. SAWYER with Mr. STEWART, of Georgia.

Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS with Mr. MARTIN, of Texas.

Mr. LANSING with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. GROSVENOR with Mr. GIBSON.

Mr. WALLACE, of Massachusetts, with Mr. ANDREW, from Thursday, May 29, except bankruptcy bill.

Mr. THOMAS M. BROWNE with Mr. DIBBLE, including the contested-election case of McDuffie *vs.* Turpin.

Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan, with Mr. FITHIAN, until the 10th of June.

Mr. CARTER with Mr. BOATNER, until June 20, 1890.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR with Mr. CLEMENTS, for one week.

Mr. LAIDLAW with Mr. CARLETON, for ten days.

Mr. BOOTHMAN with Mr. YODER, from Wednesday until Saturday.

Mr. MILLIKEN with Mr. CRAIN, for this day.

Mr. WADDILL with Mr. LEE, for this day.

Mr. BANKS with Mr. PRICE, on all political questions and contested-election case of McDuffie *vs.* Turpin, for three days.

Mr. BECKWITH with Mr. GEISSENHAINER, for this day.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to have the vote recapitulated.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. I would like to know if I am recorded.

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to change my vote.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the name of the gentleman.

The name of Mr. BLOUNT was called, and he voted "yea."

The result of the vote was then announed as above recorded.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to reconsider the motion by which the resolution was adopted.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. BLOUNT. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 124, nays 118, not voting 85; as follows:

YEAS—124.

Adams,	Dalzell,	Lacey,	Reyburn,
Allen, Mich.	Darlington,	La Follette,	Rife,
Atkinson, Pa.	Dingley,	Laws,	Rockwell,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Dolliver,	Lind,	Rowell,
Baker,	Dorsey,	Lodge,	Russell,
Banks,	Dunnell,	Mason,	Scull,
Bayne,	Evans,	McComas,	Simonds,
Beckwith,	Farquhar,	McCord,	Smith, W. Va.
Belden,	Featherston,	McCormick,	Smyser,
Belknap,	Finley,	McDuffie,	Snider,
Bergen,	Flick,	McKinley,	Stephenson,
Bingham,	Flood,	Miles,	Stivers,
Bliss,	Frank,	Milliken,	Stockbridge,
Brewer,	Gear,	Moffitt,	Struble,
Brosius,	Gest,	Moore, N. H.	Sweney,
Brower,	Gifford,	Morey,	Taylor, E. B.
Browne, Va.	Greenhalge,	Morrill,	Taylor, Ill.
Buchanan, N. J.	Hall,	Morse,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burrows,	Hansbrough,	Mudd,	Thomas,
Burton,	Harmer,	O'Donnell,	Thompson,
Butterworth,	Haugen,	O'Neill, Pa.	Vandever,
Caldwell,	Henderson, Ill.	Osborne,	Van Schaick,
Cannon,	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Wade,
Caswell,	Hill,	Payson,	Walker, Mass.
Cheadle,	Hitt,	Perkins,	Watson,
Clark, Wis.	Hopkins,	Pickler,	Wickham,
Cogswell,	Houk,	Post,	Williams, Ohio
Coleman,	Kennedy,	Raines,	Wilson, Ky.
Comstock,	Kerr, Iowa	Randall,	Wilson, Wash.
Conger,	Ketcham,	Ray,	Wright,
Craig,	Kinsey,	Reed, Iowa	Yardley.

NAYS—118.

Abbott,	Crisp,	Lanham,	Rogers,
Alderson,	Culberson, Tex.	Lester, Ga.	Rowland,
Anderson, Kans.	Dargan,	Lewis,	Sayers,
Bankhead,	Davidson,	Magner,	Seney,
Barnes,	De Haven,	Mansur,	Shively,
Bartine,	Dockery,	Martin, Ind.	Skinner,
Barwig,	Dunphy,	McCarthy,	Springer,
Biggs,	Edmunds,	McClammy,	Stewart, Tex.
Blanchard,	Elliott,	McClellan,	Stockdale,
Bland,	Ellis,	McCreary,	Stone, Ky.
Blount,	Enloe,	McRae,	Stone, Mo.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fitch,	Montgomery,	Tarsney,
Brickner,	Flower,	Moore, Tex.	Tillman,
Brookshire,	Forney,	Morgan,	Townsend, Colo.
Brown, J. B.	Fowler,	Morrow,	Tracey,
Brunner,	Funston,	Mutchler,	Tucker,
Buchanan, Va.	Goodnight,	Oates,	Turner, Ga.
Buckalew,	Grimes,	O'Ferrall,	Vaux,
Bynum,	Hatch,	O'Neall, Ind.	Walker, Mo.
Candler, Ga.	Hayes,	Outhwaite,	Washington,
Caruth,	Haynes,	Owens, Ohio	Wheeler, Ala.
Catchings,	Heard,	Parrett,	Whitthorne,
Chipman,	Hemphill,	Paynter,	Wike,
Clancy,	Henderson, N. C.	Peel,	Wiley,
Clarke, Ala.	Herbert,	Perry,	Willcox,
Clunie,	Hermann,	Pierce,	Williams, Ill.
Cobb,	Holman,	Quinn,	Wilson, Mo.
Connell,	Kelley,	Reilly,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cooper, Ind.	Kilgore,	Richardson,	
Cowles,	Lane,	Robertson,	

NOT VOTING—85.

Allen, Miss.	Culbertson, Pa.	Maish,	Smith, Ill.
Anderson, Miss.	Cummings,	Martin, Tex.	Spinola,
Andrew,	Cutcheon,	McAdoo,	Spooner,
Arnold,	De Lano,	McKenna,	Stahlnecker,
Boatner,	Dibble,	McMillin,	Stewart, Ga.
Boothman,	Ewart,	Mills,	Stewart, Vt.
Boutelle,	Fithian,	Niedringhaus,	Stump,
Bowden,	Forman,	Norton,	Taylor, J. D.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Geissenhainer,	Nute,	Townsend, Pa.
Browne, T. M.	Gibson,	O'Neil, Mass.	Turner, Kans.
Bullock,	Grosvenor,	Owen, Ind.	Turner, N. Y.
Bunn,	Grout,	Penington,	Venable,
Campbell,	Hare,	Peters,	Waddill,
Candler, Mass.	Hooker,	Phelan,	Wallace, Mass.
Carlton,	Kerr, Pa.	Price,	Wallace, N. Y.
Carter,	Knapp,	Pugsley,	Wheeler, Mich.
Cheatham,	Laidlaw,	Quackenbush,	Whiting,
Clements,	Lansing,	Rusk,	Wilkinson,
Cooper, Ohio	Lawler,	Sanford,	Yoder.
Cothran,	Lee,	Sawyer,	
Covert,	Lehlbach,	Scranton,	
Crain,	Lester, Va.	Sherman,	

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. QUACKENBUSH with Mr. PRICE, for this day.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the recapitulation of the names be dispensed with.

Mr. SPRINGER. I object.

The Clerk recapitulated the names.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be a session to-morrow evening for debate only. I understand that our friends on the other side want a caucus to-night, and I do not wish to interfere with that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask that the pension session which, under the rule, would be held to-morrow night, be transferred to Saturday night, and that he also make a request for leave to print upon the silver bill.

The SPEAKER. The proposition to substitute Saturday for Friday may lead to some complications, because, under the rule, the House takes a recess at 5 o'clock on Fridays.

Mr. BLAND. Say Monday evening, then.

Mr. BAKER. I think we ought to have Monday and Tuesday evenings for bills reported from the Committee on Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? The Chair will state the proposition. The gentleman asks that members desiring to print remarks upon the silver bill may have leave to do so, that a session be held Friday evening for debate only, and that Monday evening next be substituted for Friday evening of this week for the consideration of pension bills.

Mr. MCCREARY. Is there to be a limit to the Friday night session?

Several MEMBERS. The same as usual.

The SPEAKER. And the understanding will have to be that the House will take a recess on Monday at 5 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, are conference reports in order under the special rule just adopted?

The SPEAKER. Conference reports are in order under the rule. They take precedence——

Mr. ROGERS. But are they in order under this special order?

The SPEAKER. They are. They take precedence even of a motion to adjourn.

Mr. CRISP. They might take up all the time covered by the special order.

Mr. BAKER. Oh, no; this report will take but a very short time.

The SPEAKER. Besides, the Chair understands that this matter will take but a moment.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I understood that the purpose of the Committee on Rules was that immediately after the reading of the Journal to-day this order should be adopted, with the view of commencing at once the debate on the silver question, in order that we might have three days for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest that the House can dispose of this conference report by raising the question of consideration, and undoubtedly the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] will withdraw the report if it creates discussion.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope he will allow us at once to proceed with the debate on the silver bill.

Mr. BAKER. This is a conference report relating to the funding act of Arizona. It is a matter of considerable importance to the Territory, and it will take but a moment to dispose of it, and there is no occasion to complain.

Mr. BLOUNT. But why take this time? There is occasion to complain.

Mr. BAKER. Not at all. Let us hear the report read——

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, the House has adopted a specific order. The rules have been changed to that extent, and I object to any interference with that order.

Mr. BAKER. I have been in daily receipt of letters and telegrams from the governor of Arizona in relation to this matter; the Delegate from Arizona is interested in having it disposed of, and it will take but a moment.

Mr. CRISP. That is not the question.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to appeal to the Chair——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no desire to decide this matter except in accordance with the rules of the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] rose and announced that he desired to present a conference report. The rule of the House provides that—

The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read, while the roll is being called, or the House is dividing on any proposition.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is very true, Mr. Speaker, but we are not acting now under those rules; we are acting under a special order reported from the Committee on Rules, which allows three days' debate on this subject, to-day, to-morrow, and Saturday until 3 o'clock.

Mr. BAKER. And by unanimous consent you have got Friday night added, and also leave to print. Now, what more do you want?

Mr. BLOUNT. It is manifest, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can raise the question of consideration and the House will dispose of it at once. The Chair does not believe that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] will undertake to press this matter in contravention of the will of the House.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I appeal to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] to withdraw his conference report. Whatever may be the rule, the understanding was that immediately upon the adoption of the special order we should enter upon the debate of the silver bill, and that understanding ought to be carried out, and the gentleman from New York ought not to insist, in my judgment, upon presenting his conference report at this time.

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the appeal, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw the report. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution requesting the President to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1293) for the relief of Charles F. Bowers, in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the resolution of the House directing the Clerk of the House of Represesentatives to correct an error in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4970) to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which concurrence was requested, the bill (H. R. 8591) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 1115) granting a pension to Arthur D. and Alfred A. Lyford.

SILVER-BULLION CERTIFICATES.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask the attention of the gentleman in charge of this measure [Mr. CONGER] to a question as to the division of the time for debate. If it is agreeable to that gentleman and the House that he shall have control of one-half of the time on that side and that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] shall control the other half on this side, I desire to ask unanimous consent for that arrangement.

The SPEAKER. What is the arrangement that the gentleman proposes?

Mr. BLOUNT. That the time allowed for debate be equally divided, and that the time occupied by the majority be under the control of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER], the chairman of the Committee on Weights and Measures, and the time on this side be under the control of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND].

Many MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. CONGER. When you speak of the two sides, you mean those favoring the bill and those opposing it?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONGER. I have no objection to that arrangement.

Mr. BLAND. Do I understand the gentleman to agree that the time be divided equally between those opposing the bill and those in favor of it?

Several MEMBERS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the precise effect of this proposition. Is the Chair to receive from the two gentlemen indicated lists of members for recognition?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, has the request of the gentleman from Georgia been submitted to the House?

The SPEAKER. It has not been. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] have control of the recognition of members opposed to the bill and that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER] control the recognition of the friends of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I do not see any necessity for taking away from the Speaker the power of recognition which belongs to him under the rules.

Mr. PAYSON. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Does this proposition include the power on the part of these two gentlemen, respectively, to indicate how much time may be occupied by members who take the floor?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would so understand.

Mr. PAYSON. Then I object to the arrangement. It is an unheard-of thing to allow three days' time to be parceled out by two members of the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to ask the gentleman whether there is any arrangement which would be agreeable to him. Suppose we provide that the time be equally divided between the two sides of the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think we had better proceed in regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. PAYSON. I have no objection to the last suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that call until I can make a statement.

The SPEAKER. It is the usual practice of the House to divide the time equally between the friends and the opponents of a bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is the usual practice; and the proposition I have made is in accordance with the usual practice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hardly thinks that is the fact.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I must differ from the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been called for.

Mr. HEARD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry or rather to a matter of information. I was not in the House when the order under which we are about to proceed was read; and I ask the Chair for information now as to when it will be in order to offer amendments, if any are to be offered, to this bill. If at 3 o'clock on Saturday the previous question is to be considered as ordered, when will it be in order, if at all, to offer amendments to the bill?

The SPEAKER. It will be in order after the bill has been read.

Mr. HEARD. That is just what I wanted to know.

Mr. SPRINGER. When will it be in order to have a vote on them?

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for and the bill will be read.

Mr. SPRINGER. I demand the reading of the bill at length.

Mr. BLOUNT. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does this debate proceed under the hour rule?

The SPEAKER. The debate proceeds under the hour rule.

The bill (H. R. 5381) authorizing the issue of Treasury notes on deposits of silver bullion was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any owner of silver bullion the product of the mines of the United States or of ores smelted or refined in the United States may deposit the same at any coinage mint or at any assay office in the United States that the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, and receive therefor Treasury notes hereinafter provided for, equal at the date of deposit to the net value of such silver, at the market price, such price to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, under rules and regulations prescribed, based upon the price current in the leading silver markets of the world; but no deposit consisting in whole or in part of silver bullion or foreign silver coins imported into this country, or bars resulting from melted or refined foreign silver coins, shall be received under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be prepared Treasury notes in such amounts as may be required for the purpose of the above section, and in such form and denominations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That no note shall be of a denomination less that $1 nor more than $1,000.

SEC. 3. That the notes issued under this act shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when received into the Treasury may be reissued, and such notes, when held by any national-banking association, shall be counted as part of its lawful reserve.

SEC. 4. That the notes issued under the provisions of this act shall be redeemed upon demand at the Treasury of the United States or at the office of an assistant treasury of the United States by the issue of a certificate of deposit for the sum of the notes so presented, payable at one of the mints of the United States, in an amount of silver bullion equal in value, on the date of said certificate, to the number of dollars stated therein, at the market price of silver, to be determined as provided in section 1; or such notes may be redeemed in gold coin at the option of the Government: *Provided*, That upon demand of the holder such notes shall be redeemed in silver dollars.

SEC. 5. That when the market price of silver, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall exceed $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to refuse to receive deposits of silver bullion for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. That it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President of the United States, to suspend, temporarily, the receipt of silver bullion for Treasury notes at any time when he is satisfied that through combinations or speculative manipulation of the market the price of silver is arbitrary, nominal, or fictitious.

SEC. 7. That the silver bullion deposited under this act, represented by Treasury notes which have been redeemed in gold coin or in silver dollars, may be coined into standard silver dollars or any other denomination of silver coin now authorized by law, for the purpose of replacing the coin used in the redemption of the notes.

SEC. 8. That so much of the act of February 28, 1878, entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character," as requires the monthly purchase and coinage into silver dollars of not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. That any gain or seigniorage arising from the coinage which may be executed under the provisions of this act shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury as provided by existing law.

SEC. 10. That silver bullion received under the provisions of this act shall be subject to the requirements of existing law, and the regulations of the mint service governing the methods of receipt, determining the amount of pure silver contained, and the amount of charges or deductions, if any, to be made.

SEC. 11. That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the purchase, from time to time, as may be required, of silver bullion for the subsidiary silver coinage.

SEC. 12. That a sum sufficient to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 13. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 14. That this act shall take effect thirty days from and after its passage.

Mr. CONGER. I desire to offer a substitute. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill just read, and substitute what I send to the desk.

Mr. McCOMAS. And I desire to offer an amendment to be pending as an amendment to that substitute.

The SPEAKER. The proposed substitute will first be read.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to know whether the amendment now offered is a bill which members can send for and obtain. I observe it is a long bill; and I would like to know whether we can get it.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROGERS. I hope the gentleman who offers the amendment will give us that information. Is this amendment a bill which we can get by sending to the document-room?

Mr. CONGER. You can get it; but there are some amendments to it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it will be printed in the RECORD of to-morrow morning.

Mr. BLAND. I object to undertaking to debate a proposition which we have no opportunity to examine.

The SPEAKER. It will be read to the House. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER].

The Clerk read the proposed substitute, as follows:

Substitute submitted by Mr. CONGER, namely: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to purchase from time to time silver bullion to the aggregate amount of $4,500,000 worth in each month, at the market price thereof, not exceeding $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, and to issue in payment for such purchases of silver bullion Treasury notes of the United States to be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury, in such form and of such denominations, not less than $1 nor more $1,000, as he may prescribe, and a sum sufficient to carry into effect the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

"SEC. 2. That the Treasury notes issued in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be redeemable on demand, in coin, at the Treasury of the United States, or at the office of any assistant treasurer of the United States, and when so redeemed may be reissued; but no greater or less amount of such notes shall be outstanding at any time than the cost of the silver bullion then held in the Treasury purchased by such notes; and such Treasury notes shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract, and shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued; and such notes when held by any national banking association may be counted as a part of its lawful reserve: *Provided*, That upon demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes herein provided for the Secretary of the Treasury may, at his discretion and under such regulations as he shall prescribe, exchange for such notes an amount of silver bullion which shall be equal in value at the market price thereof on the day of exchange to the amount of such notes presented.

"SEC. 3 That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin such portion of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for, and any gain or seigniorage arising from such coinage shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury.

"SEC. 4. That the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act shall be subject to the requirements of existing law and the regulations of the mint service governing the methods of determining the amount of pure silver contained, and the amount of charges or deductions, if any, to be made.

"SEC. 5. That so much of the act of February 28, 1878, entitled 'An act to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character,' as requires the monthly purchase and coinage of the same into silver dollars of not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. That whenever the market price of silver, as determined in pursuance of section 1 of this act, is $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, it shall be lawful for the owner of any silver bullion to deposit the same at any coinage m nt of the United States, to be formed into standard silver dollars for his benefit, as provided in the act of January 18, 1837.

"SEC. 7. That upon the passage of this act the balances standing with the Treasurer of the United States to the respective credits of the national banks for deposits made to redeem the circulating notes of such banks, and all deposits thereafter received for like purpose, shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt, and the Treasurer of the United States shall redeem from the general cash in the Treasury the circulating notes of said banks which may come into his possession subject to redemption; and upon the certificate of the Comptroller of the Currency that such notes have been received by him and that they have been destroyed and that no new notes will be issued in their place, reimbursement of their amount shall be made to the Treasurer, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, from an appropriation hereby created, to be known as 'National-bank notes; redemption account;' but the provisions of this act shall not apply to the deposits received under section 3 of the act of June 20, 1874, requiring every national bank to keep in lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States a sum equal to 5 per cent. of its circulation, to be held and used for the redemption of its circulating notes; and the balance remaining of the deposits so covered shall, at the close of each month, be reported on the monthly public-debt statement as debt of the United States bearing no interest.

"SEC. 8. That this act shall take effect thirty days from and after its passage."

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the subtitute.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized to offer an amendment, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding to section 6:

"And purchases of silver bullion shall be suspended while it is being so deposited for coinage."

Mr. TAYLOR, of Illinois. I offer an amendment to the original bill.

Mr. BLAND. I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized to offer an amendment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have risen to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to section 1 of the original bill: "*Provided*, That if the net amount of silver bullion received in accordance herewith and not paid out as hereinafter provided shall be less than $2,000,000 worth in any one month, it shall then be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase, during the succeeding month, at the market price, not exceeding however $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, an amount of silver bullion equal to such deficiency, and to issue in payment therefor Treasury notes hereinafter provided for."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. O'DONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further amendment to the original bill.

The SPEAKER. The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "three."

Mr. CONGER was recognized.

Mr. BLAND. I desire to offer a substitute for the two amendments.

The SPEAKER. It will not be in order.

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, when will it be in order——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has been recognized.

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a question of order. There have been two amendments offered to the original bill. I now desire to offer a substitute for the two. That is certainly in order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. McCREARY. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BLAND. I want to know if it is not in order under parliamentary proceedings to offer a substitute at this time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is not in order. The gentleman from Iowa in charge of the bill has been recognized.

Mr. BLAND. I rose to a parliamentary inquiry. I certainly have a right to an answer to my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine that question when the amendment is offered.

Mr. BLAND. Then will the Chair recognize me to offer a substitute?

The SPEAKER. That is another matter altogether.

Mr. BLAND. Yes, evidently.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. McCREARY. I have been trying for some time to make myself heard in order to secure recognition of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman will recognize the difficulty of obtaining recognition of the Chair when another gentleman has already got it. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCREARY. But I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] offered an amendment to the substitute, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAYLOR] offered an amendment, and then the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'DONNELL] offered a further amendment.

Now, my friend and colleague from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] desires to offer a substitute for one or all of the pending amendments and asked recognition for that purpose. He rose in time and addressed the Chair. Other gentlemen were recognized. Now, I desire to know when it will be in order for his substitute to be presented, and when will it be in order for an amendment to be offered from this side of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Kentucky understands the rules of the House to such an extent that it is impossible to instruct him further.

Mr. McCREARY. If there is anything in the rules of the House forbidding this, I do not know it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. McCREARY. Was the Speaker making his ruling on the resolution adopted by the House this morning?

The SPEAKER. Precisely.

Mr. McCREARY. Which, as construed, excludes us from offering amendments.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Kentucky understands that, why does he ask the Chair for information? [Laughter.]

Mr. McCREARY. I wanted to get a ruling from the Speaker as to the order to be enforced.

The SPEAKER. If the question arises the Speaker will rule according to the rules of the House.

Mr. McCREARY. The reason I asked was to get instructions from the Speaker on that point.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair hopes the gentleman is satisfied with the instructions he has received. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCREARY. They are not altogether satisfactory. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an order be made authorizing the printing of the substitute bill, which has just been read, in bill form, with the amendments proposed to the same.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, there is no necessity for that. Let it be printed after we vote.

Mr. BLAND. It will be printed in the RECORD, I suppose, but I hope it will be printed in bill form for the convenience of the House.

Mr. McCOMAS. I suggest that a double quantity be provided.

Mr. HEARD. I move as an amendment that double the quantity be printed, and that they be equally divided among the members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that double the usual number of bills be printed, together with the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HEARD. And be equally divided.

Mr. BLAND. I hope it will be understood that the bills so ordered printed will be ready here in time in the morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker, the silver question has become one of the most important, and at the same time most difficult of satisfactory solution, of any that are now pending before Congress or the country. It has been continuously agitated and discussed for the past fifteen years; theorized upon and prophesied about, and yet during all this time the conditions which surround it have each day made its immediate solution more difficult.

I shall not attempt to recite the history of silver nor to discuss the philosophy of its use as money, but, leaving that to my distinguished friends who are to follow, shall content myself with a few practical suggestions on the present unfortunate situation and the bill proposed for relief.

The time has arrived in which something must be done, and whatever the solution may be it should be wise, conservative, and judicious, and yet at the same time liberal, comprehensive, and courageous.

The settlement must be made on facts and logical conclusions, not on mere fancy or vain hope.

The conditions must control, and not the theory.

We must take the conditions as we find them and meet the demands in a practical way.

Silver is and always has been one of the twin money metals of the world, and for generations walked side by side with gold. But now it has been outlawed or discriminated against by the great commercial nations of the globe.

The United States furnishes about 45 per cent. of the entire world's production of silver, and yet in 1873—no matter how nor for what purpose—our Government, by legislative enactment, joined in the general crusade against this metal, and gold has become the principal standard of value in the great markets of the world. Since that date the price of silver, as compared with gold, has fallen 30 per cent., or at least the two metals have parted company to that extent.

Our business and population are marvelously increasing, and a corresponding increase of money is demanded. By reason of approaching maturity and consequent high price of bonds our national-bank circulation is being rapidly retired. We are now purchasing $2,000,000 worth of silver each month and coining it into dollars. There is great depression in some branches of industry, notably that of agriculture, the largest and most important of all, and in which more than half of our entire population is directly or indirectly engaged.

