

Second Lieut. Lucius L. Durfee, Seventeenth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, May 19, 1893, vice Seyburn, Tenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles G. Dwyer, Twenty-first Infantry, to be first lieutenant, May 22, 1893, vice Buttler, Third Infantry, appointed regimental quartermaster.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22, 1893.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF COLORADO.

Thomas D. Robinson, of Denver, Colo., who was appointed June 15, 1893, during the recess of the Senate, to be surveyor-general of Colorado.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William C. Perry, of Kansas, to be attorney of the United States for the district of Kansas.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank P. Arbuckle, of Denver, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Denver, Colo.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Edwin P. Harman, of Denver, Colo., to be register of the land office at Denver, Colo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, August 22, 1893.

The House met at 11 a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. SAMUEL W. HADDAWAY.

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

SILVER PURCHASES, TREASURY NOTES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury; which was read, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1893.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of the following resolution passed by the House of Representatives on the 16th instant:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby respectfully requested to communicate to the House the following information relating to the purchase and coinage of silver under the act of July 14, 1890, entitled 'An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes':

"First. How many ounces of silver bullion have been purchased, and what has been the highest, lowest, and average market price paid?

"Second. What amount of Treasury notes has been issued in payment of the silver bullion, what amount redeemed, and what amount reissued?

"Third. What amount of Treasury notes has been redeemed in gold coin and what amount in silver coin?

"Fourth. How many standard silver dollars have been coined?

"Fifth. How many ounces of silver bullion are now owned by the Government?"

In reply, I have the honor to state:

First. The number of ounces of silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, from August 13, 1890, to August 16, 1893, inclusive, was 161,521.000 fine ounces, costing \$150,663,459. The highest price paid was \$1.204, August 20, 1890, and the lowest price, \$0.696, July 24, 1893—average price, \$0.93284.

Second. Treasury notes to the amount of \$150,115,985 have been issued to date, August 16, 1893, in payment of the silver bullion, and that amount is still outstanding, the redemptions having been replaced by issues, with the exception of \$714,636, which have been redeemed in standard silver dollars and retired from circulation since August 3, instant.

Third. Up to August 1, 1893, \$49,184,169 in Treasury notes have been redeemed in gold, and since August 3, 1893, \$714,636 in Treasury notes have been redeemed in silver dollars, this being the first redemption of these notes in silver.

Fourth. The number of standard silver dollars coined from bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, to August 16, 1893, has been 36,087,185.

Fifth. The number of ounces of silver owned by the Government, purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, on August 16, 1893, was 133,161,375 fine ounces, costing \$121,217,677.

Very respectfully,

J. G. CARLISLE, Secretary.

Hon. CHARLES F. CRISP,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I presume that this letter, having been read, will be published in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. It will be ordered printed in the RECORD, if that is the desire of the House.

Mr. BLAND. And in pamphlet form also.

The SPEAKER. That will also be ordered, if desired. There is no rule on the subject.

Mr. BLAND. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD and in document form.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter just read will be printed in the RECORD and also in ordinary document form, and it will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. I presume the usual number will be printed?

The SPEAKER. The usual number.

CALIFORNIA MIDWINTER INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S^o 50) in aid of the California Midwinter International Exposition; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. LOUD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas there will be held in the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, from and after January 1, 1894, an exposition to be known as the California Midwinter International Exposition, in which foreign nations and foreign exhibitors have been invited and have agreed to participate; Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at said exposition, upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted free of payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, and all articles which have been imported from foreign countries and which are now on exhibition at the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago, upon which there is a tariff or customs duty, and which have been heretofore admitted free of payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, be removed to the city of San Francisco, in the State of California, for the sole purpose of exhibition at said California Midwinter International Exposition.

SEC. 2. That it shall be lawful at any time during such exposition to sell for delivery at the close of the exposition any of the goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition in the exposition buildings or on its grounds, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of the import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided,* That all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of the importation; and all penalties prescribed by law shall be applied and enforced against such articles and against the persons who may be guilty of any illegal sale or withdrawal thereof.

SEC. 3. That all of the provisions of public resolution No. 30, entitled "Joint resolution authorizing foreign exhibitors at the World's Columbian Exposition to bring to this country foreign laborers from their respective countries for the purpose of preparing for and making their exhibits," approved August 5, 1892, are hereby extended to and made applicable to said California Midwinter International Exposition to the same extent as if said California Midwinter International Exposition was therein specifically named.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] that this bill be immediately considered?

Mr. BAILEY. I am not inclined to object to the consideration of this bill if the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] will give us the assurance that its passage is not to be made a predicate hereafter for asking from the Government an appropriation in aid of this exposition.

Mr. LOUD. It has not been the intention of the city of San Francisco to ask Government aid for this exposition to the extent of one cent; and so far as I am concerned (and I think I can speak for all my colleagues on this floor) we will not ask for one cent of Government appropriation in aid of the exposition.

Mr. BAILEY. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. COOMBS. I would like to inquire in reference to this California exposition whether there is to be the same provision of law now applicable to the exposition at Chicago as to the holding of imported goods in bond, under regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. LOUD. The same provision will apply in this case.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF UNITED STATES BONDS FOR TREASURY NOTES.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk be printed and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with leave to report at any time after the pending special order is disposed of.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill to permit the exchange of United States bonds for Treasury notes.

Be it enacted, etc., That any holder of bonds of the United States may, after the passage of this act, deposit such bonds at the Treasury of the United States, or at the office of any assistant treasurer of the United States, and receive therefor their face value in Treasury notes of the United States, as described in the act of July 14, 1890. Such bonds shall be held as a special deposit to the credit of the party depositing them, and during the time they are so held shall draw no interest, and shall be returned on the order of the party depositing them on the payment of their face value in United States currency.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall make such regulations as may be necessary to save to the Government the payment of interest on such bonds during the time they are held as a special deposit, and he is hereby authorized to issue Treasury notes to the amount needed and to provide for the cancellation of an equal amount of such notes on the return of said bonds to their owners, 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. 3. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the introduction of this bill as requested by the gentleman from Ohio, and its reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency? The Chair hears none.

The bill (H. R. 2) was accordingly read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. The Speaker omitted to put to the House a part of my request, which was that the committee have leave to report this bill at any time after the disposition of the pending special order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none.

Leave was accordingly granted.

TOWN SITE ENTRIES IN CHEROKEE OUTLET.

Mr. MCRAE, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 4) to make the provisions of the act of May 14, 1890, which provides for town-site entries of lands in a portion of what is known as Oklahoma applicable to the territory known as the Cherokee Outlet, and to make the provisions of said act applicable to town sites in the Cherokee Outlet; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. MCRAE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all the provisions of an act of Congress, approved May 14, 1890, which provides for town-site entries of lands in a portion of what is known as Oklahoma, be, and the same are hereby, made applicable to the territory known as the Cherokee Outlet, and now a part of the Territory of Oklahoma; and that all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this joint resolution be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. TRACEY. I think we ought not to go into the consideration of any measures of this kind until we get through with the pending special order. I dislike to object.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY] objects.

Mr. MCRAE. The passage of this resolution is recommended by the Interior Department; and I hope that the letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office transmitting the resolution will be read. If, after that, the gentleman from New York objects, he will do so with a full knowledge of the facts. It is no favor to me, but a matter of public importance.

The SPEAKER. Unless the objection is withdrawn—

Mr. TRACEY. I have no objection to the reading of the letter.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the letter will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL LAND OFFICE, Washington, August 21, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find draft of joint resolution, which I talked with you about this morning. I have submitted the same to the Secretary and he has approved the same. If necessary the Secretary will so state to the committee. Its passage is recommended, as by a mistake in the drafting of the original act of March 3, 1893, it was inadvertently left out. This resolution should be passed at once, which will really make it a part of the act of March 3, 1893.

Very respectfully yours,

S. W. LAMOREUX, Commissioner.

Hon. THOMAS C. MCRAE:

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas explain this proposition?

Mr. MCRAE. With the leave of the House, I will.

The act of May 14, 1890, providing for the town-site entries of lands in what is known as Oklahoma, used these words of limitation as to the territory to which it should apply:

The Territory of Oklahoma now [then] open to settlement.

And the act of the last Congress which provided for the opening of the Cherokee Strip makes no provision for the use of this act in that Territory. The Attorney-General has decided that there is no provision of law by which the act of 1890 can be used in that portion of the public lands which is to be opened to settlement within the next month. The Interior Department has no authority to appoint town-site boards in the Strip. It is thought that the Department should have such authority. This resolution makes that act applicable to the public land which will be opened to settlement by proclamation within the next few weeks, so that the necessary boards can be organized and have a uniform town-site law in all of the Territory of Oklahoma.

Mr. FLYNN. Does this provide for the appointment of town-site boards by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MCRAE. This makes applicable the provisions of the act of May 14, 1890, to the "strip," which act allows the Secretary to appoint the boards.

Mr. FLYNN. Since the passage of that act the town-site boards have been appointed in Oklahoma by the probate judges. What is the object of this resolution?

Mr. MCRAE. This resolution simply makes the act of May 14, 1890, of general application in that Territory. That is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas for the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not object, but I will give notice that in future I will object to any discussion being brought before the House pending the argument on the silver bill. We can not get our speakers in now. I withdraw my objection.

There being no further objection, the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHELL, on account of sickness.

SILVER.

Mr. BRICKNER. Mr. Speaker, this question is to my mind a purely commercial one—a matter of supply and demand. Having been engaged in commercial pursuits for over 40 years, having passed through several periods of commercial depression, and remaining in active business up to the present day, my experience has tended no doubt toward shaping my views on the silver problem. The condition of affairs to-day demands from every Representative upon this floor an expression of opinion on this vital question, and I would be neglectful of my duty to my constituents and to this House did I fail to make known my sentiments.

It is not my purpose to arraign any party for the enactment of this unfortunate so-called Sherman law. While my vote was cast against it in this House at the time of its passage, and I feared evil results instead of beneficial, as was claimed for it by its framers and advocates, yet I have no right to assail the other side and say they were not sincere at the time in their claims that this law would be of great benefit to the country.

It has proved a grave error, and is now acknowledged so to be by those who were most active in securing and who voted for its passage. A large majority of them will, I am informed, now vote for the repeal of the purchasing clause, and their courage and devotion to the welfare of our common country can not be too highly praised. It is to the honor and glory of this great country that upon such grave questions of national character partisanship is brushed aside and patriotism rules.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I expect we shall all be manly and honest in dealing with this purely commercial question. The country is in sore distress, and it is no time for trifling or quibbling. Commerce is at a standstill. The majority of our workshops are silent, our factories closed, our railways do poor business, mines are shut down, and our harbors are crowded with ships with sails furled. Steamers with their fires out are moored idle and unfruitful at their docks, and sailors are lounging about the great cities in enforced idleness. No fierce fires burn in the rolling mills, and our great furnaces are cold.

Even in the great wheat fields of the Northwest I am told much grain is wasting for the lack of currency to pay the laborers, who would otherwise gather up and thresh a bountiful harvest. Doing business in over twenty States I find the same distress is everywhere—there is no exception—whether you go to the manufacturing States of the East or the grain and cotton raising States of the West and South. And all this at a time when the country's granaries are full to overflowing with the products of the soil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the men who control these industries, as well as the laborers employed therein, are looking to this Congress for some wholesome legislation. They do not want long-winded speeches, made up largely from extracts taken from old musty books in the library reiterating what some one said ten, twenty, forty, or one hundred years ago. They demand action. If the men who first uttered the sentiments that have been paraded here time and again, since this debate began, as original with the orator could be awakened from their everlasting sleep and hear some of the statesmen of to-day in their endeavor to turn back the dial of time and progress, they would gaze at each other in amazement and say wonderingly: "Are these our posterity?"

The country is suffering, and yet these silver-tongued orators want to feed the unemployed laborers on platforms and theories that may have been suited to a former day and need, but are certainly not applicable to the present situation. They seem unable to comprehend that conditions have changed since then, and that methods of years gone by will not meet the changed and changing conditions of to-day. Are they patriots, or are they trying to prejudice one section of the country against the other, or men in one pursuit against those in others?

Advocates of silver now opposing the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, so-called, admit it is bad law and harmful in its effects, and yet nearly every member who opposes repeal now and who was in the Fifty-first Congress condemned it then, and cast his vote against its passage. They now boldly proclaim that unless the House amends the Wilson repeal bill [which amendments I propose to show later on would make matters worse than to leave the Sherman law remain as it is] they

will resist its passage and defeat the repeal of the purchasing clause. They admit the purchase clause is wrong and yet charge that those in favor of its repeal are controlled by Wall street; that Wall street only and its hirelings and dupes are for repeal. I for myself brand that statement as uncalled for and untrue. I am not the dupe of Wall street, neither am I the hireling of the silver kings. Nor do I want class legislation in any form for either.

Mr. Speaker, there are but two questions to consider in this whole matter. How much silver can we float in addition to the amount we already have? And what effect will repeal have on our currency and on the country? If we can float more silver, then let us have more at the same ratio as the silver now in circulation. Let the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to purchase silver bullion at its market value, or, better still, use the seigniorage bullion now in the Treasury, coin into dollars all that can be paid out to those who will accept them, and stop there. Turn the profits into the United States Treasury and the whole country will have the benefit and not the bullion holders alone. It is my opinion, however, that we can not at this time use to advantage any more silver than we have now. If it were possible to float more silver it would not be necessary to issue certificates to represent it.

It is said repeal of the purchase clause would demonetize silver in this country and reduce the circulating medium about one-half. I can not see how it would do that. The Government has already guaranteed coined dollars to the amount of \$58,917,196 and certificates issued upon the coined silver in the Treasury to the amount of \$331,019,178, all now in circulation. I will oppose the retirement of this amount of circulating medium should its retirement be attempted.

The condition of the country requires more circulating medium, but we can not pay the premium that would be required to procure it through free coinage. The nonsilver-producing States are not willing to pay the enormous premium the silver States are asking in the proposed amendments to the Wilson bill. In other words, 65,000,000 people are not willing to pay tribute to 1,000,000. It would be far cheaper to pension them all or board them in our most fashionable hotels. When a boy, my father gave me what appeared to be a penny. Its inscription was: "Not one cent for tribute, but millions for defense." That was the principle of patriots in those days. Has that spirit died out in our land?

I have had prepared from the report of the Director of the Mint for 1892, page 51, a table showing the amount of silver produced in the four great silver-producing States of Colorado, Montana, Idaho, and Nevada, which I shall ask leave to print in the RECORD. The table shows the population of those four States according to the census of 1890, and probably does not vary largely from the population of to-day. The table is as follows:

Silver product, in ounces, in 1891, of the four great silver-producing States; also population in 1890.

State.	Product.	Population.
Colorado	21,100,000	412,198
Montana	16,350,000	132,159
Idaho	4,035,000	84,385
Nevada	3,520,000	45,761
Total	45,065,000	674,503
Total for balance of United States	13,265,000	61,946,757
Total for United States	58,330,000	62,621,260

NOTE.—It may be well to state that of the 13,265,000 ounces of silver produced in the United States outside of the four States named, 11,555,000 ounces were mined in the three Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah; so but a small fraction of all the silver bullion comes from the remainder of the States and Territories.

From these figures it is easy to ascertain just how much premium the people of the United States would have to pay to the people of these four States every year if we entered upon the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the present ratio. This is based upon the products of 1891; but should a free-coinage bill pass there would be no telling whether this product would be doubled or trebled or quadrupled.

Calculating the value of bullion at to-day's figures, 73 cents, and at its price under free coinage, \$1.29, gives us the difference, or premium, called for by free-silver advocates, in each of these States, as follows: Colorado, \$11,961,200, or \$21.01 for every man, woman, and child in the State. And remember this premium would be paid every year, varying only with the price of bullion and amount produced. Montana's premium would be \$9,319,500, or \$70.51 per capita each year—nearly three times that of Colorado. Idaho would get \$2,319,950 premium, or \$27.45 per capita, and Nevada \$2,006,400, or \$43.84 per capita.

But not all the people in these States are engaged in them in-

ing of precious metals. From the census of 1890 I have again gathered statistics showing the number of people engaged in mining in these States, which includes not only those who dig the metal out of the ground, but also the laborers and mechanics employed above ground. Those who desire to substantiate these figures may find them in the Report on the Mineral Industries of the United States, pages 59 and 60. This table also I should like to have appear in the RECORD.

It is as follows:

Average number employed in gold and silver mining according to census of 1890 in the four great silver-producing States is as follows:

	Above ground.	Below ground.	Total.
COLORADO.			
Foremen	330	396	726
Mechanics	781		781
Miners		9,585	9,585
Laborers	1,505	599	2,074
Boys	16	14	30
Total	2,632	10,564	13,196
IDAHO.			
Foremen	128	163	291
Mechanics	354		354
Miners		2,569	2,569
Laborers	964	318	1,282
Boys	2		2
Total	1,448	3,047	4,495
MONTANA.			
Foremen	96	65	161
Mechanics	207		207
Miners		2,552	2,552
Laborers	2,613	254	2,867
Boys	5	5	10
Total	2,921	2,876	5,797
NEVADA.			
Foremen	83	84	167
Mechanics	261		261
Miners		2,003	2,003
Laborers	779	214	993
Boys	1	1	2
Total	1,124	2,302	3,426
Grand total			27,004

NOTE.—Above figures are taken from Mineral Industries of the United States, pages 59 and 60.

In addition to the 45,065,000 ounces of silver mined by these 27,000 men, the census of 1890 gives the following statistics about the output and value of lead, copper, and gold product in the four States named, as the results of the labor of the same workmen who mined the silver:

LEAD.			
States.	Tons.	Value.	
Colorado	70,788	\$2,100,014	
Montana	10,183	456,975	
Idaho	23,172	1,042,627	
Nevada	1,994	72,633	
Total	106,137	3,672,271	

COPPER.			
States.	Pounds.	Value.	
Colorado	1,170,053	Not stated.	
Montana	98,222,444	Do.	
Idaho	156,490	Do.	
Nevada	26,420	Do.	
Total	99,575,407	Not stated.	

GOLD.			
States.	Fine ounces.	Value.	
Colorado	169,312	\$3,500,000	
Montana	169,312	3,500,000	
Idaho	98,750	2,000,000	
Nevada	145,125	3,000,000	
Total	582,499	12,000,000	

NOTE.—The above figures are taken from the Mineral Industries of the United States Census of 1890, pages 48, 155, and 163 respectively.

These figures give a still more startling exhibit than the others. Of the 674,503 population in these four States, but a trifle over 4 per cent, or 27,004, are engaged in mining. The other 650,000 really would not get their per capita yearly premium in the event of free coinage, but like the rest of us pay their share over to the ones engaged in the industry. What percentage of the 27,000 are mine owners is hard to tell, but it is safe to say it is not large.

It is also probably safe to say that very few of the real workers in the mines would ever realize any premium after all. It would be gobbled up by their employers—the silver kings. But supposing every one was to get his share, what would it amount to? Why, for Montana the premium would be \$1,580.19 each year, and for Colorado, \$907.11 each year; for Nevada, \$588.88 yearly, and for Idaho, \$516.11 a year for every miner in the State.

These figures are based upon the population of 1890 and the product of 1891, but since they were compiled I have been reliably informed the product of 1892 exceeded 75,000,000 ounces, or an increase in production of about thirty per cent over the previous year, unquestionably caused by the enforced purchase on Government account of 4,500,000 ounces per month. So that while the figures I have stated are correct as to 1891, for 1892 they would be much larger.

Let us see what they really are. Now, as is shown in the tables I have presented, the production of silver is confined in a large measure to the four States named, only 13,000,000 ounces out of 58,000,000 ounces being mined in all the other States and Territories—but 22 per cent of the entire output. So we can assume that the proportion will hold good as to the increase. This would make the premium that would be paid to the miners in the several States as follows, presuming, of course, that the number of miners had not varied greatly from 1891:

	Per miner.
Montana	\$2,054.24
Colorado	1,179.24
Nevada	765.54
Idaho	670.94

And as the mine owners would appropriate the lion's share, how long would it be before billionaire silver magnates would take the place of the millionaires already made under the present restrictive silver laws? And how long would it be, too, before nearly all the wealth of the country would pass into their hands? Will the American people pay this immense tribute? Dare the members of this House assume the responsibility of placing such a burden upon the people?

Mr. Speaker, silver is a product, the same as gold, copper, iron, coal, wheat, or cotton. By aid of improved machinery it is now more cheaply and rapidly mined than formerly, and the supply has overtaken and passed the demand. The result has been a decline in the market. The same holds good with wheat. This commodity can now be produced for less than half the price possible before the invention of labor-saving machinery and the introduction of improved methods. The same applies to all these products in a greater or less degree.

The law of supply and demand fixes prices. This principle is as unchangeable and as fixed as the north star. There is no government large or strong enough to turn aside the effect of this natural law any more than it could change the course of the sun. It is thought by some people that we can fix the price of our own products. That idea is erroneous. What do we do with our surplus? Do we not depend upon Europe to buy it? Let there be an advance or a decline in the price of cotton, wheat, or silver in Liverpool, London, Paris, or any of the market centers of Europe and its effect is felt in ten minutes in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, in fact, in hundreds of our purchasing markets, and prices are adjusted according to the change.

The seller has invariably to submit to the purchaser. You can not compel a purchaser to buy your products if he does not need them, neither can you make him pay more than the current price without his consent. There may be exceptions sometimes in seasons of great scarcity and exorbitant prices can be obtained, but it is generally of short duration. This applies to all commodities. It applies to money as well as to the products of the soil, the mines, or mills.

I have heard bankers very much abused by some of the speakers on this question.

I have no sympathy with the Shylock, whether he speculates in money or the necessities of life, or if he be one of the robbers in the several professions; but an honorable banker is entitled to consideration. He is part of the machinery of commerce, and is as necessary to commerce as the driving-wheel to a machine. He is as essential a factor as the merchant or miner. If he is eliminated, trade, will suffer and in time the whole machinery of commerce be ruined.

The Government can assume the right to stamp anything and call it money, whether it be gold, silver, rags made into paper,

or what not, place its stamp upon it, and compel its citizens to accept the same in payment of debts; but you take our silver-dollar across the borders of our country and try to pass it upon one who has no direct interchange with our people, and he will tell you that your dollar is only worth to him 63 cents, more or less, as the bullion price varies. No one claims we can use our silver dollars abroad for more than bullion value. Our silver-producer ought to take his chances as all other producers do, and sell where the highest price can be obtained, and not come to Congress asking that a market be created for him where more must be paid than the product is worth in the open market.

I am told that a new city in one of our silver-producing States has more millionaires, according to its population, than any city in the world. And yet they come to Congress asking to be made richer still. In the face of all this, we are told that we are the creatures of the gold-bugs. Why should a premium not be given to the grain-raiser, the cotton-planter, the stock-grower, and others as well? No, Mr. Speaker, I can never agree to such legislation.

The amendments proposed providing for free coinage at the ratio of 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 to 1 would make matters even worse than to leave the Sherman act remain as it is. I understand the strongest fight will be made on the last amendment, the 20 to 1 ratio. Let us see what free coinage at, say, 20 to 1, means; how it affects commerce, and how much it will cost the people, *i. e.*, the Government, to recoin at that ratio the silver dollars we already have. According to the latest obtainable reports from the Treasury Department, we have in round numbers \$419,000,000 now in the Treasury and in circulation. The loss, if this is to be recoined at 20 to 1 ratio, will be over \$100,000,000.

According to the Treasurer's statement, also, it will require five years' labor, five years' running of the mints, to recoin all our silver dollars into new dollars at the proposed weight. And as the loss would be over \$100,000,000, our circulating medium would be contracted that amount, just at a time when we need expansion. We would have the bad end of a barter in a commodity of uncertain value. This new coin would not pass in Europe, for it would be too light, even at the increased weight, to contain one dollar's worth of bullion.

They would serve no better purpose than the 16 to 1 dollar, as the ratio of bullion prices to-day to gold is over 28 to 1.

We would have no use for it in this country, for our people would rather have the paper certificate representing the coin than the coin itself. The effect might be to advance the price of bullion by reason of the Government being compelled to purchase in order to make up the deficiency in weight. The Government could be compelled to buy from the Shylocks (who are, and rightly, too, denounced by the free-silver men), who would surely corner the market if so large an amount of bullion was to be purchased.

They would buy up our silver certificates, and, having cornered the metal in the market, would compel the Government to pay them their own price for it, so as to be able to redeem the certificates with the new and heavier dollar. Now, after all this vast sum has been coined into dollars, no agreement being in operation with other countries as to uniform weight in coinage, silver bullion would go back to present prices or less.

Now I ask, in all candor, have we a right to attempt this? Is it necessary? I certainly say no. It is a dangerous experiment, upon which we have no right to enter, and it is fraught with the possibilities of absolute and permanent injury to the country.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to touch upon before leaving this part of the subject, and it is in support of my statement that we can not float our silver coin in foreign countries. Last year there was exported twenty-three million dollars' worth of silver bullion and only ninety-four thousand dollars in United States silver dollars, which goes to show that foreigners will not have it for use as a circulating medium.

These are the figures for 1892, as furnished by the Treasury Department. But in 1891 there was imported of foreign and domestic coins over seventeen millions, of which over \$6,000,000 was in domestic coin, so that it is apparent all our exported coin is shipped back to us at the very first opportunity. Probably the silver men do not stop to think that our silver dollars can not be used abroad, even as fine bullion is used, for it is one-tenth alloy, and other nations, having a different percentage of alloy, find our coins unfitted for coinage in their own standard; therefore what little gets out of the country soon finds its way back again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the consideration of the second proposition I laid down at the beginning of my remarks as one of the two into which is resolved the whole silver problem. It is: What effect will the repeal of the purchase clause have on the currency and on the country? The primary effect, of course, will be to stop piling up silver bullion in the Treasury at the rate of 4,500,000 ounces a month. Back of this is the salutary effect of restoring public confidence that has been gradually under-

mined, and now all but destroyed through the distrust created, since the so-called Sherman law went into effect, by the large and continued purchases and constant accumulation of piling up of silver bullion under its provisions. People will know that the policy of depleting their Treasury of gold must cease.

Confidence in commercial lines and among manufacturers will again prevail when our policy shall have ceased to give cause for apprehension at home and abroad, when our finances shall be maintained upon a solid basis, and the Treasury no longer be made the dumping ground for a debased metal of uncertain value. The country can use and has use for the silver heretofore coined and the certificates issued thereon, and it is just and right that their legal-tender quality be kept unimpaired and the parity of our gold and silver coins maintained.