These, then, are the conditions to be met, and therefore the objects to be attained by legislation are to restore silver to its old place by the side of gold, increase its use, and so appreciate its value, increase the volume of our currency, raise prices of farm and other products, give relief to all depressed conditions, and finally coax or compel some international agreement that will make the desired situation stable and permanent, but at the same time do nothing that shall imperil values, endanger business, or greatly risk personal or national credit and prosperity.

Every possible measure has been proposed and every sort of solution suggested, from the closing of our mints to silver by the man who believes only in gold, to the immediate opening of our doors to the free and unlimited coinage of all the silver of the world by him who puts all his trust in that metal.

The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures have given patient hearings to all, to the suggestions of men who have given the question years of study, to those of practical experience, to Representatives who have introduced favorite measures, and to the distingished Secretary of the Treasury, whose personal experience and successful refunding operations during a previous term of service entitled his suggestions to careful consideration and great weight.

We recognize the fact that no measure can be satisfactory to all men, nor to all parts of the country. You might as well expect the Laplander and the Hottentot to exchange residences and then each insist that the climate of his new home was delightful.

In a great country like this, with interests so divergent, all general legislation must of necessity be a sort of compromise. So the bill we have offered to-day exactly suits no one. I am sure it is not just such a law as my gold friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] would have prepared if left to himself; neither is it the ideal measure of my silver friend from Nevada [Mr. BARTINE]; nor is it entirely satisfactory to me. I have believed and still believe that the bill first reported and now on our Calendar was the best.

But this is a bill which a majority of the committee believe will greatly improve the present status and make a long stride in the direction in which we ought to go. It is a plain, simple, practical plan, experimental it is true, yet one which meets all the demands of the bimetallists, except that of immediate and absolute free coinage, and it is a most important preparation for that step, an end which under this scheme may be hoped for at no distant day.

The first section of the bill directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase $4,500,000 worth of pure silver each month at the market price, not exceeding $1 for 371¼ grains, and to pay for the same in Treasury notes prepared for the purpose. This will take substantially the entire product of the mines and smelters of this country.

Our product last year, including Mexican ore smelted and refined here, was 60,000,000 ounces. About 6,000,000 was used in the arts, leaving 54,000,000 for purchase, practically the amount required under this bill at the present price, which is about $1 per ounce.

This measure will add 54,000,000 new Treasury notes each year to our circulation. And these notes go at once into circulation, the Secretary being compelled to pay out these, and only these, in purchase of the bullion, while under the present law the Secretary pays for it with any funds on hand, and the coin may be represented by certificates or it may, as much of it does now, lie idle in the vaults, without any representation whatever in the circulation of our country.

In my judgment fixing an absolute limit to the amount which must be purchased every thirty days may lead to speculative attempts at cornering, etc., which may prove dangerous, if not disastrous. But the more conservative element has yielded this point to our extreme silver friends, with the assurance from them and the hope that we may be mistaken. As bearing upon this feature of the bill, I will append to my remarks in the RECORD some valuable statistics in regard to the production and distribution of silver and gold the world over, furnished by the able and experienced Director of the Mint and by Mr. Ivan C. Michel, one of the most reliable statisticians in regard to precious metals in America.

From these many obvious conclusions will be deduced as to the scope and effect of this legislation which it is not necessary for me now to take time to discuss.

Section 2 provides for the redemption of the notes, namely, in coin, *i. e.*, gold or silver coin, or, if the holder demands it, the Secretary may, at his discretion, pay out bullion. This insures the redemption in the best money we have, if desired. Or if, peradventure, the best can not be received, the holder knows that he can demand a dollar's worth of silver bullion. But it is not believed that redemption will be required, but that faith in the Government, and absolute knowledge of its ability always to pay, will keep the notes continually and permanently in circulation.

The bullion proviso in this section, while only the shadow of that in the original bill reported to the House, yet is practically the only real

conservative feature of the substitute, and ought to be conceded by all; for it both adds credit to the notes and gives the Government the opportunity to protect itself in case danger should arise, and it also furnishes the opportunity to the public to procure silver bars from the mint, just as gold bars can now be procured under existing law, and I believe silver should be treated as well as gold.

Whether the prophecies of the silver men or the gold men shall come true, or neither, this feature of the bill makes it absolutely certain that come what may, happen what will, the man who owns one of these notes, whether earned by the sweat of his face or won in speculation, whether in strong-box of the capitalist or in the sacred fund of the small savings-bank depositor, will at all times and under all circumstances positively know that his dollar will always be worth 100 cents. But without this feature that assurance can not be had, unless we should authorize the Secretary to sell bonds to procure gold in case the necessity for its use shall ever arise. Our people seem to be unwilling to perpetuate our bonded indebtedness for any purpose, and so I insist that the bullion redemption clause should be left in this bill.

It is charged that this provision furnishes the opportunity for collusion between the Secretary of the Treasury and the holder of Treasury notes to buy and sell the same bullion over and over, and so prevent the increase of circulation, as intended or expected. But there is nothing in this, for no inducement can exist for such manipulation. The bullion of the world will be for sale, and neither the owners thereof nor the holders of the notes could possibly profit by its depreciation.

Such a charge, Mr. Speaker, can only be based upon the assumption that we are to have occupying the exalted position of Secretary of the Treasury a man devoid of conscience, a scoundrel fit only for the penitentiary. And the fact is, if such a thing should ever be attempted by any Secretary, he would at once be impeached or removed in disgrace.

The proposition is so utterly improbable and preposterous that I dismiss it without further comment.

Section 3 directs the Secretary to coin whatever amount of bullion may be necessary to redeem notes presented for redemption in coin, thus fully preserving the coinage and money principle and absolutely exploding the charge that silver is to be treated simply as a commodity.

Section 4 is simply administrative and directed to the management of and accounting for the bullion at the Mint.

Section 5 repeals so much of the act of 1878 as requires the monthly purchase and coinage of not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth of bullion, but does not affect the legal-tender character of the standard silver dollar.

Section 6 provides that whenever the market price of silver, as determined in pursuance of section 1 of this act, is $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, it shall be lawful for the owner of any silver bullion, the deposit of which for notes is herein provided for, to deposit the same at any coinage mint of the United States, to be formed into standard silver dollars for his benefit, as provided in the act of January 18, 1837. And by the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McComas] purchase of bullion shall close while the mints are open, so that we will not be buying $4,500,000 worth and coining free at the same time.

Section 7 repeals certain provisions of law which require a special fund to be held for the redemption of notes of national-banking associations, the effect of which is simply to unlock about $70,000,000 which is now held as a special fund to redeem the notes of national banks that have become insolvent, gone into liquidation, reduced their circulation, or surrendered their charters, and which can be used for no other purpose. This covers it into the Treasury whence it can be paid out and thus add that much more to our volume of circulation.

The notes issued under this bill are a full legal tender. It is true some of the ablest lawyers at both ends of the Capitol think that even under the latitude of the late legal-tender decisions no warrant can be found for clothing them with this function. But certainly no harm can result and much good may, and because we want the best money possible we have given them this power, and we hope our judgment will be indorsed by the House.

While it is neither expected nor believed that, under the administration of this law, much of the bullion will be coined, yet it preserves the right and empowers the Secretary to coin every ounce of it, if it shall be necessary.

But it is quite evident, from our experience under the present law, that we have already an amount of silver coin very much in excess of any demand; for, although the Treasury Department will ship silver dollars to any and all points free of expense, yet it has during all the years since 1878 been able to put out and keep in circulation less than $60,000,000, while we have piled up in our vaults $295,000,000 represented by certificates.

The people do not want more of the coin; but they do want its paper representative, and they do not care whether it is based on bars or on coin.

We have, therefore, gone to all the trouble of coinage, with the necessary expense and wastage, to no purpose whatever, since the bars stored in our vaults would answer every legitimate demand. Under the proposed law every ounce of silver purchased will be represented by paper in our circulation, while under the present one the silver is bought with current funds, coined, and then much of it piled up in the vaults without any representation in our circulating volume, and frequently the amount of this unrepresented or "dead silver" has reached the enormous sum of seventy, eighty, and even ninety millions of dollars.

It is claimed by many, and the statement is frequently reiterated by the press, that our currency has recently been suffering a serious contraction. The statement is not borne out by the facts, but on the contrary our circulation has considerably increased every year since 1878. The total circulation of all kinds on March 1 of that year, as shown by the books of the Treasury, was $805,793,807.

Mr. PAYSON. What does that include?

Mr. CONGER. That includes every thing that was in circulation, gold, silver, and paper.

On October 1, 1889, the amount was $1,405,018,000, showing a total expansion of $599,224,193. During that time the increase of population has only been about 33 per cent., while the circulation has increased over 74 per cent. The per capita circulation was only $16.50 in 1878; but in 1889 it was $21.75.

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Speaker, will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question? The figures which the gentleman from Iowa gives, if I understand it, make a statement of the amounts of currency of different kinds outstanding, including everything that has been issued from the mints and everything that has been issued from the Treasury, without regard to the vast amounts of money that are absolutely tied up and practically as dead as though they had never been issued. Am I not correct in making that statement?

Mr. CONGER. That is not right; but if the gentleman will allow me——

Mr. PAYSON. Now, can the gentleman from Iowa state, so that the House may understand, what as a matter of fact the actual per capita circulation is in the United States? I do not mean what amount ought to be in circulation, if all issued was actually used, but what amount is in active circulation?

Mr. CONGER. This is the fact as nearly as it can be ascertained in the entire country. It is presumable that the per cent. in actual circulation of the total volume in 1878 would be the same as the per cent. in circulation of the total volume in circulation to-day.

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand—and I ask this so that we may understand the facts in what we are trying to do here—the total amount in circulation as given by the gentleman from Iowa is one billion four hundred and some odd millions of dollars; and it is upon that basis, dividing that amount of money by the population of the United States, that he arrives at the per capita circulation.

Now, I understand the fact to be, and I think I will be able to demonstrate it when the time comes for me to take part in this debate, that as a matter of fact there is to-day less than $900,000,000 of money in actual circulation in this country; in other words, that $700,000,000 of this money, embraced in the figures made by the gentleman from Iowa, are tied up and are as dead as though that amount had never been issued. The fact is this, as I believe: This amount given by the gentleman from Iowa is made up from statements by the officers of the Mint, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Register of the Treasury. All money issued, of every kind, is charged up to circulation; but no account is taken of the vast sums held in reserve by the Government, as well as the banking institutions of the country, nor of the vast sums lost by actual destruction in the conflagrations of great cities, as in Chicago, Boston, etc., nor of the natural destruction by ordinary use, nor of gold hoarded, nor of gold taken abroad and spent, and numerous other losses, obvious without statement.

The statement of the gentleman is therefore misleading, and badly so. This I can show.

Mr. CONGER. I will be glad if the gentleman can show that; but he can not, for the figures represent only the actual circulation outside the Treasury, and not a dollar held therein as reserve or for any other purpose. Of course, I can not tell, neither can the gentleman from Illinois tell, how much is hoarded by banks and individuals; but the fact remains the same, that the per cent. of the total volume of circulation that was in use in 1878 is just the same to-day, and I divided that eight hundred and five million by the population in 1878 just the same as I divide the one billion four hundred and five million by the population to-day, and that gives the per capita circulation as correctly at one time as another, and the per cent. of increase would be the same, regardless of how much was tied up, as the gentleman says.

Mr. PAYSON. But you do not take into consideration the amount that is tied up.

Mr. CONGER. Certainly I do; but I do not agree with the gentleman's guess, and it is only a guess, as to the amount tied up; the proportionate amount tied up or lost would be the same at one time as at another—the same in 1878 as in 1889.

Mr. PAYSON. Not at all, because there are $100,000,000 in gold tied up in the Treasury now as a reserve fund, to protect the $340,000,000 in greenbacks outstanding, that might just as well be in the mines as in the Treasury, as far as circulation is concerned. I can show the gentleman where there are millions and millions of dollars of other reserves; this I shall be glad to call the attention of the House to when my time comes to address the House.

Mr. CONGER. Do you not know that that $100,000,000 and more was also there in 1878.

Mr. PAYSON. No, sir, because the law authorizing it was not passed until 1879.

Mr. CONGER. There is really no law authorizing it now. But the resumption act was passed in 1875, and by 1878 a considerable portion of the redemption fund was collected in the Treasury.

Mr. PAYSON. I only wish to understand the gentleman from Iowa as we go along.

Mr. CONGER. I will be glad to have you show the date of the passage of the bill authorizing the $100,000,000 gold redemption fund.

Mr. PAYSON. I will show it.

Mr. CONGER. Of course I have not time to go to the records now, but when you do go to the records you will find it as I state.

I will print tables, Mr. Speaker, which will show the fact more in detail, and the gentleman from Illinois can find in those tables a sufficient and accurate answer to his question.

Notwithstanding this increase in circulation I join in the general belief that we need more money, and this bill will furnish it. As a compromise, this bill for the present meets fairly well every demand.

If wisely administered, the apprehensions of the most conservative will be avoided; the silver producer who demands the largest use of his product finds a market for the entire output of this country. The farmer who believes an increased money volume will bring better prices and relieve the great depression which his calling now experiences will find $60,000,000 or more added annually to our circulation; and all who hope for good from the permanent establishment of bimetallism will find realization from the operation of this measure.

I believe in silver and in its largest possible use as money, and believe we should have free coinage at a fixed ratio at the earliest possible date; but we should reach it under conditions that will be safe and permanent. But with the present attitude of the great commercial nations of the world toward silver it would be neither wise nor safe for this Government to attempt it alone.

The world's market has, for the present at least, established the value of silver at its present price, namely, 33 per cent. less than gold, and free coinage here means simply that this Government alone shall undertake to raise the price of all the silver in the world one-third and keep it there. In my judgment and in the judgment of many of the wisest and ablest financiers and statesmen of our day, this can not be done without serious disturbance to all values and the risk of such financial disaster as neither this nor any other Government could stand.

On the 1st day of March, 1890, the credit of the Government was already carrying at a nominal value—

Of standard silver dollars	$58,850,380
Of subsidiary silver	53,950,382
Of silver certificates	284,176,262
Of United States notes	337,087,151
Of national-bank notes	187,928,229
In all	921,992,384

Of this amount the United States notes owe their whole value to the public faith, and the other items are upheld on a par with gold by the readiness of the Government to receive them as equivalent to gold and by its ability to pay gold to creditors if they so demand.

To uphold its credit under this burden the Government had on that day of gold $100,000,000 in its legal-tender reserve and $87,988,948 besides.

Now, if in addition to this burden we undertake to carry the silver of the world and should fail, we will, instead of establishing bimetallism, have driven our own country to the single silver standard, and, surrendering the high commercial place now occupied, must take our place by the side of China, Mexico, and India. Then the gold-using nations would make out of the United States the same profits of exchange which it is alleged England now extorts from India.

For theorize as we may the fact remains and should not be lost sight of that the commerce of the world is based on gold as the standard or value, and the balances of trade and the exchanges of products among the great commercial Governments, even those using silver, are uniformly settled to-day in gold, or, if in silver, at its gold valuation.

Our duty, then, as men charged with a great public trust, is to so legislate as to force silver to bear its full share of trade burdens and at the same time relieve the pressure somewhat from gold, and compel them both together to bear the weight of the world's exchanges.

As before stated we produce nearly one-half of the silver of the world. But if we open wide the doors of our mints and fix the price at $1 for 371¼ grains, the price must come up all over the world or else all the silver will come here.

It would at once add $30,000,000 to the value of the foreign product of last year alone, without any advantage whatever to us, but with possibly the disadvantage of furnishing the foreign owners with a market for it at the increased price.

Free coinage at once means still more. It means a profit of 26 cents on every dollar's worth of bullion taken to our mint. It means that the bullion-owners of this country can take their $50,000,000 worth of bullion to the mint and walk away with $63,000,000, pocketing at once a clear profit of $13,000,000, and the tax-payers must pay it; while under the present practice, or under the proposed law, the Government makes whatever seigniorage there is. And last year this amounted to over $9,000,000, and since 1878 it has in the aggregate amounted to $56,000,000, which has been covered into the Treasury and been used to pay the current expenses of the Government.

It is claimed, Mr. Speaker, that if we should open our mints to free coinage the other great nations would be forced to open theirs; that a strong silver party is growing up in England and on the Continent, and that France is anxious to take the step. But the legal ratio between the two metals in France is 15½ to 1, while ours is 16 to 1, and she knows that the moment she unlocked her mints, our silver, both bullion and dollars, would be poured in there and overwhelm her. It is also susceptible of demonstration that opening our mints, and thus loosening our gold, would, instead of inviting to free coinage, be an added inducement for other Governments to further demonetize silver.

Take the situation of France again. Lying between the gold-using countries of England and Germany, she has been trying for years to reach a single gold standard, and while in forty years her silver coin has increased only $200,000,000 her gold has increased more than $800,000,000. She could, even at the difference in our ratios, exchange her silver for our gold with comparatively little loss. The Bank of France holds $250,000,000 of silver as the basis for the same amount of paper circulation; but as such basis it only has its bullion value, and that is $190,000,000 in gold; the balance is simply upheld by the credit of the Government. She could, therefore, exchange this silver for gold and float the same amount of paper with equal ease.

It is also claimed by the advocates of free and unlimited coinage that our Government is great enough, rich enough, and powerful enough to do whatever we please in this line; that we can open our mints and defy the world.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to no man in admiration for my country and appreciation of her strength and credit. I know we are the richest and the strongest Government on the face of the globe and I know we have a credit far beyond that of any other nation in the world. I know, and I glory in the fact, that wherever our flag floats among civilized men it is the symbol of a promise that is payment itself. But it is so because of our always wise, safe, and honest financial legislation, and it always will be so, for I believe the good sense of our law-makers will still hold us inside "the danger line of peril."

We ought to get to free coinage of silver at the earliest possible date. But we must have some of the other great commercial nations join with us in the effort. It is true several attempts have already been made in that direction, but always with unsatisfactory results. Yet it is believed by those best able to judge that the time is now ripening for successful negotiations it attempted. The trend of our legislation should therefore be in that direction, and not away from it. This bill is a step, and a very long one, on that line. If passed and fairly executed, as it will be, it will surely pave the way for a succeeding Congress to open the doors and rehabilitate the white metal with all the power and crown her with all the dignity now enjoyed by her yellow sister.

Mr. Speaker, it is a favorite argument with some of our extreme silver friends that our volume of currency is grossly inadequate to our needs, and they cite the per capita circulation of France for proof. Why, sir, the circulation per capita is larger in the United States than in any of the leading countries of Europe, except France; and when we take into consideration our greater number of banks, our unparalleled national and individual credits, and our innumerable facilities for making a single dollar do countless duties by checks, drafts, certificates of deposit, exchange, express, telephone, and telegraphic orders, etc., many of which are unknown in France, we really have a larger and more effective per capita circulation than even that country.

The following table shows by way of comparison the estimated amount of gold, silver, and paper money in circulation in the United States and the principal countries in Europe:

Statement of the estimated amount of gold, silver, and notes in circulation in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the United States.

Countries.	Population.	Gold.	Silver.	Notes outstanding.	Total metallic and paper.
France	38,250,000	$900,000,000	$700,000,000	$594,000,000	$2,194,000,000
United Kingdom	38,165,000	550,000,000	200,000,000	190,000,000	840,000,000
Germany	48,000,000	500,000,000	215,000,000	275,000,000	990,000,000
United States	64,000,000	375,607,112	116,298,802	938,728,545	1,430,634,459

Per capita.

Countries.	Gold.	Silver.	Paper.	Total.
France	$23.53	$18.30	$15.53	$57.56
United Kingdom	14.41	2.62	4.98	22.01
Germany	10.42	4.48	5.73	20.63
United States	5.87	1.82	14.67	22.36

In France gold and silver coins are the investments of the peasantry. Their savings are not deposited in banks or loaned out as here, but hidden away in the proverbial stocking or earthen pot, to be brought out only in time of personal need or at the demand of the Government, as was the case when the great war indemnity was so quickly paid to Germany.

At least two-thirds of the gold and silver coin in France is thus hidden away, and might as well have remained forever uncoined, so far as any exchanges in trade or commerce are concerned.

I wish it distinctly understood that I am not making this argument to disprove the present necessity for a larger circulation here, but simply to show the extreme, unfair, and untruthful lengths to which the bullion-owners or their advocates in this Congress are willing to go to gain their cause; for, disguise it as they may, this contention is one between the silver-mine owners and bullion speculators on the one hand and the business welfare and best interests of our 65,000,000 of people on the other.

It is true the former have called to their aid all that element which believes in and which has for the past fifteen years advocated and fought for *fiat* money, and they have also taken advantage of the present agricultural situation, and by means of specious arguments, illogical conclusions, and false promises have prevailed upon some of our farmer friends to lend themselves as cats'-paws to pull their (bullion-owners') chestnuts out of the fire.

It will be represented on this floor, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great clamor by the people and a general demand, especially from the farmer, for immediate free coinage. I have given careful and thorough investigation to this matter, and do not believe the statement. All winter long, Mr. Speaker, a powerful silver lobby has been operating about this city, a lobby paid for and supported by the bonanza mine and bullion owners. They have been faithful to their trust. They have been persistent in season and out of season, have plied their vocation at Capitol, hotel, and private residence.

From their headquarters printed petitions by the thousands for free coinage have been sent all over this land, with urgent appeals "to sign and return." And yet at the time our bill was reported to the House less than one hundred, with less than twenty-five names on each, had been returned, and found their way to the Coinage Committee of this House.

The purpose of these men is not to establish bimetallism in this country, but is unmistakably to drive us to a single silver basis. The arguments of their ablest and most effective advocates at the other end of the Capitol abundantly prove this, and they openly admit that they prefer such a situation.

They clearly show how, under present conditions, England is enabled to mercilessly rob her helpless subjects in India, and yet they are willing, if only the price of their bullion can be enhanced thereby, to surround us by the same conditions and plunge us down to a situation in which she can practice the same piracies upon us.

Gentlemen, do you know what a single silver standard means in this country? It means Mexicanization. It means an additional element of cost to be added to every dollar's worth of our imports, an additional tax upon every dollar's worth of our exports, for exchange must be drawn and settlements made in gold, but made through the medium of silver, and as that would be subject to rapid and material fluctuations the exchange will always involve a question of speculation. For this risk the broker must be paid, and the producers and the consumers must pay him.

This expense could not normally be less than 8 per cent. or 10 per cent., and would place an additional annual burden upon our people of more than $100,000,000.

The deplorable condition of a silver-using country has been so ably and truthfully portrayed by Mr. M. L. Scudder, jr., in a recent article on Mexico, as to merit the considerate attention of every one. I shall not take the time of the House to quote from or read it, but shall print it with my remarks, and I hope every member on this floor will carefully peruse it.

Sir, I have taken my stand with the sixty millions of toilers and tax-payers of my country as against the handful of bullion-owners and silver-speculators.

Gentlemen may do as they please, but while I retain my reason or my conscience I will never vote for a measure that will drive the intelligent farmer or laborer of my country down to the awful condition of the peons of Mexico, the coolies of China, and the ryots of India. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is claimed that by reason of the act of 1873 a great and unjust burden was placed upon the debtor class; that it takes more of labor and its products for the farmer to pay interest on his mortgage now than then.

There is no force whatever in this statement, because ninety-nine-hundredths of the mortgages now upon the Western farms have been placed there during the last five years, and at a rate of interest more than 30 per cent. less than in 1873.

But the farmer has something else to do with the products of his farm than to pay interest and mortgages. He must buy clothing, food, and comforts for his family, and all of these are very much cheaper, and hence require much less of product and labor to pay for them than in 1873.

There is another condition the farmer must face. Should we so legislate as to make silver money plenty and cheap and at the same time drive gold into hiding or make it scarce, the frightened owner of loans and mortgages will demand immediate payment at maturity, and will not renew, except upon promise to pay in gold, and so bring upon borrowers and debtors a calamitous condition far more burdensome than the present status. Such instructions are already being sent by loan companies to their agents, and gold notes and mortgages are being prepared everywhere, in view of threatened free-coinage legislation.

This question, Mr. Speaker, should be approached from every side, and, as I said in the beginning, the conditions must control, and not the theory, and I very much prefer a practical, helpful, homely fact to any unsubstantial will-o'-the-wisp theory, however pretty and inviting it may be.

I want bimetallism. I want to see silver brought back to its old place by the side of gold, not only here, but in all the great commercial nations of the earth. I want a larger volume of good, sound money. I want better prices, better pay for labor, and better conditions for all my countrymen. The enactment of this bill into law will hasten their realization; immediate free coinage will not.

It is true that some of our farmers are in sore distress and are looking in every direction for help, and panaceas are being offered them on every hand. One tells them that the sugar-beet industry is to lift them from their slough of despond; another insists that the suppression of gambling in their products by bucket shops and boards of trade is to be their only salvation; another that the destruction of trusts and combines will bring relief, and another that certain changes in the tariff will help them up; another that certain amendments to the national-bank acts will give material aid; and still another that in more silver is their only hope.

But the truth is that in no one of these is there complete relief, but some in each and much in all. Gentlemen, your constituents are not imbeciles; you can not fool them with mere sentiment. They know their prices are down, and they believe that an increased volume of currency will raise them. They want more money and they want it quick, but they also want it good; and they want it under such conditions as will keep it good—such conditions as will give relief and at the same time make relief permanent. These conditions first and free coinage afterward. I believe both should come, and I believe both will come under the administration of this act, and your constituents believe it also.

Mr. Speaker, we have promised the country that this should be a business Congress. So far it is splendidly fulfilling that promise. Let us, gentlemen, emphasize that fulfillment by the speedy enactment of this bill.

In it there is much of hope for all, promise for increased remuneration for toil, for enhanced price of farm products, fresh impetus for all business and trade, greater confidence in investments, and stable and permanent financial improvement everywhere. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

The amount and kinds of money in actual circulation on certain dates from 1878 to 1889.

[From report of Secretary of the Treasury.]

Year.	Date.	Total circulation.	Gold coin.	Standard silver dollars.	Subsidiary silver.
1878	March 1	$805,793,807	$82,530,163	.....	$53,573,833
1879	October 1	862,579,754	123,698,157	$11,074,230	54,088,747
1880	October 1	1,022,033,685	261,320,920	22,914,075	48,368,543
1881	October 1	1,147,892,435	328,118,146	32,230,038	47,859,327
1882	October 1	1,188,752,363	358,351,956	33,801,231	47,153,750
1883	October 1	1,236,650,032	346,077,784	39,783,527	48,170,263
1884	October 1	1,261,569,924	341,485,480	40,322,042	45,344,717
1885	October 1	1,286,630,871	318,268,740	45,275,710	51,328,206
1886	October 1	1,264,889,561	364,894,599	60,170,793	48,176,838
1887	October 1	1,353,485,690	391,090,890	60,614,524	50,414,706
1888	October 1	1,384,340,280	377,329,865	57,959,356	52,020,975
1889	October 1	1,405,018,000	375,947,715	57,554,100	52,931,352

Year.	Date.	Gold certificates.	Silver certificates.	United States notes.*	National-bank notes
1878	March 1	$44,364,100	.....	$311,436,971	$313,888,740
1879	October 1	14,843,200	$1,176,720	327,747,762	329,950,938
1880	October 1	7,480,100	12,203,191	329,417,403	340,329,453
1881	October 1	5,239,320	52,590,180	327,655,884	354,199,540
1882	October 1	4,907,440	63,204,780	325,272,858	356,060,348
1883	October 1	55,014,940	78,921,961	321,356,596	347,324,961
1884	October 1	87,389,660	96,491,251	325,786,143	324,750,271
1885	October 1	118,137,790	93,656,716	318,736,684	311,227,025
1886	October 1	84,691,807	95,387,112	310,161,935	301,406,477
1887	October 1	97,984,683	154,354,826	329,070,804	269,955,257
1888	October 1	134,838,190	218,561,601	306,052,053	237,578,240
1889	October 1	116,675,349	276,619,715	325,510,758	199,779,011

*Includes outstanding clearing-house certificates of the act of June 8, 1872.

Comparison between March 1, 1878, *and October* 1, 1889.

[From Report of Secretary of the Treasury.]

	In circulation March 1, 1878.	In circulation October 1, 1889.	Decrease.	Increase.
Gold coin	$83,530,163	$375,947,715		$293,417,552
Standard silver dollars		57,554,100		57,554,100
Subsidiary silver	53,573,833	52,931,352	$642,481	
Gold certificates	44,364,100	116,675,349		72,311,249
Silver certificates		276,619,715		276,619,715
United States notes	311,436,971	325,510,758		14,073,787
National-bank notes	313,888,740	199,779,011	114,109,729	
Totals	805,793,807	1,405,018,000	114,752,210	713,976,403
Net increase				599,224,193

Gold product of the United States.

Calendar years.	Fine ounces.	Value.
1878	2,476,800	$51,200,000
1879	1,881,787	38,900,000
1880	1,741,500	36,000,000
1881	1,678,612	34,700,000
1882	1,572,187	32,500,000
1883	1,451,250	30,000,000
1884	1,489,950	30,800,000
1885	1,538,325	31,800,000
1886	1,693,125	35,000,000
1887	1,596,375	33,000,000
1888	1,604,841	33,175,000
1889	1,586,700	32,800,000

Silver product of the United States.

Calendar years.	Fine ounces.	Commercial value.	Coining value.
1878	34,960,000	$40,270,000	$45,200,000
1879	31,550,000	35,430,000	40,800,000
1880	30,320,000	34,720,000	39,200,000
1881	33,260,000	37,850,000	43,000,000
1882	36,200,000	41,120,000	46,800,000
1883	35,730,000	39,660,000	46,200,000
1884	37,800,000	42,070,000	48,800,000
1885	39,910,000	42,500,000	51,600,000
1886	39,440,000	39,230,000	51,000,000
1887	41,260,000	40,410,000	53,350,000
1888	45,780,000	43,020,000	59,195,000
1889	50,000,000	46,750,000	64,646,000

E. O. LEECH, *Director of the Mint.*

BUREAU OF THE MINT, *April* 28, 1890.

World's production of gold and silver, 1889.

[Kilogram of gold, $664.60; kilogram of silver, $41.56, coining rate in United States silver dollars.]

Countries.	Gold.		Silver.	
	Kilograms.	*Dollars.*	*Kilograms.*	*Dollars.*
United States	49,353	32,800,000	1,555,486	64,646,000
Australasia	49,784	33,086,700	144,369	6,000,000
Mexico	1,465	974,000	1,335,828	55,517,000
European countries:				
Russia	32,052	21,302,000	14,523	604,000
Germany	1,958	1,301,286	32,040	1,331,576
Austria-Hungary	1,877	1,247,450	53,391	2,218,900
Sweden	76	50,000	4,648	193,000
Norway			7,200	299,000
Italy	160	106,000	34,280	1,424,600
Spain			51,502	2,140,400
Turkey	10	7,000	1,323	55,000
France			54,314	2,257,300
Great Britain	97	64,370	8,734	363,000
Dominion of Canada	1,919	1,275,045	10,868	451,680
South American States:				
Argentine Republic	47	31,000	10,226	425,000
Colombia	4,514	3,000,000	24,061	1,000,000
Bolivia	90	59,800	230,460	9,578,000
Chili	2,953	1,962,430	185,851	7,723,957
Brazil	670	445,300		
Venezuela	2,130	1,415,598		
Guiana (British)	687	456,580		
Peru	158	105,000	75,263	3,128,000
Central American States	226	150,000	48,123	2,000,000
Japan	564	375,000	32,065	1,332,650
Africa	12,155	8,078,000		
China	13,542	9,000,000		
India (British)	2,273	1,511,000		
Total	178,760	118,803,559	3,914,555	162,689,063

Stock of gold and silver in civilized world.

Countries.	Gold.	Silver.
United States	$689,275,007	$438,388,624
United Kingdom	550,000,000	100,000,000
France	900,000,000	700,000,000
Germany	500,000,000	215,000,000
Belgium	65,000,000	55,000,000
Italy	140,000,000	60,000,000
Switzerland	15,000,000	15,000,000
Greece	2,000,000	4,000,000
Spain	100,000,000	125,000,000
Portugal	40,000,000	10,000,000
Austria-Hungary	40,000,000	90,000,000
Netherlands	25,000,000	65,000,000
Norway and Sweden	32,000,000	10,000,000
Denmark		
Russia	190,000,000	60,000,000
Turkey	50,000,000	45,000,000
Australia	100,000,000	7,000,000
Egypt	100,000,000	15,000,000
Mexico	5,000,000	50,000,000
Central American States		500,000
South America	45,000,000	25,000,000
Japan	90,000,000	50,000,000
India		900,000,000
China		700,000,000
The Straits		100,000,000
Canada	16,000,000	5,000,000
Cuba, Hayti, etc	20,000,000	2,000,000
Total	3,714,275,007	3,846,888,624

E. O. LEECH, *Director of the Mint.*

World's circulation of gold coins.

[Comparative statistics by Ivan C. Michel.]

Countries.	In 1849.	In 1889.
Austria	$15,480,000	$46,145,847
Belgium	10,200,000	54,642,250
France	80,400,500	899,272,547
Germany	48,665,500	498,580,923
Great Britain	295,558,500	574,095,175
Holland	20,525,000	27,061,478
Italy	80,475,000	112,863,644
Portugal	46,870,500	46,695,866
Russia	30,500,000	249,156,845
Sweden and Norway	8,940,000	20,930,518
Spain	28,000,000	98,804,873
Switzerland	6,850,000	16,965,000
Turkey	8,540,800	77,652,000
United States	168,950,800	705,061,975
China	None.	None.
India	22,480,000	*None.
Total	872,445,800	3,427,928,941

*Gold coins no longer a legal tender in India.

In 1889	$3,427,928,941
In 1849	872,445,800
Increase	2,555,483,141

World's circulation of silver coins.

Countries.	In 1849.	In 1889.
Austria	$50,840,500	$88,088,487
Belgium	40,500,000	58,505,400
France	525,800,000	752,749,537
Germany	195,000,000	226,446,970
Great Britain	60,580,400	125,714,049
Holland	42,875,000	64,156,780
Italy	55,600,000	88,279,395
Portugal	35,400,000	13,459,855
Russia	50,250,000	49,020,580
Sweden and Norway	9,660,000	6,754,247
Spain	39,000,000	144,125,234
Switzerland	11,400,000	19,782,000
Turkey	5,760,000	46,880,000
United States	30,250,000	403,516,756
China	450,500,000	750,000,000
India	290,500,000	1,119,750,540
Total	1,895,905,000	3,957,229,830

In 1889	$3,957,229,830
In 1849	1,895,905,000
Increase	2,061,324,830

THE FREE COINAGE OF SILVER—THE EXAMPLE OF MEXICO.

A. J. Warner, of Ohio, in a speech accepting the chairmanship of a convention held in St. Louis in November, 1889, for the purpose of advocating free coinage of silver in this country, referred to the act of Congress of 1873, by which the gold dollar was made our sole monetary unit, as "worse than a blunder." Ten years ago he and the other so-called silver men of the country probably would have said that the passage of this act was effected by a conspiracy and by stealth. Possibly many American citizens still regard the dropping of the silver dollar from our coinage by the act of 1873 as the deliberate attempt of mysterious finan-

cial potentates to force the people of this country to pay in gold debts which might otherwise have been paid in silver.

At the time of the silver agitation which culminated in the act of 1878, authorizing the coinage of silver dollars, the circumstances surrounding the passage of the act of 1873 were closely examined, and every possible conjecture as to the motive of the authors of that act was submitted to a test of probability. It was established beyond controversy that the failure to continue the old silver dollar as a legal-tender coin was due solely to the fact that it was not, and had not been for at least a generation previous, in use as a monetary unit in this country. In the four months following the passage of the act of 1878 more silver dollars were coined than in all the time since silver-dollar coinage was first authorized by the act of 1792 up to the discontinuance of the coinage in 1873. Of the old silver dollars, 8,045,838 had been coined in the eighty-one years previous to 1873. From February 28 to June 30, 1878, $8,593,500 were coined.

What would have been the result had the act of 1873 continued the old silver dollar, though actually not in use, as a legal-tender coin? If the decline in the price of silver, which began in 1873, had found the mints of the United States obliged to accept silver bullion and give in exchange therefor coined silver dollars of 412½ grains each, nine-tenths fine, which would be a legal tender in payment of debts, it is hardly doubtful that the manufacture of these coins would have been demanded and carried on with all possible rapidity, and that the currency of the country at the resumption of specie payments in 1879 would have been based upon the silver dollar as its monetary unit.

I do not propose to go into an elaborate statement of the effect which the opening of the mints of the United States for free coinage of silver during the years following 1873 would have had upon the price of that commodity. The silver production of the world largely increased in those years, and the price of silver rapidly but gradually declined until, in 1888, it reached the lowest point in comparison with gold which it has ever touched. In the light of experience it can not be contended that the United States, by adopting an exclusive silver coinage and exporting its gold, could have prevented wholly this decline. Instead of accumulating a stock of gold, this country would have accumulated a stock of silver dollars. The gold—something like $500,000,000—which has been either produced here or imported since 1873 would have found its market elsewhere, and we should have had, say 1,000,000,000 or more of silver dollars in the banks or Treasury or in the hands of the people. What would have been our condition commercially and financially had this taken place?

For the purpose of picturing our condition under such circumstances we have a close analogy in the experience of our neighboring Republic, Mexico. The most notable product of Mexico is silver. The Government of Mexico, whether in the old time when it was a colony of Spain or during the many changes which it has experienced since the declaration of independence in 1821, has always attempted to encourage and carefully watch the silver-mining industry. Before 1850 it is calculated that two-thirds of the silver in use in the world had come from the mines of Mexico. It has been the policy of the rulers of Mexico from time immemorial to compel all silver taken from the mines to pass through the mints. Even now this is the law. All precious metal, both gold and silver, when taken from the mines, must be sent to the mints to be refined, and the mint charge, supposed to be uniform and said to be about 4.41 per cent. of the value of the metal, is levied upon all gold and silver alike. This charge is compulsory on all the products of the mines, and the owner of the metal may receive from the mint either coin or bullion at his option. Whether he chooses to take coin or bullion the charge is the same. A very large proportion of the precious metals which pass through the mints of Mexico comes out in the form of coin. Mexican silver dollars are a well known article of commerce. The coinage of the mints is much greater for this reason than the monetary affairs of the country require. Consequently there can not be a scarcity of metal money. The coinage of the mints is in large quantities taken for immediate export, and never passes into circulation at all.

The following table exhibits approximately the coinage of silver and gold since the conquest of Mexico by Cortez, the coinage in this case being almost identical with the production:

Coinage of Mexico from 1537 to 1873 (beginning of fall in price of silver).

GOLD.	
Colonial, 1537 to 1821	$68,778,411
Independence, 1822 to 1873	45,598,020
	114,376,431
SILVER.	
Colonial, 1537 to 1821	$2,082,260,656
Independence, 1822 to 1873	758,822,710
	2,841,083,366
Since decline in silver began, July 1, 1873, to June 30, 1888.	
Gold	$8,386,069
Silver	350,594,608

By the laws of Mexico the so-called bimetallic standard is established. Both silver and gold are legal tender. Previous to the fall in silver the currency of the country consisted of both gold and silver coins. Travelers report that the tables in the gambling-houses held piles of gold "onzas" as well as silver "pesos." Gold was used for larger transactions, and being more convenient for transportation, performed the principal service. The conditions in Mexico, therefore, when the decline in the price of silver took place, were similar to those which would have existed in this country had not the free coinage of the silver dollar been suspended by the act of 1873. There was an abundant supply for monetary use either of silver or gold in Mexico.

When, however, the fall in silver took place, the gold coin was rapidly exported and disappeared from circulation. The difficulty in effecting domestic exchanges, by reason of the greater weight of the silver, caused a notable embargo on internal commerce. The disturbed condition of the country made the transportation of large amounts of silver very precarious, and the rates of exchange between the capital and the chief towns became very high and constituted an almost total prohibition of trade. The unreliability of the Government rendered banking unprofitable, for a bank-vault containing precious metals afforded a temptation too strong to be resisted by the military chiefs temporarily in power. The issue of note circulation under these circumstances was impossible. For ten years following the fall in silver Mexico remained dependent entirely on silver dollars as a medium of exchange. This caused great complaint from foreigners undertaking to do business in the country. Travelers were obliged to carry heavy bags of silver dollars, and every enterprise of moment was compelled to employ a mule train and an armed guard in effecting its regular business transactions.

When the Government become more stable, after the railroads were built and brigandage was suppressed, and the party in power showed ability and determination to protect commercial credit, banks of issue sprang up, and paper money began to take the place of silver dollars. The National Bank, which had existed for a few years previously, was reorganized in 1884 under a new charter. This was soon after the second election of President Diaz. The first statement of this bank after reorganization, June, 1884, shows that it had in its vaults $2,890,274.85 in silver, and had a paper circulation outstanding of $4,341,377. About this time it was estimated that the coin circulation of the country was from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 of silver dollars.* This I think an underestimate.

The National Bank at the present time (October, 1889) reports in its vaults in specie $12,304,206, and a paper circulation outstanding of $15,352,229. The London and Mexican Bank, the second largest in Mexico, reports $3,357,793 "cash," and an outstanding circulation of $5,344,698. This indicates a rapid increase in recent years in the circulating media of Mexico. In addition to the banks here mentioned there are in nearly all the principal cities banks which have some outstanding note circulation.

The population of Mexico is about 12,000,000. The rapid increase in the circulating media, it may well be supposed, has had a stimulating effect on the trade of the country. But even when thus stimulated it fails to attain what we would call a condition of activity. There has been some rise in prices. Staple commodities, however, are said not to be materially affected, but the prices of real estate in the capital and the wages of laborers along the lines of the railroads and in the principal cities have increased from 25 to 50 per cent. The import and export business of the country has also increased somewhat. It is probably 30 per cent. greater in volume than it was ten years ago. Government revenue has also shown an increase, but is still very small in comparison with that of other countries. The Mexican tariff on importations is said to be higher than that of any other country. Its foreign trade is limited and harassed by vexatious and intricate customs regulations. The internal trade of the country is hampered by irregular taxes levied on common commodities by the various States. Retail trade and banking operations are burdened by stamp taxes. The cities of Mexico levy petty taxes on food products, even on the canoe-loads of radishes or lettuce which the poor peons bring to market. A burro's load of fagots is taxed at the gates of the city of Mexico. Contending with such unwise and variable restrictions commercial affairs must be limited in magnitude and must remain in anything but a flourishing condition.

It interests us at the present time to trace the influence which the exclusive use of silver as a monetary basis has on the commerce and finances of Mexico. It is not to be contended that the sluggishness and unprofitableness of Mexican trade is chargeable solely to the silver currency. The mediæval methods of collecting Government revenue there would effectually prevent general prosperity, even if the soundest and most perfect monetary system prevailed. Yet I think there is a peculiar phase of the paralysis which affects Mexican commerce which may be attributed directly to the use of silver as the standard of value. There first is the inconvenience and expense involved in each movement of a considerable sum of money. Silver coins, even when at par with gold in Mexico and in the United States, are sixteen times heavier than equal values of gold. Whenever, therefore, it is necessary to transport a round amount of money the expense is sixteen times more if it be in silver than if in gold. But this is not the only or the most burdensome evil which the use of silver money inflicts upon the Mexican people.

The American traveler in Mexico experiences an agreeable sensation when he exchanges his United States funds for Mexican money. For every $100 of American money he receives from $135 to $140 of Mexican money. The purchasing power of his funds appears to have expanded. Nor is this altogether a delusion. Those commodities and services which a traveler requires are not notably higher in the city of Mexico in Mexican currency than they are in the United States in United States currency. Hotel and restaurant charges, carriage hire, railroad fares, and articles of common use produced in the country are generally obtainable at about the same figures as we are accustomed to pay in the United States.

The effect of this is that the American money which a traveler carries procures for him much more than it would in his own country, and his return across the border is accompanied by a disagreeable sensation when he sees his funds dwindle to their old proportions. Mexico, to the American traveler, seems therefore a land where living is cheap and where a given amount of income from the United States will go much further than at home. The first impression is that surplus funds from the United States placed in Mexican investments should prove very profitable. But a closer examination and a little experience remove or dissipate this view. The experience of investors in Mexican enterprises, railroads, banks, mines, and haciendas shows that there is an annual loss from a decline in the domestic currency which offsets the apparent profit. Reports of the railroad companies and of the banks owned by Englishmen or Americans contain each year a considerable item to be deducted for the depreciation of Mexican currency.

The experience of foreign merchants in Mexico is especially instructive. The question of exchange on every payment on foreign goods which the importers take into Mexico is one in which they find themselves constantly at a disadvantage. The process of shifting from the silver to the gold standard in making payments is an expensive one. It involves a speculation in silver. Exchange is always against Mexico in consequence of this peculiar condition. The money in which the Mexican importer sells his goods is only merchandise in the market in which he buys them; consequently in every transaction he is obliged to add a very considerable percentage over and above the difference between silver and gold to the price at which he sells his goods in Mexico in order to cover the risk he takes in paying for them in gold. This addition to the price must necessarily eventually come from the consumer or else the importer suffers loss. But the difficulty which has been experienced in correctly calculating with each importation the amount necessary to cover this risk often results in a loss to the importer. He finds that the price at which he has sold his goods, adding expenses, duties, and exchange into gold, will not cover the price at which he has bought them. It is probably not unfair to say that the average prices of imported goods to the consumer are made at least 10 per cent. higher than the difference between silver and gold indicates, in consequence of the risk necessary in the conversion from a silver standard to a gold standard in making foreign payments therefor.

Nor is the importer the only one who suffers from the uncertainty involved in making conversion from the gold to the silver standard. The exporter is obliged to take a similar risk. The larger part in value of the exports of Mexico is silver, mostly in the form of silver dollars. Exchange drawn against these shipments is estimated on the London price of silver and is converted at the Mexican banks into Mexican currency. The conversion involves a speculation by the banks in silver, and the charge for this service is necessarily much higher than it would be if the rate of silver were stable and showed no fluctuations—necessarily much higher than if the Mexican currency were on a gold basis and could be turned without risk into foreign currency on the same basis. In other words, if Mexican domestic trade were conducted on a gold basis, the Mexican mine-owners would receive more for their silver product. The same is true as to producers of all other Mexican products sold in foreign markets.

A friend of the writer, who contemplated engaging in the banking business in the City of Mexico, in making inquiries into the conditions of the exchange market, asked a broker how long it would take him to collect $25,000 in gold, to be shipped against an equal amount of exchange drawn. The broker replied that he would not be able to find so much gold in the City of Mexico in less than ten days. This fact shows that Mexican exchange must be almost altogether drawn against shipments of silver or merchandise, and the banker who draws such exchange can not protect himself against the risk of speculation by shipping gold, even if he is willing to pay a premium therefor. How

*D. A. Wells: A Study of Mexico.

much the export charge, made necessary by the conversion from gold foreign currency into the silver currency of Mexico, adds to the expenses of exportation can not be readily estimated. It is a fluctuating item, always adding something to the cost of selling in a foreign market, sometimes resulting in loss to the banks on exchange transactions, but generally undoubtedly being a loss suffered by the producer.

The experience of the Mexican importers and exporters affords an exact illustration of what would be the condition of our foreign trade if we were doing business in this country on a silver basis. The imports and exports of Mexico are comparatively small. They amount only to about $30,000,000 annually of imports and $40,000,000 annually of exports. The annual imports of the United States are not less than $700,000,000 and the annual exports are at about the same figure. If doing business on the basis of depreciated metal is a damage to Mexico, how much more would it affect the commercial affairs of the United States?