But the free and unlimited coinage of silver can not but injuriously affect the value and usefulness of the amount we already have and also render it impossible for the Government to maintain their parity at this time. Should, however, an international agreement be made at some future time, which I hope is not far distant, then will it be possible to have free coinage of silver, and the parity will take care of itself.

Additional circulating medium is urgently needed, but it must be provided for in some other way than by free coinage of silver under present conditions. Neither will it do to enact into laws hasty, ill-advised, and crude systems of finance and banking. Let us pass this bill repealing the purchase clause of the Sherman act, and thus in a measure restore lost confidence. Then take up the question of amending our banking laws or formulating new ones. Let them be elastic, so the circulating medium can be increased or diminished according to demand, and let it be provided that the liability of bank stockholders to their depositors shall be unlimited, as a guarantee for deposits. Then will the people have renewed faith in the soundness of our financial policy, our currency will be ample in volume and unquestioned in value, and our banks deserving of the fullest confidence.

If our country was a creditor nation, Mr. Speaker, instead of a debtor, it would make but little difference how we legislated or what we had for a circulating medium. But we are a debtor nation. We owe largely to Europe, and are liable at any time to have our securities returned to us and payment demanded, it may be through mistrust or scarcity of money in their own country, and our railway and other bond will be sent over here and collections enforced when payment is due, working severe hardship in many cases. To some extent this appears to be the situation to-day. Mistrust due to the fear that the Sherman law will remain unrepealed and that this nation is drifting toward a silver standard is largely the cause of the present crisis, and liquidation of our industrial indebtedness held abroad is being enforced to an extent never before known.

As a nation we must have a form of money that will cancel our obligations held in other countries—our bonds must be paid in the money that represents to the holders a standard of value the world over. Were the balance of trade always in our favor we would not need to worry about gold, for the balance of trade would bring it to us without difficulty. But when our crops are short, or we overtrade, or should there be a great stringency in the money market in Europe, then we must be prepared to meet our obligations honestly and in the recognized money of the world.

An individual may be dishonest and not fulfill his obligation. The distress it will bring will be felt and borne only by individuals. But when a nation is dishonest and loses its credit there is no telling where the distress ends. Instances are numerous in the history of the world where nations had not fulfilled their honest obligations, and war, bloodshed, and untold misery ensued. Let us not add a black page of strife and destruction to our nation's history by becoming dishonest, too.

I ask this House in all sincerity to pass the Wilson repeal bill now under consideration. Mark the prediction: Unless it is done ruin and distress will stalk through the country hand in hand, and woe follow after woe in swift succession until we shall all be swallowed up in financial chaos. The peril now threatening the welfare of the country will come full upon us, and disasters multiply a thousandfold. Bread riots, with all their bloody and ghastly results, will strike terror to the hearts of the people in our great cities, and starving mobs will overturn all semblance to law and order in their mad strife for food.

Winter's awful cold will drive thousands upon thousands of the unemployed into the workhouses, prisons, and reformatories, and Necessity will be the recruiting officer that will add hundreds to the ranks of the pauper and criminal classes. Business will be paralyzed, commerce brought to a standstill, and many industries wiped out unless we give some measure of relief.

A great deal has been said by the advocates of free silver depicting the terrible condition of affairs in the great silver States and the distress that prevails among all classes, and especially among miners. The pictures are doubtless not overdrawn, and

they are entitled to some measure of relief. It may be noted, however, that all the speakers for the white metal claim this condition is due to the shutting down of mines through fear of repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman law, and the consequent closing of a great market for their product.

Now, the other side of the picture is still darker, and I think my assertion will be sustained by the observations of many representatives from the nonsilver producing sections of our country, that far more wide-spread and far-reaching in its effects is the apprehension and consequent business stagnation and suffering among our business men and laboring classes that exists everywhere throughout the great manufacturing and industrial States of the Union. And this apprehension is caused by the fear that the nation is drifting toward a silver standard and that the present ruinous policy relating to silver will not be changed for the better, if changed at all. Free silver to them under present conditions means untold misery and suffering.

Of what consequence to the nation is the shutting down of the silver mines of the West and throwing out of work the 27,000 men employed therein compared to the general shutting down of factories, mills, workshops, furnaces, and the great industries of the country, and to the closing to millions of workmen the means of earning their daily bread?

Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House any longer. I have endeavored to avoid personal allusions in my remarks, and hope they will not be so construed. I am not prejudiced against any industry. I am not an enemy of silver and would be only too glad to see the way clear to use more of it as the money of our country; but that seems to me impossible at this time and be just to all sections and all classes. I hope a sufficient number of the members of this House will look at this question unbiased by prejudice and vote for the pending bill without amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. MALLORY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this question which is presented for the House to determine is narrowed down to two points, which preclude those who entertain views lying between the two extremes from following out these views to a practical conclusion.

I am free to say, sir, that I am opposed to the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law, and I am also opposed to the coining of silver in this country further, on the basis of 16 to 1; and it has been only after very careful consideration and reflection that I have been able to bring myself to vote affirmatively upon any of the propositions that are presented to the House for its determination.

But, sir, whatever may be the result, whatever may be the conclusion which the wisdom of this body shall bring us to, I must say that under no circumstances, under no conditions, can I bring myself at this time to vote for the unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act. While disaster may come upon us from other sources, while the predictions of those gentlemen who have told us that financial ruin and disaster that is threatened by further continuance of the coinage of silver may be verified, I do not believe they will bring upon us one tithe of the lasting injury, the inevitable ruin, that an affirmative vote by both bodies of this Congress on the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act would entail upon us.

Sir, we are told that the purchasing clause of the Sherman act is the only obstacle in the way of the rehabilitation of our disordered finances. We are told that the repeal of that act and the consequences resulting therefrom, will restore confidence to the country, and we have heard it predicted on the floor by a number of gentlemen, very able men, who have given the subject much thought and consideration, that the country, by that single action on the part of the House, will be once more launched upon a sea of prosperity and the dark cloud of distress which is now threatening us will be dissipated.

I confess, sir, that I have given the subject very careful examination, and have failed to see in any particular wherein the Sherman act is responsible for all these woes.

I am not here, Mr. Speaker, to defend that measure. I agree with the assertion that it was a makeshift, and would gladly join with the rest of this body in voting for its repeal if I could do so under conditions which I thought would not bring disaster on the country.

I, sir, have given a little investigation, I have said, to the matter, and in looking over the condition of the country for several years past find some facts brought forth by the figures which I have thought may be of possible interest to this body, and possibly throw a little light on the pending question. I have taken the fiscal years of 1890, 1891, and 1892, ending on June 30th of each year, respectively, and find that the balance of trade in these three years was decidedly in favor of the United States. In 1890 the excess of merchandise exported from the United States amounted to \$55,983,419.

In 1891 the excess of merchandise amounted to \$27,354,088, and

in 1892 it amounted to \$188,329,549. The aggregate excess, therefore, of merchandise exported during those three years was \$271,667,056.

During that same period, while the balance of trade apparently was on our side, I find that in 1890 we exported an excess of gold and silver over our imports amounting to \$18,172,094.

I find that in 1891 we exported an excess of gold and silver over our imports amounting to \$72,685,205.

In 1892, that year of grace in which we were blessed with abundant crops and which brought the excess of our exportations of merchandise over our importations of merchandise up to over \$188,000,000, we still had to send out gold and silver in excess of what we exported, to the amount of \$11,391,346.

Thus we find that in these three years we exported an excess of gold and silver over our importations, amounting to \$102,238,645; and during those three years that I have mentioned, as I have already shown, we exported an excess of merchandise of over \$271,000,000.

During those three years I find that in 1890, of gold alone, we exported \$4,331,149 in excess of gold imported.

In 1891 we exported \$68,121,087 more of gold than we imported. In 1892, that year of grace that I have referred to, wherein we exported of merchandise \$188,000,000 more than we imported, I find that our gold imports exceeded our gold exports by \$1,474,127 only, making the excess of gold exports over gold imports for those three years \$71,178,109.

There, Mr. Speaker, we have presented to us an exhibit which, it seems to me, calls for reflection on the part of those who are contending that the Sherman act is responsible for the present prevailing distress.

Here we find, that in three years—one of those years closing on June 30, 1890, and the Sherman act having been passed July 14, 1890—we find that in those years we were paying out millions and millions more of money than we could possibly take in. We have been doing a business upon a losing basis. It is true it has been a large and thriving business, but at the same time our expenses have been so heavy that when we come to balance our accounts, we find that we have been putting out large quantities more of money than we have taken in.

I do not think there can be any question about the truth of these figures. They are derived from the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury; and if they state the facts correctly, it is surprising that this country has at last reached a point beyond which she can not go?

Is there anything else which accounts for this state of affairs? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, without trenching upon the forbidden ground of politics, without leaving for any length of time this momentous subject of the finances, if we cast our eyes toward the other field, which has occupied the attention of the people of the United States for many years past; if we examine into the revenue system of this country, which has, by its rules, almost compelled us to do business on a losing basis, we will find that under the pretense of forcing foreign nations to buy from us, it has placed us in a position where we have antagonized every friendly nation on the face of the earth.

I say that to my mind, if this thing is investigated and examined more carefully, we will find that that subject has more to do with the prevailing discontent and distress in this country than anything that the Sherman act has ever done.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I claim that I do not see any reason that has been urged by the gentlemen who are advocating this unconsidered, hurried repeal of the Sherman act unconditionally, to influence me to change my views upon this subject, or to vote with them.

But, sir, there are other reasons why I can not vote for this measure. I think it has been conceded that the unconditional repeal of this purchasing clause will serve to contract the currency of this country. I think it has been conceded that it will render it more difficult to pay certain debts at least that are now in existence in this country.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS], who spoke the other day—and who to my mind threw more light upon this subject than has been cast upon it by any speaker in the House—stated that there were exceptions to the application of the measure he advocated to the debtor class of the country. (I do not undertake to quote the gentleman's language, because I have not read his speech, and only heard it.) He said that there was an exception of debts that would be affected by the action proposed by Congress; that long debts, debts having a long time to run before payment, will be materially affected, and that it will be more difficult for the debtor under the new condition of affairs to make a settlement.

I have given an imperfect and hasty examination of some of those debts referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi—the long-standing debts of this country. I have taken the census reports and undertaken to compile a few figures from

those interesting documents. I have taken three of the representative agricultural States of the country—Iowa, Illinois, and Kansas.

I have examined into the existing mortgage debt on real estate as was shown by the census on January 1, 1890. I find in the State of Iowa an existing mortgage indebtedness on lands to the amount of \$199,034,956. I find that in the State of Illinois, on same date, there existed of recorded mortgage debts \$384,299,150. I find that in the State of Kansas, at the same date, there were recorded \$235,485,108 in mortgage indebtedness.

Now, sir, I find further, that in Illinois the mortgage debt averaged per capita \$100; in Iowa it averaged per capita \$104, and in the State of Kansas the average per capita is the enormous sum of \$170.

I find, according to the calculations of the Census Bureau, a system of calculation which I do not vouch for as being correct in all respects, but one which meets the approval of the statisticians of our country, the average life of a mortgage in Iowa is 4.93 years, or practically five years; that in the State of Illinois it is 4.02 years, and in Kansas 3.38 years.

I do not know what the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. CATCHINGS) or what other gentlemen who agree with him in his views on this subject, mean by a long debt, but it seems to me that a debt that lasts three years—that one who has a mortgage debt for three years can be said to have a long debt hanging over his head. Now, sir, the total for these three States, out of forty-four States in the Union, figures up a total mortgage indebtedness—and when I say mortgage indebtedness, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that there are not included in this anything but mortgages on real estate, no deeds of trust, nor chattel mortgages, nor anything but a mortgage that is recorded in the clerk's office—I find that the aggregate in these States upon the lands held by the farming class and real estate owners amounts to \$818,819,214.

Now, if it is an admitted fact that here in three States of the Union property valued at \$818,000,000 (we will say nearly a billion of dollars) is to be radically affected by this legislation (and it is practically admitted by the gentlemen on the other side); if the difficulty in the way of these unfortunate farmers, the men mentioned in our Democratic program, and the men so pathetically referred to in the Democratic platform at Chicago, is to be increased—if we throw in their way in addition to the burdens they have been contending with for the last twenty years another and greater burden, they will be unable to rid themselves of this incubus that is resting on their shoulders, and what can we say to our constituents, what can we say to our friends of the Democratic party?

After making this declaration as to the Sherman act, our platform goes on, and it has been read so often before that I feel a little delicacy in reading it, but I will read this paragraph:

We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets, and in payment of debt; and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

Yet, by the admission of some of the leading gentlemen upon the opposite side of the question here, it is proposed by this legislation to throw in the way of these people whom we profess to protect an almost insurmountable obstacle, and anyone can see how it will be almost impossible for them to throw off the load of debt that is almost crushing them to the earth.

I confess, Mr. Speaker, I have been surprised at the ready acquiescence in this project which has been given to it by some gentlemen who in the past have agreed with me in their views upon this subject. I say "ready acquiescence" because I have seen gentlemen who, without listening to arguments on this floor, before this debate began had already made up their minds and turned their backs upon principles which, until a year ago, they most ostentatiously professed.

It reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of an old colored brother down in my part of the country, who figured more or less conspicuously, in a limited sort of manner, on the banks of the Suwanee River. Old "Uncle Eph." was his name—a most disputatious, contentious, and dogmatical old colored man, who, among the young men of his color, allowed no contradiction or attempt at refutation of any of his assertions. One day one of the young gentlemen of the plantation happened to meet him coming along apparently absorbed in thought, and hailed him and said: "What are you thinking about, Uncle Ephraim?" "Oh," he says, "me and old marse just bin having quite a big argyment down in the old field." "Oh! What about?" "Well, old marse he 'lowed that a open, sandy soil is de bes' for de cultivation of de water-

million." "What did you say?" "Oh, me? I 'lowed that I thought so, too." [Laughter.] And that, Mr. Speaker, seems to be expressive to some extent of the frame of mind of some of our friends upon this floor who last year were so emphatic in their advocacy of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and who, without any apparent argument having been brought to bear, have suddenly turned and joined with old marse, and say, "I think so, too." [Laughter.]

My time is limited, and I certainly can not do justice to all the various phases of this question as they present themselves. I listened with a great deal of interest the other day to the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Governor MCCREARY] who, by reason of his connection with the International Commission that endeavored to bring about some uniformity of action among the nations of the earth with regard to bimetalism, I inferred was well acquainted with the subject and well qualified to discourse upon its merits.

I listened to him with careful attention, and I heard him proclaim time and again that Great Britain was the only obstacle in the way of an international agreement for a bimetallic currency all over the world. But, after making that declaration, he turns and appeals to this House to join with him in voting to put a stigma upon silver, to join with Great Britain in doing that which she has just done in India, where she has struck silver the most severe blow, perhaps, that it has ever received, crushing it into the dust. He called upon this great country, with its sixty-seven millions of people, to practically demonetize silver and to proclaim to the world that it was the policy of the United States Government to relegate silver to the past, and never again to incorporate it into our standard coins.

There may be something in that argument, Mr. Speaker, but I have failed to see it. In my experience I have encountered men so passionately vindictive that they would lift a fallen enemy from the ground and set him on his feet for the pleasure they took in knocking him down again; but it has remained for the bimetallic single gold standard school of Democrats to illustrate a degree of charity that is too sublimated for my comprehension. They are willing to knock down a friend and trample him in the dust for the tender, devotional pleasure it gives them to set him on his feet again. [Laughter.]

That is practically the position occupied by gentlemen who proclaim their devotion to a bimetallic currency, and who at the same time tell us that now is the time to demonetize silver and to proclaim to the world that we will have nothing more to do with it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are symptoms to which we can not close our eyes, indicating what is to be the result of this vote. I have no idea or hope but that the majority of this House will vote for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act and stop there. I am sorry, because I believe it portends more to us than any of us can now adequately predict.

I fear it, sir, because I think it is only one link more in the chain which is being welded to separate the two classes of people in this country. There is nothing more dangerous to the future of a republic than disparity in the wealth of its people, and I can see plainly, to my mind at least satisfactorily, that the demonetization of silver means a still wider separation of what are known as the wealthy classes from the laboring and other classes of people in this land.

Under a system of tariff that has built up nabobs, and enabled them to live in a style that rivals the magnificence of royalty, these distinctions have grown and flourished, and now, beyond that, it is proposed to add to the gains which they have accumulated during twenty-odd years past, and to put upon the shoulders of the laboring masses, the toilers, and the delvers the additional burden caused by the appreciation of gold which will necessarily come from adopting the single gold standard in this country.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall not make any prognostications. I can only say to my brethren on this floor that while we may be defeated in this first effort, while we may be crushed for the present, still I am hopeful of the intelligence of the people of the United States, and I believe the time will come when the wrong which is about to be perpetrated will be righted, and when we, who represent what I believe to be the sound money policy of the country, will be able to look back upon our record with pride. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the message which the President of the United States submitted to Congress at the opening of this session he used this language:

The existence of an alarming and extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people, has constrained me to call together in extra session the people's representatives in Congress, to the end that through a wise and patriotic exercise of the legislative duty which they solely are charged present evils may be mitigated and dangers threatening the future may be averted.

And after speaking at some length of the peculiar and forlorn condition in which the country is placed to-day, he said:

I believe these things are principally chargeable to Congressional legislation touching the purchase and coinage of silver by the General Government.

This legislation is embodied in a statute passed on the 14th day of July, 1890, which was the culmination of much agitation on the subject involved, and which may be considered a truce, after a long struggle, between the advocates of free silver coinage and those intending to be more conservative.

This language of the President clearly indicates what to his mind should be the subject of legislation at this extraordinary session of Congress, and it also expresses the sentiment that party considerations should not enter into the deliberations of either of the great political parties in determining the remedies for the evils portrayed in his message.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the Democratic party, as represented in this House, would accept of this message in the spirit in which it was given by the Chief Executive, and would embark upon the consideration of the legislation that is proposed to relieve the country from its present financial distress, on broad and patriotic grounds. The Republican Representatives in Congress were ready and willing, and even anxious, to meet their Democratic colleagues, not as partisans, but as patriots, to confer together, and from such conferences to evolve some kind of legislation that would meet the demands of the public in this great emergency, and that would show to the country that in a crisis, such as is now experienced by the people, sectionalism and partisanship would not dominate and control either of these great political organizations.

This wish and hope that I have expressed was indulged in not only by the Republican members of this House, but by the country generally. That we were fated to disappointment is now known to all. On the 11th of this month the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] presented the following resolution for adoption in the House:

Ordered by the House, That H. R. No. 1 shall be taken up for immediate consideration and considered for fourteen days. During such consideration night sessions may be held, for debate only, at the request of either side. The daily sessions to commence at 11 a. m. and continue until 5 p. m. Eleven days of the debate on the bill to be given to general debate under the rules of the last House regulating general debate, the time to be equally divided between the two sides as the Speaker may determine. The last three days of debate may be devoted to the consideration of the bill and the amendments herein provided for, under the usual five-minute rule of the House, as in Committee of the Whole House. General leave to print is hereby granted.

Order of amendments: The vote shall be taken first on an amendment providing for the free coinage of silver at the present ratio. If that fails, then a separate vote to be had on a similar amendment proposing a ratio of 17 to 1; if that fails, on one proposing a ratio of 15 to 1; if that fails, on one proposing a ratio of 13 to 1; if that fails, on one proposing a ratio of 10 to 1. If the above amendments fail, it shall be in order to offer an amendment reviving the act of the 28th of February, 1878, restoring the standard silver dollar, commonly known as the Bland-Allison act; the vote then to be taken on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended, or on the bill itself if all amendments shall have been voted down, and on the final passage of the bill without other intervening motions.

This resolution was the result of a conference or caucus between the Democratic members of the House representing the extremes on the silver question. No Republican member had any voice or vote in determining any of the propositions embodied in the resolution which I have just had read at the Clerk's desk. It is the result of Democratic partisan consideration. When it was presented and its passage demanded by the Democratic Representative having it in charge, by authority of the caucus of the party, various members on our side protested against its adoption because they believed, as we all believed, that, in a great emergency like this, no Representative should be limited to either of the extremes presented in this resolution.

I say either of the extremes, because the bill itself calls for a repeal of the purchasing clause of what is known as the Sherman law unconditionally, and without any legislation accompanying it tending to the increase or expansion of the currency of this country to meet the wants of a constantly increasing population and a constantly increasing volume of business, while the amendments which are proposed in the resolution limit the vote to the free coinage of silver upon some ratio varying from 1 to 16 to 1 to 20, not one of these ratios being in accordance with the commercial difference that to-day exists between the two metals.

Republicans have a right, Mr. Speaker, to be justly indignant, as they are, at the treatment which has been accorded them by their Democratic colleagues on this floor in forcing the adoption of this resolution, and the consequent limitation of the consideration of this great question, which is affecting every section of our common country, without any privilege of suggesting any amendment, or embodying any proposition in the way of a substitute, that in the judgment of the Republican members of this House will aid in lifting this pall from the business of the country.

No political advantage can be gained by such partisanship. The people of this country are too intelligent, and their attention is directed too strongly to the consideration of this question

in Congress now to be misled by any of these limitations which have been imposed upon the representatives of the people in this resolution on which we are called to vote on the 28th of this month. What they demand now is legislation that will relieve the country from its present stagnation of business. They wish to see legislation that will restore confidence to the business men and to the manufacturers in this country. They wish to see the wheels of industry again started, the factories thrown open and the unemployed men who are to-day crying for bread or for work, given their old employment, with the remunerative wages to which they have been accustomed during the many years that the Republican party has been in control of this country.

What is the remedy that is offered by Mr. BLAND of Missouri and the majority of the Democratic party as represented on this floor? It is the free and unlimited coinage of silver on a ratio of 16 to 1, or some ratio intermediate between that and 20 to 1, including the latter number; and in case of the failure of any of these propositions to receive the indorsement of this House then the proposition is to reenact what is denominated the Bland bill of 1878.

These, and these alone, are the propositions which are presented by the members of the Democratic party, as represented on this floor, as a panacea for the ills under which the country is suffering. It will require, Mr. Speaker, more than the faith of the early Christians for any person to believe that a remedy can be found in the adoption of any of them. When they are subjected to cold analysis, in the light of historical facts, they fail utterly in furnishing the relief that is needed by the people of this country.

I have noticed in all the speeches that have been made by the friends of the white metal that they are more powerful in declamation than logical in reasoning, and that glittering generalities are substituted for substantial reasons to lead the public to a silver basis. Each speaker who has followed Mr. BLAND, the great apostle of free silver in this country, on that side of the question has prefaced his remarks with a statement that he is a bimetalist, and has assumed, without any reason therefor, that those who are not prepared to adopt any of these ratios submitted in this resolution under consideration are enemies of bimetalism, if indeed they do not belong to that despised class denominated by our Populist friends "the Gold Bugs of Wall street."

Bimetalism can not be had in this country by arbitrary legislative enactment. The commerce and trade of the world can not be commanded or changed by the American Congress alone. It would be as easy to change the flow of water over the Falls of Niagara by bill in Congress as to create practical bimetalism of the two metals—gold and silver—in this country by legislative enactment, without taking into consideration the commercial value of the two metals and their condition and use in the other civilized countries of the world.

These so-called friends of free silver are misleading the people, if not themselves also, when they insist that the adoption of any one of the ratios proposed in the pending resolution will restore practical bimetalism in the United States. They say with truth that gold and silver are recognized in the Constitution as the money metals, and that in 1792 we established bimetalism in this country by recognizing both gold and silver at a certain fineness on the ratio of 15 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold, and that from that day to 1873 we were committed by acts of Congress to bimetalism.

In all these statements, Mr. Speaker, I find myself traveling the same road with the so-called friends of free and unlimited coinage of silver. These are historical facts that are known even to the school children of this country, but it is equally well known that never for three consecutive days, from the adoption of the ratio of 15 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold in the laws of 1792, up to the present time, have these two metals traveled in company upon the ratio fixed by law. The commercial values of gold and silver have invariably controlled their legal value, and the enactments of Congress upon this subject have been a dead letter.

Whenever legislation interferes with the natural laws of trade it becomes inoperative. You can no more fix and determine by legislation adopted in this Congress the relative value of the two metals than you can change and modify the laws of nature. The laws of trade and commerce are as inexorable as the law of gravitation.

These principles were well known to the founders of the Republic, and it was for that reason that Robert Morris, the great financier of the Revolution, was opposed to the double standard. He believed from the wide experience that he had had in financial matters, and from the profound study which he had given the subject, that the two metals, gold and silver, could not by legislation be held at a certain ratio for any length of time, and hence in his discussion on the adoption of the laws relative to

this subject, and the establishment of a standard of value and medium of exchange, he favored one metal.

It is true at that time he favored the silver metal. And why? Because at that time silver was used as a standard of value in all civilized nations of the world. It was before the discovery of gold in California and Australia, and before gold had become the standard of value of the great civilized nations, as it is to-day.

Alexander Hamilton himself, while recommending, as he did in his celebrated report to Congress, the adoption of the bimetallic theory, did it with grave doubts and many misgivings. He saw with almost prophetic eye, that if the ratio established by law of the two metals did not conform strictly with the commercial value of the two metals, that it would be utterly impossible to have them interchangeable in the channels of trade in this country on the ratio fixed by act of Congress. He stated, and it is a well-known fact, a fact that will not be disputed by any intelligent member of this House, that he held to the belief that if but one metal should be adopted as the standard of value and the medium of exchange, that metal should be gold, because of its less variable value.

What is the result, Mr. Speaker, of the adoption of bimetalism in this country at the ratio of 15 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold? The records from the Treasury Department, together with standard financial works treating of this subject, show clearly that the two metals never for one day traveled in company under that ratio. Gold was undervalued, and refused to keep company with her white brother.

At that time the legal ratio between the two metals in France and other European countries was 15½ grains of silver to 1 grain of gold, and hence the silver that was coined drove out of the channels of trade the yellow metal, and we were practically a monometallist country on a silver basis from 1792 up to a revision of these laws, under the leadership of the great Senator from Missouri, Thomas H. Benton, who, in 1834, secured a change of ratio, making 16 ounces of silver the legal equivalent of 1 ounce of gold.

This ratio did not conform to the commercial difference in the two metals, but at this time England had established the gold basis for her standard, and gold was coming into more general use as the great money metal of the world. The country at the time of this change felt the need of more gold in the channels of trade in the American States, and this change in the ratio was for the purpose of inducing gold to leave foreign countries and seek our shores for investment. By the establishment of this ratio of 16 ounces of silver to 1 of gold, silver was undervalued, and it, in its turn, refused to circulate as a money metal on that ratio with the yellow metal.