The foreign commerce of Mexico in 1880 amounted to only $5.66 per inhabitant. The foreign commerce of the United States in the same year amounted to $31.63 per inhabitant. The foreign commerce of the United States is not nearly so great in proportion to population as that of the principal nations of Europe; but if this commerce is curtailed or burdened with additional unnecessary charges it will greatly interfere with our prosperity as a nation At times in our history there have been outbreaks of narrow-minded American spirit when it was argued that this country was independent of the rest of the world, and would be most prosperous without international commercial intercourse. Many of the advocates of the free coinage of silver have maintained that this nation could adopt and maintain a silver currency no matter what the other chief commercial nations of the world might do. I think there is a prevailing notion that if we chose to use silver as our monetary basis, whatever loss there might be would fall on foreign nations. According to this idea the foreigners to whom we owe money would be obliged to accept silver instead of gold in payment. This would be simply scaling our debts held by the outside world. But we should still go on conducting our domestic commerce, producing food and manufacturing goods and exchanging commodities among ourselves with as much energy and success as ever. We could be as prosperous as we are now if the civilized nations outside our borders had no existence.

How far this conception of our actual situation is from the truth it is hardly worth while to consider. If we no longer had a foreign market for our wheat and cotton, our petroleum and provisions; if we no longer bought from foreign nations sugar and coffee and tea, it should be apparent to the least intelligent that our buying power of home products would be greatly curtailed and the condition of our lives rendered much less comfortable. We depend on our foreign commerce for our prosperity as absolutely as upon our internal commerce. Every unnecessary impediment placed in the way of our commercial intercourse with other nations is a distinct step backward, and materially damages our welfare.

The effect of estimating our transactions in silver money, while the chief nations with whom we exchange commodities estimate theirs in gold, is not, I think, clearly understood, and, so far as I know, has not been carefully analyzed. Even those who are opposed to free coinage of silver content themselves with saying that it would be a great damage to our foreign commerce, but do not attempt to show the particular forms in which this damage would occur. The condition of Mexican foreign trade illustrates well the damage which would result to the foreign commerce of the United States if we should come to do business exclusively on the silver standard. It costs the Mexican importer probably from 2 to 5 per cent. over and above the current discount on silver to make the change from the gold price, in which he buys his goods, to the silver price, in which he sells them. It would cost our importers a similar percentage to make the same conversion. In each case there would be a speculation in silver, and the charge for the risk involved would necessarily be imposed upon the goods imported. This charge would eventually be paid by the consumer. The effect would be the same as if an uncertain and fluctuating additional charge were made for the transportation of goods coming to our shores. Sugar, coffee, tea, rice, all articles which we buy from other countries would experience this rise in price. On our $700,000,000 of imports this additional exchange charge would aggregate many millions, and would be paid in the long run by the people.

In the case of exports the necessary conversion from a silver to a gold standard would work even more to the disadvantage of the people. For the sake of illustration let us take as an example a common transaction. Say that a London commission merchant buys, through a Chicago commission merchant, 100,000 bushels of wheat, to be shipped to Europe. Say that the price of this wheat is $1 per bushel in the silver currency of the United States and that silver is selling in the London market at 42⅜ pence per ounce, which would be about 70 cents for our silver dollar. The Chicago merchant ships the wheat, draws his draft on the London merchant, and takes it, with a bill of lading, to his Chicago banker. He asks the Chicago banker to buy the draft, in order that he may with the proceeds pay for the wheat. The draft is drawn payable in English currency, which is gold in London. The Chicago banker in buying the draft is obliged to make the conversion from gold currency to silver. He must estimate the value of the gold draft in silver, based on the quotation for silver in London, and he must take the risk of silver advancing or declining between the time when he buys the draft and the date at which the draft is payable. This necessitates a speculation in silver on his part, and it is reasonable to suppose that he will not engage in the speculation without making a charge which in his opinion will cover the risk of the transaction. What this risk may be will depend somewhat on the activity in the silver market. If silver is rapidly fluctuating in price, the charge will be higher than if the price of silver is comparatively stable; but under the most favorable conditions it is hardly probable that the banker will take this risk without compensation. He will pay less for the draft than the gold price of silver in London would indicate it worth. Exchange on London now never sells at a greater discount than the cost of sending gold to pay it in London, with interest added for the time. The speculation involved in the conversion from gold to silver would add a new element and make an additional discount.

Silver may fluctuate 5 per cent. in price while the wheat and the draft are on their way to Europe. If silver advances, the banker who buys the draft at the value of silver at the time when it is drawn will lose money. If silver declines he will make money. It can be readily seen, therefore, that the business of buying exchange against exports will be burdened with a considerable extra charge in consequence of the risk made necessary by the conversion of paper payable in gold into money on the silver basis.

This exchange charge, made necessary in the exportation of wheat by the conversion from gold to silver, must be taken account of by the Chicago merchant in purchasing wheat for export. He will pay less for wheat than he would if there were no exchange charge to be considered in the transaction, and it is obvious that the producer of wheat must eventually sell his product for export at a less price than if no exchange conversion from gold to silver were necessary in disposing of it in a foreign market. All the wheat exported from the United States will suffer this extra expense and be reduced in price accordingly.

It is a common belief that the price of wheat in this country is regulated and determined by the price of so much of our wheat product as is exported. If the wheat taken for export, therefore, must be sold at a less price, in order to pay for the risk made necessary in converting gold to silver, the price of the whole wheat crop must suffer accordingly. Can any one calculate what will be the effect of this depreciation? Will it be one, two, or three cents less per bushel that the farmers of the country must take for their wheat crop if it is sold on the silver basis in this country? What is said regarding the price of the wheat crop will be equally true with regard to the prices of our other principal products for export, our cotton and meats, our petroleum and manufactured goods.

We should not forget that much of the prosperity of the United States is due to the well ordered machinery by which commercial exchanges are here conducted. The facilities afforded for buying and selling, for handling goods, and for settling accounts, in no small degree increase the volume and the profit of our foreign and internal trade. Any change which causes new friction in the machinery will surely diminish both the volume and the profit of all our business operations.*

What has been said as to what would be the commercial situation of the United States had not the act of 1873 prevented free coinage of silver dollars may be said as to the future should free coinage of silver now be made lawful. The only means of avoiding the expense of converting gold into silver in international exchange, and the consequent burden upon our commerce, would be by raising the price of silver to par with gold and maintaining it at that point. It is improbable that such a consummation could be effected by any act of this nation or even by a combination of nations. The production of silver was so greatly in excess of the production in the early part of the century and is so constantly increasing, year by year, that the attempt to raise silver to par with gold, even by supplanting the gold in this country entirely by silver dollars as fast as our mints could turn them out, may well seem hopeless.

The following table shows the world's production, and the production of Mexico and of the United States, of silver for periods of five years each, beginning with 1851. (The last figures in this table are for three years only, from 1886 to 1888 inclusive:)

PRODUCTION OF SILVER.

Years.	World.	Mexico.	Per cent.	United States.	Per cent.	All other countries, per cent.
1851-1855	$197,274,775	$104,635,125	53.0	$258,250	0.18	46.87
1856-1860	203,664,440	101,033,050	49.6	878,090	0.43	49.97
1861-1865	246,515,300	106,131,825	43.0	38,481,400	15.0	42.0
1866-1870	295,950,850	115,588,025	39.0	65,599,175	22.0	39.0
1871-1875	423,870,430	130,555,775	30.7	161,673,555	38.0	31.3
1876-1880	477,314,230	128,158,680	27.0	210,538,225	44.0	29.0
1881-1885	558,473,400	158,112,610	28.0	244,216,945	44.0	28.0
1886-1888	373,597,105	107,049,585	28.7	164,993,820	44.0	27.3

The following table shows the production by years for the last decade, and more plainly illustrates the relation of Mexico and the United States to the silver market.

PRODUCTION OF SILVER.

Year.	World.	Mexico.	Per cent.	United States.	Per cent.	All other countries.
1879	$96,293,845	$25,955,580	26.9	$40,800,000	42.4	$29,537,265
1880	97,284,135	27,935,950	28.7	39,200,000	40.3	30,148,185
1881	103,715,045	30,200,440	29.1	43,000,000	41.4	30,514,605
1882	108,801,445	30,298,555	27.8	46,800,000	43.0	31,702,890
1883	109,517,730	30,546,490	27.9	46,200,000	42.2	32,771,240
1884	115,383,600	32,742,770	28.4	48,800,000	42.3	33,841,830
1885	121,055,580	34,324,380	28.4	51,600,000	42.6	35,131,200
1886	121,541,320	35,239,670	29.0	51,000,000	41.9	35,301,650
1887	124,833,670	35,743,800	28.6	53,357,000	42.7	35,732,870
1888	127,222,115	36,066,115	28.3	59,195,000	46.5	31,961,000

(The above tables are compiled from figures furnished by the Commercial and Financial Chronicle and the Reports of the Director of the United States Mint, and are probably approximately correct.)

Mexico has produced yearly an increasing quantity, but the United States has increased its production of silver more rapidly. These two countries have increased their production of silver more rapidly than the rest of the world, but everywhere the production of this article has increased.

The price of silver declined from 59⅝ pence per ounce in London in January, 1873, to 41⅝ pence per ounce in May, 1888. This decline was attended by considerable fluctuations, and fluctuations still characterize the silver market. The price of standard silver when at par with gold, in London, is 60⅞ pence per ounce. Although there is no large stock of uncoined silver now in sight anywhere in the world, the large accumulations in the form of plate and ornaments constitute a great reserve stock which would be drawn on undoubtedly if any considerable rise in price should occur. It is quite probable that if the free coinage of silver should be enacted by Congress at the present time, and the capacity of the mints for coining silver be made equal to the demand for silver dollars, silver sufficient to replace all our gold coin would be furnished from the world's stock within a year or two, and without raising the price of silver in the London market to anything like par with gold.

The act of 1878, at present in force, under which $2,000,000 worth of silver is purchased each month by our Government and coined into dollars, furnishes a

* Since this article was written, my attention has been called to a portion of the address delivered before the Bankers' Association, at Saratoga, in August, 1884, by the president of the association, at that time Mr. Lyman J. Gage, who is vice-president of the First National Bank of Chicago. As the course of reasoning, and the conclusion reached as to the effect of conversions from a gold to a silver standard, and *vice versa*, in making exchanges, is so exactly in accord with what is contained in my article, I quote here nearly all that is there said on that subject:

"It will not be disputed that, for all our commercial transactions with other people, settlement must be made in the London money market. If we buy sugar in Cuba, we pay in London. If we sell goods in Brazil, we take payment in English funds payable in London. So that, whether we buy or sell in the course of our foreign trade, London is the settling-house for all this trade. At the present moment our financial system rests upon and our commercial values are measured by the same metallic standard, namely, gold coin. Our gold coin shipped to the British mint may be coined into sovereigns at a nominal expense, and English sovereigns shipped to us may be transmuted into our gold coins at no material cost. Thus, in the competitive struggle for a place in foreign markets, we enjoy a great advantage in using the same metallic money standard.

"The rise and fall of gold, or the rise and fall of commodities in their relation to gold, affect us in our great competition in an exactly similar manner. We enter the commercial contest with weapons equally matched. Now it is proposed to voluntarily surrender this important condition. With silver money of the present weight and fineness the recognized and established money of ac-

market each year for about $25,000,000 worth of silver, which is coined into more than 28,000,000 of legal-tender silver dollars. At the time when this act was passed it was predicted by its advocates that the effect of the purchase monthly of silver by the United States would raise the price of silver to par with gold. In February, when this act was passed, silver sold in London at 55½ pence per ounce; in December of the same year it had declined to 49½ pence per ounce; and the decline from that time has been gradual, and apparently unaffected by the purchases of our Government.

In the face of these facts it is reasonable to conclude that any action of the United States in the coinage of silver dollars will not have a permanent effect on the market price of silver bullion. The coinage of the United States, under the act of 1878, of legal-tender silver dollars, has now amounted to about $350,000,000. The advocates of silver coinage now demand, if free coinage can not be secured, that the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States exercise the discretion conferred upon him by that act to purchase $4,000,000 worth of silver each month to be coined into silver dollars.

What will be the ultimate effect of the coinage of silver dollars under the act of 1878 should be a matter of grave consideration. Should the coinage continue until there is a supply of this kind of money equal to the monetary needs of the United States, it may well be imagined that a contingency will arise in which this silver money will take the place of the higher-valued gold money, and our stock of gold coin be exported. Should such displacement of gold by silver take place in this country, our commercial affairs will necessarily be brought from a gold to a silver basis. In that event the example of Mexico will be brought home to our experience. Mexico floated from a gold to a silver basis as a log floats down stream. The United States, under similar conditions, would yield to the same resistless forces, although it may be a fully equipped vessel, steered by commercial intelligence and manned by an energetic crew.

If silver circulation is provided in sufficient quantity for all our monetary uses, either by free coinage or by the manufacture of dollars under the act of 1878, or otherwise, the laws of commercial gravity will draw us down to the silver level.

The paralysis which the use of silver causes in Mexican trade will then also affect our foreign and domestic commerce. Our production, distribution, and consumption will be at a disadvantage. We shall be handicapped in the struggle for life in comparison with the chief European nations. Can we afford to assume this burden?

M. L. SCUDDER, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order for me to offer some amendments now to the substitute, I desire to do so, and if necessary will ask that my amendments may be read first to see whether they would be in order.

The SPEAKER. There is one amendment already pending to the substitute. No other amendments are in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. I desire to send up the amendments I wish to offer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can have them read as part of his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. Very well. It will be the best part of my speech, I have no doubt.

Amendment to section 2:

"Amend by striking out the word 'may,' in line 6, section 2, and insert in lieu thereof the word 'shall.'"

Amendment to section 2:

"Strike out the word 'may,' in line 11, section 2, and insert in lieu thereof the word 'shall.'"

Amendment to section 2:

"Strike out from and including the word 'provided,' in line 13 of section 2, to the end of said section."

Mr. Speaker, I opposed the adoption of the special order under which we are now considering this question for the reason that it does not allow us to offer a free-coinage bill, either as an amendment or substitute, and deprives the members of this House of the opportunity of a direct vote upon a free-coinage bill; and yet a majority of this House are in favor of free coinage.

Mr. Speaker, the subject under discussion is one in which all our people are very much interested, but more especially are the farmers of this country watching the action of their Representatives upon this question with the greatest anxiety. We have heard of late a great deal said about the present condition of the agricultural class. Representing as I do an agricultural district, composed of intelligent, industrious, and economic farmers, cultivating as fine land as can be found in the great valley of the Mississippi, and no doubt doing about as well as the average farmer of the country, I think I can speak of the unfortunate condition of affairs which exists among the farmers to-day without any exaggeration. I regret to say it is not a healthy condition, and only those who have lived among the farmers during the past sixteen years and observed the great changes which have taken place in their opportunities for making a living and paying their debts can form an adequate conception of the distressing circumstances which many of them are in at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, these people are beginning to realize that they have been oppressed by unjust legislation, and are now demanding relief at our hands. Sir, we can not afford to disregard the complaints of these people; they are entitled to a hearing in this House. Upon the success and prosperity of our farmers depends very largely the growth and development of our country; their busy hands have transformed our country from a wilderness of timbered lands and wild prairies into productive fields and fruitful farms; their untiring labor and industry have made this Republic the garden spot of the world; their sweat and toil furnish daily food to our whole sixty-five millions of people and send large balances abroad to increase the wealth of our nation.

When we recognize, as we must, the absolute dependence of all other classes upon the industry, energy, and success of the farmers, it does seem to me that they should have at least an equal share in the benefits of legislation, and that we should not fail to consider their rights and interests in legislating upon the question of finance now before this House. I have said the condition of the farmers is not a healthy one, nor do I believe the fault is theirs. I know the farmer, his wife, and children have been working hard to feed and clothe themselves and keep the creditor from their door, but in spite of all their sweat and energy the creditor has come and in many instances their home is gone.

I do not agree with those who claim that the farmer is suffering from an overproduction of crops; that he has been so industrious as to work himself into the poor-house. Yet, sir, in the midst of a most abundant harvest, with barns filled with wheat, corn, oats, and other agricultural products; with pastures covered with cattle, hogs, and other stock, we hear the same sad complaint of the farmer from every section of our country, and we see him forced to sell in that beautiful home market for which he has paid so dearly in the past many of the various products of his toil at much less prices than it actually costs to produce them.

In fact the great staple, corn, has become so cheap that during the past winter many Western farmers have been burning it for fuel because it was cheaper than wood or coal. The average price of wheat in the New York market for the year 1873 was $1.67 per bushel; at the beginning of this year it was worth in the same market about 90 cents per bushel, a loss to the farmer who has a thousand bushels of wheat to sell of $770, or 77 cents on every bushel, and the decline has been about the same in all the products which the farmer has to sell. Let us see if this is the result of overproduction. The increase in farm products during the past ten years has not equaled our increase in population, and yet there has been a steady decline in the price of farm products during that period.

The average acreage of wheat in this country from 1880 to 1884, inclusive, a period of five years, was 37,721,343 acres, while the average acreage from 1885 to 1889, inclusive, a period of five years, was 36,819,442 acres; the average annual yield in bushels during the first five years was 463,973,117, while the average annual yield during the last five years was 435,179,000; the average export price during the first five years was $1.147 per bushel, while the average export price during the last five years has been 87.4 cents per bushel, a fall of over 27 cents per bushel.

The entire yield of wheat in this country in 1879 was 448,756,630 bushels, and the average export price of wheat for that year was $1.33 per bushel. In 1888 our total yield of wheat was 415,868,000 bushels, and the average export price of wheat for that year was 85.8 cents per bushel. In 1880 our total yield of wheat in this country was 498,549,868 bushels, and the average export price for that year was $1.243 per bushel. In 1889 our total yield was 490,560,000 bushels, and the average export price for that year was 89.7 cents per bushel. That is, the average export price of wheat was about 35 cents less per bushel in 1889 than in 1880, although we had about 8,000,000 bushels less in 1889 than we had in 1880 and our population was over 10,000,000 more. I have given two successive years at each period, so it can not be charged the prices in 1880 and 1889 were affected by the years immediately preceding. Our yield as shown was less in 1888 than in 1879, and in that respect our market in 1889 had an advantage of the market in 1880.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I insist that these unreasonably low prices are not the result of overproduction, but have been brought about by unwise and unjust legislation. The fault is not with the farmer, except so far as he has failed to do his duty at the ballot-box, but the fault has been right here at this Capitol, with the members of Congress. Nor will I leave this declaration unsupported by authority. A careful examination of the records of Congress for the past twenty-five years will disclose but very little legislation in the interest of the farmers and other laboring classes, while we find statute after statute enacted in the interest of the manufacturer, the banker, and the bondholder. Let us briefly examine some of our financial legislation during the period to which I have referred.

On account of our late war it suddenly became necessary to increase our volume of currency, to borrow money, and issue the bonds of our Government to secure its payment. The law authorizing the issue of United States notes, commonly known as greenbacks, provided that these

---

count in our domestic affairs, we shall have our industrial exchanges carried on under a money standard about fifteen points removed from the English or settling-house standard. Our domestic values will rise and fall in relation to an entirely different standard. Can any one measure the deranging influence of this fact upon our foreign trade? But this indirect and ambiguous adverse influence is not all. In every settlement abroad we shall be at the disadvantage of converting our domestic money of account, silver, into English money of account, gold. And that this will always be at a charge to us is plain if we reflect a moment.

* * * * * * *

"We all know that trade turns upon small percentages, and the larger the transaction the more influential is a fractional per cent. It follows, then, that, with silver the established money of account at home, our foreign trade will be prejudiced and restricted. It follows, also, that those who furnish products to go abroad must furnish them at a price somewhat less, and those who consume products brought from abroad must pay somewhat more, to make good the increased margin for cost and risk in converting the unrelated standards of the two countries. It will give an increased profit to dealers in foreign exchange. It will force the importer to add an extra per cent. to his otherwise selling price. It will make the exporter deduct a percentage from his otherwise purchasing price. Who will suffer therefrom? The industrial classes who produce and consume the exchangeable products."

notes should be lawful money and a legal tender for all debts, public and private, except duties on imports and interest on the public debt. The law authorizing the issue of these Government bonds provided that the interest of the bonds should be paid in coin, but allowed the principal to be paid in any lawful money. These bonds were purchased with greenbacks, or at greenback prices, and, according to law and every principle of equity, were payable in greenbacks or any lawful money.

In 1868, Senator SHERMAN, in answering a letter upon this subject, said:

I think the bondholder violates his promise when he refuses to take the same kind of money he paid for the bonds. If the case is to be tested by law, I am right; if it is to be tested by Jay Cooke's advertisement, I am wrong. I hate repudiation or anything like it, but we ought not to be deterred from doing what is right by undeserved epithets.

In the face of the fact that many of these bonds had been bought with greenbacks when worth less than 40 cents on the dollar, in March, 1869, a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President passed the following law to increase the value of the bonds at the expense of the people:

An act to strengthen the public credit.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to remove any doubt as to the purpose of the Government to discharge all just obligations to the public creditors, and to settle conflicting questions and interpretations of the laws by virtue of which such obligations have been contracted, it is hereby provided and declared that the faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the obligations of the United States, not bearing interest, known as United States notes, and of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of any such obligations has expressly provided that the same may be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver.

I have given all that part of the act which changed the character of our Government bonds and made them payable in coin. If, at the time these bonds were issued, one farmer had loaned another $100 and taken his note for it, without specifying any particular kind of money in which the note should be paid the holder of that note would have been required to accept greenbacks or any other lawful money in payment of such note. These Government bonds did not specify in what kind of money they should be paid; hence the same principle of law would apply as in case of the note, and the Government had the right to pay them in any lawful money, including greenbacks as well as coin.

Greenbacks were considered good enough to pay the soldier for all his hardships, even for the very limbs which he left upon the battlefield, yet they were not good enough to pay the bondholder, although he had bought his bonds with that kind of money. Sir, it would have been much more appropriate to entitle that act "An act to rob the people and enrich the bondholders, to strengthen the public creditors instead of the public credit."

At the time this act was passed the amount of bonds it applied to was $2,107,876,650. At that time a dollar in coin was worth $1.32 in United States notes, or greenbacks; hence to make the bonds payable in coin instead of greenbacks increased this part of our public debt 32 per cent.; that is, 32 per cent. of $2,107,876,650, which was $647,520,480. This act of legislation took from the pockets of the people and placed in the vaults of the bondholders $674,520,480, and all this unjust burden has to be paid by the labor of the people. As I have already stated, some of these bonds were bought with greenbacks when they were worth less than 40 cents on the dollar in coin.

The money-lender could take $400 in gold, buy $1,000 in greenbacks, and exchange the greenbacks for a thousand-dollar Government bond, bearing 6 per cent. interest, payable in coin and exempt from taxation; that is, he got a thousand-dollar Government bond for $400 in coin, and when he received $60 on his thousand-dollar bond, he received 15 per cent. on his $400 originally invested, and this above taxes. Not only this, but by virtue of the national-bank act he could deposit his thousand-dollar bond with the Government, issue $900 in bank notes, or black-backs, loan these to some Western farmer at 10 per cent., then he would receive on his $400, $60 interest from the Government, $90 interest on his bank notes; total interest received, $150, or 37½ per cent. on his $400. And the act of March, 1869, required the Government to pay the bondholder $1,000 in coin for the bond that had cost him $400.

Mr. Speaker, whatever sins the Democratic party may have to answer for in that final day, I am glad to know that its skirts are clear of that gigantic steal of 1869, for only one Democrat in either House of Congress voted for that unrighteous law.

No wonder the bankers and bondholders have flourished under such legislation and no wonder the people have been crushed to the earth.

On the 14th of July, 1870, the act to authorize the refunding of the public debt was passed. The act contains the following provision:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to issue, etc., bonds of the United States, etc., redeemable in coin of the present standard value.

That is, gold or silver of the standard value of the United States on July 14, 1870.

All our bonds for Government loans now outstanding, except our 3 and 3½ per cent. bonds, were issued under this act and the bonds themselves state upon their face that they are redeemable in coin of the standard value of the United States on July 14, 1870. Now, sir, in the face of that law and the provision contained in the bond itself who would insist that these bonds, both principal and interest, are not payable in silver as well as gold—silver dollars of 412½ grains, nine-tenths fine, for that was the standard on July 14, 1870?