The commercial difference of the two metals at this time was only 3 cents on a dollar. In other words, a silver dollar, on this ratio, was worth 3 cents more, intrinsically, than a gold dollar, and this difference was sufficient to send it abroad for investment, and leave gold as the sole metal for trade and commerce in this country. The mints of the United States were open equally to both metals on this ratio; yet, as a matter of fact, silver was practically unknown as a money in use. Whatever was coined at the mints was immediately shipped to other countries, and there melted into bullion and sold at its market value.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, there was no cry raised in favor of this white metal. By the establishment of this ratio this country was placed upon a gold monometallic basis as firmly and as securely as it would have been had silver been demonetized. Gold was the standard of value and our only medium of exchange, and was the circulating medium of this country up to the time of the outbreak of the civil war and the issue of Treasury notes such as are now known as the greenback.

The crime of the demonetization of silver, if crime it be, antedated the legislation of 1873. It is true that up to the revision of our coinage laws in 1873 the silver dollar was known upon our statute books, but it was practically demonetized, as I have before said, in 1834, when the ratio of the two metals was changed, and the legislation of 1873 was but recording what commerce and trade had already done for this white metal.

On the ratio established in 1834 between the two metals, of 16 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold, the legal value of an ounce of silver is \$1.29. Under the old ratio that was established in 1792, of 15 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold, the ratio was fixed upon the basis of silver being worth \$1.38 an ounce. At this time, as I have already said, all of the civilized countries of the world had their mints open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver; and yet, Mr. Speaker, because the legal ratio fixed in 1792 of 15 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold did not correspond with the commercial ratio, the two metals refused to circulate together; they varied in their commercial value from year to year, but slightly, it is true, but in a sufficient amount to drive silver from our shores and cause it to seek investment, not as the coin of our country, but as bullion, in foreign markets.

In 1819 the commercial value of an ounce of silver was \$1.35. This, you will see, was within 3 cents of par, or the legal value fixed upon an ounce of silver when bimetalism was established in this country.

Now, bear in mind the fact that the mints of all the civilized nations were open at this time to the free and unlimited coinage of silver; bear in mind, also, the fact that every country in the then known world was using silver as a money metal, and yet, with a 3 per cent difference between the commercial and the legal ratio, the friends of silver were unable to bring it to par with gold, and unable to keep it in the channels of trade.

In view of these facts, which are as plain and clear to the members of this House as the king's highway, I ask in the name of common sense, I ask in the name of justice to the great laboring masses of this country, I ask in the name of the great producing classes of this country, when to-day there is a difference of more than 57 per cent between the legal and the commercial value of an ounce of silver, and it has been demonetized in all the civilized countries of the world, how is it possible for the friends of silver to hope that by the reestablishment of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, as proposed in the pending amendment now under consideration, it will come to par, and that an ounce of silver, which can now be purchased in the market for 72 cents, by a stroke of the Congressional pen can be made of the value of \$1.29?

The very statement of the proposition is its best refutation. As well might you say that an act of Congress would cause the waters of the Mississippi to stop their flow, or the rocks of the Sierras to burst asunder at Congressional dictation, as to contend that under present conditions the reestablishment of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country, on the ratio proposed, will bring the commercial value of silver up to its legal value.

Let us consider for a moment, if you please, Mr. Speaker, this subject a little further in order to demonstrate the utter absurdity of the position of the so-called friends of bimetalism who advocate the free and unlimited coinage of silver on any of the ratios that are proposed in the pending amendments. There are in the world in round figures \$4,000,000,000 worth of silver. This to-day is worth about 72 cents an ounce.

Now, these free-silver advocates, the followers and supporters of Mr. BLAND of Missouri, in their efforts to force this legislation upon Congress, and its results upon the people of this country, tell us that by the very magic of free coinage by the United States, standing separate and alone from all the other civilized nations of the world, it is going to raise this \$4,000,000,000 worth of silver from 72 cents an ounce to \$1.29 an ounce. In other words, that by the enactment of this proposed amendment for the reestablishment of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country on the ratio of 16 to 1 they are going to add a value of more than \$1,500,000,000 worth to the world's supply of silver.

Was ever a more astounding proposition presented to any legislative body or to any intelligent, sane men? Does not the simple rehearsal of these facts demonstrate to those who are least familiar with this subject the fact that the position they assume is utterly untenable, and that if it were carried out it would instantly put this country upon a silver basis and would drive the six hundred and odd millions of dollars of gold that are now in circulation in this country into safe-deposit vaults, and to other secret places where trade and commerce would know it no more forever?

Mr. Speaker, it does not lie with the gentlemen who are advocating the free and unlimited coinage of silver upon this ratio, or even upon any of the ratios that are suggested in the amendments, to claim that those who are opposed to their propositions are the enemies of bimetalism in the United States. These men, while they are professing to be desirous of carrying out the provisions of the Constitution and the principles of the early fathers in establishing and maintaining the two metals at a parity, know when they make these professions, that if their propositions are adopted that this country will become a monometallic and not a bimetallic country, and that it will be a silver monometallic and not a gold monometallic country.

I have not the time nor the inclination to stop here and portray to the members of this House or the country the direful results that would follow from their successful efforts in this session of Congress. The first result would be to contract the currency to the amount of the six hundred and odd millions of gold which are now in circulation.

We are to-day, Mr. Speaker, experiencing the sad results of a contraction of the currency. This legislation, instead of proving a relief, would still further aggravate the disease that it seeks to remedy. Whenever this country substitutes a silver for a gold basis our stocks and bonds and other obligations held in European countries will be immediately sent over here for liquidation, and

what we are now experiencing in the way of a practical cessation of all business will become complete, and this country would go into general bankruptcy.

I shall take no time to demonstrate the impracticability of adopting either of the other ratios proposed in the pending amendments. Neither of them conforms to the commercial ratio between the two metals. The commercial ratio, as shown by the report of the Director of the Mint, dated August 1, 1893, is as 1 to 28.52. How long that ratio will remain it is impossible for any man to state.

If the legal and commercial ratio should be made identical in this legislation by the adoption of 28.52 of silver to one ounce of gold, a week after the adoption of the law the commercial ratio would be different. The report which I hold in my hand, made by the Director of the Mint on the 1st of this month, shows that there has been a steady decline in silver since 1873, and that it has been more rapid since 1890 to the present date than for any like period in the history of our country.

Some gentlemen may say that this decline is attributable to the demonetization of silver in 1873; but I would ask all such to bear in mind the facts which I have stated already, that the demonetization of 1873 was only recording in a legal way what had been practically a commercial demonetization of silver for a period of nearly forty years prior to that date.

The chief reason, in my judgment, that silver has steadily declined in value is the fact that during this period its annual production in this country has more than doubled, and its use as a money metal has been destroyed in the leading countries of Europe. In 1871 Germany suspended the free coinage of silver and adopted a single gold standard. In 1873 the German Empire provided for the retirement of silver coins in circulation and the sale of its silver bullion. This threw about \$140,000,000 of silver bullion upon the market and still further depressed the market price of silver.

France also, in 1873, by a Treasury order limited the amount of silver to be accepted; and in 1874 silver was demonetized in Sweden and Norway. In 1875 Holland suspended free coinage of silver and established a gold standard. In 1876 France discontinued the further coinage of silver, and Russia, in the same year, suspended free coinage of silver and adopted the gold standard; and in the same year Spain, by her royal decree, stopped the further coinage of silver.

In 1892 Austria-Hungary adopted the single gold standard and discontinued the use of the white metal as a money metal. Then in 1893, just previous to the assembling of the members of Congress in this extra session, India, the great silver country of the world, suspended the free coinage of silver.

Under these circumstances it requires no metaphysical arguments and no philosophizing to show to the people of this country that silver has constantly and steadily fallen in its commercial value in the great countries of the world; and these facts, too, must demonstrate to all alike the utter futility of any effort upon the part of this Congress or any subsequent Congress, while the other countries which I have just named maintain a gold standard, to attempt to establish free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country on any ratio whatever.

It is a practical impossibility, and, as I have said, the men who advocate it upon this floor or in any other place, in the limits of our broad Republic, are not the friends of bimetalism, but for selfish motives, or from misguided reason, they have adopted this theory with the knowledge, unless they are blind to all the facts, that the adoption of it upon any ratio whatever will place the greatest Republic of all times upon the silver basis of our sister Republics in Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be representing the intelligence of my district were I to vote, under these conditions, for any of the amendments proposed by the honorable member from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]. Not only, sir, would I be misrepresenting the intelligence and the interests of my immediate constituency, but, in my judgment, I would be false to the best interests of our common country if I yielded to any of the seductive arguments which have been portrayed in such eloquent terms by members who have spoken on that side of the question, and vote in favor of any one of the propositions which they present. This is a crisis which calls for intelligent action; not only intelligent action, but for prompt action, if we would benefit our country in this its hour of commercial peril.

The reasons in part assigned for my objection to the indorsement of any of these ratios for the free and unlimited coinage of silver lead me also, Mr. Speaker, to vote against the proposition, which is suggested in the last amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, for the reenactment of the so-called Bland-Allison act of 1878. That act, Mr. Speaker, provides for the purchase by the Government each month of not less than \$2,000,000 worth of silver and not more than \$4,000,000 of silver bullion for

coinage into silver dollars, at a rate of 412½ grains of standard silver or 371½ of fine silver for each dollar.

It was left in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, between these limits, to determine the amount of silver bullion that should be purchased under that act from month to month. It was upon the statute books of our country until the enactment of the so-called Sherman law on the 14th day of July, 1890. That it was a menace to the continuance of our maintaining our paper currency and silver on an equality with our gold currency is evidenced by the letter of President Cleveland, in 1885, to Gen. Warner of Ohio, a letter which has become somewhat celebrated in the consideration of the silver question, and which affirmed, in substance, that the continuation of that act upon the statute books would lead this country to a silver basis.

This agitation, Mr. Speaker, of the silver question was begun by the opponents of the resumption of specie payments, which, under the act of 1875, was to take place on the 1st day of January, 1879. It was, in one sense, a demand for more money. That demand for more money first found expression in what is called the inflation bill, which was passed by both Houses of Congress in 1874, and was subsequently vetoed by President Grant.

When the friends of an inflated currency were foiled in their attempt by our great military chieftain, who was then the President of the United States, they took up the subject of the demonetization of silver under the act of 1873, which agitation continued with varying success until 1878, when, as a compromise with the friends of free and unlimited coinage of silver, the Bland-Allison act was proposed, and finally enacted into a law. It never met the hearty approval of the able financiers of the country, but was then regarded and has since been treated as a temporary makeshift between the advocates of sound money on the one hand and the inflationists on the other.

There was nothing in this act, Mr. Speaker, when it became a law, that pledged this country to maintain the silver dollars which were to be coined under that act at a parity with gold, and that is one of the reasons why President Cleveland, as early as 1885, believed that it was a pernicious law, and that the continued coinage of silver dollars under that act would drive gold to foreign countries and place us upon a silver basis.

The much-abused Sherman law, in my judgment, is in many respects preferable to the adoption of the proposed amendment for the reenactment of the so-called Bland-Allison act; because, while it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase 4,500,000 ounces of silver per month, and issue silver certificates for the market value of this bullion, it also pledges the property and the credit of the Government to maintain these silver certificates at a parity with gold.

And it is that pledge, and that pledge alone, which has been faithfully carried out by each Republican Secretary of the Treasury, which, in my judgment, has enabled this Government to maintain this vast sum of silver dollars and silver certificates at a parity with gold. You divorce these silver dollars and silver certificates from gold, and allow them to circulate upon their own merits without the pledge of the Government's property and its credit to maintain them at a parity with gold, and they would sink instantly to their commercial value.

At the present price of silver more silver dollars would be coined under the Bland-Allison act per month than would be by the purchase of silver bullion under the Sherman act of 1890. As I have already shown, under the Bland-Allison act the Secretary of the Treasury is to purchase not less than \$2,000,000 worth of silver per month and coin the same into dollars. At the present price of silver, which I estimate at 72 cents per ounce, \$2,000,000 worth would produce \$3,685,714, while 4,500,000 ounces of silver at the same price cost only \$3,150,000.

Thus you see that the purchase of silver under the act which it is proposed to repeal, at the present price, is \$515,714 a month less than would be coined under the so-called Bland-Allison bill. Under the present condition of the Treasury the reenactment of the law of 1878 would put us upon a silver basis as quickly as the enactment of a free, unlimited coinage bill on any of the ratios suggested in the pending amendments. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the facts and figures which I have here presented furnish a sufficient reason, for me at least, to vote against all of the propositions that are contained in the proposed amendments to the pending bill for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act.

This leads me to a consideration of that act. I remember well the discussion which took place in this Hall, and in the Senate, which resulted in this legislation. My friend from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] was then contending, as he is now, for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. His party associates then were not, as now, divided upon this question. We then had a Republican President, and men who to-day on that side of the House denounce the free and unlimited coinage of silver as a menace to the maintenance of our commercial prosperity, were then

agreed to follow him in his efforts to secure legislation of this kind.

Whether since that time, by a careful study of this subject, they have abandoned the heresies which they then professed to believe in, or whether they permitted partisanship and their desire to embarrass the Republican party to control their voices and votes, I shall leave to them to say. In the discussion of this question at present I shall not stop to indulge in any partisan debate or to array unnecessarily the Democratic party for its peculiar position upon this question in the years that have gone. The impending crisis is too grave and the necessity for prompt action too great to stop in the midst of this effort to relieve the country from this condition to indulge in crimination or recrimination.

It is due to the facts of history, however, to state that by an almost united vote the Democratic members of the House of Representatives voted for the free and unlimited coinage of silver on the ratio as proposed in the first of the pending amendments. It had passed the Senate by a combination between the Democratic Senators and the Republican Senators from the silver States. The Republican members of the then House of Representatives believed then, as they believe now, that the true interests of this country would be imperiled if such a bill were enacted into law, and they refused to approve of the bill that was sent to the House from the Senate and sent a substitute to the Senate therefor.

This resulted, as those who are familiar with legislation will understand, in a conference committee, composed of a certain number of members selected by the House and another number selected by the Senate. After mature deliberation it was deemed by a majority of this conference committee that this act, as it is now found on the statute book, would be better for a temporary measure than to adopt the then Democratic idea of free and unlimited coinage. No man who had favored this measure believed that it was to long remain on our statute books.

The hope was then indulged that time and experience would lead a sufficient number of Democratic Representatives and Senators to understand that the prosperity of our country must depend upon sound financial legislation, and that under the facts that exist in the world to-day regarding silver it would be utterly impossible for us to maintain it at any ratio on a parity with gold, and these considerations would induce them to desist from their efforts to secure the legislation that has always been championed by Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

That hope, Mr. Speaker, has been partly realized by the firm stand that has been taken by President Cleveland upon this question. Many members of this House who three short years ago were loud in their declamation in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver are now arrayed on the conservative side, under the leadership of their President, a position which has been held for so many years alone by the Republican party.

I am not one of those, however, Mr. Speaker, who are willing to confess that nothing but unmixed evil has followed from the adoption of the Sherman law. That legislation, as I have shown, was an improvement over the legislation that was given to the country in 1878, known as the Bland-Allison law. The question may arise, then, why should I vote for the repeal of the purchasing clause? The answer, to my mind, is clear and simple. The President of the United States, by his message to Congress, has said, in substance, that he is unable to maintain the parity between the two metals because of the constantly increasing amount of silver that is stored in the Treasury under this law.

There is no doubt in my mind that the attitude of his party as a free and unlimited silver-coinage party has added to the complications of this question. The people of Europe who have been in the habit of purchasing our bonds and stocks have seen a party placed in power by the votes of the people whose cardinal principle for many years upon the financial question has been the free and unlimited coinage of this white metal, and with this legislation upon the statute book, and that party in power, they have felt that the President himself would not be able to control his party on this subject, and the result has been an effort upon their part to dispose of all obligations in this country that might by legislation be required to be paid in silver instead of being paid in gold.

The President's message to Congress, as it is interpreted by the Republicans, is an appeal to them to come to his aid and assist him in reestablishing the finances of this country upon the stable basis upon which they had been maintained for more than a generation by the Republican party, and as lovers of our country we are willing to respond by our voices and votes, and repeal this clause, thus placing it beyond the power of this Democratic political organization, committed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, to destroy the equality between the metals as they have been maintained under Republican administration.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the bill by which we repeal

the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890, reaffirms a determination upon the part of this Government to maintain the two metals at a parity. We have a vast amount of coined silver dollars and a large amount of silver certificates, aggregating in round numbers six hundred million dollars. Those silver dollars and those silver certificates must be maintained at their par value. This bill, as I have said, pledges the property and the credit of the Government to that policy.

I am reminded, however, by gentlemen who sit around me, that the repeal of the purchasing clause of this Sherman law as is proposed under the pending resolution gives no legislation for the future of silver, and leaves us without an expanding circulating medium to meet the wants of the country.

I appreciate that to its full extent, Mr. Speaker, and am one who believes that this country should have legislation that will utilize both of these metals for the benefit of the people. It will not do after the Republican party, through its members in the House and the Senate, have aided in securing the repeal of the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890, thus enabling the President of the United States to maintain our present volume of silver and silver certificates at a parity with gold, for him and his party to stop there.

The people of this country expect the President and the Democratic party, by proper legislation, to present some scheme of finance that will utilize these metals, and will furnish to the country a sufficient supply of money to meet the wants of trade and commerce; and if they fail in that the people will condemn them as false to the interests that they pledged themselves to protect and maintain when they were placed in power.

Now, sir, had this resolution that has been adopted here not limited us to the amendments upon which I have spoken, I should have been glad for one to have suggested proper and germane amendments to this bill looking to an increased circulation, expanding and elastic in its character, to meet the wants of a constantly increasing population in this country, and the needs of a growing commerce and trade. My views might not meet with the approval of all this House, but a discussion along this line would certainly lead to the adoption of some proposition that would meet the requirements of this occasion.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the great cry that is made by the friends of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country is that if it is treated simply as a commodity, and its money qualities taken away from it or limited or impaired in any manner, that the people will suffer because of a scarcity of a circulating medium, and have argued with a good deal of justness that the prices of all commodities will fall if there is a contraction in the standard of value and medium of exchange.

In my judgment their objections can be met by legislation that will continue the gold dollar as established by the law of February 12, 1873, as the unit of value of the United States. Instead of from this date coining gold at the mints, I would use the gold bullion as a basis for the issuing of gold certificates. That could be managed, Mr. Speaker, in this manner: Whenever the holder of gold bullion in an amount of \$100 or more should deposit that in the Treasury of the United States, or at any mint or assay office, that the Secretary of the Treasury might designate the depositor should receive, instead of gold coins therefor, registered Treasury notes, of such denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury might designate, called Treasury notes, for an equal amount to the number of dollars of the bullion deposited.

Upon these notes I would have certified by the Secretary of the Treasury that there had been deposited in the Treasury of the United States an amount of gold equal to \$100, or the amount that the depositor had placed in the Treasury of the United States, and then have the notes certify that they are redeemable in an amount of gold equal to \$100, or whatever was deposited, on demand of the holder thereof.

I would treat silver in precisely the same way, and whenever the holder of silver bullion in quantities aggregating a hundred dollars' worth or more deposits that bullion with the Treasurer of the United States, or at any assay office of the United States that might be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, I would permit him to receive therefor a Treasury note certifying that the depositor had left in the Treasury of the United States an amount of silver equal to \$100, or whatever sum the silver bullion was worth according to our standard of value on the day of its deposit, and then have that silver note certified by the Secretary of the Treasury that it is redeemable in an amount of silver equal to \$100 or whatever amount was deposited at the time it was issued, on the demand of the holder thereof.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, from this that neither the gold nor the silver certificate is redeemable in any number of dollars, or at any specified time. The unit of value in this country, as fixed by the law of 1873, is the gold dollar of 23.22 grains of pure gold; and these gold and silver certificates would be measured

in the market by that unit of value. Under this plan, as it seems to me, properly elaborated and carried out by well-considered legislation, both of the great money metals can be utilized by the Government of the United States to furnish a suitable and elastic and constantly increasing currency to the people of this country.

There is no danger under legislation of this kind of a silver certificate depreciating in the market—that would be utterly impossible. It would be as valuable in the markets of Europe as a gold certificate. It would be as valuable in any section of the United States as the gold certificate. Why? Because it evidences upon its face that it is good for a quantity of silver equal to its face value.

I would make these certificates legal tenders for all public and private debts.

Under this system, as I have said, there can be no question but what those silver certificates would circulate as money in the country as readily as gold coin or gold certificates.

In this manner the product of the American mines can be utilized for the benefit of the whole country, and at the same time the certificates that are issued upon bullion that is deposited with the Treasurer of the United States will circulate in New England or through the Middle States or in any section of the country as well as the greenback of to-day or as gold coin.

It has been demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, I think, by experience, that gold and silver coins do not circulate among the people. They seek places of deposit in our banks and subtreasuries, and there is a demand among the people for a paper money. It is more convenient. It is easier to handle. It is cheaper to transport from one point to another, and in every respect, almost, the people of this country have shown that they prefer this kind of money, where they can be satisfied that it is as good as gold coin. And when they are assured that back of each one of these certificates there is gold or silver bullion of sufficient quantities, so that that bond can be taken to the Treasury of the United States, or any of our subtreasuries, and redeemed at its par value, there will be no question about the people of this country receiving it in all the channels of trade.

If a bill could be prepared and passed in this Congress, embodying this idea, it could be elaborated, Mr. Speaker, so as to meet any objections arising from the fluctuations in value of either of the metals. I shall not take the time here to demonstrate to the House and the country how that can be done. From the study I have given this subject, and from the opinions of the men who are well versed in the science of finance, this is one of the most feasible plans that can be adopted by the people of this country to utilize both gold and silver as money.

By the adoption of this we shall avoid all the troubles and inconveniences and hardships of a single gold standard, that have been so picturesquely and so eloquently portrayed to the people of this country by the gentleman favoring the free and unlimited coinage of silver. By the adoption of this method we will also escape the equally dangerous ground of placing this country upon the single silver standard, and thus from a monetary standpoint place us on a par with the second-class powers of the earth.

No friend of either of the metals can object to a method of the character here suggested, because it takes the metal that he specially favors and utilizes it to the full extent of the needs of the Government. It makes no distinction between gold and silver, but treats both alike.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that with the growing demands for paper circulating medium in this country and a standard of deferred payments, that the time will come when gold and silver will have to be treated in the form here suggested, and a paper money based upon the intrinsic value of these metals will take their place; and it seems to me now is the proper time for Congress to consider this great question. Early action is called for, not only by the President of the United States, but by the people.

The picture of the condition of this country, as portrayed in the message of President Cleveland, is one that should challenge the attention of every thoughtful man. It is in such marked contrast to the condition of this country as presented by President Harrison in his last annual message that I can not refrain from quoting a few of the opening sentences in the last message to Congress from that Executive:

In submitting my annual message to Congress I have great satisfaction in being able to say that the general conditions affecting the commercial and industrial interests of the United States are in the highest degree favorable. A comparison of the existing conditions with those of the most favored period in the history of the country will, I believe, show that so high a degree of prosperity and so general a diffusion of the comforts of life were never before enjoyed by our people. * * * There never has been a time in our history when work was so abundant or when wages were as high, whether measured by the currency in which they are paid or by their power to supply the necessities and comforts of life.

This, Mr. Speaker, was the condition of the people of this country under the last Republican Administration, and has been

the condition of the people practically for nearly a generation, during which period the Republican party has been in actual continuous control of the Government.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that by wise and conservative action the President of the United States will be enabled to restore to the people of this country the happy, contented, and successful condition that they were in under the last Republican Administration. The Republicans, certainly in this great emergency, will rally to his support, and whenever he indicates, by message or otherwise, that owing to divisions in his own party, or for other causes, he needs the support of the Republican party to protect the best interests and welfare of our people, he will find them unitedly and patriotically responsive to his call.

[Mr. LANE withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Speaker, I am the sole representative on this floor of the State of Nevada, a State which has suffered more than any other portion of the Union from the discriminating legislation against silver. I am also the sole representative on this floor of my party. The people in Nevada, recognizing the fact that the platforms of both the old parties were intended to mean one thing in the East and another thing in the West, and feeling assured from the record of the candidates that the election of either meant disaster to the cause of bimetalism, formed an independent organization, called the Silver party of Nevada.

Their hope was that the contest between the two old parties would be a close one, and that the independent vote of the silver States, united with the third-party vote elsewhere, would hold the balance of power in the electoral college and would either secure the election of a new candidate favorable to the silver cause, or secure from one of the existing candidates substantial concessions to that cause. The overwhelming victory of the Democratic party in States hitherto uniformly Republican rendered that hope futile; but their expectations were realized and are realized to-day, so far as the party platforms are concerned; for we find members in this House construing these party platforms in different ways, according to the interests of their section, their locality, or their individual views of the monetary question, without regard to party discipline or the unity of party faith.

I, therefore, can not take a partisan view of this subject. There are no members of my party here whom I can call to task for straying from the straight path, and I certainly can not call to task the members of other parties for recreancy, for that is a right which belongs only to those of the true faith.

I shall take simply a general view, in the interest of this entire country, taking it for granted that an enlightened self-interest will determine the action of this country as it does that of individuals.

There are two aspects to this question, one the industrial and the other the financial, and you will pardon me if I refer to the industrial aspect first, as it concerns the progress, the development, and the destiny of that great section of the country which I represent, and as the determination of this question is freighted with either beneficence or disaster to it.

But, whether we consider the industrial or financial aspect of this question, it is necessary to bear in mind the relation of this country to other countries so far as its material interests are concerned; for the rule obtains, in national as well as individual affairs, that life is a struggle for existence in which individual effort for individual success and advancement leads to the highest development of the race and of the world.

So far as the relations of debtor and creditor and the ownership and production of the precious metals are concerned, England and the United States may be taken as the two representative nations of the world. England is the greatest creditor nation; the United States is the greatest debtor nation. England is the greatest owner of the accumulated gold of the world. The United States is one of the greatest owners of accumulated silver. England, through its African discoveries, is fast becoming the greatest producer of gold. The United States is the greatest producer of silver. They are the only money metals sanctioned through the ages by custom and law.

Both metals depend for their value upon an artificial demand created by law. The laws of the various countries giving each the privilege of coinage at the government mints, providing for the weight and fineness of the coins, and declaring them a legal tender for debt, create the use of and the demand for these metals, and give them their value, and to the extent that the laws shall deny either of these metals recognition, to that extent the demand for and the value of such metal is diminished.

Leaving out the financial view of the question, it is self-evident that, if America is the greatest owner and producer of silver and England the greatest owner and producer of gold, the legislation of this country, so far as it affects the question at all, should be in favor of silver rather than gold, for silver mining sustains the life of six States, in whole or in part, and three Territories. It is the vital industry of one-third of the area of our entire country, constituting the field of exploit, of endeavor, and of hope.

It is true silver mining is not the only industry in that region; but all the other industries are built upon and dependent on it.

Silver mining stands at the base of every industry in that region. I deal in no exaggeration when I make that statement. It is true we have other industries—lead, copper, and coal mining, commerce, banking, and transportation—but you will find that they are all allied to and dependent upon this great industry. In lead mining, silver is a by-product, and often constitutes the only element of profit.

So also, but in a more limited degree, in copper mining. Coal mining is prosecuted, not with a view of supplying distant markets already supplied with coal, such as Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, but for the purpose of supplying the smelters, the population of the mining camps, and the cities and towns dependent upon them, and also for the purpose of supplying the motive power for the transportation of that region.

Agriculture is pursued not for the purpose of seeking distant markets—transportation would be too expensive for that—but for the supply of the local markets of the mining regions. The lands there are not moistened from the heavens as in the East. Artificial irrigation is necessary and vast irrigation schemes, involving large expenditure, necessitating the storage of water in the mountains for the period of drought and its transportation through long and expensive canals over vast areas of what had been an arid waste, have been inaugurated and carried out for the purpose of reclaiming that country from the desert. The farmers of the Mississippi and Ohio valleys little know under what difficulties and at what expense agriculture is pursued in the intermountain region.

What will become of this vast interest when silver mining and the kindred industries are destroyed? What will become of the commerce of that region, having its sources of supply in the great commercial cities of the East and West, dependent upon local industries for its support, realizing great profits out of the most generous markets in the world; for it is well known that the most liberal market is the mining market? All the expenditures are on a liberal scale, and a mining community will spend much more per capita for supplies, for transportation, for all the necessities, conveniences, and comforts of life than any other community of a like population.

The transportation companies in this great region are also dependent upon silver mining. Did you ever reflect how many hundreds and thousands of miles of railroads have been built for the purpose of tapping the silver mines? All the transportation companies have endeavored to reach them directly or by extensions and branches, all the transcontinental railroads are dependent upon silver mining and the allied industries for their traffic—the Northern Pacific, the Union Pacific, the Central Pacific, the Oregon Short Line, the Great Northern, the Colorado Midland, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe—the transcontinental business of these roads gives little profit because of the keenness of competition. It is the local transportation in the mining regions which is profitable. The only exception to this rule is the Southern Pacific, which is entrenched in and draws its support from the rich and fertile valleys of California, yielding, as they do, products of such high value as to sustain high rates of transportation. The capital stock and bonds of these railroads are owned largely in the money centers of the East.

The money centers of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia have a direct monetary interest in the prosperity of that section. I recall that several months ago I saw it stated in the papers that Mr. Villard, of the Northern Pacific, was present with others during the last Congress, urging the repeal of the Sherman act. I wondered whether the newspapers had correctly reported the fact. I could not believe that the president of that great railroad, passing through Montana, Idaho, and eastern Oregon, more dependent upon silver mining for its business than upon any other industry, gaining more profit from it than from its through transcontinental business, which is subject to extensive competition, could be here directly antagonizing that sustaining industry.

Upon inquiry I found that he represented not the stockholders, but the German bondholders, who were insistent that this country should be kept on a gold monometallic basis. Their position was that of a man holding a gold mortgage upon a silver mine, and yet they were aiding in the destruction of the very industry which stood at the basis of their bonds and gave them value.

So it is you will find throughout these monetary centers of the East—men largely interested in these great transcontinental railroads who do not know the danger which threatens their property in the destruction of silver mining. I remember when I heard that Mr. Villard was advocating the repeal of the Sherman act, I predicted that within sixty days after the repeal of that act the Northern Pacific would be in the hands of a receiver. That prediction has been prematurely vindicated. That road is already the victim of the decline in silver caused by the action of India, and is now in the hands of a receiver. The market value of the stock and bonds on the mileage of railroads actually located in the mining regions amounts to between six hundred and a thousand million of dollars. All these transcontinental or intermountain roads running throughout that country with the exception referred to will be in the hands of a receiver within sixty days after silver mining is suppressed by legislation.

You can not strike a great interest and predominating industry

of any section of the country without involving other sections. The East has a great monetary and proprietary interest in the West, a greater monetary interest than the West itself. The people of the mining region are the workers employed mainly by Eastern capital. You will find in Denver, built up by Eastern capital, magnificent buildings owned by Eastern capital, a building owned by the Equitable Insurance Company of New York which has cost between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000, and others of equal character; and yet you propose to destroy the industry, the development, and the civilization of that great region, comprising one-third of our country, and to bring additional disaster to Eastern stock markets and capital.

Ah, you say, it will not be destroyed; but I have already shown you that all the industries there are allied to silver mining, and depend upon it—lead mining, copper mining, commerce, agriculture, transportation—and after you destroy those what is there left? What is there left for that region but a return to the arid waste from which capital and civilization have wrested it?

Now, if this were the only feature of the case to be considered, I think that we all, as Americans, would agree that the great industries of that vast region should be sustained. But we are told that the industrial view of the question is a narrow one; that finance knows no boundaries of section, State, or nation; that the entire civilized world is drifting to gold; that it is fashionable to adopt the gold standard, and that we, the greatest nation of the world—I have heard that vainglorious expression very often in this debate—must be in fashion.

Let us consider that. Let us consider where our financial interest lies and ascertain whether it does not lie with our industrial interest. And here comes in the distinction between debtor and creditor nations. England is the representative of the creditor nations and is herself the greatest creditor nation in the world. She has swept the seas with her commerce, has made gain from every nation in every part of the globe, and has taken it home in the shape of gold, and loaned it to the nations of the world upon gold-bearing obligations. She has her tentacles upon every nation. She owes none but her own people, while every nation owes her.

America, on the contrary, is the greatest debtor nation of the world. She needs such large quantities of money for the development of this great country that she can not produce enough to satisfy the demand. Hence she has to borrow from other countries and she has borrowed largely from England upon bond obligations, national and State, and upon the obligations of private corporations and individuals. It is estimated that those obligations amount to about \$4,000,000,000, and yet we have in this country only \$600,000,000 of gold to respond with, and only \$1,500,000,000 of all kinds of money.

England, then, is the great creditor nation, America the great debtor nation. England is the greatest owner and producer of gold, America the greatest owner and producer of silver. And when we bear in mind that silver is the only metallic competitor of gold, the only metal which has been dignified through the ages with gold as one of the precious metals, I ask whether it is our policy to discredit that silver, to destroy its value, to increase the value of English gold by the destruction of its only competitor, American silver?

I wish to indulge in no declamation whatever against England. I admire the power and wisdom of that great people, infinitely more powerful, infinitely more wise than we, because they exercise their power in international affairs, and they are wise enough to legislate in their own interest, and not in the interest of other countries. [Applause.] Self-interest constitutes the prevailing motive of the governmental and political action of that great nation, while we are spending our energies in building up other nations, in appreciating the value of their accumulations and their productions and neglecting our own.

But we have another interest in this question, and that is connected with Mexico, which lies next to us. Mexico has been built up and developed by American capital, and you will find that the basis of every industry there is silver mining. It has promoted the building of railroads throughout that entire region, which are largely owned and controlled by Americans. President Diaz, the Gen. Grant of that country, has pursued a most liberal policy, and has welcomed Americans, and the country has witnessed an unprecedented development.

We have in it a monetary and a proprietary interest. Now what do we propose to do with that country? To sink its only currency to 25 cents on the dollar, to destroy the value of the product upon which its interests are based, to destroy the value of the product upon which the value of the transportation interests of that country, which are owned by us, are based. We propose to repeal the Sherman act. We propose to withdraw from silver the prop of "the greatest nation in the world," so our friends on this floor tell us. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is a question with me whether we are the greatest nation in the world. We are constantly asserting it on this floor, but England is acting it. We deal in assertion; they deal in action.

We propose to destroy silver, for it will be destroyed by this action. If, under the influence of progressive adverse legislation, silver has fallen from \$1.29 an ounce to 73 cents an ounce, I ask where will it fall after America has struck the final blow, and how,

then, will you be able to restore it? Silver will then be simply the material in which promises to pay gold are written. We say that we will keep in circulation in this country this vast amount of silver, five or six hundred millions, but it will be simply the material in which promises to pay gold are written, and would it not be cheaper to write those promises on paper.

Where will we, then, get the gold with which to do our business? We may rest assured that we can not remain satisfied with only a hundred millions in our Treasury. We shall have to issue the bonds of this country and draw in more gold and thereby increase further the value of England's gold and diminish the value of American products. And when we have got that gold it will be subject to be withdrawn at any time when the desire or the caprice may seize England; so that we shall be in the position of a debtor on "call," responsive to the demand of his creditor at any time and liable to have his securities sacrificed.

We will place ourselves in the merciless grasp of the gold contraction, destructive not only of the value of silver but of the value of all our products—wheat, cotton, and all the products of labor—destructive even of the value of labor itself, for its unions can not withstand the withering effects of poverty and distress.

What are the lessons of the past twenty years as to the effect of monetary contraction? We have been through three monetary panics during that period—the monetary panic of 1873, that of 1890, and the present panic.

Toward the close of the war we had added to our population by the surrender at Appomattox 12,000,000 of people without a currency; yet we started at that time and destroyed the greenbacks, the only currency of the country, and at the same time we took steps toward the resumption of specie payments, which meant resumption in coin, either gold or silver. And though nature, as if intending a special benefaction, had exposed its riches in the silver mines of the West, we passed laws denying our people access to them. That legislation denying us the right to resort to the silver mines for one of the precious metals of the world, and the legislation diminishing the greenback currency, the only currency in use when our population had been increased in the manner I have described, started the panic of 1873. And you all know the distress, the insolvencies, the bankruptcies of the period from 1873 to 1878.

Again, in 1890, England had some difficulty with her debtors in the Argentine Republic, for all those debtors who have promised to pay in gold are coming to bankruptcy. The English bank reserves had fallen low, not because England had not an abundance of money but because she had loaned her money to other nations of the world and could not quickly recall it. She looked around, surveyed the field to see which one of the debtor nations of the world could best respond to her demand; and she fixed upon America.

Within a period of five months she called from us between eighty millions and ninety millions of dollars, constituting one-fifteenth of the currency of this country. The withdrawal of ninety millions of dollars from this country almost landed it upon the shore of bankruptcy. The banks of New York were in suspension; they issued clearing-house certificates which were taken as money, though under the law they were not legal tender; a wave of contraction swept across the country, and it was only the return of the gold, by reason of the sale of our products to Europe, that saved us from universal bankruptcy.

During the present year, when Mr. Cleveland was about to come into power, when the metropolitan press of New York, aiding the banks of that city, saw a favorable opportunity of forcing the repeal of the Sherman act, the newspapers of that city, particularly the New York Herald, the New York Times, and the New York Evening Post, joined in a clamor for its repeal, predicting every kind of calamity if it should not be repealed immediately.

A single issue of the New York Herald would embrace five or six editorials to every column, italicized and double-leaded, calling attention, in the most inflammatory and alarming language, to the danger of the situation, stating that our gold would be exported, that our foreign investors would lose confidence and sell their securities, that we were drifting on a silver basis, that our gold reserve was in danger, that our savings-bank depositors would meet with loss, that our dollar was a 58-cent dollar—editorials well calculated to excite alarm both at home and abroad. Those papers were read in England, and the owners of our securities there, thinking there was something in this senseless clamor, commenced to send their securities to this country for sale. They changed what was a natural drain from this country abroad, in the first part of the year, into a forced demand. Then came the withdrawal of deposits from the banks, and so England's withdrawal of eighty or ninety million dollars from this country has placed it in its present condition, involving the sacrifice of every kind of property, aggregating hundreds of millions—wheat, cotton, all the products of labor.

And now to-day, having sold their securities in this country two or three or four months ago, those same English investors are taking those securities back at 30 cents below what they sold them for, and so the English gold is being coaxed back by the sacrifice of American securities and products.

This presents an object lesson of what our condition will be when our financial dependence upon England becomes further assured, subject as we will be to her call whenever caprice or disaster may prompt her. We shall be subject to the storms that sweep every one of her financial seas—whether in India or South America or in Africa. We shall be obliged to sacrifice our securities and products in order to pay her back whenever she calls for her gold. If she disapproves of our policy she can withdraw her gold; if we contemplate war she can arrest prompt and decisive action; if aggression upon her part arouses us to appeal to the god of battles she can paralyze our energies upon the very threshold of war. Is it wise or patriotic to so place ourselves in the power of our great rival?

Do you say that these bonds are time bonds, and that immediate payment can not be demanded? That is true; but England can at any time force their liquidation by putting them upon the American market, and we will be obliged to absorb them. There are too many and too vast values dependent here upon the maintenance of the price of those bonds to permit us to allow their value to be sacrificed.

Now, we all admit that we must go to England for our gold. The total gold product of the country is, I believe, only \$30,000,000 per annum; and one-half of that will be lost when silver mining is destroyed. We must go to England for our gold. We are in debt upon call. We shall have to store a large amount in order to be prepared to respond to every disaster that may affect that country, or to her forced demand in case of caprice, disapproval, or war.

But it is said that credit is a good thing, that there is no need of a large per capita, that credit satisfies all the demands of money. This may be true of a creditor nation, but it is never true of a debtor nation. Gentlemen refer to the per capita of England or Germany as being somewhat less than ours. That means simply that the actual coin in either of those countries is somewhat less per capita than in ours. But those countries, when the bank reserve falls below a normal standard, can recoup, can restore their reserve by calling upon the debtor nations, the nations that owe them money, whilst we have no debtor nations upon which to call. We must, therefore, preserve a larger amount of money subject to call.

Now I ask what is the lesson of the panics to which I have referred; three panics within twenty years? Why, sir, the lesson is that in all cases the volume of money here has been too small. The lesson is that the metallic money of the world is not sufficient for its demands; and this has always been proved by the existence of a large amount of paper money uncovered either by gold or silver. One-third of the world's money to-day consists of paper money not covered either by gold or silver. Yet we propose to destroy one-half of the metallic money.

We, who have suffered in this way, propose to join England as a creditor nation in a crusade against the only resource, the only salvation of the debtor nations of the world.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, where will we get gold? Austria is clamoring for gold. She has got about a hundred or a hundred and twenty-five of the one hundred and eighty millions she desires. She has been looting our Treasury in order to secure what she has. Almost all of her gold bears the stamp of the American eagle. We are the only country on earth that has not protected its gold. If Austria should go to Germany and attempt to get it, the great Imperial Bank says, "No; we have no gold for export." If she goes to France, with its seven hundred millions of silver circulating side by side with an equal quantity of gold, and presents to the Bank of France a note or check and asks to be paid in gold, it would not be given for such a purpose.

France exercises the option which we ought to exercise for the protection of her gold. If the Bank of France has a surplus of gold and desires to pay it out on check against it or in the redemption of its notes it does so. If not convenient, it pays in silver. But yet we hear no talk there about a 5-franc piece being worth only 3 francs. Suppose the great press of the city of Paris should unite in a clamor against the coinage of that country, such as has disgraced the metropolitan press of this country for some time past. Suppose they declared that the 5-franc piece was worth only 3 francs, and dinned in the ears of the people the danger of its silver currency. I would like to know how long France could resist a monetary panic? Ah, but before that exigency could arrive the editors of the papers would be behind the bars serving a sentence for sedition. [Applause.]

Look also, Mr. Speaker, at the condition of Russia. She has accumulated 500,000,000 of gold, and see how she protects it. She puts it in the war chest, locks it up for emergency, and issues against it fiat money, paper money, which circulates at par or nearly so. No one can get gold for the paper money of Russia; but we—the greatest nation in the world, the most powerful nation in the world, the wisest nation in the world (so our song goes)—allow our Treasury to be looted by every foreign speculator who so desires, by the failure to exercise the option which the law and the contract give us.

Why, a year ago we heard the announcement that a firm of New York bankers had presented \$1,000,000 of Treasury notes, payable in terms in either gold or silver, to the United States Treasury for redemption in gold, and the Treasury determined it must pay gold.

What did it mean? It meant that the Rothschilds, in connection with the great syndicate of bankers in Paris, Berlin, and Vienna, who control the finances of the great nations of Europe, were preparing to undertake changing Austria from a silver to a gold basis.

This syndicate of bankers who held Austria's silver bonds were preparing to arrange for their funding in gold bonds. The profits can be imagined. Silver bonds bought at a discount exchanged for gold bonds taken at a discount, with all the probabilities of a great rise in value. But where could they get the gold for the reserve fund necessary for the adoption of the gold standard?

They knew that England would not give it, for the Bank of England would raise the rate of discount. They knew that the Imperial Bank of Germany would not let them have the gold. Neither could they expect to get it from the Bank of France, and therefore they fastened on the country, protected by a similar option under the law, and made a test case by presenting \$1,000,000 of United States Treasury notes, and then having ascertained that they could take the gold out of our Treasury, they entered into a binding contract which proposed to place Austria on a gold basis. And behold the result—our gold has gone to Austria and we are on the shores of bankruptcy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we go on a gold basis we will have to be wiser than we have been. We will have to pull the gold here and lock it up in our war chests and surround it with sentinels, and issue against it fiat money; or else we will have to go to fiat money alone, for when we destroy one-half of the money of ultimate redemption, metallic money is doomed in this country. I say that the consequences of this act are too awful to be contemplated in their effect upon our own values, upon our own securities, upon our own products, upon that vast mining region now threatened with depopulation, upon the country at large.

The civilization of the future depends upon the restoration of silver, and if we withdraw our support it may be lost forever. I do not believe in the specious suggestion that we now give silver its final blow and kill it in the hope that international action will resurrect it. I believe rather in nursing what remains of life in the hope that health and vigor may be restored. The task has grown in difficulty as time has advanced. We the greatest silver-producing nation in the world, we the greatest debtor nation of the world, we who required both gold and silver for the resumption of specie payments closed our mints against the product of our mines, in February, 1873, and proposed to throw it on the world for absorption.

Germany responded by demonetizing silver within two months after. France and the Latin Union, finding that Germany was pouring into their mints her accumulated silver coin, and that the United States was pouring into their mints the products of her mines, closed their mints finally about 1876. The Latin Union abandoned silver reluctantly, and yet during that period of agitation in this country the metropolitan press and the bankers in the money centers prevented its restoration. When the Bland act was passed it would have been easy.

The task would have been easy in 1890 when silver had the great sustaining power of India, which absorbed one-third of the product of the world. It is of course made more difficult now. But let the support which America affords be withdrawn and silver is destroyed and lost, and there is no hope of international bimetalism. We had the assurance of that in the language of Sir William Harcourt, chancellor of the English exchequer, the other day, when he said that the action of India was the death of bimetalism.

If my time permits, I hope to dwell upon the importance of America assuming courageous leadership on this subject, and as she was the first great nation, within the last half century, to demonetize silver so she should be the first to restore it. I should like to present my views upon the prospect of international bimetalism, as well as to this alleged danger of silver monometallism and with reference also to the unification of our currency and the retirement of the five or six kinds of paper money now in existence and the substitution in their place of one form of United States Treasury note, payable in coin and backed by ample reserves in both gold and silver in the Treasury.

But before doing so I wish to express my regret that Congress has allowed itself at this time of public danger and excitement, when imagination and alarm are enthroned and reason is unseated, to enter upon the discussion and consideration of a great subject requiring careful consideration and deliberate action. It would be better in my judgment to immediately take hold of some measure that would relieve the situation. But the controlling minds in this attack on silver have insisted that the existing panic should be made use of as a weapon for its destruction and they will not allow the consideration of any remedial measure.

We are suffering now from the want of legal-tender money, and the only thing to do is by prompt action to provide the people with money which will take the place of the money exported and hoarded, under provisions which will automatically force its retirement when the emergency is over. Such an increase of money could be easily made by legislation which would not contain the word gold or silver in it. Remember that the settlement of the silver question now either by the repeal of the Sherman act or by an act providing for the free coinage of silver will not give the full and adequate relief

which the situation demands. The repeal of the Sherman act will not restore the confidence of those who are now hoarding money.

This debate will instruct them that we are about to enter upon a period of contraction greater than any ever yet experienced, and the people will know that at such times the value of money increases and, just as when property is high people hold on to property and resist offers of purchase, so when money is scarce and correspondingly high they will clutch their money in the hope that the future may bring them better bargains. On the other hand, the free coinage of silver would add to the circulation of this country only \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 per annum, a sum entirely inadequate to meet the contraction caused by export and hoarding. I hope that at some stage in these proceedings instead of engaging in a Greco-Roman contest over this silver question, whose determination either way will not bring immediate relief to the country, we will enter upon the consideration of some emergency remedial legislation that will meet the requirements of the pending crisis.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. TARSNEY in the chair). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have leave to continue his remarks without limit. That courtesy has been extended to others, and I have been very much interested in the gentleman's remarks.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman's time be extended without limit, until he shall have completed his remarks?

Mr. TRACEY. How much extension is asked?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Without limit.

Mr. TRACEY. I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] is recognized.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I am free to confess that I assume to address the House on the measure under consideration with some degree of diffidence. Having entertained and expressed views different from those I shall present to-day, I deem it but just to myself as well as my constituents, especially those who still believe that the free coinage of silver would be a great blessing to the country, to give the reasons that shall control my vote.

The condition of the country, as stated by the President in his message, is in many respects without a parallel. With an abundant harvest; free from pestilence; at peace with all nations; our manufactories spreading over the country; our railroads penetrating every corner, and our wealth rapidly increasing, we find ourselves in the midst of a panic the like of which we never before experienced.

There must be some cause, or combination of causes, some one of which was a prime factor in producing this disastrous condition of affairs.

Unquestionably a great majority of all classes believe that the silver law enacted on the 14th of July, 1890, is responsible for the evils with which we are afflicted. In order to discuss this measure to the comprehension of those not familiar with its provisions, I shall briefly outline its main features. It requires the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion at the market price each month, and issue in payment therefor Treasury notes. These notes are made a legal tender and are redeemable in gold or silver coin, at the discretion of the Secretary.

The authors of this measure were of the opinion that to enlarge our purchases of silver bullion would increase the demand, and thereby appreciate its price. The monetary value of an ounce of silver being \$1.29, while its commercial value was only \$1.05, our silver dollar was intrinsically worth but 81 cents.

The results of the operation of the act of 1890, called the Sherman law, were directly opposite to what was anticipated by its friends. With the exception of a sudden and, no doubt, speculative rise immediately after its passage, the price of silver has gone steadily down. The average price per ounce in 1890 was \$1.05; in 1891, 99 cents; in 1892, 87½ cents, and in July last, 72½ cents. Up to July 1 last the Government, under the provisions of this law, had purchased 156,575,000 ounces of silver and issued in payment therefor Treasury notes to the amount of \$147,215,000.

The constant fall in the price of silver bullion, notwithstanding the large purchases by the Government, began to excite apprehension in the minds of financiers. The rising volume of silver bullion, being stored away, unless coined by the Government into money would result in a great loss.

Had the Secretary of the Treasury been required to dispose of the bullion on hand on the 1st day of July last it would have brought at the market price but \$114,828,500. To have redeemed the obligations of the Government outstanding therefor would have required the Secretary to have taken from the revenues the sum of \$32,390,500; in brief, by the constant fall in the price of silver bullion the Government was losing, under the operations of the Sherman law, over \$10,000,000 a year. During the operation of this law, whether as a result of the same, I shall not

now attempt to prove, gold was being exported in large sums. From July 1, 1890, to January 1, 1891, our net exports of gold amounted to \$624,771. In 1891 they aggregated \$33,885,571, and in 1892 they reached \$58,570,536. During the present year to July 1, they were \$70,815,096.

Thus we see that during the existence of the present law our net loss of gold has been \$164,098,975. This was not the only alarming symptom. The gold reserve in the Treasury on the 1st of August, 1890, two weeks after the passage of this measure, was \$184,092,075. One hundred million dollars of this sum had been treated as a reserve for the security and redemption of the greenback notes. The excess of the total reserve, above the one hundred millions, was known as the free gold in the Treasury, subject to whatever use the Secretary might have for it in the due administration of his department. The reserve began to diminish until the free gold was about exhausted. We finally reached the limit and the Secretary was driven to encroach upon the hundred millions in order to meet the demands and preserve the credit and standing of the Government. On the 1st of the present month, of the \$184,092,075 of gold in the Treasury on August 1, 1890, there remained but \$95,485,413.

Under such conditions it was but natural that our own as well as the people of other countries holding our securities should become alarmed lest they would be compelled to take payment in depreciated silver money. It was natural that American securities should begin to return home in anticipation of a collapse; and that our own people should begin to hoard gold in anticipation that the same would soon go to a premium.

While this was going on the channels through which the Treasury received its supply of gold were running lower and lower. In July, 1890, there was paid into the Treasury, through the custom-house at New York \$17,173,016. Of this sum 95 per cent was paid in gold certificates. In July, 1891, the payments aggregated \$11,303,169, of which 2 per cent was in gold coin, 14.9 per cent in gold certificates, 44.6 per cent in United States notes, and 28.9 per cent in Treasury notes, issued under the provisions of the Sherman law.

In July, 1892, the payments amounted to \$12,295,908, of which 1 per cent was in gold coin, 13.8 in gold certificates, 28.4 in United States notes, and 42.2 in Treasury notes. In June, 1893, the payments reached the sum of \$18,068,600, not a cent of which was paid in gold coin or gold certificates.

Thus the supply was cut off, and the stock on hand rapidly being exhausted. The Secretary of the Treasury was powerless to do anything. The law required him to maintain the parity between our gold and silver coin and to do this it was essential that he should redeem the Treasury notes in whatever character of money the holders demanded. To have refused to do so would have been an acknowledgment that one was preferable to the other, one more valuable than the other—an admission the Government could not afford to make. To have refused payment in gold would have been to put gold to a premium and increased the excitement and aggravated the stringency.

In my judgment the Secretary, Mr. Carlisle, during the ordeal through which he has conducted the financial affairs of the Government, has not only sustained his high reputation, but has achieved a name that will compare favorably in history with those of the great men who have preceded him. That there was a great pressure to force an issue of gold-bearing bonds there can be no question. To have issued bonds would simply have been a restoration of the reserve by enlarging the demands to be made upon it.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Sherman law has no friends; that it has been disowned by its reputed father. Every person condemns it as wrong in principle and vicious in practice. The singular fact, however, is that while the friends of free coinage admit that it has worked great harm, they insist that it must remain in force unless something is adopted in its stead. The only excuse assigned for its maintenance is that it increases the volume of money and keeps down the appreciation of gold.