On the 12th of February, 1873, the American Congress, to crown this infamous legislation, passed the act which demonetized silver, and so cunningly was that bill drawn that many members in either branch of Congress did not know that it contained a provision to suspend the coinage of the standard silver dollar, and even the President of the United States, it is said, several months after he had signed the bill, declared that he did not know that it suspended the coinage of silver. The law contains sixty-seven sections, and is entitled "An act revising and amending the laws relating to the mints, assay offices, and coinage of the United States." I here give those parts of the law which accomplished the wicked work.

SEC. 15. That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade-dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece, a quarter-dollar or twenty-five-cent piece, a dime or ten-cent piece; the weight of the trade-dollar shall be 420 grains; the weight of the half dollar shall be 12 grams (grammes) and one-half of a gram (gramme); the quarter-dollar and dime shall be respectively one-half and one-fifth the weight of said half-dollar; and said coins shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding $5 in any one payment. * * *

SEC. 17. That no coins, either gold, silver, or minor coinage, shall hereafter be issued from the mint, other than those of the denominations, standard, and weights herein set forth.

Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that the silver dollar of 371¼ grains of pure silver had been the dollar of the Constitution, the dollar of our fathers since 1792, over eighty years, and during all that time it was our unit of value, and while the weight of fine gold contained in the gold dollar was changed at different times the weight of pure silver contained in the unit dollar remained unchanged. On the very day the silver dollar was stricken down it was worth more than gold.

Whatever might have been the motives of those who secured the passage of that unjust law which robbed the people of a part of their constitutional money, the injurious effects it has had upon the people are plain. The honorable Secretary of the Treasury argues in his report that as we had no silver dollars in circulation in this country in 1873 the act of the United States suspending their further coinage had no effect in depreciating the value of silver. It is true there was but little coin, either gold or silver, in circulation in 1873, when silver was demonetized. But if that act had not been passed and we had continued the free and unlimited coinage of silver, thereby creating a demand for all our silver as fast as it came from the mines, it is certain that this would have had a very great effect in keeping up the value of silver and preventing a depreciation.

Up to this time the acts of European nations which demonetized silver had not depreciated the value of our silver dollar; neither had the increase in the annual product of this metal. But as soon as we legislated out of use a part of our money, we increased the demand for that which was left, and in this way have increased the value of gold, and that was the object and effect of the act which demonetized silver. If we had continued to coin standard silver dollars, they would have taken the place of a part of our gold, the use and demand for gold would have been less, and its value under such circumstances would not have appreciated, and farm products and other commodities would not have fallen to their present low prices. The direct effect of that act increased the value of gold, in which all our indebtedness then had to be paid, and to that extent enriched the bondholders and other creditors and increased the burdens of the tax-payers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that such legislation as I have referred to could have had no other than an oppressive effect upon the farmers and other laboring classes. In 1878 a law was passed which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth of silver bullion per month and coin same into standard silver dollars of 412½ grains, which were made a legal tender for all debts, public and private. This still left a limitation upon silver and did not place it upon an equality with gold.

As under this law only a limited amount was coined and only a limited demand for our silver was created, the price of silver bullion continued to fall; whereas if it had been placed upon an equality with gold, so far as our laws could do so, if it had been admitted to free and unlimited coinage of money, no surplus of silver bullion would have accumulated, and the price of silver would not have been depressed by a supply exceeding the demand. Under the law of 1878 every Secretary of the Treasury has continued to purchase the minimum amount required by law, being but $2,000,000 worth per month, thereby creating as little demand as possible for silver bullion, which helped to diminish its value.

I insist that that was not a fair and equitable execution of the law. It is very clear that if the Secretary had purchased $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion per month, or even three millions, instead of two, thereby increasing the use and demand for silver, he would have increased the value of silver bullion. There has been no complaint that the silver dollar when coined or silver certificate did not equal gold as money in any market in this country. You can always buy as much with a standard silver dollar as you can with a dollar in gold. The only objection against silver has been that the value of the silver bullion, out of which the dollar is coined, has depreciated; then why have they not purchased and coined more of it under the present law, and in-

creased its value by increasing the market and demand for it? This is only one instance of the unfriendly and unfair treatment which silver has received from the officers of the Government. We have already shown that all our bonds issued under the refunding act of July 14, 1870, are payable in standard silver dollars as well as gold.

The act of 1873 which suspended the coinage of the standard silver dollar did not affect the legal-tender character of those already coined, but the standard silver dollar continued to be lawful and legal-tender money. Our 3½ and 3 per cent. bonds have been issued under laws enacted since 1878, when both gold and silver coins were legal tender, and are payable in coin, gold or silver, of the present standard. Hence all our Government bonds now outstanding are payable in coin, gold or silver, of the present standard. Yet in the face of this law and equity the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, on page 50 of his report, says, and I give his exact language:

Our bank currency is based upon United States bonds, the principal and interest of which are payable in gold.

And in other parts of his report he speaks of the gold obligations of the Government. Now, I challenge the honorable Secretary or any of the supporters of his scheme upon this floor to point to a single line of law that makes any of the bonds of this Government payable in gold coin alone. They are payable in coin, and silver money is coin in our Constitution and in our laws, and when the Secretary of the Treasury makes a distinction between gold and silver in paying the interest on the bonds, which he is now doing, he does so without authority of law and in violation of every principle of equity. The bondholder is no better than the farmer or laborer and is entitled to no better money.

This has been the practice of every Secretary of the Treasury since 1878, and I shall have occasion hereafter to refer to the injurious effect that it has had upon the value of silver. I submit that under such limitations and restraints as these the silver dollar has not had an equal chance with gold since 1878, as claimed by some of the gold-bugs, and the very fact that the coined silver dollar under all this embarrassment has maintained itself at par with gold, while silver bullion was much below par, is evidence that silver could maintain its parity with gold if accorded the same advantages.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury admits, in his report, that legislation upon the silver question is demanded, that it is necessary to use both gold and silver as money. It is true there are some who would suspend the coinage of silver and provide for no further use of it as money, for the reason, as they claim, we have plenty of money without coining silver. And as an evidence that money is plentiful they say it can be had at a very low rate of interest, while the very fact that interest is low is an evidence that times are hard, money scarce, and prices are declining. When money is plentiful, times good, and prices are rising, money seeks investments; but when times are close and prices of everything are falling, money is withdrawn from investments and its holders, rather than invest it in property, which is constantly declining in value, would prefer to put it out on call at a low rate of interest, because under such conditions money is increasing in value much faster than anything else for which it could be exchanged. The Secretary states substantially in his report that the unlimited use of both silver and gold as currency in this country is not at all likely to produce more money than the welfare of the people requires.

For reasons which I shall hereafter discuss, the honorable Secretary opposes the free coinage of silver and submits to this House a bill which he regards as the best plan for using silver as money. That bill with a few amendments made by the committee has been reported favorably to the House by a majority of the Committee, while two members of the committee—the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] and myself—have submitted a minority report, in which we recommend the passage of a bill which provides for the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

The Republican caucus afterwards adopted a substitute for the Windom bill, and we now have a second bill from the Republican caucus offered as a substitute.

Let us fairly consider all the bills now before the House, including the last substitute offered by the Republican caucus, and pass the one which will give the greatest good to the greatest number.

As the Windom bill is still before the House and as its most objectionable principle is retained in the substitutes offered by the Republican caucus, I shall discuss it first.

The bill presented by the Secretary of the Treasury, as amended by the committee, in brief provides that the owner of silver bullion, ores of the United States, or ores smelted or refined in the United States may deposit the same at any of the mints of the United States and receive Treasury notes therefor equal to the net value of the silver at the market price on the day of deposit, to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury under such rules as he may adopt, based upon the leading silver markets of the world. The notes issued shall be receivable for customs taxes and all public dues, and shall be redeemable in silver bullion at its price on the day of redemption, or in gold at the option of the Government or in silver dollars at the option of the holder. That the silver bullion so deposited represented by notes which have been redeemed in gold or silver dollars, may be coined into silver dollars or any other denominations of silver coin. The present act authorizing the coinage of standard silver dollars is repealed. This is the substance of the bill. In discussing it I shall point out only what I regard as some of its leading objections.

The first one is, it entirely eliminates from silver its monetary attribute and treats it as a mere commodity. It really demonetizes silver, gives us a single gold standard, and every debt, every bushel of wheat, corn, and all other products, even silver itself, must be measured by the gold dollar at its present high value. Without stopping to observe how much gold has appreciated or how much silver has depreciated in comparison with all other commodities, the Secretary sees a difference in their value and undertakes to bring them together by leaving gold where it is and increasing the amount of silver in a dollar until it shall equal the present high value of gold. The honorable Secretary, in his report, makes the same mistake that all other advocates of a gold standard make in assuming that gold has a fixed value; that the value of everything else changes, but the value of gold always remains the same.

It must be remembered that the gold dollar has two values, its nominal or coinage value and its relative value or purchasing power. Its nominal value is considered when used in paying debts, but in all other transactions its relative value controls. Its nominal value is fixed, but its relative value changes. When we speak of the value of gold in this discussion we mean its relative value, for that is its true measure or purchasing power.

Gold is always the same value in what respect? It is always the same value, in gold. In their efforts to prove that gold has a fixed value, the gold-bugs will say that 25.8 grains of gold .9 fine is always worth a gold dollar? Why? Because our mints are open to the free and unlimited coinage of gold at this ratio, that is, you can always have coined at our mints, free of charge, 25.8 grains of gold into a gold dollar, or can exchange it for a gold dollar. Now, is it strange that always at the same time and place one gold dollar should be worth another gold dollar?

Does this prove that gold has a fixed value? Upon the same theory we might say one bushel of wheat is always worth another bushel of wheat of the same kind at the same time and place; that is, the value of wheat, valued in wheat, never changes, therefore wheat has a fixed value. If you open our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of standard silver dollars of 412½ grains, so the holder of silver bullion can have 412½ grains of standard silver coined into a legal-tender dollar or exchange it for a legal-tender dollar, under such conditions 412½ grains of standard silver will always be worth a silver dollar, and in that sense silver will have a fixed value.

If it were true that gold had a fixed value, then you might destroy all the silver and paper money of the world, which is about two-thirds, and the value of gold would still remain the same, though it would exchange for three times as much property as before. Then if you go further and destroy one-half the gold coin in the world, the value of a gold dollar would remain the same, though it would buy much more of all kinds of commodities than before. We must not misunderstand the meaning of value. When we speak of the value of a thing we do not mean its value—valued in itself—but its value in something else. Value is a relative term, and nothing has a fixed value. The value of a gold dollar depends upon what it will buy or exchange for in all other commodities. The value of money largely depends upon the amount of money in the country, compared with the demand for it.

If money is scarce, and the demand for it great, its value will be high. If money is plentiful, and the demand for it less, its value will be lower. A thousand dollars in gold at a certain time and under certain conditions might buy 80 acres of good land, and the value of that gold in land is much higher than it would be at another time and under other conditions when the same thousand dollars would buy only 40 acres of the same land. There has been no change in the intrinsic value of the gold or land, but there has been a change in their relative value. It would be unfair to say the whole change of value had been in the land and the value of the gold had remained fixed, and especially when we find the value of the land has remained the same when valued in all other commodities.

When we compare present gold prices with gold prices in 1872, before silver was demonetized, we find the value of gold has increased not only when compared with silver, but its value has increased at least 40 per cent. when compared with wheat, corn, cotton, cattle, etc.; that is, a hundred dollars in gold will buy as much of all farm products, generally speaking, as $140 in gold would buy in 1872. While silver bullion has fallen in value since 1873, when compared with gold, it has not declined when compared with all other commodities. While 371¼ grains of uncoined silver, the amount contained in a standard dollar, was worth but 72 cents in gold until the recent rise in silver, yet 371¼ grains of silver bullion is worth as much wheat, cotton, corn, or any other farm products now as it was in 1873; therefore, while the value of silver bullion has depreciated when compared with gold, it has not depreciated when compared with all other commodities.

Now, in bringing gold and silver to a parity, why not bring the value of gold down as well as the value of silver up? Why leave gold at its

present high value, and add 28 cents to the present silver dollar to bring it up to the value of gold? Why increase the standard silver in a dollar from 412½ grains to over 500 grains, which is done by the Windom bill? Why not bring the relative value of gold down to a parity with silver, wheat, corn, cattle, and other commodities by increasing our volume of silver dollars and silver certificates? They would take the place of a part of our gold, diminish the demand for gold, bring gold down, and bring the prices of all commodities up. The people of this country are more benefited by a rise in the price of wheat, corn, and all products of labor than they are in the rise of gold.

I repeat that the secret of the Secretary's bill is to demonetize silver, reduce us to a gold basis, make gold the measure of all values, make all our Government bonds payable in gold, increase the value of the dollar with which all indebtedness has to be paid at least 28 cents. The more valuable a dollar is the more labor, wheat, corn, etc., it takes to obtain a dollar. Hence when you increase the value of our currency 28 cents on the dollar, which the Windom bill seeks to do, you to that extent increase the burdens of the people who have all indebtedness to pay. The following is an estimate of the present indebtedness of our own country:

Public debt, July 1, 1889	$1,640,673,340.23
Debts of States and Territories, including all municipal debts	1,263,901,775.00
Private debts, say	15,000,000,000.00
	17,904,575,115.23

It is impossible to give a correct estimate of the private debts, but parties who have investigated the subject have generally stated it at a larger amount than we have named. All these debts have to be paid in labor or the products of labor, whose value must be measured by the legal-tender dollar, which will be the gold dollar under the Secretary's bill. When you increase the value of the measuring dollar with which these debts are measured 28 cents, you increase the indebtedness of the people 28 cents on every dollar, and 28 per cent. of $17,904,575,115.23—our total indebtedness of all kinds is $5,013,281,031.20, and this is the amount of money the Windom bill would legislate out of the pockets of the debtor classes into the hands of the money-lenders.

This would increase the indebtedness of the people of the United States about $83 per capita, and over $400 to every famly of five persons. I believe it would be easier for the people to pay this indebtedness in standard silver dollars of 412½ grains than it would in silver dollars of over 500 grains, and I am opposed to increasing the burdens of the people for the benefit of the bondholders and other creditors, as proposed by the Secretary's bill. Again, Mr. Speaker, what effect would silver certificates issued under the Secretary's bill have upon the $350,000,000 of silver certificates and standard silver dollars now in circulation? A dollar note issued under the Windom bill at the present price of silver would be worth or represent over 500 grains of standard silver, while our present silver-dollar certificate represents but 412½ grains of standard silver. How would you expect these two certificates of unequal value to circulate side by side at par? Would not the dollar note representing over 500 grains of standard silver depreciate the dollar certificate representing but 412½ grains of standard silver, and would not the Government be forced to call in our present silver dollars and silver certificates and issue in their place Treasury notes under the Windom bill? Such would certainly be the result if the stamp of the Government in coining money and giving it legal-tender character adds nothing to its value, as claimed by the gold bugs. It must be remembered that the Treasury notes to be issued under the Secretary's bill are not lawful money, are not a legal tender, and are not redeemable in money.

They are mere warehouse receipts to show a certain amount of silver bullion has been deposited in the Government warehouses. To undertake to use silver in this manner gives it no more the character of money than so much iron, copper, wheat, corn, or any other product deposited in the warehouses of the Government as security for such circulating notes, and the value of silver under such conditions would be as fluctuating as other commodities subject to the various speculative rings that would at once be formed. You never can bring the value of two commodities to a fixed ratio. Their values change as conditions change. Gold bullion is as much a commodity as silver bullion, and when you undertake to bring the value of gold and silver to a fixed ratio regardless of the effect which coinage and legislation have upon their value, you will find it as impossible as to bring the value of iron and copper to a fixed ratio.

Mr. Speaker, the people not only demand more money, but they demand good sound legal-tender money that will pay debts, and I am in favor of having the same kind of money for the farmer we have for the banker. I want to see the dollar of the plow-holder just as good as the dollar of the bondholder.

If the Windom bill is in the direction of free coinage of silver, how strange it is that the gold champions are giving it their earnest support. They say they are satisfied we will have to adopt the gold standard in the end and abandon silver, but they are anxious, they say, to try the experiment of the Windom bill and give silver a chance, and see whether it can be brought to a parity with gold. What kind of chance do these liberal gentlemen propose to give silver under this new experiment, as they call it? About the same kind of a chance that the devil gives the sinner. They propose to cripple silver with limitations and unjust legislation, and then say if silver, under these burdens, can perform its monetary duty and maintain its parity with gold; that is, if the silver dollar can do as well, with the law and the administration of the law against it, as gold can with the law and the administration of the law in its favor, then we will remove the restraints from silver and place it upon an equality with gold, and this is what the gold-bugs call giving silver a fair chance. These gentlemen speak of the Windom bill as an experiment. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for us to experiment with silver. I am opposed to embarking upon any unknown sea. Let us determine now whether we will continue to use silver as money or not, and if we do, let us coin and use it according to the Constitution. Let us pursue the same course so successfully followed by our fathers for nearly one hundred years.

The Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, and further provides that no State shall have the right to make anything else but gold and silver legal tender. Now, if Congress has the power to demonetize silver it has the power to demonetize gold, or both, and yet the Constitution provides that no State shall have the right to make anything else but gold and silver legal tender. Does not this look very much as if the founders of our Constitution intended that Congress should coin both gold and silver into legal-tender money for the States and the people.

Many gold advocates claim that to coin money and regulate its value simply means to certify to the weight and fineness of a piece of gold or silver, and that the stamp of the Government which gives the coin a nominal value and the law which makes it a legal tender have no effect upon the value of the coin. If that were true every time the value of bullion changed a dollar would have to be made larger or smaller; that is, on one day when silver was of a certain value the Government would coin 412½ grains of standard silver into a dollar; if silver should rise within the next year the Government would be required to coin, say, 400 grains of silver into a dollar, and if silver should fall within the next two years the Government might be required to coin, say, 420 grains of standard silver into a dollar, and these three silver dollars, different in amount, would all have to circulate at par with each other to maintain a stable currency. No such absurd construction of our Constitution was ever intended by those who formed it. If to coin a silver dollar and regulate its value simply mean to certify to the weight and fineness of a piece of silver, and whatever else the law does has no effect upon its value, why is it that the trade-dollar stamped with a certificate showing it contains 420 grains of silver, nine-tenths fine, was worth but 80 cents, while the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains was worth a dollar? Because the trade-dollar was not a legal tender and the other was. This was the only difference.

The enemies of silver money insist that it is not right for the Government to take 72 cents worth of silver bullion, coin it, and call it a dollar. These gentlemen make a mistake in assuming that silver bullion would remain at its present value after free coinage is established. Whenever our mints are open to the free and unlimited coinage of standard silver dollars, so that the holder of 412½ grains of standard silver can have it coined into a legal-tender dollar or exchange it for a dollar, he is not likely to sell that silver for 72 cents. But it is said the miners will be benefited by this operation. It should be remembered that while free coinage would increase the value of the silver bullion of the miner, it would also increase the value of all products, and for that reason the special benefits to the miner would not be as great as many would suppose. But even if the miners should gain some special benefits by free coinage, that is no reason for refusing to adopt it, provided it would be for the general good of the people.

The honorable Secretary of the Treasury, in his report, does not claim that we should suspend the coinage of silver because money is too plentiful, but because the value of silver bullion is so low that it gives our silver dollars a fictitious value and renders them unstable. If the Secretary's desire is to increase the value of silver bullion, why has he not purchased $48,000,000 worth of silver bullion per year instead of $24,000,000 under the present law. If he had increased the demand for silver and made a market for $24,000,000 worth more than he has, does he not see that such would have increased the value of silver. The trouble is that every Secretary of the Treasury who has administered the present law has used his influence to depress the value of silver rather than advance it. While the present law authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver at the market price, the records show that they have purchased it at less than the market price, requiring the seller of silver to make a deduction, thus using their influence to depress the value of silver. And so the present Secretary and his successors, under the Windom bill, allowed as they are to make their own rules by which they determine the market price, and required to allow the depositor only the net market price, may require the holder of silver bullion to take less than the market price, deducting for transportation, etc. As the law does not compel the Secretary to buy, nor the holder of silver to deposit, except at his pleasure, the discretion of the Secretary may have considerable effect against the use of silver as money under his own bill. And we have no assurance as to what amount of

silver would be deposited under this bill; there is no inducement for the holder to deposit his silver with the Secretary of the Treasury if he can find a market more convenient.

On page 54 of his report the Secretary, in his argument against the further coinage of silver, says:

As to the other propositions that increased coinage would enhance the value of silver by absorbing the world's surplus product, it is a matter of grave doubt whether the purchase of an additional $2,000,000 worth of silver per month would have the effect of materially and permanently increasing the price of silver.

Yet this same Secretary, when arguing his own proposition on page 66 of his report, in stating the amount likely to be deposited under his bill says:

From the above it will be seen that the annual surplus product of silver which would probably be deposited at the mints of the United States approximates $51,000,000 (coinage) value, corresponding to 39,445,312 fine ounces, worth at the present market price of silver (96 cents) $37,867,500. At the present price of silver $4,000,000 will purchase 4,166,666 fine ounces, or for the year 50,000,000 fine ounces, an excess of 10,546,688 fine ounces above the estimated surplus. There is in fact no known accumulation of silver bullion in the world.

I have given the exact language of the Secretary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in his argument against free coinage, the Secretary claims that the purchase of $48,000,000 worth of silver per year instead of twenty-four millions would not have materially advanced the price of silver, yet, in another part of his report which I have just stated, he says that at the present price of silver, $37,786,500 would have purchased the entire surplus product of silver in the United States, thereby showing that if he had purchased a little over $3,000,000 worth of silver per month, he would have exhausted the supply, and if he had purchased four millions per month he would have made the demand for silver much greater than the supply, which would have advanced the value of silver very much. If the honorable Secretary thinks that to have purchased $48,000,000 worth of silver per year instead of twenty-four millions would not have increased the value of silver, why does he make this statement on page 60 of his report, while enumerating the merits of his bill? and this is his language:

Third. By the utilization of silver in this way a market would be provided for the surplus product. This would tend to the rapid advancement of its value until a point be reached where we can with safety open our mints to the free coinage of silver.

He speaks of creating a market for the surplus product of silver under his bill and thereby increasing its value. Why has he not created a market for more silver under the present law by buying and coining more, and thereby increasing the value of silver? How passing strange it is that the honorable Secretary is able to see that an increase in the market or demand for silver under his scheme would increase its value, and not able to see that an increase in the market or demand for silver under the present law or under free coinage would increase the value of silver. He should not forget that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Another argument advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury against the further coinage of silver is that it would drive all our gold out of the country. This same prediction of evil was made by the gold advocates in 1878, and has been repeated by them at every opportunity since. It was then claimed that even the coinage of $2,000,000 worth of silver per month would cause us to lose all our gold. Let us examine the records and see if there is any cause for alarm from this source. The reports of the Secretary of the Treasury show that during the year 1877, while silver was demonetized, our exports of gold for that year were $26,590,374, while our imports of gold for the same time were $26,246,234, or $344,140 less than our exports. In 1888, after we had been coining and using standard silver dollars for over ten years, our annual export of gold for that year was $18,376,234 and our imports of gold for the same period $43,934,317, or our imports of gold over our exports for 1888 were $25,562,083. Our imports of gold from 1878 to 1888, inclusive, have exceeded our exports of gold for the same period $234,192,846.

Again, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that on the 1st of March, 1878, when we began to coin standard silver dollars, there was in circulation in the United States gold coin $82,530,163; gold certificates, $44,364,100; total gold coin and gold certificates in circulation March 1, 1878, $126,894,263. On October 1, 1889, after we had coined nearly three hundred and fifty million standard silver dollars we had in circulation in the United States gold coin $375,947,715; gold certificates, $116,675,349; total gold coin and gold certificates in circulation on October 1, 1889, $492,623,060. That is, our gold coin and gold certificates in circulation have increased since March 1, 1878, to October 1, 1889, $365,728,797. Now, is not this driving gold out of circulation at a rapid gait? On the contrary, our volume of gold coin has increased as silver coin increased. Another charge which the Secretary of the Treasury makes against the further coinage of standard silver dollars, and one which the enemies of silver money consider of very great importance, is that the standard silver dollar will not circulate, but they are only coined to be hoarded in the Treasury. Let us examine the reports of the Treasury upon this question and see the results. The following table is taken from statements and reports of the Treasury:

July 31, 1886, standard silver dollars coined, 235,643,286; net standard silver dollars in the Treasury after deducting silver certificates in circulation, 93,959,880; that is, on July 31, 1886, about 41 per cent. of our standard silver dollars were idle in the Treasury and not represented by silver certificates. On December 31, 1889, standard silver dollars coined, 349,902,001; net silver dollars in the Treasury after deducting silver certificates in circulation, 5,585,427, or about 1½ per cent. To repeat, on July 31, 1886, silver dollars in the Treasury not in circulation, not represented by certificates, 93,959,880. On December 31, 1889, silver dollars in the Treasury not represented by silver certificates, 5,586,427. Does this not show that silver money in the form of silver dollars or silver certificates circulates better every year.

Let us now compare the circulation of silver with the circulation of gold. December 31, 1889, total gold in the Treasury, $313,818,941; total standard silver dollars in the Treasury, 288,535,500; gold certificates in circulation, $122,985,889; silver certificates in circulation, $282,949,073; net gold in the Treasury not in circulation by certificates, $190,833,052; net standard silver dollars in the Treasury not in circulation by certificates, 5,586,427; idle gold in the Treasury, over $190,000,000; idle silver in the Treasury, about $5,500,000. Is this not a pretty good showing for silver when compared with gold? In the face of these facts the honorable Secretary argues that silver money will not circulate, when his own reports show it circulates better than gold. The way the enemies of silver deceive the people upon this branch of the question is by continually stating and calling attention to the gross amount of standard silver dollars in the Treasury without explaining that on nearly every one of those silver dollars a silver certificate has been issued, has taken the place of the silver dollar, is in circulation as the representative of the silver dollar, and the silver dollar is required by law to be kept in the Treasury to redeem the silver certificate.

The people, on account of convenience, prefer to use paper money to coin. For convenience the law authorizes the issue of silver certificates for silver dollars, but the silver dollar remains in the Treasury as the basis and security for the silver certificate, and the same is done with gold. Now, why does the honorable Secretary not tell us that gold will not circulate. I appeal to the Secretary of the Treasury and every enemy of silver upon this floor if this is not a very small and unfair argument against the further coinage of standard silver dollars. The standard silver dollar gives us our silver certificates, and these certificates circulate far better than gold; many people prefer them to gold.

But the honorable Secretary says the United States can not successfully open her mints to the free coinage of silver while England and some of the other European countries adhere to the gold standard, and he prefers to adopt some temporary measure until an international agreement can be reached. Sir, the enemies of silver have been talking about an international agreement on silver coinage ever since silver was demonetized, and we are no nearer an international agreement now than we were then.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be allowed to conclude without limit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SPRINGER, asks unanimous consent that his colleague be allowed to conclude his remarks without limit. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for this courtesy. Of course the enemies of silver are in favor of waiting for an international agreement, which they know is not likely to be reached and in that way they hope to postpone and defeat free coinage in this country. If the United States in her infancy and poverty could adopt the free coinage of both gold and silver and continue them successfully for over eighty years, independent of England, why should she with her present sixty-five millions of people, with all her commerce, wealth, and power hesitate and wait for England to take this step? Why not lead England rather than follow her?

It must be remembered that England produces but about 7 per cent. of the annual product of silver in the world, while the United States takes from her mines about 45 per cent. of the world's product. England has to buy her silver; we produce ours at home. England is interested in keeping the price of silver down. We are interested in advancing it. If England can come to the United States, buy 371¼ grains of pure silver for 72 cents, take it to India and with it buy a bushel of wheat, which in India is worth 98 cents in silver, silver being standard money in India, in this way England gets her wheat from India for 72 cents a bushel, and thus forces the American farmer to sell his wheat cheaper. If we had free coinage and England had to pay $1 instead of 72 cents for 371¼ grains of silver, her wheat in India would cost her more, and she would buy more wheat from the United States and less silver. It will be seen that our farmers are the chief sufferers from this process. Now, why should the United States wait for England to lead in changing this condition of affairs? But the United States would not be alone in using silver as money.

The following table shows the number of people in the world who

use silver alone, those who use gold alone, and those who use both gold and silver, estimated from the population of 1880:

SILVER-STANDARD COUNTRIES.	Population.
Russia	70,000,000
Austria	36,000,000
Egypt	4,500,000
Mexico	8,000,000
Central America	2,600,000
Ecuador	1,300,000
Peru	3,400,000
China	400,000,000
British India	237,144,456
Total	768,944,456
DOUBLE-STANDARD COUNTRIES.	
Greece	1,400,000
Roumania	4,000,000
Colombia	2,900,000
Venezuela	1,600,000
Chili	1,700,000
Uruguay	400,000
Japan	33,000,000
United States	50,000,000
France	36,200,000
Belgium	5,100,000
Switzerland	2,700,000
Italy	26,800,000
Spain	16,400,000
Paraguay	1,200,000
Holland	3,700,000
Total	187,300,000
GOLD-STANDARD COUNTRIES.	
Great Britain	32,000,000
Canada, Cape of Good Hope, and Australian colonies	7,000,000
Germany	42,000,000
Norway	1,700,000
Sweden	4,300,000
Total	97,000,000

That is, over 900,000,000 people use silver coin as standard money, while but 97,000,000 have the gold standard, and silver coin is used also in the gold-standard countries.

The Secretary of the Treasury and the advocates of his bill claim that the free coinage of silver at the old ratio of 16 to 1 is the result they seek to reach. How they expect to help bring about free coinage by ceasing to coin silver at all is what I fail to understand. They claim that we must first increase the value of silver before you establish free coinage, while we insist that free coinage itself will increase the value of silver bullion. There is no scheme that will increase the value of a piece of silver bullion so quick as the stamp of the Government, which converts it into a legal-tender dollar and gives it a new and additional use. While the Secretary's bill may increase the value of silver it is not at all certain that it will increase the price permanently.

It is said these Treasury notes will be as good as gold, because for each dollar of them you get a quantity of silver worth a dollar in gold. This is no evidence that these notes will answer all the purposes of gold. They are not a legal tender, they are not redeemable in legal-tender money, you can not pay a debt with them if a creditor refuses to take them. The bankers, the bondholders, and other money organizations may combine against these notes, refuse to take them, demand gold, and thereby increase the value of gold by increasing the demand for it, and this would depress the value of silver. The Windom bill places the value of silver in the hands of the speculators, who, by combinations and corners, may advance it or depress it according to their own selfish desires. After acquiring a large number of these notes they might by some scheme depress the value of silver, and while silver is low present their notes for redemption, and then advance silver and present their silver for Treasury notes, and continue to speculate off of the Government. You thus leave it to these money powers to say whether we shall ever have free coinage of silver under the Windom bill.

Mr. Speaker, the people are not so much interested in increasing the price of silver as they are in increasing the price of all the products of labor. What they want is more standard legal-tender money, not warehouse receipts or promissory notes, but money that will pay debts.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury states that the total volume of money of all kinds in circulation in this country is $1,426,104,391, which is about $22 per capita. It is safe to say the amount in actual circulation is much less. Of this sum about $130,000,000 consists of national-bank notes, which are being withdrawn very rapidly. Over $37,000,000 were withdrawn last year. When we take into account the contraction of our currency from the withdrawal of national-bank notes and the increase of our population and the rapid development of the country it is evident that, in order to even maintain present prices and to prevent products from falling still lower than what they are, it will be necessary for us to increase our volume of money from some source about $50,000,000 a year.

The best authority upon the subject states that the annual product of gold is nearly all consumed in dentistry and in the arts, and that not to exceed $15,000,000 is left to the entire world for coinage purposes, and of this but a very small portion should be allowed for the United States; hence we can not hope to increase our volume of money from gold. We must then take either silver or paper. It is estimated by those who have carefully investigated the subject that the world's annual product of silver is about $140,000,000, a considerable portion of which is used in the arts. That left for coinage must be distributed among all the countries using silver coin, which countries I have already stated. It is generally estimated by those who have given the subject careful study that if we should adopt free coinage not more than $50,000,000 per year would come to our mints, and this is corroborated by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such an increase would not be inflation, but, as I have stated, that amount will be required to keep prices from falling still lower than they are. We need both gold and silver as money. With both metals in use the volume and value of money are not so easily changed. The presence of one helps to regulate the value of the other. The strong opposition to silver during the last seventeen years has come from the bankers and bondholders and has had much to do in depressing its value.

Now, sir, I am opposed to allowing these parties to profit by their own wrong. I am opposed to experimenting with silver any longer. Let us return to the requirements of the Constitution and pursue the old plan which our fathers followed for nearly a hundred years, and during all that time the silver dollar was the best of money. Let us repeal the infamous law of 1873 and give back to the silver dollar all the monetary functions and governmental sanction which it had before that law was passed. That is all the bill presented by the minority proposes to do, simply to repeal the law of 1873, and every member upon this floor who opposes the free coinage of silver to that extent defends the outrageous law which demonetized it.

It is argued by the gold advocates that it would be to the interest of the laboring man to reduce our currency to a gold basis, so he would be paid in dollars of the greatest value. Sir, you contract the currency of this country to a gold basis, make money scarce and times hard, so the laborer can get but four days' employment a week, instead of six, at 50 cents a day instead of a dollar, and it will be a very poor consolation to him in such distressing times to tell him he is paid in a sound currency. The laborer would prefer good times, work six days in the week at a dollar a day, paid in silver dollars or silver certificates, which will buy in any of our markets as many of the necessaries of life as gold.

It is very amusing indeed to hear these money lords and their representatives on this floor contending for a contraction of the currency to a gold basis in the interest of labor. These money kings while trying to feather their own nests appear in the garb of virtue as the special champions of the poor farmer and laborer. How safe and secure would be the fortunes of the farmers and laborers of this country while thus guarded by the very men who have been robbing them of their earnings for the last twenty-five years? Sir, it is like the wolf guarding the lamb, or the fox guarding the hen-roost, and the people so understand it.

The best times for everybody, unless it is the money-lender or persons with fixed incomes, is when money is plentiful, times good, and prices gradually rising. Then the farmer is encouraged to produce as much as possible, will employ more hands on his farm and laborers are thereby benefited. Men with money are willing to invest it in manufacturing, building, railroads, and other various enterprises, while prices are rising. This creates new fields and new demands for laborers, and thus increases their wages and gives them more employment.

So long as the silver dollar and silver certificates will buy as much in any market in this country or go as far in paying a debt as the gold dollar, we need not be afraid of having too many. We never had any money that circulated better or gave the people more general satisfaction than our present silver certificate, and as it takes the place of and represents the silver dollar the statement that the silver itself does not circulate is a groundless argument.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a few words in regard to the Republican caucus bill proposed as a substitute. Let this much be said for it, that it is of exclusively Republican paternity. The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures have had no opportunity to consider it, and members on this side of the House have had no opportunity to see it. It therefore comes here fresh from the hands of a Republican caucus. Consideration by the committee, however, would have been useless, as the Republican members on the committee were pledged, no doubt, to support the bill just as it came from the Republican caucus. The Republican caucus took this subject away from the House and its committee; they were unwilling that a majority of the people's Representatives should legislate upon this important question.

The Republicans had said early in the session that they wished to adopt rules by which a majority could legislate, and now they propose by the aid of a party caucus that less than one-third of the members of this House shall force through here a bill on the silver question which three-fourths of the people of this country are opposed to, and which could not receive the voluntary support of one-third of the members upon this floor if they were left free to vote their own convictions or the sentiments of their districts. The caucus bill, so far as it pertains to the silver question in brief, provides that the Secretary of the

Treasury shall buy four and a half million dollars' worth of silver each month at the market price and issue in payment therefor Treasury notes, which Treasury notes are redeemable in coin or on demand of the holder may be redeemed with silver bullion at the market price at the option or discretion of the Secretary. Such Treasury notes are a legal tender for all debts, except when the contract otherwise provides, are receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received or when redeemed in coin they may be reissued. I repeat that the Committee on Coinage has had no opportunity to consider this bill, but I think I have been able to observe one very serious objection to this caucus substitute, which of itself is enough to condemn the bill in the mind of any member who in good faith favors the use of silver as money. It is that provision which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem the Treasury notes with silver bullion.

I have offered an amendment striking out the provision to which I have referred, but under the special order adopted by the majority we will not be allowed to vote on that amendment. If the bill passes with that proviso in it, I insist the Secretary of the Treasury can comply with the law without increasing our currency from this source $5,000,000 a year, and in fact without any increase at all.

When the bill becomes a law, some silver syndicate can purchase four and a half million dollars worth of silver bullion and during the first month present it to the Secretary of the Treasury and receive Treasury notes. Before the Secretary is required to make another purchase, this syndicate can return to the Treasury its Treasury notes, and receive the four and a half million dollars' worth of silver, and when the time comes for the second month's purchase, they can again present their four and a half million dollars' worth of silver for Treasury notes, and they may continue this process from month to month and year to year, thereby defeating the purchase of silver or any increase of our currency from this source, yet the Secretary would be complying with the law.

While this is an extreme case, we have had some very extreme Secretaries of the Treasury and may have them in the future. It is enough to know that this provision would allow the Secretary to pursue the vicious course I have suggested from the smallest to the greatest extent.

The fact that this provision is in the bill and the enemies of silver insist in keeping it there is evidence that they intend to use it against silver. The present Secretary believes these notes should be redeemed in silver bullion, that it would make them a better currency. Now, why might he not follow his own judgment if given the discretion to do so?

But, Mr. Speaker, to state a case less extreme: Suppose a syndicate is formed for the purpose of purchasing silver for other countries through the Treasury of the United States; suppose England desires to buy $15,000,000 worth of silver, she can collect that amount of these Treasury notes, present them to the Secretary of the Treasury, and receive that amount of silver bullion. This amount of Treasury notes is withdrawn from circulation, are not reissued, our currency to that extent is contracted, and the silver goes to England. Other foreign demands for silver may be supplied in the same way, and whatever amount of silver necessary to supply this foreign demand, whether twenty million or fifty million ounces, would have to be deducted from the $54,000,000 of our annual purchase, and the net balance would show the amount of silver which would be used to increase our currency, which might be five million or fifty million dollars. Can a bill which promises such uncertain results receive the support of a majority of this House?

I know what the defense is to this provision. It will be insisted that this provision is only to be used at the discretion of the Secretary, and that he will not use it except when in his judgment it is necessary. But his judgment may not always be in the interest of the people. We have had some experience with the discretion of Secretaries of the Treasury in the past, and we know they have always exercised it against silver. As I have already shown, under the present law it is in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion per month for coinage, and with that discretion every Secretary of the Treasury since the law was passed in 1878 has purchased the least amount required by law. It is in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out silver or gold coin as interest on our public debt, and every Secretary since 1878 has been paying this interest in gold only, thereby using his discretion to discredit silver.

I shall never give a bill my support which places so much power and control over our currency in the hands of one man. If placing silver in the Treasury under this bill has the effect to monetize it, the Secretary should not be authorized to dispose of it as a mere commodity, and thereby demonetize it at his discretion. When it becomes money, let it remain money. Such discretion is to be used only on the demand of the holder of such Treasury notes, and he will only make such demand when it would be to his interest and against the interest of the Government to have such notes redeemed with silver bullion, that is, such discretion, when used at all, would be used against the interest of the Government.

Another objection to the substitute is in line 6, section 2, where it provides that the Treasury notes redeemed in coin *may* be reissued. It does not provide they *shall* be reissued, but leaves it to the discretion of the Secretary to reissue or withdraw them from circulation. A similar objection occurs in line 11 of the same section, where it is provided that the Treasury notes received for customs, taxes, and other public dues *may* be reissued; again leaving it to the discretion of the Secretary whether such notes *shall* be reissued or withheld from circulation. These objections show how skillfully this bill has been drawn to demonetize silver and show how likely we are to be deceived and disappointed if we adopt some new and untried experiment in lieu of free coinage. I have endeavored to amend the bill by striking out the word "may" at the places I have stated and inserting the word "shall."

It is true, Mr. Speaker, the substitute makes these Treasury notes a legal tender for all debts, except where otherwise provided by the contract. But, sir, they are not a legal tender for the payment of the interest and principal of our bonds. Our bondholders must be paid in coin, and when you stop the coinage of silver it makes it necessary to pay them in gold alone. These Treasury notes are a legal tender among the common people, but not for the bondholders.

Mr. Speaker, the Windom bill and substitutes offered by the Republican caucus are wrong in principle, and no number of amendments will make either equal to a free-coinage bill in my judgment. I have already said that our farmers feel a special interest in the free coinage of silver. It must be remembered that in large cities, where banks are plentiful and deposits have a multiplied use, much of the business is transacted by the use of checks and other substitutes for money, while in agricultural districts the small dealings of farmers are carried on in money and require the actual presence and use of money in the trade. Hence a contraction of the currency is more quickly and severely felt among the farmers. Money is the life-blood of the nation, and what we want is more of this life-blood in circulation.

Let us pass the bill offered by the minority; open our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of standard silver dollars; issue silver certificates to take the place of, and circulate instead of, the silver; make those certificates a legal tender for all debts, public and private; let the national banks pass out of existence and the Government control the currency of the country; require the Secretary of the Treasury to make no further distinction between gold and silver coin in paying the interest and principal of our public debt. It will then be to the interest of these money-kings to maintain the value of the silver dollar, and when you get this power and the influence of the Government in favor of the silver dollar instead of against it, you will see silver appreciate to a parity with gold.

Now, I appeal to the sons of Jeffersonian Democracy on this side of the Chamber to stand by the money of the Constitution; stand by that principle of Democracy which believes in legislation that will give the greatest good to the greatest number; and I appeal to the members on the other side, whose oppressed people are demanding the free coinage of silver, not to follow the advice of their enemies, but to stand by the interests of their constituents. Sirs, it will be no answer for you to say to the people of your respective districts that you voted for the Windom bill or the bill of the Republican caucus because it was the best you could get.

If a few members on that side of the House will join this side in an effort to get a vote on a free-coinage bill and every Representative upon this floor will vote the sentiment of his constituents, it will pass this House by a good majority, will pass the Senate, and become a law unless vetoed by the President. Nor will it be any excuse for you to say that the President would have vetoed such a bill. If we pass it we shall have discharged our duty, and if the President vetoes it the responsibility will be with him, and not with us. If the Republican Representatives from the West will examine their national platform upon this question they will find there is no party obligation which requires them to disregard the wishes and interests of their constituents in order to support the sentiments of a Republican caucus. They are under no partisan obligations to sacrifice at the dictate of a Republican machine the rights of the people who sent them here.

I have no doubt that the Kansas corn-burners would prefer a free-coinage bill passed by the aid of Democratic votes rather than accept this vicious and unsound measure fresh from the hands of a Republican caucus.

Mr. Speaker, as to those members on the other side of the House who represent agricultural districts and people, who are anxious for the free coinage of silver, I confess I have some curiosity to see whether their devotion to the interest of their constituents is stronger than their devotion to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury and his Administration. Of those whom I know personally I believe they will prefer to stand by the people they represent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anxious as I am for the passage of a free-coinage bill and confident as I am of the good effects it will have upon the country, I would not flatter the farmers and other laboring classes that the passage of such a bill will give them all the relief to which they are entitled and which they so greatly need. I do not lose sight of other causes which are operating against the farmers with a heavy hand. The unjust tariff laws which allow certain manufacturers in this country to

take from the earnings of the farmers and other consumers large bounties every year without consideration, under the pretense of taxation, have not failed to bring their annual burdens upon the people. Trusts, gambling boards, and other evils have all brought their tributes of misfortune. I would not claim that the free coinage of silver is a cure for all these ills. Yet, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a step in the right direction, and I shall give it my hearty support, with the hope that it will give some relief to the farmers and other laboring classes and tend to restore our people to those prosperous and happy times of former years. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TAYLOR, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regard the question under consideration as the most important one to come before this Congress. The question as to how this measure will affect the producers of silver or the owners of silver bullion is local; but, while this feature of the question is local, the result of our acts or the result of any measure that may be passed by this House is national, affecting every citizen of the United States. There is no other measure likely to come before this House that can affect all the people of the country as this measure will. Therefore it is a measure that should be considered with great care and honesty of purpose, and entirely without reference to how it may affect certain localities, with solicitude only as to its effect upon the country at large. I do not approach the consideration of this subject as one of the Representatives of the State whose commission I am proud to bear, but as a Representative of this great nation; and I shall endeavor to consider it in the interest of the greatest number of people of the country.

There are two bills reported from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, a majority and a minority report; and I first desire you to examine with me and see how far the two measures agree and where they separate and why they separate. First, they both agree that the measures now providing for adding to the circulating medium in this country do not keep pace with the increase of population and the growth of business; second, that the silver produced in this country shall be taken by the Government and Treasury notes or silver certificates issued for the same; third, the bill reported by the majority makes provision for coining all the silver into standard silver dollars that may be necessary to redeem the Treasury notes issued in purchase of silver, dollars of 412½ grains and legal-tender.

The bill reported by the minority provides for the coinage of all silver that may be brought to the Government into the same kind of silver dollars and issuing Treasury notes or silver certificates for it: so there is but little difference between the two propositions in this respect, the difference being in favor of the majority report, as all persons agree that it is impossible to put more than a limited amount of silver dollars into actual circulation and that the only way to utilize it as money is in the form of a silver certificate or Treasury note, leaving the silver on deposit with the Government. Therefore it would seem to be unnecessary to incur expense in the coinage of more of these silver dollars than are needed for the redemption of the notes. Fourth, the bill reported by the majority provides for the purchase by the Government of $4,500,000 of silver a month, to be paid for in legal-tender Treasury notes, which is intended to consume the product of the silver mines of the United States.

The bill reported by the minority provides that the Government shall take all the product of the silver mines of this country and issue certificates upon it, which is virtually a purchase. Therefore, the measures substantially agree up to this. The bill reported by the majority provides that the Government shall purchase this silver at its value in the markets of the world, which now is about 75 cents on the dollar. The minority bill provides that the Government shall take it at 100 cents on the dollar, regardless of its market value. Therefore, the two measures separate at this point.

Let us examine the two now and see which is the honest measure and which is in the interest of the greater number of people. The Government has been purchasing $2,000,000 worth of silver per month since 1878 on the principles embraced in the majority bill—that is, at the value of silver in the markets of the world—and has now as profit from that purchase over $50,000,000 in the Treasury. This $50,000,000 is now the property of all the people of this country. Each man has an interest in this accumulation of money. Had we been taking this silver on the principles embraced in the minority bill, a few rich mine-owners, instead of the people of the country, would have had this money; and at the present value of silver, if the majority bill should become a law, the saving to the people would amount to from ten to fifteen million dollars a year. If the minority measure should be adopted, this money would all go into the hands of the rich silver syndicates, whose hardships the benevolent members of the minority are striving to soften.

I cannot understand why any member upon this floor who does not represent a silver-mining constituency should support the bill reported by the minority. I know it is contended by some that a great wrong was committed, some time in the past, when silver was demonetized. This may be so; but we are not here to redress the wrongs of the past by committing another wrong. We are not here to legislate for the past, but for the future. We are here to legislate under the light of to-day for the benefit of our constituents in the future.

I know of no reason why the silver producer should have preference to the farmer who grows wheat. I know of no reason why the Government should purchase the product of the silver mine at 100 cents when it is worth only 75 cents; and if the minority bill should become a law, then Congress should pass an act to compel the Government to purchase wheat at $1 a bushel when the value of it was only 75 cents. Such a law would be far preferable, as it would be in the interest of the great masses; while the bill reported by the minority is in the interest of only a few mine-owners and all benefits derived under the minority's bill would go to the pockets of these few millionaires.