We have already seen that since its enactment \$164,098,974 in gold has been driven out of the country. Nor is this all, during the same period the circulation of national banks was reduced \$7,370,623, making a reduction in the volume of money in circulation of \$171,469,597.

The entire amount of Treasury notes issued under the provisions of this act to August 1, 1893, was only \$148,286,234, showing a net reduction in circulation during its existence, if there had been no accessions from other sources, of \$23,183,249. Why, then, should this measure, productive of such dangers, be maintained a single day? Why should it be used as a club to drive the representatives of the people into the adoption of some other measure which their judgments do not approve? [Applause.]

We have witnessed its operation for three years. It has failed to meet the approbation of anyone. It is condemned not only as pernicious, but as dangerous. It has not only failed to arrest

the fall in the price of silver bullion, but has driven from our shores more than \$170,000,000 in gold. It has reduced the circulation of the people nearly \$25,000,000. It has closed the channels of the Treasury to the further ingress of gold. It has pulled down the pillars of credit that support and sustain our trade and commerce. It has frightened all classes and driven into hiding every character of money, including its own offspring, and yet we are told that we must wait till we get something better in the way of affirmative legislation before it can be repealed.

The cry of distress comes from every quarter. Business is at a standstill, factories closed, labor idle, but no helping hand is to be extended by those who favor free coinage. While the country is prostrate, helpless, and unable to resist, they propose to dose it with their remedies or let it suffer for fear that when restored it will reject their treatment. We who favor unconditional repeal have been warned again and again that if we support the measure that we will lose our seats on this floor.

It may be that there are those here whose sole ambitions are to be returned, and are ready to sacrifice their convictions upon great questions to secure the same, but I scorn to believe it. My confidence is not unbounded, but I am loth to believe a single vote, for or against this measure, will be cast from such base and unprincipled motives. These threats, if not in bad taste, are exceedingly untimely. The people are excited. They feel that something is radically wrong, and they are in a frame of mind that should not be inflamed or misguided. The time has come when cant and subterfuge must be driven from the councils of men and nations, and reason and judgment enthroned in the minds and in the hearts of the people. [Applause.]

Gentlemen who are demanding that something shall be enacted in the place of the Sherman law know that that can not be done now. They know it is unconditional repeal or nothing. If they succeed in grafting upon the measure for repeal a single one of their proposed amendments they know that the same can not be enacted into a law. Your alternative, therefore, is to accept repeal or nothing, and upon that issue you must return and answer to your people.

If this measure should fail, you gentlemen who will have defeated it can return to your constituents and say to them that you knew they were in desperate straits; that the Sherman law was a bad measure; that it had shaken confidence until there was not a sufficient amount of money in circulation to carry on the business, but that you thought it best to keep it on the statutes till you could get what you wanted.

Go home to your merchants who are unable to make collections to meet maturing bills, and say to them that you knew they were being pressed, but you could not secure just what you wanted, and that they will have to bear it the best they can. Go back to the farmers, who are unable to market their wheat at any price, and tell them that you admit there was and is great stringency in money; that the repeal of the Sherman law would probably have relieved the situation, but that you feared that if that was done you would be unable to get something in its stead in the future.

Go to the idle workingmen, against whom the doors of the mills and factories have been closed because their managers could neither collect nor borrow a sufficient sum to meet their pay rolls, and tell them that you knew they and their families were suffering, but that you felt it was better for them to bear their afflictions till your views should be incorporated into a new law, and if they do not denounce your conduct in words of condemnation, bitter and burning, I am mistaken in their character and temper.

Mr. Speaker, I might conclude and submit the question at this point, but my argument would be incomplete without a discussion of the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]. The substitute offered by him proposes that the mints of the Government shall be opened to the free coinage of silver, first, at a ratio of 16 to 1; if that should be voted down, then at 17 to 1; if that should fail, then at 18 to 1; if that should be defeated, then at 19 to 1, and if that should not be successful, then at 20 to 1, and if the above amendments should be defeated, that the Bland-Allison law, in force from 1878 to 1890, be voted upon.

As has already been argued in this debate, the number of different ratios proposed by the gentleman from Missouri is a full surrender of his position. Why is the ratio of 20 to 1 any better than that of 16 to 1? If the Government can maintain one it can maintain the other at a parity!

At the average price of silver bullion during 1892 the commercial value of the silver dollar at the ratio of 16 to 1 was 65 cents; at the ratio of 17 to 1 it would have been 69 cents; at the ratio of 18 to 1, 73 cents; at 19 to 1, 77 cents, and at 20 to 1, 81 cents. I do not give these as exactly correct, but approximately

so. Could we safely open our mints to the free coinage of silver at any of these ratios?

It requires no argument to demonstrate that one of three results would inevitably follow the moment we did so: Either the commercial value of silver bullion would rise to its monetary value, the monetary value would fall to the commercial value, or one would go up and the other down until they came together. The instant the silver dollar and the bullion contained in it became convertible at the pleasure of the holder, they necessarily would command the same price. This, then, is the important question to be considered.

In order to logically present the question, it will become necessary for me to repeat in some measure facts and arguments which have already been presented.

By the act of 1793, first establishing a mint and providing for the coinage of both gold and silver, our fathers adopted the ratio of 15 to 1. There was considerable discussion as to the correct ratio between the two metals, but from the best evidence that could be obtained this was ascertained as about correct.

For one hundred years prior to that time there had been a remarkable stability of the ratio between the two metals, silver never having risen to 14.14, except during the year 1760, or fallen below 15.50 but once, and that in 1702. Shortly after the ratio was fixed at 15 to 1, within the next three years, silver fell to the ratio of 15.65.

It is a striking fact that silver never, since our mint was first established, has reached the ratio it then had. The slight fall in the value of silver destroyed the parity. Gold was worth more than its coinage value; not very much—only 3 or 4 cents—but enough to make it profitable to export it. Our gold, therefore, left the country. Recognizing the fact that gold was undervalued by the act of 1793, and that so long as that measure was continued in force it would be impossible for us to retain any gold in circulation, in 1834 the ratio was changed by Congress to 16 to 1. At that time the true ratio was 15.73, so that by the latter act silver was slightly undervalued, and the result was the very opposite—gold coming from abroad, while silver took flight.

A mistake was made in the act of 1834 in making our subsidiary coins contain equal proportions of the silver in a dollar. There was as much profit in exporting the minor coins as there was in shipping away our silver dollars, and although nearly all of our silver coin was in fractional pieces, the people were left without small change. So, in 1853 the quantity of silver in the subsidiary coins was reduced, so that a loss, instead of a profit, would be incurred by exporting them.

From the action of Congress in 1834 in purposely undervaluing silver, and in 1853 overvaluing our subsidiary coins, we are driven to the conclusion that our fathers purposely adopted the gold standard in 1834. That we were upon that standard from that time until the suspension of specie payments during the war there can be no controversy. The silver dollar, about which we have heard so much, was practically no part of our circulation up to 1873. From the time we first opened the mint to 1873 there was coined but 8,031,000 silver dollars, while there was coined \$137,000,000 of minor coins and \$852,214,507 in gold.

When the question of a change of ratio was under consideration in the Senate Mr. Benton said:

He did not think it necessary to discant and expatiate upon the merits and advantages of a gold currency. These advantages had been too well known from the earliest ages of the world to be a subject of discussion in the nineteenth century; but, as it was the policy of the paper system to disparage that metal, and as that system in its forty years reign over the American people had nearly destroyed a knowledge of that currency, he would briefly enumerate its leading and prominent advantages.

1. It had an intrinsic value, which gave it currency all over the world, to the full amount of that value, without regard to laws or circumstances.
2. It had a uniformity of value, which made it the safest standard of value of property which the wisdom of man had ever yet discovered.
3. Its portability, which made it easy for the traveler to carry it about with him.
4. Its indestructibility, which made it the safest money the people could keep in the houses.
5. Its inherent purity, which made it the hardest money to be counterfeited, and the easiest to be detected, and, therefore, the safest money for the people to handle.
6. Its superiority over all other money, which gave to its possessor the choice and command of all other money.
7. Its power over exchanges; gold being the currency which contributes most to the equalization of exchange, and keeping down the rate of exchange to the lowest and most uniform point.
8. Its power over the paper money; gold being the natural enemy of that system, and, with fair play, able to hold it in check.
9. It is a constitutional currency, and the people have a right to demand it for their currency as long as the present Constitution is permitted to exist.

Not only was gold recognized as the standard from 1834 to 1860, but it was so recognized after the war and even after the act of 1873, about which so much has been said. On the 11th of February, 1874, Senator STEWART of Nevada said:

I want the standard gold, and no paper money not redeemable in gold; no paper money the value of which is not ascertained; no paper money that will organize a gold board to speculate in it.

On the 20th of the same month, on a resolution to instruct the Committee on Finance to report a bill providing for the convertibility of the Treasury notes into gold coin or bonds, he said:

By this process we shall come to a specie basis, and when the laboring man receives a dollar it will have the purchasing power of a dollar, and he will not be called upon to do what is impossible for him or the producing classes to do, figure upon the exchanges, figure upon the fluctuations, figure upon the gambling in New York, but he will know what his money is worth. Gold is the universal standard of the world. Everybody knows what a dollar in gold is worth.

On the 1st of April of the same year, Senator JONES, of the same State, said:

Does this Congress mean now to leave entirely out of view and discard forever a standard of value? Did any country ever accumulate wealth, achieve greatness, or attain a high civilization without such a standard? And what but gold can be that standard? What other thing on earth possesses the requisite qualities? Gold is the articulation of commerce. It is the most potent agent of civilization. It is gold that has lifted the nations from barbarism. So exact a measure is it of human effort that when it is exclusively used as a money it teaches the very habit of honesty. It neither deals in nor tolerates false pretenses. It can not lie. It keeps its promises to the rich and poor alike.

Mr. Speaker, if the slight undervaluation in 1793, not more than 3 or 4 cents on the dollar, drove gold out of the country prior to the act of 1834, and the latter drove silver out afterwards, what might we expect if we should open our mints to the free coinage of both metals at a ratio that would undervalue gold at from 23 to 52 per cent, when the people of the civilized world are on the alert for opportunities of speculation and advised as to markets and quotations in every financial center on the globe on the morning of the succeeding day?

We are told, however, that silver has not fallen in value, but that gold has risen, and that if we will but open our mints to the free coinage of silver, as we have to gold, that silver will again take up its position by the side of gold. Silver, it is said, has appreciably fallen in price because it has been under fire for twenty years. There is some force in this argument. No doubt if silver had not been demonetized by so many nations it would not have reached its present low price. Eleven nations, I believe, have closed their mints to the free coinage of silver since 1873. But what difference does this make? They will not open them at our bidding, and we are powerless to compel them to do so.

We must face the facts as they exist, not as they ought to be, or as we would like to have them. No one who has read the debates of the Brussels conference but has come to the conclusion that all efforts at international bimetalism under present conditions will fail. It is patent that Great Britain is satisfied with her monetary system, and that no other European nation will unite in any agreement to which she is not a party. It is further evident that none of the European governments will change their monetary systems unless it be toward a more perfect gold standard. Whatever action, therefore, we may take we must take alone.

Can we, without the aid and coöperation of other nations, carry this great burden? The coinage values of the world's product of gold and silver from 1873 to 1892, inclusive, were as follows:

Years.	Gold.	Silver.
1873	\$96,200,000	\$81,800,000
1874	90,750,000	71,500,000
1875	97,500,000	80,500,000
1876	103,700,000	87,600,000
1877	114,000,000	81,000,000
1878	119,000,000	95,000,000
1879	109,000,000	96,000,000
1880	106,500,000	96,700,000
1881	103,000,000	102,000,000
1882	102,000,000	111,800,000
1883	95,400,000	115,300,000
1884	101,700,000	105,500,000
1885	108,400,000	118,500,000
1886	106,000,000	120,600,000
1887	105,775,000	124,281,000
1888	110,197,000	140,706,000
1889	123,489,000	162,159,000
1890	113,149,600	172,234,500
1891	120,578,800	187,733,000
1892	130,816,600	196,605,200

It will be seen from the foregoing table that while there has been a large increase in the production of both metals; that of silver has more than doubled in the last twenty years. Silver has not only suffered because of the large increase in the production of gold and its own relegation to the position of token money by the civilized nations of the world, but because of the enormous increase in its own production.

In view of the fact that all civilized nations have closed their mints to the free coinage of silver; in view of the great increase in its production, and in view of the recent action of the Government of India, heretofore the largest consumer of silver, could we for one moment uphold, much less appreciate the price

of silver by opening our mints to free coinage, even at the ratio of 20 to 1. It may be asked, if we could open our mints to free coinage at any ratio? I answer emphatically, No, not under present conditions.

With the mints of all the great commercial nations of the world closed to free coinage; with a redundancy in many parts of the world, and with a rapidly increasing production, I unhesitatingly say we could fix upon no ratio that would give stability to the price of silver, so that it could be used independently as a standard or measurement of values.

The moment we opened our mints to free coinage to the products of the world a wild rush would be made upon us by the people of all the gold-standard nations and a veritable scramble would ensue in the contest to get possession of some of our gold before it was all exhausted. There would pour in upon us in one year more silver than our mints could coin in ten. What would be the result? Does any one seriously believe that silver under such circumstances would rise in price? In my judgment it would be the worst blow that could be given to silver.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of argument I will suppose for a moment that my reasoning is fallacious and that my conclusions are erroneous; that silver will not go down, but that with our mints open to it freely its commercial value will go up from 73 cents an ounce, its present price, to \$1.29, its parity or monetary value. In brief, I will suppose that after we shall have adopted free coinage the silver dollar will contain 100 cents' worth of silver bullion. Would the farmers of the country derive any benefit from this change? Would the workingman be in any better condition? Their dollar in silver would be just what it is now; worth no more nor no less. What advantage would it be to any class except the silver producers? They alone would reap the profit.

It may be interesting to the farmers of the country to know what profits the silver producers have been making during the last few years while they have been striving to keep their taxes paid and make ends meet. The Daily mine in Utah in 1891 paid in dividends \$450,000. The Ontario mine in the same Territory and year paid in dividends \$900,000. The Granite mine in Montana in 1892 paid in dividends \$1,020,000. The Barrier Range (Broken Hills mines) in New South Wales last year paid dividends to the amount of \$5,805,000. That the farmers may get a more perfect knowledge of the profits enjoyed by the "silver kings," I will give the results of an investigation made by the Director of the Mint in 1887 as to the cost of production of an ounce of silver.

From estimates from 155 mines, producing 43 per cent of the domestic product, it was ascertained that the cost of production was 52.4 cents per ounce. What advantage will it be to the farmers and wage-workers of the country to pay to the producers of silver, in the way of products and toil, \$1.29 per ounce for silver that they can now purchase for 73 cents and which costs the producers but 52 cents? It may be answered that that will not be the result. If the theory of those who favor free coinage be correct, that silver will rise in value, it is exactly what will be the result.

While I do not think for a moment that silver will rise in value, I have presented this to show how untenable is the position of the free-coinage advocates and how fallacious their arguments.

That the result of free coinage would be that the value of the silver dollar, now at a parity with gold, would drop to its commercial value, now about 56 cents, I have not the least doubt. There is not a government in the world to-day where the mints are open to the free coinage of silver that the coin is worth more than the bullion it contains.

This was true in India before she closed her mints. Mexico has free coinage of both gold and silver; her silver dollar contains 6 grains more of silver than ours, and yet to-day you can buy Mexican dollars in New York at 59½ cents a piece and pay for them with our own silver coins.

The free coinage of silver means here, as it has everywhere, silver monometallism. Of all the enemies of bimetalism none are laboring so industriously and earnestly to destroy it as the advocates of free coinage. It can result in nothing else.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN] in eloquent terms portrayed the glorious results that would accrue to the debt-ridden farmers of the West and the unemployed wage-workers of the whole country when we shall have reached the silver standard. The mistake the gentleman makes, slight though somewhat serious, is in assuming that we would have a standard. There would be no more stability in the price of silver than there is now. When we reach that blissful state it would be necessary for every man with a silver dollar in his pocket to daily ascertain, if he could, what it was worth. As well said by Senator STEWART, the producing classes do not want "to figure upon the exchanges, figure upon the fluctuations, figure upon the gambling in New York," to ascertain the value of their money.

Let us investigate for a moment and see what the real condition of the farmers and the wage-workers will be when the gentleman's silver millennium is reached. I will suppose that next year, and I hope my supposition will come true, Providence will smile upon the people of Nebraska; that rains will descend in copious showers and at seasonable times; that the storms and cyclones will be confined within their caves; that the grasshoppers will not come to devour their fair fields; that their crops will be so abundant that the sun at his zenith will stop and linger in admiration and wonder a moment on his ceaseless course to the Pacific; yea, more, I will suppose that the farmers of the whole country have been similarly blessed, and that the yield of wheat will be 600,000,000 of bushels.

Four hundred millions will amply supply the home demand; where will the other 200,000,000 bushels find a market? In the gold standard countries of Europe!

Tariff reformer as he is, I presume that the gentleman from Nebraska has not neglected to impress upon the minds of his constituents that the market for the surplus regulates the price at home. The glories of that silver standard are rapidly disappearing. The constituents of the gentleman from Nebraska would still be in the clutches of the "gold bugs."

This is not all; if the transaction ended here the results might not be so serious, but look to the final outcome. We are upon a silver basis. The price of wheat in Europe will be fixed upon a gold basis; exchange will rise and fall in this country as the price of silver falls or rises. Here will be a new element of uncertainty, which will enter into trade. The buyers, knowing this fact, and that there will likely be a fall in the value of their exchange by the time their deal is perfected, will not only calculate against the farmer the risks of handling his wheat or his cotton, but they will also calculate against him a sufficient amount to insure against any risk of loss in money.

The producers will have to bear all the risks and burdens of a fluctuating standard. Nonation, as Senator JONES aptly said, "will ever accumulate wealth without an invariable standard."

It was stated by one of the presidents of one of the great produce exchanges of the country that margins were so close that 1 penny a bushel often determined the source of supply of millions of bushels of grain, and yet with our great and growing commerce, we here have seriously presented to us a proposition that will throw into trade an element of uncertainty against which no man can calculate. To abandon the standard fixed by the great commercial nations of the world is to demoralize and damage our trade beyond comprehension.

Mr. Speaker, there is another class to which I desire to address a few thoughts—the wage-workers of the country. I have received petitions from some of the assemblies in my State protesting against the repeal of the Sherman law and requesting me to support free coinage. My relations with organized labor has been close. The laboring men of my district have always given me a loyal support, and I know that they believe I would not knowingly cast a vote that would in the slightest degree oppress or harm them. Whatever else may have fallen in price as compared with gold, it is an acknowledged fact that wages have not only been maintained, but have increased. It is not, therefore, to be reasonably assumed that under any circumstances there will be an increase in the rates of wages.

How then will the workingmen be affected? To my own satisfaction, and I believe to the satisfaction of every unbiased mind, I have demonstrated that the only effect of free coinage will be a fall in the value of our standard. A fall in the value of the money in which the workingman receives his wages is in effect a reduction of his pay. If silver money should fall to the commercial value of silver bullion it would result in the reduction of the purchasing power of the workingman's dollar nearly one-half. Believing that I could not cast a vote that would so directly and injuriously affect the laboring classes, I shall follow the dictates of my judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it requires no stretch of imagination to see, at a glance, that by the free coinage of silver the whole machinery of trade, of commerce, and of exchange, domestic as well as foreign, because they are so intimately interwoven as to be inseparable, would be thrown into such inextricable confusion and disorder as to completely paralyze all our industries and destroy our prosperity. Think but a moment of the result, and the mind recoils at the conception. This great country, with her matchless resources, inhabited by the most enlightened and progressive people on earth, with a commerce, domestic and foreign, surpassing the wildest dreams of her pioneers, deliberately abandoning the measurement of values recognized by all the civilized nations of the world and chaining herself to the systems of those still lingering in the shades of barbarism.

There is another question which deserves our serious consideration before we take this leap into darkness. A fall in the value of our money, a reduction in the standard of values means a de-

ciency in the revenues of the Government of at least \$100,000,000. We have outstanding large obligations payable in gold; these must be met according to the terms of the contract, and to do so would require us to raise the additional sum necessary to purchase gold at whatever premium it might command over silver money.

Not only would we need more money for this purpose, but the rise, apparently, in the price of products required to equip and maintain the different departments, especially the War and Navy, would call for an increased amount, and it is safe to say there would be needed not less than one hundred million more. The revenues of the Government are now barely sufficient to meet our expenditures. If we are to open the doors of our Mints to free silver, we may bid farewell to any reduction of taxes, but prepare to seek additional sources of revenue. This is the very question that drove India to close her mints against free coinage; her money had depreciated until she was no longer able to meet her expenditures, a large part being payable in gold.

The friends of repeal have been charged with being the representatives of the moneyed powers and "gold-bugs" of Europe. It has been said that a conspiracy had been formed to "down" silver. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] was heard to raise his voice in the far-off West when India closed her mints. He was certain that the British Government had forced India to the extremity, and that the Congress of the United States would be the next subject of her attack. Unfortunately for Mr. BLAND'S assumption, it turns out that India wanted to close her mints against silver, but Great Britain would not permit it.

What reasons Great Britain may have for desiring that we should cease coining silver has not been explained. What advantages would accrue to her have not been stated. We have heard nothing but the bare assertion of the fact. Great Britain produces neither silver nor gold in quantities worth mentioning. Her entire product in ten years, I venture, would not amount to a half million dollars. She is upon the gold standard, and has been there for three-quarters of a century. She is content with her monetary system, and is apparently indifferent as to what other nations may do. She pays all of her obligations in gold, notwithstanding the balance of trade is nearly five hundred millions of dollars against her every year.

Why should we fear the gold standard? Above all nations on the face of the earth we should be benefited by it if any would. We produced last year \$33,000,000 in gold, and coined in the same period \$34,787,222. During the past one hundred years we produced \$1,969,693,945 in gold, a sum greater than one-half of the world's supply of gold coin at the present time. If Great Britain and Germany, which practically produce no gold whatever, can adhere to the gold standard, why can not the United States, that produces one-fourth of the world's supply. Not only do we produce gold enough to supply ourselves, but over all nations we produce an abundance of supplies that draw gold from the farthest corners of the earth.

The products of our farms, our breadstuffs and provisions, will command gold when nothing else will secure it. The balance of trade in our favor against Great Britain is more than three hundred millions every year. England and Ireland paid to our farmers in 1891 over two hundred millions of dollars in gold for breadstuffs and provisions. Great Britain has an interest in the result of our action, but we are not her servants; that distinction is enjoyed by others.

In the Brussels conference her delegates had but one proposition to offer, and that was that the European nations should purchase £5,000,000 in silver for five years if the United States would continue to purchase 54,000,000 ounces annually. She was willing to go down into her pocket and assist in purchasing between thirty and forty million ounces of silver if we would but continue the operations of the Sherman law for the same period. It was a shrewd proposition. Her representatives no doubt calculated that if they could get us into an agreement for five years they would at the end of that time have all our gold, including the balance of the reserve in the Treasury. We not only repel the insinuation but denounce the action of the advocates of free silver with striving to accomplish what the British Government would give a handsome bonus to have done.

It has been argued that the Democratic platform of the last national convention declared in favor of the free coinage of silver, and that the President and his supporters were untrue to their pledges. It is the right of each and every Democrat to construe the platform for himself, and in doing so I acknowledge no authority save my own judgment and conscience. The platform favors the use of both gold and silver as money, but demands that they must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value. The convention voted down an amendment proposed by Mr. Patterson, of Colorado, to insert the word "free" before the word coinage. The convention, if it had favored free coinage at all hazards, could easily have said so in a few words.

Whatever may have been the intentions of the convention, there was one act it performed which removed all doubt, and that was the nomination of Mr. Cleveland on the first ballot by a two-thirds vote. His oft-repeated statements, his well-known views, his bold and courageous declarations in the presence of the most alluring temptation placed a construction upon that platform, and thereafter no one could have been deceived. If there is one principle in the Democratic creed for which the party has stood firmly through the storms of criticism and defeat over and above all others, it is the one in favor of sound money.

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen upon the other side of this question, apparently, through the whole of this debate have been unable to distinguish the difference between the gold standard and gold monometallism. Great Britain has a gold standard, but maintains \$100,000,000 of silver money, and coins from eight to ten millions every year. Germany has the gold standard, but maintains \$100,000,000 of full and \$100,000,000 of limited tender silver. France maintains the gold standard with \$700,000,000 of silver.

There is not a nation on earth with a gold standard but what has more or less silver to supply the needs of its people in domestic trade. This cry about destroying silver is all sham. There is a large and useful field for silver, and no warfare is being made upon it. We are told that there is not enough gold in the world to supply the different nations with sufficient money upon which to transact their business. Most assuredly there is not, nor could the business be transacted with gold if there was a superabundance. But there is plenty of gold by which to fix and measure values and adjust the balances between nations. Were it not for the clearing houses in our great cities, the exchanges there could not be transacted with any kind of money, much less gold, to say nothing about silver. They wholly ignore the fact that a standard must first be established; that after that is done an indefinite number of aids and substitutes may be used as measures.

The gold standard does not mean that gold alone shall be used, but that all measures must conform to that standard; silver, paper, drafts, checks, clearing-house certificates, or any other device may be used, but they must be used in such a way as to give exact measure by the standard. We who are contending for the preservation of the gold standard do so because it is the most stable that has ever been discovered and because all the civilized nations of the world have adopted it. I am in favor of the use of all the silver that we can coin and maintain at a parity with gold, of providing for the issue of all the currency that can be floated at par, but not another dollar.

I have no faith in that character of prosperity which comes with cheap money. Money to be of value to the people, to protect the weak against the strong, must honestly measure the results of human toil. I fully agree that the medium of exchange should be ample to enable the people, at the least cost and in the briefest time, to exchange their productions, but an oversupply of money stimulates wild speculations, unsettles credit, and, sooner or later, brings on a collapse.

In my opinion there is not a scarcity of money in the country to-day. We have transacted a much greater commerce and enjoyed the highest prosperity with far less money than we have in circulation now. Our exchanges are made upon a different basis from those of other nations. We could not do business as France does with her \$40 per capita. We have been driven to the use of greater conveniences. Necessarily ours is largely a system of credits based on confidence, hence the greater the importance that we should at all times and under all circumstances maintain a true standard of value.

I have been amused during this debate at the remarks of some gentlemen who have so indignantly scorned the idea that our standard of values should conform to that of the civilized nations of the world. We are a free and independent nation, they say, and therefore should cut loose from the monarchies of the Old World and establish one of our own. We can do this, but it would be well to know that our parachute is in good working order before we try the experiment.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a pessimist, but I look into the future with some forebodings. The minds of the people in many sections seemed to have been turned from the paths of true wisdom. The seeds of paternalism that have been sown broadcast through the land seem to have taken a firm hold in some localities. From every quarter comes the cry, "What is Congress going to do for the people?"

The belief that Congress, by legislation, can produce unlimited wealth, and distribute the same among the people, seems to prevail in every quarter. There is but one way in which a nation can become rich and her people prosperous, and that is by the productions of toil and not by the inflation of values by enlarging the volume of money. We should do our duty fearlessly and the people must do the rest. [Applause.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, this debate presents some novel features. It presents some gentlemen in new characters and playing new rôles. There are some gentlemen of this House, more noted perhaps for their intensesness of party love, of party zeal, than anything else, who are now assuming a condition of absolute nonpartisanship and urging all other men, especially Republicans, to get into that same happy frame of mind, notably a gentleman who has recently taken his seat [Mr. BYNUM], who tells us that "the time has now come when cant and subterfuge should be driven from this Hall, and patriotism be permitted to take its place."

Are we to understand that in the esteem of that gentleman, in his experiences, cant has been the rule, and that now he is turning over a new leaf? Or does he, as a measure persuasive, to induce his opponents to adopt the new régime of nonpartisanship, suggest to them that heretofore they have been indulging in cant and in the hypocrisy of partisanship? A lecture of that kind seems strange to those who have memories and who remember a scene in which a distinguished member of this House marched down the aisle, shaking with violence his fist in the face of the organ of this House, its Speaker, and denouncing him in all of the bitterest terms of vituperative declamation; a man conducting himself so that the censure of the House was placed upon him because of the extreme, indecent partisanship that he then was manifesting.

It is noticeable, Mr. Speaker, that those who most exhort Republicans to rise above party and aid the monometallists of the Administration to repeal the Sherman law, are those who on all occasions are most intense and indecent in their assaults upon everything that Republicans hold to be most sacred in their creed; those who are least fair to their opponents and who most strenuously labor for party advantage. They are partisans always, save now, when they want Republican votes. The President exhorts us to sink party, and then, setting us an example—showing us how the thing ought to be done—proceeds to shift responsibility justly belonging to his own party and throw it upon the shoulders of Republicans, where it does not belong. Intensely partisan in his nonpartisanship, he seeks to utilize a condition of public distress and by its use persuade Republicans in aiding his party to take the first step toward the permanent disuse of silver as one of the money metals of this country. Note, if you please, Mr. Speaker, the unfair and partisan methods adopted by the majority in the presentation of this question.

It is known that there is vital difference of opinion between the wings of the Democratic party, but for the purposes of a vote agreement is reached by them. The free-silver wing is placated by permitting a vote on six propositions. Five propositions as to ratio, and the Bland-Allison bill, are to be voted on to appease that wing and to suppress filibustering. Then follows the vote on the repeal bill. This is all agreed to among themselves by these patriots who sink all partisanship in their godly efforts to secure the nation's good. But what do they offer to the Republicans who are adjured to be patriotic and come up to the help of the Democracy? Why, sir, they bind them hand and foot by the tyranny of the previous question, and refuse them the poor privilege of making one single amendment—not one amendment can any man on this side of the House secure a vote upon. We are invited to take your propositions of relief and that only. You want "the patriotism" of our votes, and not "the patriotism" of our suggestion. Do you think, gentlemen, that we can be patriotic in our votes, and that we can not be in the plans we might offer to relieve the distress? Many of my colleagues on this side of the chamber have plans to offer—amendments to offer—but by the tyranny of your previous question you debar us from this and tell us that while you want us to be patriotic, yet we must exemplify that virtue on your lines, and in manner that you prescribe.

In this great emergency why did you not treat us as copatriots? Why did you not invite us upon terms of equality to aid in relief measures, giving us the opportunity to suggest method and remedy? But, no; this did not serve your purpose. You thought by this cant and twaddle about our being nonpartisan and patriotic you could cajole certain Republicans to vote with you, thus making good the loss of votes the silver Democrats would not furnish, and in this way start the Cleveland party on its march toward a single gold standard and aid it in its effort to destroy silver as one of the precious metals.

I am sick and tired, for my part, of all this nauseating talk about nonpartisanship. I am a Republican because I believe Republicanism to be right to-day as in other days. I am a Republican because I believe in the doctrines announced in its platform as the best of all theories and principles to carry this Government and the people to the highest mark of civilization and their greatest good; and I am not to be driven from these ideas and from the doctrines of my party because it suits some man's purposes now to urge aid from the Republican party. I believe I am most patriotic when I adhere closest to the doctrines of my party. I know of no sufficient reason why this extraordinary action, the repeal of the act of 1890, should be taken.

I remember that the Democratic convention when it last assembled had no words in its platform pledging the party to the repeal of this measure that it is now said must be repealed in order to avert the direst of all disasters. In its last national convention the Dem-

ocratic party contented itself with this deliverance upon the subject: "We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, which should make all of its supporters as well as its author anxious for its speedy repeal." This is all. No pledge for its repeal; no declaration that it has done harm—simply the rhetorical flourish, that it is "fraught with possibilities of danger." And yet when this declaration was made the Sherman law had been in operation nearly two years, and nearly one hundred millions of Treasury notes had been issued under its provisions. Four national conventions met last summer, and no one of them thought to pledge itself to the repeal of this law.

We know that the Republican party, with that measure in force for two years, bringing as I believe benediction and beneficence to this land, had no word of rebuke; but, on the contrary, impliedly indorsed it. It and every measure of the then administration received the approval of that convention of more than 800 Republicans, representing all parts of the party and every section of this land. It was approved; and the measure that is now suggested as a precursor of another—the establishment of a single money standard of gold—was condemned by every Republican there assembled. [Applause.]

If there was any one utterance plainer than all others made by that convention it was the declaration that the Republican party of this country was in "favor of gold and silver as standard money." Those were the words used—"standard money." [Applause.] That money "proclaimed by authority as the measure of value," and when anyone asks me to follow his leadership, be he Democrat or be he Republican, and vote for the repeal of this act, a vote here proclaimed on every hand to be the first step toward the discarding of silver as a standard money, I want to ask him where does he get his authority to reform the Republican platform and the party. [Applause.]

In view of the extraordinary absence of partisanship certain Democrats are talking so much about, I want to call attention to the remarks made by my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] the other day. I regret that he is not at this moment in his seat. He was assuming to give the history of the passage of the act of 1873, that is said to have demonetized silver—that act of "great iniquity" as we sometimes hear it called. The gentleman gave its history. He traced it down into the hands of the conference committee, and then he tells us that "by the surreptitious," and I understood him to say "fraudulent," but I find in looking at his revised remarks I was in error, and that he did not say it was fraudulent; but "by the surreptitious action of six men the important words, eleven in number, were injected into that law, which gave it all of its harmful and pernicious characteristics," and made it demonetize silver. These words are:

And no deposit of silver for other coinage shall be received.

The gentleman tells us that in the 21st section of the act the interlineation of these words, with the knowledge of no other men in this land save six, this great crime against the nation and the age was perpetrated; and he tells us this in the face of the fact that the 15th section of the act was unchanged, and that section provided that "the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade dollar, a half dollar, a quarter dollar, a dime."

And then he tells us this in the face of the further fact that the seventeenth section was not changed by the committee of conference, which reads:

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

He makes this declaration of surreptitious crime in the face of that other fact that section 15, unchanged by the committee, provided "that silver hereafter shall be legal tender only in sums of \$5."

What becomes of the force and value of that charge in the presence of these other broad declarations with regard to the office that silver is hereafter to accomplish in the financial economy of the United States?

This is only important because it ought to stop forever this rot and trash about the surreptitious character and the fraudulent character of that legislation, and because when charges of that kind are made by gentlemen against a great political party they are not in the best possible position to urge nonpartisanship. They say they want to allay strife, contention, zeal for party, and then charge their adversaries with the gravest of crimes.

Mr. Speaker, nine months ago the condition of this country, while perhaps not what every man would have desired, was certainly in a most prosperous condition. The labor field was well filled, and there were places everywhere where the toiling men of this land could receive a fair wage. There were no idle mills; there were no fireless forges; there were no silent looms; there were no untilled fields. Everywhere the business of the country was satisfactory in the main to those who were engaged in its conduct.

About nine months ago there was an announcement made. It was announced that for the first time in very many years the Democratic party would have an opportunity of making good its promises and establish as the law of the land the theories of its platform. It was the belief of men everywhere that when the

Democratic party announced that there was to be a radical change in the industrial system of the country that there were to be very radical changes in the revenue laws of the country, that the tariff of 1890, the McKinley tariff, was to be repealed, that those men who made the declarations, with authority, were honest of purpose and meant what they said.

Immediately, over all this land, there came paralysis. The mills stopped; the fire of the forges died out; everywhere there was a swarming multitude of idlers clamoring for labor but finding no places in the great labor field. Its changed condition was the legitimate result of that menace to the interests of this country that the Democratic party, with purposes such as it had announced, will always present when it is found to be in power. [Applause on the Republican side.] Gentlemen, there is no escape from this. You had declared there was no warrant in the Constitution for any element of protection to the industries of this country. If you were honest men you meant what you said when you declared that the McKinley bill, the sum of all infamies, should be repealed if the people trusted you with power.

They have done that. They have placed you in the situation where you said you would exert yourselves as legislators on these lines. It is true that we in the North did not have much belief in the sincerity of the Northern wing of the Democratic party, but we did believe in the integrity, no matter how we might have doubted the wisdom, of the Southern wing. We believed that you gentlemen of the South had Constitutional convictions. You had given earnest of it in the past. In support of views that you announced as your Constitutional convictions you had risked all that honorable men could risk.

We knew that, and when you said that, in your judgment, there was an inhibition upon every man who had sworn to support the Constitution of the United States from engaging in legislation that would stimulate and protect the industries of this land we believed you meant it, and so did the manufacturers. Hence, after you came into power—controlling the Executive and Congress—as soon as contracts then existing on the part of the manufacturers were filled, as soon as existing obligations expired, came the difficulties of inaction, because men of business could not be apprised of what lay in the future. Wool, in the country where I live, fell in price from 22 cents a little while before to 10 cents, and there was a general business paralysis all over the country.

This condition must be disastrous for the Democratic party. But the President of the United States, with an adroitness that was wonderful, a political skill and sagacity that mark him as the great Democratic politician of his age, determined to shift the responsibility from the Democratic party to the one that had just ceased to be in power, and he discovered that the evils under which the country groaned from the dangers of Democratic legislation were not, in fact, attributable to that cause, but existed because the Republican party, three years ago, had passed the Sherman bill. [Laughter.]

And, Mr. Speaker, strange to say, there are within the sound of my voice Republicans who have extolled upon the stump every provision of that law, who have called it beneficent in all its operations, who have pointed to it with pride as the only method known to legislation whereby there could be that increase of the circulating medium which was necessary to keep pace with the growth of population and business—there are, I say, such Republicans here who propose to aid the President in this shifting process of legerdemain designed to place the responsibility upon Republican shoulders, who propose to aid that attempt by voting "aye," a confession that the Sherman act contains in itself all the iniquities that the Democrats in their enthusiasm have charged that it does.

They tell us that we should vote for the repeal of this law because the whole country clamors for it, because the business interests of the country demand it. Gentlemen, where are the petitions that have been sent to your desks from the people of this country demanding the repeal of the Sherman law? I am not disposed to take aught from the importance of the place that boards of trade and banking associations and chambers of commerce hold in our business economies. I recognize them as essential to the successful conduct of business upon our methods. I have no assault to make upon the gentlemen who compose them. They are necessary factors in the general business of the country and have their legitimate place. But they are not of first importance. They are not "the people," and they may have interests opposed to the true interests of the great mass of the people. They are as selfish as other men, and often intent upon securing legislative measures that confer special benefits upon themselves that are not shared in by all of the people.

And I want to remind you, gentlemen, that boards of trade and chambers of commerce and bankers' associations do not do the real business of this land. Their business begins where the great business of production ends. [Applause.] They simply levy toll upon that which the real business men of this country create. [Applause.] They are necessary, but they are not all. The banks, for purposes of their own, desire the repeal of this act. I have known but few bankers who were not monometallists. They are nearly all such. They see that the President of the United States is one.

They remember his letter to Mr. Warner eight years ago, in which he took grounds against silver coinage. They remember his first message to the Congress, and his letter of last summer, and his recent message. In all, he is the enemy of silver, and they can now recall the closing sentence of this last message, in which he urges the repeal of the Sherman law and hopes "other legislative action may put beyond all doubt or mistake the intention and ability of the Government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries." They know that this money is gold. They know that all of the earnest friends of the Administration who have spoken in this debate tell us that the repeal of the Sherman act is the first step to the demonetization of silver, and they know that the act for the repeal and their declarations and arguments in favor of a single gold standard should be construed together.

They believe that now is the favored time when this great "step in advance," as they call it, can most successfully be undertaken. The men who compose the boards of trade and chambers of commerce are creatures of the banks. They are the borrowers. When they find that accommodations no longer come, and when they are gravely told by the bankers, who are supposed to be financiers, that the reason why they can not have discounts is the presence of this obnoxious law upon the statute book, and that the only way of securing relief and new accommodation lies in the direction of carrying this repeal, they pass at once the resolutions that are prepared for them, and which, later, find their way to our desks. Then, too, the great metropolitan press, representing home interests, the interests of the men who support them, assume to speak for the country, and to say that the people make a demand for the repeal of this law.

There are 2,000,000 of people in the State of Iowa, but I know of only one of my colleagues who has received a letter or petition requiring or asking him to vote for this measure. In the district in which I live there are more than 180,000 people; agriculturists, all of them. There is not an important manufacturing industry in the whole district. And yet, Mr. Speaker, not one word has been said to me in all of the days while at home I was inquiring, nor has anything come to me here in the shape of a petition, asking me to vote for this repeal. I believe, sir, there is no such public opinion as is asserted demanding this action.

But they tell us that it is "absolutely necessary to repeal this law in order to restore the confidence of the people." The confidence of the people in what? Not in the money that you propose to strike down. What is there in all the varieties of money that we have that equals in all the elements of value this same derided Treasury note of 1890? Behind that Treasury note lies the pledge of a nation, never dishonored, that its notes shall be redeemed in coin, and, as the Secretary of the Treasury has interpreted his duty, it is redeemed in gold. In addition to that, and behind it, it has, as a collateral, its bullion value in silver. What other money have you got that is as good? Not the greenback. It has but \$100,000,000 in gold to redeem \$346,000,000. Not the silver certificate. It is just the promise to return a silver dollar. But the Treasury note of 1890 has the same pledge for its redemption that the greenback has, and in addition, its full value in bullion silver. It is the best form of money that we have.

There is no distrust of that money on the part of the people. Time and again your attention has been called here to the fact that a day or two ago it was selling at a premium in the markets of New York for gold. No matter what the cause may be, there is something in the way of evidence in that fact. It shows that the people who are pledged to its redemption have not lost faith in their pledges or in their power. There is no trouble with the money.

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] a few days ago gave the true key to the whole difficulty. In extolling the beneficent action of the banks he told us that we had \$24 per capita of money furnished by the Government, but the banks by their processes and their methods had enlarged that volume until there was \$72 per capita in circulation among the people. Twenty-four dollars of it was the cash capital on which business was done—it was supplied by the Government; \$48 of \$72 per capita was the credit capital supplied by the banks—the debts of the banks, and on which they were doing business. The want of confidence is not in the money of the Government, it is in this substitute for money furnished by the banks. [Applause.] There is where the trouble is, gentlemen—not with the Treasury notes.

Gentlemen tell us that the presence of this Treasury note of 1890 is a menace to the money interests of the country; that it drives the gold out of circulation. How is that? Every dollar of our Treasury notes, treated as they are to-day by the Secretary of the Treasury—redeemed at the pleasure of the holder in gold—is in effect a gold dollar added to the circulation. Does the presence of a newly issued gold dollar drive out the present gold dollar? Will the dollar that we have become alarmed because its brother is brought up as a reinforcement to stand side by side with it in the battle of commerce? To my mind there is an absurdity about this that only needs to be stated in order to show its folly.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this law has been beneficial in its operation at all times and that it is not harmful to-day. A million and a half is added to the population of the United States every twelve months. The business of this country increases rapidly every

twelve months. Ever since 1861 there has been a demand for the addition of about \$63,000,000 annually to the circulation. To the four hundred and forty-odd million dollars that we had in 1861 we have made such additions that now we have in the Treasury and in circulation more than twenty-three hundred million dollars. There has been since 1861 an average increase of about \$63,000,000 each year. This increase is necessary for the future. If you repeal the Sherman act how do you propose to get it?

There is not a law upon the statute books, save the Sherman act, that enables you to get more. You can not have more silver certificates. You can not have more gold certificates, because the tendency is to decrease them. You can not have more greenbacks, because of the pledge of the nation. You can not have more national bank notes under present legislation, because the period for ultimate redemption of the bonds grows so near. The only hope of meeting this demand for an increase of currency, as the statutes are framed to-day, is in the maintenance intact of this much-abused act of 1890. It gives us more of circulation. It gives us a most desirable circulation. It gives us the best form of money that we have. It is our only hope for expansion.

A gentleman who recently spoke on this floor announced as one of the reasons why this act should be repealed that under its operation there was a constant exodus of gold from this country. Does he assume that this act has aught to do with that? I remember that from 1819 to 1860 more than \$600,000,000 of gold fled from our shores to other lands. Why? Because the balances of trade were against us; because we were a debtor nation and because we paid in gold, not because gold was then the only standard, but because commerce so elected. No Sherman act was in existence then, gentlemen; but there was a free-trade tariff; and it gave the balances against us and made it necessary for us to ship something that other nations would accept in payment, and that was gold. These balances are against us now.

A gentleman quoted a little while ago from the Treasury a statement to show that the balance was in our favor. Seemingly this is so; but that is the custom-house balance from which he read, that is made up from the aggregate of the invoices of incoming merchandise on the one hand and the aggregate of manifests of outgoing vessels on the other hand. It simply shows the custom-house transactions of this country. To that aggregate of invoices it is necessary you should add the undervaluations of the port of New York, estimated at from twenty-five million to forty million dollars each year. In addition you must add the sum that represents the cost of foreign travel of this country. The year before last 99,000 cabin passengers landed at the port of New York. Ninety thousand of them were American citizens. It is estimated that each one of these in journeying abroad expends a thousand dollars, making an aggregate of \$90,000,000 more which you must add to that balance against us.

You must remember that the foreign commerce of this country is carried on in foreign bottoms—all but 12 per cent. Its cost is estimated at from \$130,000,000 to \$200,000,000. Eighty-eight per cent of either sum (whichever may be correct) must be added in order that you may find what the true balances are. Then to these sums you must add interest and dividends every year paid to foreigners. I undertake to say that in no year during the last fifty has the true balance, taking into account all transactions between ourselves and foreign nations, ever been in favor of the United States.

This simple fact does away with the value of all illustrations drawn from England, from France, from Germany, for our guidance. They are creditor nations; they can have whatever money they choose. All that is needed in such a country to give efficiency to money is to give it the legal-tender quality. They have no balances to settle beyond the jurisdiction of their own laws where the preferences of other persons must be heard. They are the dictators; and so they can make whatever money they please. This is important here for the purpose of suggesting that this vast fund of illustration given to us for Godly example perhaps is not so valuable as in the minds of some gentlemen it may seem.

The true way for us to solve this financial question, gentlemen, is to compel, by wise, judicious legislation, the balances of trade to be in our favor. [Applause.] That will do it. I hear gentlemen who seem to think that this financial question is important above all others inveighing against the only means within our power to effectuate that which they assert they want. Let us buy less abroad; let us patronize less the labor fields of other lands, and more our own.

Let us by judicious measures increase the merchant marine of this country and conduct our own foreign commerce and thus save more than \$100,000,000 each year. Let us encourage by proper methods, by subsidies or bounties, the production of all the sugar that we need and save \$130,000,000 to our own people. [Applause.] Let us pursue such courses and secure the industrial independence of America, and then all the other things that you gentlemen have been extolling as most desirable, and praying to God that you may have, will be given to you. It will not be absolutely necessary that you should then resort to prayer, because you could help yourselves; and the Allwise One encourages and commends this self-help. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, I have heard with very great regret gentlemen on

this side of the House, whose opinions I have regarded as valuable, and whose example I wanted to follow, indulging in a line of discussion which seems to me, for them at least, is unwise. There is no party that has ever lived that contains multitudes of men but which, in order to secure unity of action and maintain the purpose of the organization, does not need the coercive or cohesive influences of party declarations. [Applause.] I want to suggest to gentlemen who have much at stake, because of party lines and party declarations, as well as party aspirations—I want to suggest to these gentlemen the impolicy of weakening the cords of cohesion found in the platforms that bind us together. [Applause.] I want it to be remembered that while it may be of interest to you just now to lose sight of party declarations on the money question, that there are coming up other questions; and you ought not, and you can not afford later on, to let other men exercise the same discretion and set at naught the declarations of the party that you are exercising in the present case. [Applause.]

The declarations of the Republican party in favor of the protective system are no stronger, they are no less subject to hypercriticism, and to the possibilities of interpretation, than are the declarations with regard to the double standard. We believe in them as a party in their entirety. We mean to stand by them in all their parts, and it appears to some of us most unwise and unseemly, where there may be such advantage to all, when all are observed, that men should take upon themselves to set aside a part that is just as dear to the Western heart as any in the entire declaration to be found, from first to last, in the platform. [Applause.]

We are here, Mr. Speaker, asked by the President of the United States by voting for the repeal of the act of 1890, to cast a vote of want of confidence in Republican statesmanship and Republican methods. I will not do it. [Applause.] We are asked to admit by a vote in this House, when all we have said in the way of prophecy is now fulfilled; when all that we said would come upon this country, when the Democratic party armed with the full power of the Government and the authority of the people has happened, and we are asked to say that these prophecies are not true, but are requested to declare by our action here that all of the evils that the country now labors under come solely from the Sherman law—from Republican legislation. I repeat, I will not do it. I do not believe it to be true.

I may as well state now that the Democratic party has either to go back upon its pledges with reference to the tariff made a year ago or else it is going to bid farewell to the prosperity of this land. And I want to hold you gentlemen to that issue. You took it upon yourselves and I don't propose, so far as my humble voice is concerned, to allow you by any kind of legerdemain or political trickery to get away from the issue as you presented it and the conditions as they are. [Applause.]

The Republican party has taken its position on the question of the free coinage of silver. It has said that it was in favor of the use of the two metals as money and that it would pledge itself to maintain them at a parity that now exists. But it proposes to do so in a statesmanlike way; and I for one desire that there shall be no variation from that purpose. It proposes that through an international convention an agreement is to be secured from the nations of the earth controlling in this matter that will fix the question without possibility of disturbance. How is it possible, gentlemen, you who have said that two standards can not exist—how is it possible for your pet theory to be true when all the nations of the earth use them in commercial transactions within their borders and jurisdiction? What becomes of your theory? Many gentlemen have referred to the situation prior to 1834 and subsequent to 1834, and the experiences of those periods—that gold and silver could not be kept in uniform value.

They forget that at first we adopted a ratio of 15 to 1 while the European ratio was 15½ to 1, and that when we made a change it was to 16 to 1. First we valued gold too highly, and then went as far in the other direction. We had not then attempted to secure this object through international agreement. That was the reason that there was this fluctuation once in favor of gold and once in favor of silver. Had other nations agreed there would have been no trouble. And now, in the midst of the pendency of these negotiations, while we are asking others to come to our position we are invited to change radically that position and assume another. Let us wait until after we have made every honest effort to secure bimetallism by means of international agreement. I want both gold and silver. I want them at the parity of 16 to 1. But I do not want to complicate the present situation. I want the Brussels conference to have time to act. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment this Administration has shown its hostility at all times to the use of silver.

When the Administration came into power there was in the vaults of the Treasury two hundred and seventeen millions of gold—one hundred and three millions of redemption fund and one hundred and fourteen millions on which gold certificates had been issued. Ah, says one, but that gold must remain there. Why? Simply because of the statutory direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to retain it; not because of the existence of a contract between the depositor and the Government of the United States that it

shall remain. And, gentlemen, a resolution passed in the last hour of the last Congress repealing that clause of the law would have placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury two hundred and seventeen millions of gold for immediate use in redemptions; more than one-third of all the gold in the United States and more than one-fifteenth part of all the gold in the world.

That same resolution might have placed in his hands more than \$300,000,000 of silver. Here was the astonishing spectacle of this administration coming into power with more than \$500,000,000 of coin in its vaults, each the equivalent of the other—more coin than any government in this world has ever owned at one time—and yet pleading the baby act, and crying about its inability to meet the obligations of the Government, when there was no obligation of this Government outstanding, save the gold certificates, that might not have been met with either form of that money.

Ah, but, says the objector, if the Secretary had paid out silver we would at once have been placed upon a silver basis and gold would have gone to a premium. Who would have paid a premium for gold, when the Secretary of the Treasury had \$217,000,000 of gold with which to flood the market at any moment? Men buy gold and pay a premium to make money. They do not pay a premium for it when they know that to-morrow it may be given without price to their neighbor in the ordinary current payments of the Treasury.

But the President saw fit to say that he would maintain the parity by the use of gold alone and by degradation of the other metal, by declaring in advance that silver was unfit for use and by the sole use of the gold. This was like the athlete who would start out to give strength alike to the muscles of both of his arms by tying one of them securely to his person.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. HEPBURN. If I was right sure that I knew what that question was, and that I could answer it with great credit to myself and with perilous discomfiture to my friend, I would; but as I am not advised as to the nature of the question I will decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield. Mr. HEPBURN. I want to be courteous to my friend, and I will listen to the question.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I want to ask you whether it would not be repudiation for this House to pass a resolution permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to use for any other purpose whatever the gold which is in the Treasury for the redemption of Treasury gold certificates?

Mr. HEPBURN. Undoubtedly it would not, and the question put by the gentleman shows me that he has never read that act. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] There is no sentence in it that has the semblance of a contract. All that the creditor can demand is dollars of gold when he presents his certificates. His gold is not kept as a special deposit, and it is not a special deposit. Every dollar of gold goes into the general gold fund of the Treasury Department—that is, that general account. One man's gold is not specially held for his payment, or for return to him. He is entitled to gold dollars, but not to any particular or specific dollars.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Why did not Secretary Foster apply that gold in such a way instead of proposing to sell bonds?

Mr. HEPBURN. I don't know. Secretary Foster is an Ohio man, and perhaps you know more about him than I do. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. He is an Ohio man, but he belongs in your class of people, your party.