If I were not familiar with the history of the Democratic party I should be very much surprised at its support of a measure of this kind. It is loud in its denunciation of trusts and corporations and national banks and all money institutions. But those who are familiar with its past history know that this is only sound and is issued for home consumption, to delude its followers; and when we come to any action the Democratic party is found on the side of these wealthy institutions, as in this case. If the minority bill should become a law it would be the most outrageous ever put upon the statute-books, and the title of it should be changed so as to read: "An act to take annually from the public Treasury about $14,000,000 for the benefit of the silver syndicates," as this would be its effect.

My friend from Missouri, the author of the minority report, tells us that what he wants is more money. Under the provisions of the bill of the majority there will be added to the circulation fifty-four millions a year in legal-tender Treasury notes, which will have behind them for their redemption silver bullion bought at the market price of the world and the Government behind that, so that no safer currency can be put into circulation. I agree with my friend from Missouri that if the bill reported by the minority should become a law and the price of silver remain where it is, it would increase the circulation from ten to fifteen millions beyond this; but how would this increase be made? It would be made simply by giving the silver syndicates this ten or fifteen millions, for which we receive nothing.

It is a new way of benefiting the people to give away the Treasury notes of the Government, or, in fact, the notes of the people; a new way of lessening the load of my friend's heavily mortgaged farmer constituents that he tells us about so often, by putting an additional mortgage on their farms, as this ten or fifteen million dollars given away annually to these rich syndicates would be a mortgage upon every piece of property in the country and each piece would be held for it till the Treasury notes were paid. This certainly is a new mode of financiering, original, never thought of in past ages. Think of it!—bettering a man's condition by increasing his debts; encouraging the tiller of the soil, whose fields, as in the verse of Wordsworth, are already laden with other burthens than the crops they bear, by lessening his small income. If this new principle, that we benefit the people by plunging them in debt, is correct, we should give away a billion dollars at once. It is plain, Mr. Chairman, that the concocters of this minority report have unbounded faith in the gullibility of their constituents.

I am not surprised at the great opposition made by my friend from Missouri and by his Democratic colleagues at the attempt made by this House to substitute an act for the coinage act of 1878, as that act is the only one favored by the Democratic party that has been put upon the statute-book for more than a quarter of a century which has been of any benefit to the people of this country. It is the only offspring they have to show for their labors in both ends of the Capitol that has got beyond infancy; and, therefore, I say that I am not surprised at their great opposition to the displacement of their sickly child by a full grown and legitimate son of a broader justice.

The claim of the minority that the substitution of the majority silver bill for the act of 1878 demonetizes silver is a claim that cannot be substantiated on this floor, and I cannot believe that any member on this floor thinks so, for a moment's examination of the bill reported by the majority should convince him of the utter folly of such a position; and I pity any member who represents a constituency that he must feed on such thin diet as this. As the bill reported by the majority provides for the coinage of the old standard legal-tender silver dollar of 412½ grains in sufficient quantity to redeem all the Treasury notes, the Treasurer would be compelled to coin and to keep in the vaults of the Treasury enough of these legal-tender silver dollars to be ready at any time to redeem all the Treasury notes that might be presented.

Now, on what grounds or on what line of reasoning can any man claim that this bill demonetizes silver? As the prophet Job says: "How long will ye speak these things? and how long shall the words of your mouth be like a strong wind?" I am weary of their much talking. This bill does nothing of the kind. It simply substitutes a silver-coinage law that will take in all the product of the silver mines of this country, which is expected to be four or five millions a month, for a coinage law that takes but two millions a month. To any man, sir, who is not controlled by a silver-producing constituency or whose mental and moral vision was not blighted by the baleful influence of Democratic principles, this law would seem to go as far as possible in the other direction.

The minority admits in its report that of the $355,000,000 of silver that has been coined under the act of 1878 the Government has not been able to put into circulation $60,000,000 up to this date, although the

Treasury Department sends the coins free of charge to any person who applies. The balance is represented by silver certificates: so there is no way to utilize this silver, as admitted by the minority and as shown by the facts, but by a silver certificate or Treasury note issued by the Government, the Government retaining the silver in its vaults. By this admission my Democratic friends agree that there is no necessity for the expense of coining this silver, as the coins are not needed by the dear people who send them here to retard legislation by their patriotism. There are now in the vaults of the Treasury over 300,000,000 standard legal-tender silver dollars that can be drawn out by any person presenting silver certificates: so I can not see the necessity of continuing this coinage at great expense.

The argument of the minority is based almost entirely upon the position that the bill reported by the majority demonetizes silver, which position, as I have attempted to show, is not tenable, as under the provisions of the majority bill the Government will be compelled to coin all the silver purchased into standard legal-tender dollars, if they are needed. The only difference is that the Government will not be compelled to coin them unless they are needed; whilst under the bill reported by the minority it will be compelled to coin them, when every person in the country of any intelligence knows that they will not be needed, as but few persons want a silver dollar when they can get a silver certificate or a Treasury note. So the foundation of their argument fails, and the only thing that is left of their position is whether the Government shall pay the wealthy silver syndicates 100 cents on the dollar for their silver when it is not worth more than 75.

Who can claim that this would be in the interest of the great mass of the people? Is it possible to believe that the people will favor a measure of this kind? I desire to have adopted a measure which will continue the double standard, providing for the use of gold and silver as a circulating medium, and have a tendency to bring the two metals together in value at the earliest possible time without violating all the principles of sound financiering. This I am satisfied this bill will do; therefore, I give it my heartiest support. I do not intend to go into a discussion to show how many nations are using silver and how many are not using it, nor how long silver has been used as a medium of exchange by the people.

This is history that is familiar to almost every person; and as we are not legislating for other nations or for past ages, but for the people of this country and for the future, I have endeavored to confine my remarks to the question how these measures will affect the people of this country. As an evidence that we should not be governed in our action upon this measure by the action of other countries or the uses that other countries have made of silver in past centuries, I will name some of the things that have been used as money in the past: Gold, silver, iron, copper, brass, glass, tin, lead, codfish dried, dried fish, salt, seal-skins, silk cloth, rice, cotton cloth, leather, shells, bone, coal, cocoa beans, linen, whisky, tobacco, cattle, tenpenny nails, turnips, potatoes, and human beings—human beings at about $14 a head. Corn was used in Massachusetts and Maryland, and also tobacco in Maryland; tenpenny nails in Scotland and North Carolina, and also whisky in part of North Carolina. So you will see very readily that it will not do for us to be governed by past ages; but, as I have said before, we must legislate under the light of to-day.

I am well aware that in the examination of this question we have to take into consideration the products of the silver mines and the uses made of silver in this and other countries; but for many years this country has been exporting twenty millions of silver a year that has gone into use in other countries. If this bill should become a law we would stop exporting silver, as the Government would take all the product of the mines of this country. This could not but affect the price of silver in the markets of the world and would gradually and in a short time bring gold and silver to an equal value. This is what I think to be for the best interests of the people of this country; and it is sound financiering, doing justice to all and violence to none.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the foremost question in the files of public attention to-day, coextensive with the length and breadth of this land, is perhaps to be found in the recognized and admitted necessity for just and wholesome legislation in relation to the problem of our metallic currency. It is a subject which has gone far beyond the thought and theories of experts in financial economy and fiscal science. It has pushed itself outside of the reflections and machinations of those who reside in the centers of wealth, the professional urban money-changers and capitalistic associations, and invaded the minds of those who dwell in humble rural homes and pursue the varied avocations necessary in their own spheres for earning a livelihood.

It has found lodgment and deliberation in the hearts and intellects of the great body of the plain people of the country, those who toil with their hands for their daily bread. It is far better appreciated and understood by the masses than many who are supposed to watch the current of public opinion may imagine, because it is realized by them in an intensely practical way. Their eyes and ears are constantly open to all that surrounds the real situation, and they are earnest and resolved in the purpose and intent to have a proper response to all its demands.

Until the passage of the resolution providing for the consideration of the bill now before the House, it was little dreamed by the people that a full, fair, and free opportunity would be denied their Representatives to vote upon the distinct and independent proposition for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, in a regular and appropriate way, nor was it expected that any Representative could escape the responsibility of committing himself to the record, as either in favor of or in opposition to that measure.

But, strange to say, under the peculiar parliamentary administration which now operates and arbitrarily dictates the procedure of the House, it appears that only such a measure and such amendments as it may suit the pleasure of the majority to allow shall be presented or considered, and this, too, despite the fact that the minority of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures have regularly submitted their views and proposed a substitute for the pending bill, and the further fact, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], that it was agreed by that committee that a vote should be had in the House on such substitute.

Such a course may well excite the protest and provoke the condemnation of all who favor just and patriotic legislation, and carries with it a withering censure against a system which can be employed to suppress and prevent a consideration of any proposition, no matter how important it may be, in the interests of the people at large or in sympathy with their desires.

Mr. Speaker, there has never yet been made any satisfactory answer to the complaint of the people growing out of the demonetization of the silver dollar by the act of 12th February, 1873. Before the bar of public opinion this piece of mal-legislation has been repeatedly arraigned. Popular indictment has described it as a fraud and a crime. The method and circumstance of its enactment have been criticised and denounced with all the vehemence of an outraged and indignant people, smarting under the keenest sense of injustice and betrayal of confidence.

No one has been found who has been able to successfully explain or defend it. Upon the statute-book it stood for a half decade as a taint and reproach upon Federal legislation. It has never been fully eradicated, nor will it be until the law as it was aforetime shall be restored to its ancient position and revived in its pristine vigor. Something is due a people who believe their trust has been abused; some reparation for a wrong, whether wickedly perpetrated or inadvertently committed, ought, in all good conscience, to be made.

No sensible man will deny the abiding popular grievance and dissatisfaction engendered by the fact that a constitutional and standard coin, sanctioned by reason of its strength for fourscore years, was thus suddenly and indeliberately, if not covertly and fraudulently, dropped from its rightful place and office in our monetary system. It is doubtful if any Congressional action on financial questions since the formation of our Government has provoked greater discontent or occasioned more profound distrust of legislative integrity. It has never been acquiesced in by the people. It never will be. No accessary *post factum* support of the injury done or result intended, by whomsoever tendered and contributed, will ever receive popular ratification.

There has been a constant and persistent effort on the part of the people to rectify this wrong ever since the discovery of its commission, and the movement is earnest, active, and determined. It met its primary and partial response by the act of 28th February, 1878; but it has been bitterly resisted and obstructed at every stage. Any vantage-ground gained has usually been weakened, as far as it was possible to be done, by the exercise of the lodgment of actual or constructive discretionary power in the hands of those chosen to execute the laws.

The less of this kind of power conferred on executive officers the better it will hereafter be for the people and the practical enforcement of legislative intention. Discretionary power is sometimes more easily approached and swayed by the selfish solicitations of the interested few than by a consideration of the well-being of the confiding many, and is an instrument capable of dangerous and destructive use.

From 1793, when the coinage of the silver dollar began under the mint act of 1792, to 1873, when it was stricken from the list of silver coins in the United States, there were coined 8,045,838 silver dollars; and I think it is worthy of notice that more than one-fourth of this amount was coined during the two years next preceding the act of demonetization. In 1871, 1,117,136 silver dollars were coined; in 1872, the number coined was 1,118,600; and for both years, 2,235,736. In 1870, the amount was less than one-half million, and for the ten preceding years, with the exception of 1868-'69, the average annual coinage was less than 50,000.

It appears that the coinage of silver dollars was steadily progressing in 1873, and that up to the 12th of February of that year, when the fell work of demonetization was consummated, there were coined 296,600 dollars. It is stated by Secretary Windom, in his recent annual report, that in 1873 the bullion value of the silver dollar, containing 371¼ grains of pure silver, was about 1½ cents more than the gold dollar. I have seen the statement elsewhere made that the amount of silver necessary to make a silver dollar at that time was worth over 3 cents more than the amount of gold necessary to make a gold dollar.

If the arguments made in recent years against the further coinage of silver dollars are sound it would seem that the real danger which then

confronted the country was the prospective hoarding of silver; that "silver and its equivalent would abandon the field of circulation to gold alone," and the historical demonstration would occur "that the point is easily reached in the attempt to float at the same time two sorts of money of different excellence, when the better will cease to be in general circulation." Who heard in the first years of the seventies any fears expressed that coin obligations of the Government were liable to be paid in gold, the then cheaper money?

For eighty years, under the operation of just and equal laws and the free coinage of both metals, the gold and silver dollars had kept company with each other and maintained a reasonable equivalence in the United States. Our Constitution and our laws made thereunder recognized the monetary quality of the two metals, as other peoples and other countries had done for centuries. It was not astonishing, then, that the people should rebel at a sudden departure from such a time-honored policy and revolt at the questionable manner in which such departure was accomplished.

Having discussed *in extenso* the silver question in a former Congress, it is my purpose now, as far as I may be able, to note and comment upon the history of silver legislation and attempted legislation since 1873, as well as to invite attention to the unrelenting warfare that has been waged against silver coinage and to show the necessity for the reinstatement of the silver dollar in all its ancient rights and functions. I had the honor, in the beginning of my Congressional service, to be assigned to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and for two terms to devote earnest attention to the investigation of the subject of our metal moneys.

I have never believed that the act, known as the Bland-Allison act, 28th February, 1878, which passed both branches of Congress over Executive objections, without important or noticeable party alignment, was either logical or properly responsive to the requirements of the situation. Its chief merit is in its rebuke to the indefensible legislation of 1873 and its restoration of the legal-tender character of the silver dollar, together with the fact that in a qualified and limited way it revives a coinage which had been wrongfully stopped.

It is artificial and inconsistent in that it compels the purchase of silver bullion, and treats as a purchasable commodity by the Government that which ought to be allowed to come of its own volition and in its own way to the mints of the Government, in response to natural laws and current demands, for transformation into money. Silver ought to buy, not to be bought, when viewed from a governmental and monetary standpoint. Compulsory purchase for coinage is incompatible with free coinage.

It is impossible for any human wisdom to properly estimate the appropriate *quantum* of coinage for a given number of years for such a country as the United States. No man can anticipate the products of the mines, nor exactly calculate the future necessities of so large and populous a Government as ours for any specific stock of metallic money. With open mints and free coinage the conditions of supply and demand will better regulate the matter than it is possible for any legislative prescience to do. This act also practically relegates to the judgment and inclination of one man, the Secretary of the Treasury, to determine how much or how little, between the $2,000,000 and $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion, shall be coined monthly. One-man power or discretion ought in no case to be allowed to control the silver-money supply of 65,000,000 of free people.

It has been the policy and custom of the Treasury Department since the enactment of this law to limit the coinage to the minimum; to go only to that extent which the law absolutely compelled; and we have had no Secretary of the Treasury since 1878, who has manifested the slightest disposition to exercise the discretion allowed him in favor of enlarged coinage.

Under the operation of this law, as executed by Treasury officials, and under different Administrations, there were coined from February, 1878, to December, 1885, some $215,759,431, when the country and Congress were solemnly admonished that the danger-line of such coinage was being rapidly approached, and to avert pressing and imminent fiscal calamities it was necessary to suspend such coinage. Financial ruin and national disaster were predicted.

The President recommended Congress to stop the operation of the system, which, it was affirmed, must inevitably result in the most direful consequences. The power and prestige of the Administration were summoned to enforce the recommendation, but the law remained upon the statute-books and the coinage went on in the usual limited way. Bills were introduced and referred to the House committee looking to suspension as well as the free coinage of the silver dollar. The majority of the committee reported adversely to free coinage, and a minority of three members, Mr. BLAND, Mr. BYNUM, and myself, asked the House to consider and pass a free-coinage bill.

The committee wholly failed to sustain the Executive recommendation for the suspension of the coinage and contented themselves with an adverse report on the proposition for free coinage. In the year previous, at the second session of the Forty-eighth Congress, there had been an unsuccessful effort to carry through a coinage suspension provision on the sundry civil bill, but after a pronounced vote on the question of the manner of considering the bill, relating essentially to this provision and upon which the issue was distinctly joined and the judgment of the House taken, the clause relating to suspension was abandoned and it was eliminated therefrom.

It was with extreme difficulty that we were able to obtain discussion upon and consideration of the report to which reference has been made, and which was submitted February 16, 1886. Many of the speeches made on the silver question in the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress were delivered in advance of an actual consideration of the committee's report. I ask indulgence, as explanatory of the trouble encountered, to quote from my own remarks delivered on the 6th March, 1886, as follows:

> I earnestly call upon the friends of free silver coinage to organize in order to force a vote upon the bill reported from the committee having jurisdiction of the subject. We have made several ineffectual efforts to fix a day for its consideration. It is believed by many that it is not intended to allow a vote to be taken if parliamentary tactics can prevent.

Finally, regular consideration of the measure was entered upon and elaborate discussion was had, with the result that the free-coinage proposition failed of passage; but its friends had the gratification to witness the utter failure of the counter-proposition, for suspension, to prevail.

In the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress the agitation of the silver question was to some extent revived over the measure for the retirement and recoinage of the trade-dollar. The essential contention was whether the silver obtained by the redemption of the trade-dollar for recoinage, amounting to about $8,000,000 in value, should be included in or excluded from the amount required to be purchased monthly for coinage into standard dollars.

The friends of silver insisted that the bullion thus derived should be coined in addition to the current monthly coinage, while on the other side it was urged that it should merely constitute a part thereof and be deducted from the usual purchase. The matter was discussed, and it is manifest from the debate and all the circumstances surrounding the final passage of the measure (February 12, 1887) that it was the intention and purpose of Congress that there should be an increased coinage from this source. Having had charge of the matter as a member of the committee in the first session of that Congress and been one of the House conferees on the subsequent disagreeing votes of the two Houses, I feel to some extent qualified to speak accurately concerning the object had in view; and, as illustrative thereof, I beg to quote from my remarks made on the 11th of December, 1886, the following extract:

> The redemption of the trade-dollar would revitalize and bring to the channels of business several millions of dollars' worth of what is now dormant and inoperative bullion and cause its conversion into standard dollars or subsidiary coin, as the demands of trade or the inclination of the holders might suggest. * * * It would add to the volume of our metallic money, and to the extent of such addition meet the wants of the people for an increased circulating medium. It would be a step in the direction of the free coinage of silver, an object which my judgment and research convince me ought to be promoted by the most earnest and persistent endeavors of the people's representatives.

No one, I think, can impartially review the history and discussion of this proposition and candidly construe the words of the act itself and reach any conclusion different from that stated concerning the legislative purpose and intention. Section 2 of the act is as follows:

> That the trade-dollars received by, paid to, or deposited with the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer or national depository of the United States shall not be paid out or in any other manner issued, but, at the expense of the United States, shall be transmitted to the coinage mints and recoined into standard silver dollars or subsidiary coin at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the trade-dollars recoined under this act shall not be counted as part of the silver bullion required to be purchased and coined into standard dollars as required by the act of February 28, 1878.

The act was received by the President February 19, 1887, and was allowed to become a law without his approval. If it were necessary to throw further light upon the proper construction to be given to its meaning, the absence of Executive approval, in the presence of the known hostility to silver coinage which was entertained by the President, would furnish the same. How has this law been administered? It went into effect March 3, 1887. During the years 1887–1888 it appears that trade-dollars to the value of $7,699,036 were redeemed at the Treasury and subtreasuries, and yet by the statement of the Treasurer, on May 31, 1890, it will be observed that there was then on hand of trade-dollar bullion an amount valued at $6,074,537.70.

The failure to coin this bullion involves, it seems to me, a palpable disregard of the evident object of the law and is but characteristic of the uniform treatment which silver has received at the hands of our Treasury agents. If a positive statute can not be enforced and its mandatory provisions obeyed, there is no room for hope that discretionary power, lodged at governmental headquarters, will be exercised except in discrimination against silver coinage.

In this era, when "moneyed might" abundantly controls the means and influences for "wearying out the right;" when capital and its combinations wield a power which pervades every condition of commerce and asserts its strength in all the transactions of business; when the non-productive consumer holds daily traffic with and fattens upon the prospective results of productive industry; when the prices of the fruits of the soil are fixed in advance of their maturity; when it is possible by the aggregation and manipulation of united wealth to create and determine arbitrary limits and bounds to all the commer-

cial affairs of men, to blend seed-time and harvest, to obstruct if not destroy the rules of supply and demand, to restrain from circulation at pleasure the needed volume of money; when all the old rules and recognized customs and former conditions which regulated and governed transactions in trade and industrial enterprise, and upon which the judgment and conduct of the people were based, are reversed and destroyed; when mammon can do what it pleases and how it pleases, it would seem to be of the highest propriety to so formulate the laws relating to the fiscal operations of the Government as to exclude therefrom any possible construction outside of the duty of implicit obedience and execution.

Official discretion has not yet displayed its province in the disposition to discharge any of the coin obligations of the Government in silver, nor does it appear to have exerted itself at any time or in any respect in the direction of affording silver an equal chance with gold. Silver has been fought while gold has been favored; silver has been discredited and abased while gold has been exalted.

Nearly five years have come and gone since the dismal prognostications of disastrous consequences from the continued coinage of silver dollars were officially expressed and communicated at the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress and the discontinuance of such coinage was earnestly urged.

Nearly $150,000,000 has been added to the stock then on hand. The mints have readily performed the work so grudgingly furnished them, and have turned out every shining coin that an unfriendly discretionary power could not withhold from their inviting doors. The quantity of gold and silver in the United States on the 1st of last November is estimated to have been, says the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,115,379,639, of which nearly $700,000,000 consisted of gold coin and bullion. The dreaded exportation of gold, a prolific source of apprehension pressed upon the consideration of Congress, seems not to have occurred.

It is true that there was a larger movement of gold from the United States in the last fiscal year than usual. This is the first important loss by export since the resumption of specie payments in this country, and this is accounted for by the fact that the balance of trade for the period embraced between May, 1888, and September, 1889, was against the United States, and the further fact, that the Paris Exposition has created a large demand for gold coin, and an exceptionally large number of Americans went abroad last year, it being estimated that about 120,000 people from the United States visited Paris during the exposition.

This necessarily had much to do with the unusual withdrawal of our gold coin. However, it is stated by the Director of the Mint that there is a strong probability of a large return of gold to our country, and especially so in the event of the balance of trade becoming more favorable to the United States.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the logic of facts and the truth of history have sustained and emphasized the strength and accuracy of the arguments of the friends of silver coinage; that the light of practical experience has reflected the justice of their cause and affirmed the soundness of the positions they have taken and maintained; and I insist that the propositions of their adversaries have been refuted, their lines driven back, and their forces put to confusion. Time has not verified their predictions, nor have actual events vindicated the correctness of their assumptions. We confidently appeal to the record which time and events have made, and challenge the judgment of all candid, observant, and thoughtful men.

The President tells us in his message that "the evil anticipations which have accompanied the coinage and use of the silver dollar have not been realized."

The Secretary of the Treasury says, "It is freely admitted that the predictions of many of our wisest financiers as to when the safe limit of silver coinage would be reached have not been fulfilled;" but in the next breath they proceed, as their predecessors have done, to decry future coinage, and talk about treading the dangerous edge of the peril of discreditable financial management and disaster to business interests, as well as to justify the principles on which the proven groundless apprehensions heretofore indulged were based, thereby appearing "anxious to wound, yet afraid to strike."

The conspicuous features of the policy outlined by the present Administration with reference to silver, as far as we are able to ascertain them from the Treasury recommendations, the report of the Committee on Coinage, and other sources, appear to be the continued treatment of silver as a mere commodity; discretionary authority to be reposed in the Secretary of the Treasury; the morbid fear of the importation of foreign silver, as if it were something different in its composition from that which our own mines produce; anticipated plethora of metallic currency; a timid indisposition to adopt an independent national policy of our own; a subservient waiting and attendance upon some possible concert of action by foreign nations, involving makeshifts and temporary expedients on our part; a preference for gold and a studied and unyielding hostility to free coinage.

Mr. Speaker, there is, it seems to me, a radical misapprehension or willful misconstruction and perversion of the motives and *desiderata* which actuate the advocates of free coinage. It is not, as I understand their position, intended or desired to overstock the quantity of coin, nor to depreciate it. Few, if any of us, desire a single standard. I do not know one who is not a bimetallist and who does not believe in and contend for the constitutional postulate of Daniel Webster, "That gold and silver at rates fixed by Congress constitute the legal standard of value in this country."

Not one of us desires to displace gold or deprive it of any single legitimate function of its fiscal office. It is not, in my judgment, possible for any one to estimate with even approximate accuracy the extent of silver coinage were it made free and unlimited. It is purely a matter of conjecture, and would depend on a variety of causes, chief among which, I think, would be the operation of the great fundamental law of supply and demand. It does not necessarily follow that in a series of years there would be a greater amount under the system of free coinage than would result in the same length of time from the present compulsory rule, or the increased coinage under the proposition to coin the maximum limit under the law of 1878, or to exceed that amount to the extent of one-half million dollars' worth of bullion per month.

I, for one, do not believe that there would be either a superabundance of silver money or a depreciation of its proper value as a coin of the country if it were remanded to the conditions which regulated it for more than three-quarters of a century. Our contention is for the reinstatement of simple rules and natural laws as contradistinguished from complex, arbitrary, and artificial regulations. We believe it is historically true that, while for hundreds of years previous to the work of demonetization of silver in this and other countries the ratio of the production of the previous metals was exceedingly variable, still the ratio of value for that long period was remarkably uniform.

The change came when silver was demonetized in Germany, discredited by the countries composing the Latin Union, and degraded by the Congress of the United States in 1871–1873. After this assault upon the coinage use and purpose of silver the ratio of value became fluctuating, and since then it has changed with the ratio of production. Had we contented ourselves with the genesis of the mines, the demands of our civilization, the natural suggestions of commercial enterprise, the wants of our people for a safe and sufficient circulating medium, the conditions sanctioned by the experience of mankind, the customs and traditions which ages had approved, and a due and proper regard for the Constitution and laws of our fathers, we would have been spared much of the dearth and depression, the industrial collapse and business inactivity, the gloom and adversity which have overshadowed our people in recent years.

We should have avoided the general popular discontent which everywhere obtains and finds its expression and search for relief in occasionally seizing upon doubtful expedients for the enlargement and expansion of a circulating medium, had we kept in force our ancient laws and pursued a wise and patriotic fiscal policy.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that our currency is contracting, while we know that our population is constantly increasing. Nearly $40,000,000 were retired last year. We had of all kinds of money in circulation on the 1st of March last less than one and one-half billions of dollars, which, on the usual estimate of population, would afford a per capita circulation of less than $22.

What appalling danger could there be for the next few years if we were to coin the entire silver product of the world, which, at coinage value, outside of what is supposed to be used in the arts, is about $120,000,000? In five years it would only give us $600,000,000, which, added to the amount of standard dollars coined to date, is not equal to the $980,000,000 which France is reported to have. But there is no probability that under free coinage we would very materially affect the current demands of India, Japan, Mexico, Asia, and Africa.

The distribution in 1888 is estimated as follows:

India took	$35,000,000
The United States for coinage purposes	32,000,000
Japan	10,000,000
Mexico, at least	10,000,000
Asia and Africa	18,000,000
Europe and America, for subsidiary coinage	15,000,000
Total	120,000,000
Leaving for the arts	22,000,000
Total	142,000,000

Suppose the total product of the silver mines in the United States, estimated at a coinage value for the year 1888 of about $60,000,000, should remain annually the same for ten years, and be coined to its full extent, is it to be seriously apprehended that, with the yearly additions to our population, the prospective current reduction of national-bank circulation, and the constantly increasing demands of trade, we would have too much silver money with which to begin the new century?

In the multiplicity of matters that are brought before Congress, the yearly augmenting demands upon Federal attention, the time required for careful legislative consideration of national affairs, and the constantly developing character of our country's conditions, it seems to be usual, if not necessary, for Congress to be in session more than half of each term. It convenes annually, and could be easily assem-

bled by Executive proclamation in special session in the presence and pressure of any extraordinary emergency.

If we were to return to free coinage, and the "dump" from foreign countries, the calamitous exportation of gold, the general dangerous inflation and consequent depreciation, the perils of a single (silver) standard, and the numerous menacing environments which its opponents allege to be its inevitable concomitants should absolutely occur, can not the patriotism of our people and the statesmanship of their law-makers be relied upon to repeal the law and check the tide of such woful disaster?

No one supposes that there will be wanting those unselfish prophets who will be ever ready to herald the notes of alarm, should there exist the slightest real or imaginary occasion therefor. There is not that wild fanaticism or fiatism, that dishonesty in the debtor class, that morbid desire that their "hands shall feel the sensation of cheapness," that devotion to the interests of the "silver barons," that purpose of repudiation, that reckless disregard of the necessity for a reliable and stable currency, which, from the arguments to which we are accustomed to listen, would be supposed to characterize the supporters of free coinage; there are none of these things that will render them impervious to all reasonable appeals in behalf of sound financial conditions or prevent them from realizing any actual peril which may hereafter involve our monetary system.

Mr. Speaker, there is confessedly a necessity, the urgency of which can not be denied or safely ignored, for an expansion of our currency. The scarcity of money is a cause of widespread, popular complaint. There is an alarming depression in all the walks of industrial life. The rewards of toil are grossly inadequate. The limited monetary supply and its concentration in the hands of the few have exerted a damaging influence on general prosperity.

The free and unlimited coinage of silver would, I firmly believe, tend to the removal of these troubles and the promotion of better conditions. It is desired by the vast body of the producing classes, and, in my judgment, would be approved by the majority of the American people, without regard to party affiliation. It is safe, constitutional, and sanctioned by former national experience, and its re-enactment is dictated by present and prospective considerations of sound financial policy. Believing that its support involves the discharge of high, patriotic, and representative duty, I shall always cheerfully contribute to its success the full measure of my humble ability. [Applause.]

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MORROW). Before putting that motion the Chair will submit a report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

Mr. BLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the titles of the bills be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

Joint resolution (S. R. 28) for the relief of the Venezuela Transportation Company;

A bill (S. 84) to authorize the Secretary of War to issue ordnance and ordnance stores to the State of Washington in payment for ordnance and ordnance stores borrowed by the State of Oregon of said State whilst a Territory during the Nez Percé Indian war of 1877 and 1878, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 555) for the relief of James W. Harvey, assignee of Joseph Parkins;

A bill (S. 680) for the relief of Alice E. Robertson;

A bill (S. 826) for the relief of Horatio Phillips Van Cleve;

A bill (H. R. 1115) granting a pension to Arthur D. and Alfred A. Lyford;

A bill (S. 1762) to change the boundaries of the Uncompahgre reservation;

A bill (S. 1854) for the relief of James H. Bacon;

A bill (S. 2296) for the relief of the Union Iron Works, of San Francisco, Cal.;

A bill (S. 2415) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Mississippi and Louisiana Bridge and Railroad Company, of Natchez, Miss., to construct a bridge over the Mississippi River at or near Natchez, Miss.," approved July 19, 1888;

A bill (S. 2548) for the relief of the commissioners of the sinking fund of the city of Louisville, Ky.;

A bill (S. 2960) to authorize the building of a bridge at Pine Bluff, Ark., across the Arkansas River;

A bill (S. 3131) for the registry or enrollment of the barges Herdis and Agostino C;

A bill (S. 3357) for the relief of Leonard Martin;

A bill (S. 3401) to provide for an American register for a steamer to be named Australia, owned by a corporation of the State of California;

A bill (S. 3599) to provide an American register for the steamer Sacrobosco;

A bill (S. 3622) to fix the time and place for holding Federal courts in the district of Kansas;

A bill (S. 3639) to authorize the sale of timber on certain lands reserved for the use of the Menomonee tribe of Indians in the State of Wisconsin;

A bill (H. R. 4970) to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenues; and

A bill (H. R. 7619) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RAINES, until Friday, June 13.

To Mr. BOOTHMAN, for three days, on account of sickness.

REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an order be made for a reprint of the bill (H. R. 283) generally known as the lard bill, the supply being exhausted.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The motion of Mr. CONGER was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

OBSTRUCTION OF STREETS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Communication from the commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of W. G. Moore, major and superintendent of police, in reference to fast driving, etc., in the streets—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. DARLINGTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the following bills; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union:

A bill (H. R. 9957) to provide for the purchase of a site, and the erection of a public building thereon, at Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania. (Report No. 2326.)

A bill (S. 559) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Fayetteville, N. C. (Report No. 2327.)

Mr. KERR, of Iowa, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the bill of the Senate (S. 1600) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pueblo, in the State of Colorado, accompanied by report (No. 2328)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILES, from the Committee on the Pacific Railroads, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 111) to amend an act entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," approved July 1, 1862; also to amend an act approved July 2, 1864, and also an act approved May 7, 1878, both in amendment of said first-mentioned act; and to provide for a settlement of claims growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of certain of said railroads, and to secure to the United States the payment of all indebtedness of certain of the companies therein mentioned, reported, as a substitute therefor, a bill (H. R. 10756) to amend an act entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," approved July 1, 1862; also to amend an act approved July 2, 1864, and also an act approved May 7, 1878, both in amendment of said first-mentioned act; and to provide for a settlement of claims growing out of the issue of bonds to aid in the construction of certain of the railroads, and to secure to the United States payment of all indebtedness of certain of the companies therein mentioned; which was read twice, and, with the accompanying report (No. 2329), was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LIND, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the bill of the Senate (S. 2692) to establish certain ports of delivery in Alaska Territory, accompanied by Report No. 2330—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 7562) for the erection of a public building at Elizabeth City, N. C., accompanied by Report No. 2331—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLUNIE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 7047) for a public building at Eureka, Cal., accompanied by Report No. 2340—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

By Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, on the bill (H. R. 4912) to relieve John W. Robinson of the charge of desertion. (Report No. 2332.)

Also, on the bill (H. R. 4954) for the relief of Hector F. Phelps. (Report No. 2333.)

Also, on the bill (H. R. 4537) to remove charge of desertion against Norman Mann. (Report No. 2334.)

Also, on the bill (H. R. 4538) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Underhill. (Report No. 2335.)

Also, on the bill (H. R. 2494) to correct the military record of Thomas Lindersmith. (Report No. 2336.)

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and indefinitely postponed, as follows:

By Mr. FLICK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, on the bill (S. 1222) granting a pension to Ellen White. (Report No. 2337.)

By Mr. NUTE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, on the bill (S. 1236) granting a pension to Mary A. Wykins. (Report No. 2338.)

Also, on the bill (S. 1240) granting a pension to Jennie H. Coghill. (Report No. 2339.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a joint resolution of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 10757) to regulate and equalize the compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10758) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to annul and cancel the subdivision of part of square 112, known as Cooke Park—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10759) granting to the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska Railway Company power to sell and convey to the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company all the railway, property, rights, and franchises of the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska Railway Company in the Territory of Oklahoma and in the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10760) relating to the bridges across the East Fork and the bridges across the West Fork of White River in Indiana—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10761) granting pensions to certain soldiers of the late war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10762) to amend section 3829 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 175) providing for the printing of Report on the Forests of North America, for sale—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BROWNE, of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 10763) to place on the retired-list as second lieutenant William Kennard Nottingham—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 10764) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. T. Emmons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAREY: A bill (H. R. 10765) to relieve William H. Fields from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 10766) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel W. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10767) granting a pension to John McKiernan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 10768) for the relief of Robert Brown, sr., of Madison County, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 10769) for the relief of Richard A. Blount, late a private in Company H, Tenth Tennessee Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10770) granting a pension to Mrs. Mira A. Thompson, widow of John A. Crawford, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Missouri Volunteers, and Company C, Twenty-fourth Missouri Volunteers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIMES: A bill (H. R. 10771) granting a pension to Robert A. Ware—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 10772) paying accrued pension to legal representatives of Zimri Messenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 10773) granting two condemned cannon and carriages to Eugene Reynolds Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bellefontaine, Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOREY: A bill (H. R. 10774) correcting the military record of Henry Nim—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 10775) for the relief of James J. Green—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: A bill (H. R. 10776) granting a pension to Sophia Catlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 10777) granting a pension to David Siess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROCKWELL: A bill (H. R. 10778) for the relief of Lester Noble—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10779) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas Coleman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10780) for the relief of Isaac Sisco—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10781) for the relief of Addison Baker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 10782) for the relief of Abel Mead—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10783) for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Humphries—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILSON, of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10784) granting a pension to Mary F. Messemer, widow of Cyrus J. Messemer, late captain Company H, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi: Petition of P. Quinn and 30 others, of Oktibbeha County, Mississippi, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania: Petition of Farmers' Alliance of Porter Township, Huntington County, Pennsylvania, in favor of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARNES: Petition of J. C. Raley and 35 others, of Jefferson County, Georgia, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of certain voters of Richmond County, Georgia, asking passage of bill for improvement of Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of George M. Gunley and others, for passage of bill improving Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BECKWITH: Petition and papers to accompany House bill 10701, for relief of Edwin A. Arnold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas: Petition of 43 citizens of White County, Arkansas, in favor of deep-water harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWER: Petition of W. H. Kidd and 33 others, of Granville County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. S. Shaw and 18 others, of Guilford County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. H. Cox and 33 others, of Forsyth County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John M. Flippin and 61 others, of Stokes County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. A. Walker and 21 others, citizens of Rockingham County, North Carolina, asking passage of Senate bill 2716—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CANDLER, of Georgia: Petition of William Harrison and other Alliance men of Dawson County, Georgia, in favor of appropriation for improvement of Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of A. M. Bell and others, citizens of Milton County, Georgia, for same measure—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of W. F. Wheeler and 16 others, citizens of Cherokee County, Georgia, for same measure—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of V. B. Faulkner and 39 others, of Hall County, Georgia, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. D. Marchbank and 24 others, of Hall County, Georgia, for same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. H. Keith and 39 others, of Hall County, Georgia, for same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBB: Petition of W. A. G. Logan and 336 others, of Chilton County, Alabama, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COWLES: Petition of D. V. Campbell and 67 others, of Alexander County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. H. Simmons and 45 others, of Cleveland County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. C. Stroup and 31 others, of Gaston County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. M. Baker and 9 others, citizens of Alexander County, North Carolina, for deep harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of G. R. Champion and 17 others, citizens of Alexander County, North Carolina, for a deep harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DORSEY: Resolutions of Archer Alliance, No. 882, of Nebraska, recommending the Butterworth bill and the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Union Alliance, No. 465, of Nebraska, favoring the same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of the Geranium Alliance, Geranium, Nebr., favoring the same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of W. A. Rafferty and 20 others, favoring deep-water harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committeee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EWART: Petition of H. B. Bradley and 41 others, of Polk County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of J. M. Good and 85 others, of Rutherford County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEAR: Petition of H. L. Creighton and 39 others, citizens of Louisa County, Iowa, praying for the passage of an act authorizing the erection of a bridge over the Iowa River without a draw—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GEISSENHAINER: Petition of Ulric Dahlgren Post, No. 25, Department of New Jersey, Grand Army of the Republic, for an appropriation for a statue of the late Rear-Admiral John A. Dahlgren—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GEST: Petition of 33 citizens of Carthage, Ill., for legislation to perpetuate the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREENHALGE: Petition of A. W. Stearns & Co., G. E. Hood, William H. Forbes, and others, of the Eighth Massachusetts Congressional district, to secure the passage of laws calculated to strengthen and encourage the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currrency.

By Mr. GRIMES: Petition of Marion County (Georgia) Farmers' Alliance, in favor of the subtreasury bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of N. M. Reece and 12 others, of Georgia, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANSBROUGH: Petition of L. N. Griffith and 50 others, citizens of Grand Forks County, North Dakota, against transportation of intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of residents of Emerado, Grand Forks County, North Dakota, against transportation of intoxicating liquors in violation of State laws—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa: Resolution of Union Alliance, No. 1203, Blackhawk County, Iowa, urging the passage of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition from 18 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Greeley, Delaware County, Iowa, asking for the prompt passage of House bill 5978, entitled "A bill prohibiting the transportation of intoxicating liquors from any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia into any other State or Territory contrary to or in violation of the laws thereof"—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of 170 railroad employés of St. Joseph, Mo., asking passage of House bill 9682—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of 122 railroad employés of Baraboo, Wis., asking passage of House bill 9682—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina: Petition of Jackson H. Wright and 7 others, members of Suballiance 2036, Pine Woods, Randolph County, North Carolina, in favor of an appropriation of $6,200,000 for the Galveston harbor, coast of Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KINSEY: Petition of 454 employés of the Anheuser-Busch Company, brewers, of St. Louis, Mo., against the passage of House bill 282, taxing compound lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of Garfield Alliance, Mahaska County, Iowa, in favor of the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of citizens of Hamilton County, Texas, for the free coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. McCLAMMY: Petition of L. Mitchell and 44 others, of Wayne County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John A. McLaurin and 29 others, of Cumberland County, North Carolina, for same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. A. Blackmore and 65 others, of Bladen County, North Carolina, for same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. D. Rogers and 39 others, of Sampson County, North Carolina, for same measure—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of Caddo Alliance, No. 81, Clark County, Arkansas, in favor of a deep-water harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of J. T. Walker and 42 others, of Little River County, Arkansas, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of 73 citizens of Benton County, Arkansas, in favor of House bill 8526—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of C. M. Condon and 362 others, asking for legislation giving to States the right to control the importation and sale of intoxicating liquors whether in original packages or not—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PERRY: Petition of Kelton Farmers' Alliance, Union County, South Carolina, for passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Spartanburgh County, South Carolina, in favor of passage of Senate bill 2716—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERS: Protest of 90 citizens and business men of Hutchinson, Kans., against the passage of the Conger compound-lard bill, which will seriously cripple one of the industries which afford a market for their beef fat—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POST: Resolution of the Commandery of Illinois Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, for the publication of the Official Records of the War of the Rebellion as rapidly as may be consistent with accuracy and completeness—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of Annie Ashe, Mary Walsh, and 17 others, employés of Government Printing Office, asking for proportionate part of 15 per cent. allowance granted to others at work on CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of J. G. Reid and 22 others, from Rutherford County, Tennessee, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: Petition of David Siess, of Mansura, Avoyelles County, Louisiana, asking for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of citizens of Arkansas, in regard to certain legislation—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of citizens of Arkansas, for deep-water harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Petition of James A. Mints and other citizens of Brunswick County, North Carolina, asking appropriation for Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of James D. MacRae and other citizens of Brunswick County, North Carolina, for same measure—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SKINNER: Petition of T. Meade and 64 others, of Pasquotank County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ross I. Leary and 27 others, of Chowan County, North Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNIDER: Resolutions of the Board of Trade, of Minneapolis, Minn., in favor of the Windom silver bill or some kindred measure—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of John Eiselmeir and other principals and teachers, of St. Paul, Minn., in favor of the adoption in all Government printing of the improved method of orthography—to the Committee on Printing.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., in favor of the limited postal telegraph as embodied in Senate bill 1557—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Memorial of citizens of Calloway County, Kentucky, praying passage of bill making provision for improving the harbor at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SWENEY: Six petitions of Frank Hedrick and 30 others, of Clayton County, Iowa; of B. F. Wright and W. J. Rice, of Floyd County, Iowa; of Arthur Wilbur and 24 others, of Floyd County, Iowa; of J. W. Smith and 44 others, citizens of Floyd County, Iowa; of W. H. Day and 61 others, of Fayette County, Iowa; of H. E. Hurd and 6 others, of Fayette County, Iowa, asking that a law be enacted making it unlawful to transport intoxicating liquors into any State or Territory contrary to the laws thereof—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of Gus Miller and 18 others, citizens of Mitchell County, Iowa, asking an appropriation for Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of George R. Cain, of Cerro Gordo County, Iowa, in favor of above measure—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TARSNEY: Petition of T. Smith and 60 others, for deep harbor on Texas coast—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of H. R. Pointier and 58 others, from Barnwell County, South Carolina, asking passage of House bill 7162—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER, of Georgia: Petition of Economy Alliance, of Decatur County, Georgia, for the improvement of Galveston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WALKER, of Massachusetts: Petition of F. L. Chapin and 62 others, citizens of Southbridge, Mass., praying for the perpetuation of the national-banking system—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia: Petition of trustees of Methodist Episcopal Church, of Charlestown, Jefferson County, West Virginia, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of trustees of Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of Boothsville, Marion County, West Virginia, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Memorial of Grange 427, Patrons of Husbandry, Wyoming County, Pennsylvania, in favor of coinage of silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Petition of 23 citizens of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, praying for some legislation preserving the principle of non-union of church and state—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June* 6, 1890.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report from the Chief of Engineers, suggesting an amendment to the river and harbor bill with reference to the sale of certain Government lands along the Muskingum River after the completion of improvements thereon; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT PUBLIC PARK.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4) authorizing the establishment of a public park in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the other House, insist upon its disagreement, and ask a conference upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Messrs. HARRIS, MCMILLAN, and HIGGINS were appointed.

TENNESSEE AND CUMBERLAND RIVER BRIDGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House is hereby instructed to re-enroll the bill (H. R. 380) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct bridges across the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers," approved January 8, 1889, and where it reads "section 4, line 3," make it read "section 4, line 2;" and where it reads "line 16, section 4," make it read "lines 14 and 15, section 4;" and where it reads "section 6, line 3," make it read "section 6, lines 2 and 3;" and leave out the word "reasonable," in lines 10 and 11.

Mr. CARLISLE. In order to make the resolution answer the purpose for which it is intended, an amendment is necessary. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 12, after the word "the," strike out all down to and including the word "eleven," as follows:

Word "reasonable," in lines 10 and 11;

And insert in lieu thereof the words:

Words; and in section 4, line 2, after the word "such," insert the word "reasonable."

Mr. CARLISLE. That will make the resolution conform to the communication received from the Acting Secretary of War in regard to the mistakes in the original enrollment. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky to the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

COURT OF CLAIMS REPORT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact filed in that court in the case of George H. Plant *vs.* the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the communication, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SPOONER. It is my impression that there is a bill for the relief of that person pending before the Committee on Claims. If that be true, the communication should be referred to the Committee on Claims. Being a private claim, it ought not to go to the Committee on Appropriations anyway.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The communication, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of the Hutchinson (Kansas) Sunday-School Association, praying for the passage of a bill to prevent the importation of liquor into prohibition States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Rev. D. A. Snow and 31 others (12 voters and 22 women), citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the proposal of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation, and sale of all alcoholic liquors as a beverage; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented the petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Post No. 222, of Olean, N. Y., praying for the passage of Senate bill 496, to remove the limitation in the act granting arrears of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Frank M. Martin and 700 others, citizens of Holton, Kans., praying for the passage of a bill to prohibit the importation of liquors into prohibition States; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Grand Army of the Republic Post 394, of Fowler, Kans., and a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Post of Cora, Kans., praying for the donation of the remainder of the Fort Dodge military reservation for the purposes of a soldiers' home; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCPHERSON presented the petition of Luther H. Kellam and 60 others, citizens of Camden, N. J., praying for the passage of a bill to limit the working hours of clerks and other employés in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a petition of Union Alliance No. 465, of the State of Nebraska, praying for the passage of House bill 283, known as the Conger compound lard bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the State Line Alliance, No. 941, of Byron, Nebr., and a petition of the Gracie Creek Alliance, No. 662, of the State of Nebraska, praying for the passage of the House bill 283, known as the Conger compound-lard bill, and also House bill 5353, known as the Butterworth bill; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the United States Brewers' Association of New York City, remonstrating against an increase of duty on hops, hop auxiliaries, and hop substitutes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPOONER presented the petition of D. W. Burns and 141 others (60 voters and 82 women), citizens of Fort Howard, Wis., praying for the proposal of a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation, and sale of all alcoholic liquors as a beverage; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of a bill of the general tenor of what is commonly known as the Windom silver bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of merchants of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of the McKinley tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of Senate bill 1557, in relation to the establishment of a postal telegraph; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLUMB presented three petitions of posts of the Grand Army of the Republic located at Wellington, Kans., praying for the donation of a portion of the Fort Dodge military reservation for a soldiers' home; which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Wallace County, Kansas, praying for the passage of legislation which will furnish a circulating medium without the intervention of national banks and in sufficient volume to successfully carry on the commerce of the country; which was ordered to lie on the table.