Mr. HEPBURN. I heard it suggested the other day by a friend of mine in whom I have great confidence generally, that while he did not believe the repeal of this act would result in any benefit, in any certain benefit, yet he proposed to vote for it; that, operating as a possible opiate, it might do some good. I think that is not wise. It is too much like putting the plaster on the well leg, it seemed to me, a kind of remedial effort that I did not want to follow him in. [Laughter.]

I believe that this repeal ought not to be had. I believe that neither one of the amendments providing for the free coinage of silver ought to be adopted. But I do not care to argue that question now. I want the situation of silver to remain unchanged until we know the result of the international conference. Certainly, at this time, while we are striving to secure an agreement between the nations upon propositions that have been made by us and have not yet been acted upon, I am not willing to change the status in any way until we know of failure; and then I am willing to do those things that are within the limits of judicious conduct, that will give to us the two metals on the best terms possible for all to perform the same kindly office for the commerce of this country that for more than a hundred years they have been able to perform. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the pending proposition to repeal unconditionally the purchasing clause of the Sherman act is, in my judgment, fraught with the gravest peril to the American people. Nothing short of this deep-seated conviction would induce me to occupy the attention of the House, at this late stage in the discussion, with a brief statement of some of the reasons which satisfy my mind that no more vicious and unjustifiable

measure than this, considering the ultimate object had in view by those who are behind it, has been seriously considered by Congress within the present century.

We have been told that the exceptionally heavy exportation of gold during the first six months of the present year is the result of the pernicious effects of the Sherman law, and that the apprehension, whether well founded or not, that the Government will not be able to maintain its silver currency at a parity with gold if the Sherman law is longer kept upon our statute books, has brought upon us the monetary crisis which has of late enveloped the country and paralyzed its business interests.

In other words, that the monthly purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver by the Government and the issuance of coin certificates to the amount of the market value of that silver in payment thereof is driving gold out of the country, and has so shaken the confidence of the people in the ability of their Government to meet its obligations that a wild panic has seized upon them for which the unconditional and immediate repeal of the Sherman law is the only panacea.

Mr. Speaker, with the utmost respect for those who may have been imposed upon by these baseless assumptions and who have honestly accepted them as true, I shall endeavor to demonstrate from figures that are incontestible and facts that are indisputable that there is no earthly connection between these shipments of gold and the much-denounced Sherman law.

The Sherman law has now been on trial a little over three years, and under its operations \$180,000,000, in round numbers, have been added to our circulating medium, every dollar of which is of full legal tender, and as good as any other dollar in our currency. To be entirely accurate—for varying statements have been made upon this floor and elsewhere—the Government has coined 36,087,185 standard dollars and issued coin notes to the amount of \$148,286,348, there being in actual circulation of these notes \$143,774,138.

According to a calculation made by the Director of the Mint, taking the depreciated value of silver bullion on the 17th day of this month as its true value, about which I shall presently have something to say, the Government has lost on its silver purchases under the Sherman act just \$33,387,108. Admitting this to be a fair calculation, does anybody believe that the total destruction of that amount of the currency of this great country could possibly shake the confidence of any sane man in the ability of this Government to meet its obligations? Does anybody believe that such a loss, if real, could have had the effect of driving gold abroad? A government whose income is half a billion of dollars a year and which gives away in charities two-fifths of that amount could hardly be embarrassed by the loss of eleven millions a year for any number of years.

The Sherman bill was approved on the 14th of July, 1890, and the gold export movement, as everybody knows, commenced more than two years prior to that date. Although we lost by exportation \$87,506,463 in gold during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, the bulk of that amount has gone abroad since January 1, and in the preceding year, when the Sherman law was in like full force, the excess of our exports over our imports of gold was only \$495,873. If the Sherman law drove gold abroad in the fiscal year 1892-'93, why did not the same cause produce like effects in that of 1891-'92?

But under the operation of the Bland law of 1878, denounced as a more vicious piece of silver legislation, and more menacing to the business interests of the country than even the Sherman act, by the very people who are now laying all of the present business depression at the doors of that act, and in almost the same breath—for they dread its restoration more than they do a continuance of the Sherman law—the Government coined 378,166,793 standard dollars, all of which, either in that form or in the shape of silver certificates, is practically in circulation to-day.

Was the effect of the Bland law to drive gold out of the country? So far from it, during the period from June 30, 1878, to June 30, 1890, there was imported into this country \$186,088,510 more of gold than was exported during that period. If it be just to charge the Sherman bill with the gold that has been sent abroad since its passage, must not the Bland act be given credit for bringing to our shores the far larger sum?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is logical. But again, for the first fifteen days of this month the importations of gold have exceeded the exportations to the amount of \$16,250,000, and by the end of the month may reach \$25,000,000 or more. How is this turn in the golden tide to be accounted for? Shall we set it down to the credit of the Sherman law? We are still purchasing silver bullion and increasing the circulating medium by issuing notes against it, and the silver dollar is daily becoming more and more dishonest in the estimation of those who seek to debase it, and who yet belie their words by paying a premium for it.

I can not, in the time allotted me, Mr. Speaker, enumerate the

causes that have led to the unusual exportation of gold during the first half of this year. For the purposes of my contention it is enough to know that the Sherman law was not one of them. But reasons in abundance are not far to seek, and it is not necessary to go back more than a few months to find them.

I may instance the bank failures in Australia, which caused a rude shock throughout the financial world, when England, the largest holder of American securities, threw large quantities of them upon the market, thus drawing from us gold that otherwise would have remained here. Austria, as all know, has recently undertaken to refund her debt and to go to a gold basis. To do this required a large amount of gold, and she has necessarily drawn heavily upon our supply.

India, at the dictation of Great Britain, has been driven to suspend the coinage of silver on private account, and the enemies of silver have not been slow to seize upon that fact as a weapon with which to beat down the market value of silver and to still further depreciate the value of gold. But in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the McKinley bill, that iniquity of iniquities, that crowning piece of Republican robber-legislation, which the people by an overwhelming majority condemned at the polls, and the repeal of which they then were told and believed would be speedily accomplished once the Democratic party was in full control of the Government, is far more responsible than all these causes combined for the recent ebb in the golden stream as well as the stagnation of trade and commerce, the depression of agriculture, and the want and distress that has been entailed upon labor.

It may be said that the McKinley bill became a law three years ago and that it would have earlier affected, if at all, the exportation of gold; but, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that our enormous exportations of breadstuffs served to postpone the day when the balance of trade should be against this country, and that we have suffered from that cause alone to the extent of \$50,000,000 during the past year.

I might go on almost indefinitely and regale this House with the forbidding story of the many failures and suspensions that have inflicted inestimable loss and injury upon the legitimate business interests of this country, but I forbear. The Reading disaster, the whisky, cordage, and other trust failures have added immensely to the financial woes that have afflicted the country and involved in the blackest ruin thousands of innocent victims.

But, Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent to every unprejudiced and dispassionate mind that the present deplorable condition of our monetary affairs is due to a great extent to the determined and persistent attempt of the money power to dictate the financial policy of our Government. This has been most aptly described as the rich man's panic. If the people have lost confidence and withdrawn their hard-earned savings, or such of them as they have been permitted to withdraw from the banks, it is because the banks have by their wicked attacks upon the people's money created that want of confidence.

But, Mr. Speaker, these attacks have proved a veritable boomerang; they have recoiled upon their inventors. Instead of precipitating a run upon the Treasury, they have awakened in the minds of the people a deep distrust in the banks themselves, which the sequel has unfortunately proven in many cases was only too well founded. Instead of driving gold to a premium, they have placed a premium upon all money—silver as well as gold—and to-day the dishonest silver dollar can not be procured, save at a premium, by the very men whose insatiable greed and unconquerable lust for money have hurled the country into the throes of a financial panic and involved thousands of their fellow-men in disaster and ruin.

The Rand-McNally Bankers' Monthly, for August, exclaims in pitiful tones:

In 1873 it was the toiler's panic; this is the rich man's turn.

Will the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law give the relief that even the bankers must now desire? Will aggravating a famine relieve hunger, as has been said upon this floor? That there is a scarcity of money must be apparent to everybody, although some people even now profess not to believe it. The workman who discounts his employer's duebills in order to secure the cash with which to supply the daily needs of his family is thus taught by a sad experience what before he had never appreciated, and the bank president, whose doors are besieged by a howling mob demanding the money which belongs to the panic-stricken depositors and which they can not rescue from the iron safes in which it is securely locked, may never have, and doubtless never will, experience the terrible pangs of actual, biting hunger, but he at least has a realizing sense of what a money famine means.

According to the last Treasury statement the total amount of money in circulation in the United States on the 1st of August,

1893, was \$1,611,099,017. This amount would make the circulation per capita \$24.02. As a matter of fact, it is much less; for when the Treasury officials speak of the money in circulation they mean the general stock of money less the amount held in the Treasury, which is, of course, misleading, and must be, accurately speaking, incorrect; for bank reserves and the contents of safety boxes can in no sense be said to be in circulation. France, the freest country upon the globe from panics and other monetary disturbances, has a per capita circulation twice as large as our own, and she has a silver circulation of \$700,000,000, which she easily maintains at a parity with gold, and that, too, at a ratio of 15½ to 1.

The total silver currency of the United States is, in round numbers, \$625,000,000, including standard dollars, subsidiary silver, silver certificates, and coin notes. With twice the population and three times the resources, commerce and trade of France, we are told that we can not maintain an equal amount of silver currency at par with gold, even at the greater ratio of 16 to 1. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the bare statement of such a proposition carries with it its own refutation, and is a reflection upon the American people.

It is impossible to speak accurately, but it is within reasonable bounds to say that prior to the civil war there was at least half as much silver in circulation here as there is to-day. We often hear it stated that free coinage of silver had practically ceased when the demonetization act of 1873 was passed, and that only \$8,045,838 had up to that time been coined. Let us examine this matter, Mr. Speaker.

The reports of the Director of the Mint show that in addition to the eight million of standard dollars coined, there was coined from 1792 to 1853 of full legal-tender fractional silver \$76,735,015. From 1853 to 1873 there was coined \$60,361,032, which, however, was not of full legal-tender quality, except in small sums, since it had become necessary to lessen its weight in order to keep it at home, a process which might perhaps be applied with advantage to our present gold coinage.

But these sums by no means represent the silver in circulation prior to 1873. Everybody knows that previous to the late war Spanish milled dollars and Mexican dollars circulated more freely than any other money, and that the Mexican dollar was by law a legal tender up to 1857. It is also an indisputable fact that the Mexican dollar continued in general circulation up to and through the war, and it was received in Texas and the Southwestern States up to ten years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I venture the assertion that when we take into consideration the vast amount of our annual productions, our prodigious wealth, and the enormous volume of our interstate commerce, the country was better supplied, according to its then needs, with silver currency before 1873 than it has ever been since.

With the war our stock of gold and silver vanished, and the act of 1873 was deliberately planned to prevent the acquisition of silver currency to supply the place of that lost. The unconditional repeal of the Sherman law means that this country is to be hereafter on an exclusively gold basis. It means that henceforth monometallism is to be the fixed policy of the United States, as it has long been of creditor England, unless the people, reduced to want and goaded to desperation by the merciless exactions of a moneyed aristocracy, whose greed is insatiable, throw off the intolerable yoke of oppression and secure through revolution what their representatives have denied to them.

The total amount of money in the civilized world at present is placed at \$3,582,605,000 in gold, \$4,052,700,000 in full and limited tender silver, and \$2,635,873,000 in paper. The world's production of gold in the year 1892 was \$130,817,000, larger by several millions than that of any other previous year since 1857. It is needless to say that the gold of the whole world is totally inadequate to do the business of the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the United States, which countries now hold the bulk of it.

They tell us that if we will only discontinue the coinage of silver that gold will come in to take its place. From whence, pray, will it come? England, Scotland, and Ireland have only \$550,000,000; less by more than fifty millions our present supply. Germany, also on a gold basis, has less than we have, and Austria-Hungary, which is desperately striving to adopt the single gold standard, has only \$40,000,000 of gold with which to accomplish that financial feat. Her needs have already served to largely reduce our stock. The average yearly production of gold for the past hundred years has been \$56,339,680. There is no prospect of any future increase, and the larger part of what is mined will be consumed in the arts and in the uses of dentistry.

With these facts before our eyes, Mr. Speaker, I ask again, can we afford to debase and to destroy the money value of the only metal that can supply the monetary needs of the world? There is none too much of both metals produced in the world,

the total production of each for the past century being, gold, \$5,633,908,000, and silver, \$5,104,961,000. Mark how nearly together the production of these two precious metals has remained, and that, measured in dollars, the production of gold has been larger than that of silver.

Who can doubt but that silver as well as gold was created to supply that medium of exchange by which every other-product of human exertion and industry shall be measured? To demonetize either of these metals, which by the consent and usage of mankind regulate the volume of the world's money, is to destroy one-half of the money now in existence; and when you blot out one-half of the money of the world you double the purchasing power of the other half. To do this is to cheapen by just one-half the price of property and labor. This is a proposition that can not be successfully disputed. The effect of the unholy war that has been waged against silver has not, as one might imagine, depreciated silver; it has merely appreciated gold. Every product of human industry and skill has shared the fate of silver.

Just as silver has gone down in the scale of prices, in the same proportion the products of labor have been cheapened. This is no baseless theory, no wild figment of the imagination. In 1872, the year before silver was demonetized, its market value was greater by 3 cents an ounce than its mint value, and that year the average price of a bushel of wheat was \$1.47. From that day to the present moment silver has declined in value, and each year there has been a corresponding decline in the price of wheat, until to-day silver is worth only 70 cents an ounce and wheat 69 cents a bushel. When they started upon the down grade the year following—a year that will long be memorable in the financial history of America—silver was worth \$1.29 an ounce and wheat \$1.31 a bushel. Every honest and intelligent man knows that this was no mere coincidence.

But we are told that whilst the free coinage of silver will make money more plentiful it will also cheapen it. Granted; but cheap money does not mean dishonest money. It does mean higher and better prices; it does mean that the products of the farm shall command higher prices and that the wages of the laborer shall be correspondingly increased. Dear money means cheap products and cheap labor. The scarcity of money is always indicative of falling prices, and the reverse is equally true.

If you repeal unconditionally the Sherman law—and that is the naked proposition of Wall street—you will not only put an abrupt stop to all increase in the volume of your currency, but you will utterly degrade silver; you will drive it down further and further in value, and you may depend upon it that wheat and corn and tobacco, and every other product of the farm and factory, will keep pace with its downward, and deathward march.

This may not be the immediate effect of repeal. It will, however, be the inevitable and certain result. We who stand here and declare that we will resist the perpetration of this crime are denounced as the advocates of fiat money and a "dishonest dollar." But the bankers, with few exceptions, in and out of Congress, the men who pretend to believe only in money that possesses intrinsic value, are demanding the passage of an act authorizing the issue and sale of from \$150,000,000 to \$300,000,000 of gold bonds.

The credit of the Government is strong enough to float its bonds upon the markets of the world, but not strong enough to maintain its silver currency at a parity with its gold currency! The silver in every dollar coined by the Government, we are told, is only worth 60 cents as measured in gold, and that therefore it is "a dishonest 60-cent dollar;" but when it receives the stamp and impress of the Government it has behind it at least 60 per cent of intrinsic value and only 40 per cent rests upon the faith and credit of the Government. The bonds that we are asked to issue and sell for the purpose of increasing our currency and placing us upon a gold basis will have nothing behind them but the bare faith of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in "an honest dollar," and I pray that the time may speedily come when there will be none other in our currency. The only "dishonest dollar" is the gold dollar. Through legislation its value has been greatly appreciated, until the purchasing power of gold, as I have shown, has actually been doubled.

I favor the repeal of the Sherman law, and I shall vote to repeal it by a substitute that will provide for the free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1. I believe that the remonetization of silver will make its market value equal to its present mint value, and that the market value of wheat and corn and labor will be correspondingly increased. I believe that this Government is strong enough and rich enough to maintain gold and silver at a parity at the present ratio, even as against the rest of the world.

Great Britain, through her dependencies, produces four times as much gold as she does silver, whilst we produce nearly double as much silver as we do gold. Why, then, should England domi-

nate the policy of the United States as she does that of wretched India? It is to her interest to cheapen silver; it is to ours to protect it. Practically the only currency that India possesses is silver. The cheaper England can purchase silver, the more Indian wheat she can buy, and the more cheap Indian wheat there is brought into competition with that produced by the American farmer, the more wretched will his condition become.

I have shown from official figures that more gold than silver has been produced within the last hundred years, according to the money value of each at the present ratio between the two; in other words, that not more than 16 ounces of silver have been produced for every ounce of gold produced, and if the production continues relatively the same, no sound reason for a change of ratio can be adduced. If in the future twenty times as much of silver as of gold should be produced through any considerable period, then it will be time enough to change the ratio to 20 to 1. An increase of ratio does not necessarily involve the recoinage of the silver now in circulation.

If the \$346,681,016 United States notes, or greenbacks, now in circulation can be maintained at a par with the gold dollar, with only a gold reserve fund of \$100,000,000 behind them, then surely we need apprehend nothing for our present silver currency. Besides, the repeal measure we are now considering does not propose either to retire or to recoin the present silver dollar, but on the contrary, proposes to maintain by law its parity with gold. It takes more than the addition of a few grains of silver to give to a silver dollar the purchasing power of a hundred cents. It requires the stamp and superscription of the Government to do that. We can each of us remember when the trade dollar, with more grains of silver in it than the standard dollar, was worth only 85 cents.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that I wished to see the Sherman law repealed, and I repeat it. It was not passed to promote free coinage, but to serve as a stumbling-block in its path until the enemies of silver the world over could rally their forces and strengthen the conspiracy hatched twenty-five years ago to strike down silver. I thank Heaven that no Democrat in either House of Congress voted for it.

It was the last expiring act in that financial legislation of the Republican party which began with the credit-sustaining act of 1869, through which the bondholders robbed the people of \$1,120,000,000, and which had well-nigh bankrupted the Government and had brought want and destitution into the homes of the producing and laboring classes, when the Democratic party came into power on the 4th day of March. Having served the purpose for which it was designed, I trust it may now prove a stumbling-block in the way of a single gold standard.

Those who stand with me would remove it in the interest of the great mass of struggling humanity; those who are on the other side of this question would remove it at the dictation of the money power and to subserve the interests of greed and avarice. It is not difficult to predict on which side our Republican friends will array themselves.

I appeal to my Democratic associates to take the side of toiling, down-trodden, helpless humanity. The bankers can take care of themselves, we are told upon high authority, and I believe it. Gold and silver have constituted the money of the world for six thousand years. Every national Democratic platform that I have read has declared in favor of the use of both metals and upon equal terms. Some gentlemen who will vote for unconditional repeal, and who do not wish their Democracy questioned, pretend to find in the Chicago platform warrant for such course. I do not read that instrument in that way. It is idle to talk of "holding to the use of both gold and silver as the standard of money," and voting to make one the only standard.

It is worse than idle to talk of resorting again to international conference. Five times have we done so, and to-day we are vastly further from an agreement than ever before. But there are other gentlemen here who, though elected as Democrats, yet hold their own judgments in higher esteem than that of their party, and who have more faith in their own wisdom than in the aggregate wisdom of a Democratic convention. One of them boldly declares that he will not be bound by the glittering catchwords of platforms, and another has affirmed that he wrote and ran upon his own platform. I give them both credit for honesty and candor.

If absolute bimetallism is ever to be the policy of this Government Congress must make it so. It has the ability and power to do it—has it the courage and patriotism? Neglect not the opportunity now presented, I beseech you, for if you do silver is doomed. It is the knowledge born of this fact that has encouraged the despoilers of mankind to concentrate all of their powerful forces in the one mighty effort which we are to-day witnessing within these Halls. Tighter and tighter is becoming the grasp which the money power has laid upon the nation's throat, and year by year the power of resistance on the part of the people is

becoming weaker and weaker. Upon every succeeding Congress a stronger hold is being exerted.

In 1878 the unequal contest waged in behalf of the wealth producers and the wage-earners of our land was almost won, but twelve years later, instead of the promised enfranchisement of silver, the Sherman law was thrust bodily down the unwilling throats of a long-suffering and patient people. If now the slight barrier which bars, to some extent at least, the way of greed and avarice is broken down, I tremble at the thought of the dire results that must inevitably follow.

Starvation is already stalking abroad in the land, and the heartrending cries of countless thousands of unemployed men and women are hourly borne in upon us from the fields and shops of the West. But greed, insatiable greed, hath neither ear nor conscience. Desolation and ruin are impending. Despondency and actual want have entered many a happy home, and the darkest gloom pervades many once prosperous sections of our beautiful land.

Mr. Speaker, as I reflect upon the perils that environ us upon every side, and behold the helplessness of my people, I realize as never before the truth of the words of that great apostle of Democracy, Thomas Jefferson, that "banks are more dangerous than standing armies." [Loud applause.]

Mr. ABBOTT. Mr. Speaker, an opportunity was tendered me in the early part of this debate to address the House on the pending bill, but, being unable to do so at the time on account of illness resulting from a severe cold, I avail myself of the privilege extended to all members by order of the House to print in the RECORD the remarks I would have made.

I am not vain enough to suppose that they will change the opinion of any member of this body on the important subject now under discussion, but I feel that it is a duty I owe to those whom I have the honor to represent, as well as to myself, to place my views before the country.

By the act of February 12, 1873, silver was demonetized. I deem it unnecessary to recur to the facts and circumstances connected with the passage of that most infamous act. President Grant and Speaker Blaine afterwards declared that they did not know, when they signed the bill, that it contained provisions which demonetized silver.

It seems that months had elapsed, even before many members of Congress knew what had been done. As soon as it became generally known that silver had been demonetized and half of the metallic currency had been destroyed, the voice of the people—especially of the laboring and producing classes—came in thunder tones from every part of the country demanding the restoration of silver. Members of Congress, of both of the great political parties, were elected, pledged to the restoration of silver as a money metal.

In obedience to that demand, seventeen years ago the battle was begun in this Hall by the Democratic representatives of the people against the gold combination of this country and Europe. The battle raged fierce and bitter until it culminated in what is generally known as the Bland-Allison compromise act of 1878, by which not less than two nor more than four millions of silver dollars should be coined per month. Under that act about \$425,000,000 have been placed in circulation and are now in the hands of the people, either in the form of silver dollars or silver certificates.

During that great contest that eloquent and distinguished statesman who now holds the portfolio of the Treasury Department, Mr. Carlisle, in referring to the ruin and disaster which would follow the permanent destruction of silver as a money metal, said:

I know the world's stock of precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever become so. Mankind will be fortunate, indeed, if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population, commerce, and industry.

According to my view on the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half of the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age. The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilence, and famine that ever occurred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads, and all other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly, at the same moment would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half of the metallic money in the world.

This eloquent and forceful language only voiced the unspoken sentiment of the producing and laboring classes. While they approved of the compromise made, they were aware that it gave them only partial relief. They were not fully satisfied with results, and therefore urged their representatives to renew the fight and never cease the struggle until the citadel of the enemies of silver should be stormed and captured and gold and silver placed on an equality.

Unfortunately, however, for the country and silver, the great

contest at the polls in 1888 resulted in the temporary defeat of the friends of silver and the placing of all the branches of the Government in the hands of the Republican party—the party that demonetized silver in 1873, passed the Sherman act of 1890, and will now vote to strangle its offspring.

The act of 1890 repealed the Bland-Allison act of 1878, and provided that the Secretary of the Treasury should purchase 4,500,000 ounces of silver at the market price, in payment of which he is required to issue Treasury coin notes, which notes may be redeemed in either gold or silver, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. Something more than \$146,000,000 of these Treasury notes have been issued and put in circulation.

I have now given a very brief statement of the silver legislation since 1873.

The President has thought proper to call us together in extraordinary session and has asked us in his message to repeal the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman law, attributing, as I understand the message, the distrust and fear existing in banking and commercial circles as well as the money stringency to the Sherman act.

With due deference to the President, it seems to me to be our duty, as well as his, to ascertain the true cause or causes which have led us to the impending financial crisis, and to discover the proper remedy to be applied to remove the causes, restore confidence, and reestablish a healthy condition of business and trade.

We see from the papers that the same financial troubles that exist here exist in England and in all the European states, as well as in India and other Eastern countries. Certainly the Sherman law can not be so far-reaching in its effects as to produce these results.

Why, Mr. Speaker, we have had in circulation for more than fifteen years \$346,000,000 of Treasury notes, usually called greenbacks, based on \$100,000,000 of gold deposit, and for nearly the same time \$330,000,000 of silver certificates, based on silver deposits. These currencies have not produced a panic! How, then, can it be possible for the issuance, during the past three years, of \$146,000,000 of Treasury coin notes, based on silver purchases and redeemable in either gold or silver, at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Treasury, to create a panic, disturb business relations, and produce a stringency or scarcity of coinage?

This proposition seems to me to be so illogical as to be unworthy of serious consideration. The amount of coin Treasury notes issued under the Sherman act is so insignificant when compared with the whole amount of money in and outside of the Treasury that it seems almost absurd that anyone would ascribe the present financial depression and money stringency to such a cause.

If these notes were to be called in and canceled, thus reducing the volume of money in circulation, I can see very well why the banks might complain of hard times and the scarcity of money; but when they go to swell the volume of currency and add to the amount of the circulation, to say that they produce a scarcity is equivalent to saying that one added to five makes four.

But we are told by some gold bugs that it is not because of the \$4,000,000 which are monthly added to our circulation under the Sherman law, that has produced the scare and uneasiness which have caused the depression and influenced depositors to withdraw their deposits from the banks and put the money in hiding places, but because if the Sherman act is not repealed it will eventually lead to the free coinage of silver and the establishment of silver as the standard of value. This sort of argument, Mr. Speaker, exposes the whole secret. It is a fight for gold and against silver.

But it will be remembered that such was not the declared purpose of those who favored and supported the Sherman bill when it passed this House in 1890. We knew then that its supporters did not intend to advance the cause of silver, but to destroy it. It is well known that it was a "cowardly makeshift" resorted to to prevent the passage of a free coinage bill.

Nearly every Democratic member of Congress voted against that bill. They charged then the friends of that measure with the deliberate purpose and "intention of destroying silver and preventing its future coinage," for, by the terms of the bill, the further coinage of silver after July 1, 1891, was left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, who was known to be hostile to that metal.

The truth of the charges then made against the supporters of the Sherman bill are being verified to-day. They have turned against their own offspring and are holding it up to the world as a great monstrosity, and charging it with all the woes and evils which now threaten the business of the country.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not intend to defend this child of the opponents of silver, I do not believe that it is in anywise respon-

sible for the fear and distrust now existing in commercial circles.

I voted against that bill because it repealed the only silver-coinage act on our statute books. I voted against it because I thought it would delay the passage of a free-coinage bill and because I thought it would eventually result in contracting our currency by destroying silver, which is the basis of one-half of our currency, which is now sought to be done.

I am aware that the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law will not affect the silver already coined or the Treasury notes issued under this law, but it will stop the coinage of any more silver in future and the issuance of any more Treasury notes based on silver. The question then arises, how can the Government increase the supply of currency to meet the rapidly increasing business and commerce of the country? If this law be unconditionally repealed, there are left only two ways by which the supply of currency can be increased—one is by the yearly product of the gold mines and the other is by issuing and selling bonds—unless we repeal the tax on State banks and look to the States to supply the demand.

The Director of the Mint shows, in his last report, that the gold product of this country for the calendar year 1892 was only \$33,000,000—\$175,000 less than for the year 1891. That during that year \$16,000,000 were used in the industrial arts, by jewelers, dentists, and plate-makers. Thus it will be seen that we can not rely on the output of the mines to supply the increasing demand for money after deducting the amount consumed in the arts. It follows, then, as a matter of course, that the Government must issue and sell bonds to get money to meet the demands of industry.

Now, I think I have arrived at a point from which the depression and distrust in business circles may be explained. The Sherman law has evidently had nothing more to do with present conditions than the laws of the Medes and Persians.

From a careful study of the subject I firmly believe that there exists a conspiracy, entered into by the money powers of this country and Europe, to destroy silver as money and force an issue of interest-bearing bonds; and to this end they have created doubt and fear in the minds of the people in almost every part of the country as to results which will follow the refusal of Congress to repeal the Sherman law and destroy silver as money.

In support of this opinion, I desire to refer to the fact that boards of trade, banking houses, and wholesale merchants of New York and other great cities have flooded every part of the country with their printed and typewritten letters, inveighing in bitter terms against said act, and predicting dire calamities to the business interests of the country if said act is not unconditionally repealed.

I do not think that I would exaggerate to say that I have received five hundred letters, sent out alone by one firm of dry goods merchants of the city of New York, and which were sent to me by constituents, who felt alarmed at the representations made therein of a threatened crisis if the Sherman law was not unconditionally repealed. These letters, which are merely duplicates, appeal to the party addressed to use his influence with his Senators and Representatives to immediately vote for the repeal of the law, and indirectly suggest that the proper solution of the matter is to issue bonds, payable in gold, with which to buy gold from abroad.

It is a fact which no one can deny, that these letters which have filled the mails and flooded the country for the past four months have created distrust and fear among the people, as well as retail dealers and country bankers. Many of these people have not had the facilities for, or the time to study the questions involved, and consequently they became alarmed and began to hoard their money, when in truth there was no cause for fear. If they would have reflected for a moment they would have understood that these representations were made for selfish motives—to make money by destroying silver, thus increasing the value of their gold. It is not surprising, however, that distrust should exist in the country, and that depositors in banks should withdraw their money and hoard it, when the daily mails informed them that a crisis was impending.

The way I interpret the signs of the times is, New York undertook to scare the people and force them to demand of their representatives in Congress the repeal of the Sherman law and the demonetization of silver. They have succeeded in scaring the people, who in self-defense have raided the banks and forced them to pay a premium for cash, whether of silver or gold or of greenbacks. My sympathy is with the depositors, but I do not have the slightest sympathy with the banks in this fight. They have brought it on themselves. They "sowed the wind, and have reaped (and are reaping) the whirlwind."

My opinion is they did not expect to force a crisis, but they gave the people such a fright they could not stay the tide that

set in against them. I hold them responsible for the existing condition of things, believing they brought it about for no other reason than to secure the demonetization of silver and the issuance of gold bonds.

We are told by the friends of gold that a large volume of currency is not necessary to do the business of the country—that over 90 per cent of all the business is done on the credit system by checks and drafts. This may be so, and in commercial circles it is a convenient method of transacting business, but when confidence is broken down, when the country becomes panic-stricken, as it is to-day, the check system is a failure.

It requires a visible circulating medium, actual cash to meet the demands of the times. Messrs. Chisholm & Co., bankers and brokers, Broadway, New York, in their circular letter of August 14, say there is a currency famine in that city, that the silver dollar is at a premium. So, we see it is performing its functions as money in that great city where it is despised, and if the impending crisis be averted it will, in my opinion, be due to the silver dollar and the currency based on it.

The Government must preserve a larger volume of currency to meet such an emergency as exists to-day and prevent a combination of bankers and bondholders from bringing ruin and disaster upon the country by the destruction of silver as attempted by this bill.

I contend that the only way a reliable and stable currency can be established and maintained is to reenact in substance the coinage laws which were in force before the demonetization of silver in 1873, and provide that the holders of either coin may deposit the same and in lieu thereof receive Treasury coin notes, such as are now issued under the Sherman law, and make it compulsory on the Secretary of the Treasury, when such notes are presented for redemption to pay the same out of that coin, whether silver or gold, which may be in excess of the other at the time the notes may be presented.

By the enactment of such a law as I have outlined a parity of the two metals would necessarily be preserved, as the holder of the notes could not dictate the coin in which they would be redeemed and, therefore, these semiannual raids on the Treasury to secure gold would be stopped.

Mr. St. John, president of the Mercantile National Bank, of New York, gave the proper solution of the trouble when he said:

If the United States will provide itself a monetary system it will be found that there are inducements enough for the outside world to trade with us to make our system satisfactory to all concerned.

To talk of "money universally recognized by all civilized countries" is a solecism and utterly meaningless.

Everybody knows that gold and silver coins, as well as paper currency, are money, in the proper meaning of that word, only in the country where the coins are stamped or the paper issued. The coins of no civilized or uncivilized country are money outside of the limits of their own country. They may have value, but it is merely a commodity value like that of wheat or cotton.

I think that the time has come when Congress should legislate for the people of our own country and not for the outside world.

Twice in our history we have declared and maintained our independence of Great Britain, but it seems, after all, that we are to become the slaves of the gold jugglers of London; and what is most surprising to me is that Democratic statesmen will rise on the floor of this House and endeavor to maintain the financial supremacy of England, the greatest creditor nation on earth and into whose coffers more than \$500,000,000 annually flow from other nations which are her debtors.

England, Germany, and France, as well as all other nations of the world, have established their own financial systems. They regulate, by law, the coinage of the metals and their value, and the issuance of paper currency to suit themselves. They do not consult each other or the people of any other nation. Then, why should we, who claim to be the freest, the greatest, and most enlightened people of earth, shape our financial system to please the kingly governments of Europe, and thereby pauperize the masses of our people?

France, which occupies a territory less in extent than the State which I in part represent, in the face of all the gold nations of Europe maintains her \$700,000,000 of silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1. With a population nearly double that of France, with natural advantages and resources infinitely superior, why we cannot maintain a silver circulation, or currency based on silver, equal to that of France is incomprehensible to me, especially so when our ratio is 16 to 1.

The Director of the Mint, in his report for the calendar year 1890, shows that the total amount of silver coin of the world, outside of the United States, is in round numbers \$3,340,000,000. If the whole amount of this silver was brought to this country and coined into dollars at the existing ratio it would be less than \$50 per capita, estimating our population to be 70,000,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how anyone can honestly believe that any considerable amount of foreign silver would be imported into this country. Certainly France would not part with her \$700,000,000, which is on a parity with gold at 15½ to 1, and coin it at our mints at 16 to 1, or at a higher ratio. Nor would India and other Eastern countries bring their \$2,000,000,000 of silver to this country to be coined at a greater ratio than their own, which is 15 to 1.

This war on silver does not spring from a belief that such would be the case, and no one knows it better than the bankers themselves.

The simple, plain truth is, that within the next fourteen years all the Government bonds will have matured, and will be paid off and canceled unless some provision be made for refunding them, or for the issue of new bonds. When the bonds, which are deposited in the Treasury to secure the national bank notes, mature and are paid off and canceled, the banks go with them, as their life depends on the length of time the bonds run. Their fight against silver is not because they fear the free coinage of silver will produce a redundancy of currency, but because it will render unnecessary the further issuance of bonds.

This fight by the banks against silver means a fight against the people, a fight for more bonds, a fight for their own existence, a fight for dear life, for they know that their death is inevitable within fourteen years unless new life is given them by the issuance of more bonds. They denounce Treasury notes which are based on the credit and good faith of the Government and also on gold and silver, yet they demand bonds, bearing interest, which rest solely on the good faith of the Government.

By this nefarious scheme they tax the people to pay interest on the bonds, and charge them usurious interest on a loan of their notes.

The gold bugs and bankers on the other hand charge the friends of free coinage with a desire to force upon the country a dishonest dollar, a 70-cent dollar. This charge is not only misleading, but absolutely false, as I will show. The coined silver dollar will purchase to-day in any part of the United States as much as the gold dollar. It commands as high a premium in the markets as gold and is as earnestly sought after by all classes. But they say silver bullion has declined in all the markets of the world, and it is now only worth 70 cents as compared with gold. This is true; but any one capable of reasoning from cause to effect readily understands why this is so.

The money powers which have dominated and controlled the financial legislation of Europe and, for the past thirty years, of this country have resorted to all known methods to debase and destroy silver as a money metal. They have been, year by year, strengthening their forces, and if they gain the great battle now being fought they will have accomplished their purpose, and silver will go still lower for a time.

It is remarkable, almost phenomenal, that silver has maintained itself as well as it has against the combined gold powers of this country and Europe. The only explanation is that silver is the money of the people. They want it, they demand it, and will never cease to fight for it until their victorious banner floats aloft from the national Capitol.

The reason that silver bullion has depreciated in value is because the principal use to which it has heretofore been applied has been destroyed.

Gold is used in the fine arts and for coining money free. When silver was thus used it was at a premium above gold, but since unfriendly legislation has denied it mintage, and thus destroyed its principal use, it has necessarily depreciated, as there is no demand for it except in the arts; but if the Bland substitute to the bill now pending should become a law, that very moment silver at 16 to 1 would be equal to gold.

The value of everything depends on the use to which it is applied. This was illustrated by the eloquent and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY], whose speech is not yet published, who said if it were possible for the Government to close all the wheat mills of the country and prevent the further grinding of wheat into flour its principal use would be destroyed, and therefore of no value except for forage.

When the gold bugs talk of the intrinsic value of gold as a fixed, inflexible, unchangeable value, they talk of a myth or something that never existed, and never will, as a fact.

There can not be an intrinsic or inherent value in anything independent of its use. Corn, cotton, wheat, and bacon have intrinsic exchangeable values as well as gold and silver; but the value of each depends on the demand for its use. All values are comparative and must necessarily be so.

When the wheat and cotton crops are short and insufficient to supply the demand, their relative value to gold is increased; but when these crops are superabundant and the supply greater than the demand, their relative value to gold is diminished. So, therefore, the value of gold, intrinsic and otherwise, depends

on the amount it will buy, or its purchasing power. Suppose that Congress and the other nations of Europe should destroy gold as a money metal and prevent its future mintage, as they are trying to do with silver; every one knows that it would immediately decline in value, as its purchasing power would be destroyed. It would cease to be a medium of exchange, and consequently its value would depend on the demand for its use in the arts.

It seems to me to be impertinent and in bad taste for bankers and gold-holders, who have secured the debasement of silver by questionable methods, to now come before Congress and the country and assert that, because silver bullion is below gold bullion, we should not coin it at the existing ratio, because it would be a dishonest dollar. Let us pause a moment and inquire on which side of this question stands the dishonest dollar. Was it honest to destroy the silver dollar in 1873, when it was at a premium of 3 per cent above gold?

After the money quality of silver was destroyed, was it honest for the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. SHERMAN, to receive \$80,000,000 gold deposit for silver certificates?

Was it honest treatment of silver, after this question had been settled at the polls by the people who elected Representatives from both of the great political parties pledged to the restoration of silver, for an unfriendly President and Senate to force an unsatisfactory compromise limiting its coinage, as was done in 1878?

After its coinage was suspended by the act of 1890, is it honest to contend that the silver dollar is a dishonest dollar because its bullion value is less than that of gold?

Treat silver as gold and it will be its companion and its equal. Take one of your horses, abuse him, maltreat him, turn him out on the commons to gather his food, will he be as useful, as serviceable, and as salable as his well-fed companion whom you protect from cold, hunger, and want?

The fact is, the silver dollar is the only honest dollar this country ever had, and I may go further and say that the bullion value of the silver dollar, though beset with enemies on every hand, is still an honest dollar. This statement, I know, will not be accepted by the gold bullionaires, but I will establish its truth by incontrovertible evidence. I appeal to the farmers, the producing classes in every part of the country, to bear witness to the fact, that the bullion value of a silver dollar will buy as much or more of the products of the farm than it ever did before.

By an examination of the following table, compiled from the official reports by the Bureau of Statistics and the Directors of the Mint, the truth of my proposition will be shown.

I used this table and substantially the same argument I now make in a speech I delivered in Congress March 23, 1892. I have added to the table then used the bullion value of the silver dollar for the years named.

Anyone doubting the correctness of the table can find its verification by referring to page 8, Bureau of Statistics, Foreign Commerce, for the year 1891, and Director of Mint Report on Production of Metals for 1890, page 223, and for 1892, page 30.

Year.	In the home markets.			Bullion value silver dollar.	Silver per fine ounce.*
	Cotton per pound.	Corn per bushel.	Wheat per bushel.		
1872	12.3	70	\$1.47	\$1.03	\$1.32
1873	13.8	62	1.31	1.00	1.29
1874	15.4	72	1.43	.98	1.27
1875	15.0	85	1.12	.96	1.24
1876	12.9	67	1.24	.89	1.15
1877	11.8	54	1.17	.92	1.20
1878	11.1	56	1.34	.89	1.15
1879	9.9	47	1.07	.86	1.12
1880	11.5	54	1.25	.88	1.14
1881	11.4	55	1.11	.88	1.13
1882	11.4	67	1.19	.87	1.13
1883	10.8	68	1.13	.85	1.11
1884	10.5	61	1.07	.86	1.11
1885	10.6	54	.86	.82	1.06
1886	9.9	50	.87	.76	.99
1887	9.5	48	.89	.75	.97
1888	9.8	55	.85	.72	.93
1889	9.9	47	.90	.72	.93
1890	10.2	49	.83	.80	1.04
1891	6.0	41	.85	.76	.90
1892				.67	

*The coinage value of an ounce of pure silver is \$1.29.

As silver depreciated in value a corresponding decrease in the value of farm products followed, as shown by the above table.

It will be further seen from the above table that in 1873 the value of the bullion in a silver dollar was of the value of \$1. It was then on a parity with gold. Cotton was then worth over 18 cents a pound. Therefore the bullion value of a silver dollar

would buy 5½ pounds of cotton, about 1½ bushels of corn, and about two-thirds of 1 bushel of wheat.

In 1880 the bullion value of a silver dollar had dropped down to 83 cents; still it bought as much or more of the products of the farm than in 1873. It bought about 7½ pounds of cotton, 1½ bushels of corn, and a fraction over two-thirds of a bushel of wheat. The bullion in the silver dollar again went down. In 1885 it was 82 cents. It bought, however, nearly 8 pounds of cotton, 1½ bushels of corn, and 1 bushel of wheat, lacking 4 cents. The bullion value continued to drop and with it all farm products. The bullion value of the silver dollar in 1891 was 76 cents. Still, at this value, it bought 12½ pounds of cotton, nearly 2 bushels of corn, and nearly 1 bushel of wheat.

By a simple calculation it can be seen that during all the years from 1872 to 1892, as the bullion value of silver as compared with gold declined, the farm products also declined in nearly the same proportion. This shows that silver is a better measure of value of the products of labor than gold. In other words, it is an honest dollar. It is gold that is the dishonest dollar, as by corrupt legislation it has been made to buy more of the product of labor than it did when it was on a parity with silver, to which free coinage would again bring it. It is just as accurate to call the gold dollar a 155-cent dollar as to call the silver dollar a 70-cent dollar. As before stated, all values are comparative.

The relative value of silver and farm products have been nearly uniform. It is not silver that has depreciated, but it is gold that has appreciated. To repeal the Sherman law without restoring the coinage of silver establishes the single gold standard, which means to still further reduce the value of silver and the products of the farms, the shops, and the mines.

Heretofore Democratic orators have justly and truthfully denounced the high protective tariff laws, especially the McKinley law, as legal robbery, because they taxed the great masses for the benefit of the few. Is it any less robbery to strike down half the money of the people, and thereby enable the gold-holder to purchase the products of labor at half their value?

How the representatives of honest laboring people can vote to do this is not plain to me. Nor is it plain to me how Democrats and Republicans can stand on the declarations of principles contained in their respective platforms, as both declared for bimetallism, and vote to do this.

The Democratic party is by its declaration of principles committed to bimetallism. It declared in its platform of 1880 that it was in favor of "honest money, consisting of gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin on demand."

The Democratic platform of 1884, on which Mr. Cleveland was elected, as well as a Democratic House, declared that—

We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss.

In 1888, when the Democratic platform, made no specific reference to money, but only reaffirmed the previous platform, the party was defeated.

In 1892, when the party boldly spoke out in favor of the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, the party was again successful. Here is what the platform says. After denouncing the Sherman law and demanding its repeal, it says:

We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal or charge for mintage, but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, or be adjusted through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts; and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

I repeat, therefore, that the Democratic party is committed to the free use of both gold and silver. It is as well known now as it was fifteen years ago, or as it will be known fifteen years hence, that we can never secure bimetallism as long as we allow Europe to dictate our financial policy. If we expect "an international agreement" to be tendered to us on a golden plate we will be mistaken.

We must force Europe to respect our financial system, as it is dependent on us, to a great extent, for the material for bread and clothing. Whenever we establish a sensible financial system based on bimetallism and will cease to make war on silver we will have all the "safe goods" necessary to maintain the parity of the metals. We never hear any talk of an international agreement to restore a parity of the metals until an effort is made to remonetize silver, but the moment such an effort is made a howl is raised about an international adjustment.

Our domestic commerce is about fifteen times as great as our foreign commerce. Why, then, do we permit one-fifteenth of the business of the country to control the whole and dictate what shall be our medium of exchange?

If the Bland substitute be voted down, and the Wilson bill to repeal the Sherman law be passed, I see nothing but ruin and bankruptcy for the people of the South and West. We will be left in the hands of merciless bankers and gold holders.

While I do not now intend to express any opinion in regard to the establishment of State banks, I think the 10 per cent tax on such banks should be repealed, and the question left to the people of the States to determine what they will do.

The States are sovereign, and Congress has no constitutional power by taxation to prevent the States from supplying their people with a medium of exchange when Congress fails to do so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. ABBOTT, until Monday next, on account of sickness.

CHANGE OF HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the session to-morrow morning may commence at 10 o'clock, instead of 11.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that to-morrow morning the session may commence at 10 o'clock, instead of 11. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHARLES W. STONE] is willing to occupy the floor, beginning at 10 o'clock in the morning. So that, if there be no objection, the session in the morning will begin at 10 o'clock. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, it is suggested by some gentlemen on my left that during the remainder of the week the sessions had better commence at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the session, then, for the remainder of the week will begin at 10 o'clock. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. It being nearly the hour for recess, without objection, the Chair will now declare the House in recess until 8 o'clock this evening, the evening session to be devoted to debate on the pending bill only, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] will discharge the duties of the Chair.

Accordingly the House (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) was declared in recess.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., resumed its session (Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee in the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*).

SILVER.

The House resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to repeal a part of an act, approved July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes."

Mr. ELLIS, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, There appears to be no conflict of opinion that some pernicious influence is seriously affecting the business and financial interests of the country. It is equally agreed that this malady, whatever it may be, has spread to almost every community and threatens, unless speedily arrested, to culminate in the bankruptcy and ruin of many enterprises and industries upon which the country largely depends for prosperity. If we were to look abroad we would discover, I think, conditions quite similar to those which affect our own domestic affairs. But it is with reference to our own interests, and with a view of arresting evils that prevail at home, as far as that may be done by mere legislative enactment, that this body has been convened in extraordinary session.

The good temper which has prevailed throughout this discussion justifies the belief that this body, without reference to political bias, is in a frame of mind to deal with the question submitted to it in the manner best calculated to relieve not only the business interests of the country from what appears to be a perilous situation, but in a manner that will be best calculated to benefit all classes and to benefit them all alike.

Although entertaining strong convictions and fixed opinions of my own, I do not hesitate to say that I am both willing and anxious to concede much of my own individual judgment in order to meet in a spirit of fair and just compromise the views and opinions of those who may differ from me as to what the true financial policy of the United States should be. I am all the more willing to do this that the purpose for which this body was assembled may be accomplished, and that whatever relief is to result from our action may be promptly granted.

It is assumed by the advocates of the bill introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON], the object of which is to repeal the purchase clause of the so-called Sherman act, that our present financial stringency and business depression is due exclusively to the operation of that law. While I do not concur in that view, but dissent from it in the most unqualified manner, and while I find no trouble in believing that the Sherman law has had very little to do with bringing about the situation from which we desire

to be relieved, I am quite ready to cooperate with those who seek its repeal, if any fair or reasonable substitute providing for the continued use of silver is adopted in its stead.

Believing silver, equally with gold should be treated as a money of ultimate payment—a legal tender for every debt, public and private, and that gold and silver ought to be coined at the present ratio of 16 to 1, I am still willing to agree with those who do not share that opinion, on some other ratio—on any ratio that will make and keep the silver dollar as good as the gold dollar. But while being willing to make the concessions already indicated, I may state here and now with all the emphasis I possess that I can not, under any state of case, support the pending measure, unless some amendment authorizing the future coinage of silver is now engrafted upon that bill.

The bill before us and which will pass into the legislative history of the country as the Wilson bill, while it looks on its face as innocent and as genuine as its author, will be far more reaching in its consequences, if it succeed, than might at first blush be supposed. Its passage means more than the simple repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman act. If that were all it meant, and if that were the only effect it would have on the financial affairs of the country, its passage would not be calculated to provoke serious opposition in any quarter. But that is not what it means. It means to strike out bimetallicism; it means an outright abandonment of the double standard, a system to which the Government has adhered for a century; a system which has the sanction of many centuries.

When the Wilson bill becomes a law this Government will be on a single gold basis; we will as effectively and as completely have demonetized silver as England did more than fifty years ago, and as Germany did twenty years ago. No such proposition as that can have my support or sanction, and while it is no part of my purpose to question the motives or challenge the good faith of others, I can not refrain from expressing the belief that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] was entirely accurate the other day when he said, in his speech, that the members of this House who voted for any proposition having for its purpose the demonetization of silver, especially those representing agricultural districts in the South and West, would have abundant leisure to study the financial question at home after their present commissions had expired. If the object of the pending measure is not to change our system from a bimetallic to that of a monometallic system and to discontinue the future use of silver as a coin of ultimate payment, what valid reason exists why some suitable provision for the future coinage and use of silver should not be inserted into the bill; why should the bill not be perfected so as to settle once and for all the financial question, at least so far as we are concerned.

The Sherman law repealed the Bland act, or so much of it as required the monthly purchase and coinage of not less than \$2,000,000 or more than \$4,000,000 of silver per month. If we are going now to repeal the only law which provides for the use of silver in any form, ought we not, at the same time, to provide by suitable legislation for its future coinage if the use of silver is to be further continued? With those who criticize the Sherman law I have no controversy; I was among the number who voted against its passage; but bad as I believe that law to be, vicious in principle, as I am quite sure it is, it is the last fragment left of bimetallicism in this country, or more properly speaking, it is the last obstruction that stands in the way of those who are bent upon the destruction of silver and the establishment of a single standard of gold.

Under the present law we have been able to add something like \$4,000,000 monthly to our volume of currency, and while bimetallicism is in no manner responsible for the presence of the Sherman law on our statute book, they can not afford, in order to get rid of it, to vote for a bill that demonetizes silver and establishes a single standard of gold, as the present bill proposes to do. But we are invited to support this bill and to trust to the future for such silver legislation as may be proper and necessary. This is advice which no prudent man, who conscientiously believes that this country needs all the gold and silver it has or can get as its circulating medium, would be likely to heed.

When the bill under consideration becomes a law, if it ever does, the last hope of bimetallicism for many years to come in this country will be gone, and we had as well understand and appreciate that fact now; and those professing to be the friends of bimetallicism who vote for this measure, much as they may dislike to do so, must assume the responsibility of having demonetized silver and of placing our monetary system in line with England and Germany, whose systems are a single standard of gold. For no man who reads this bill can doubt, for a moment, what its effect on silver will be; in fact it seems to have been conceded throughout this discussion that the purpose of the bill is to discontinue the further coinage and use of silver as a standard money of the country.

Though believing that this country is amply able to maintain the two metals on a parity at the present ratio of 16 to 1, and while believing that the best interests of all classes of people demand the adoption of that policy if it shall be insisted that ratio can not be maintained, I am ready, as already observed, to agree upon some other ratio which would "insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all

times in the markets and in payment of debts." But if all propositions to agree upon a fair and just ratio are rejected by the advocates of the pending measure and all efforts of compromise refused, I am unable to perceive how the friends of bimetallicism can do otherwise than conclude that the fixed purpose of those who oppose the use of silver as a legal-tender money is to cast it out as a base metal no longer worthy of a place in our financial system. Believing such to be the object of the bill, convinced that its passage would accomplish the results I have indicated, it can never become a law with my sanction nor by my vote.

I had supposed, Mr. Speaker, when my colleague [Governor McCREARY] arose to address the House the other day that he would adhere to the position he had uniformly occupied here and elsewhere. I had always regarded him not only a friend of the coinage of silver, but one of the ablest defenders of the bimetallic standard; and you may imagine my surprise, Mr. Speaker, when my colleague declared that he had so far lost faith in the doctrine of bimetallicism that he was unwilling to vote for the further coinage of silver.

Mr. McCREARY, of Kentucky. Will my friend allow me to interrupt him?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky. I do, of course.

Mr. McCREARY of Kentucky. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that I have lost faith in bimetallicism or changed the position that I had taken before. In 1884, in this House, I voted to stand upon the Bland-Allison act, which required the coinage of not less than \$2,000,000 worth of silver per month nor more than \$4,000,000 worth per month. That is the way I voted in 1884. I stated distinctly on last Saturday that I was a bimetallicist; that I believed in the double standard; that I believed in gold and silver, and the proposition now for the free coinage of silver, in my opinion, when all the countries of Europe had demonetized silver or suspended its coinage, and India, had closed her mints, it was not advisable for us at this time. If we adopt free coinage of silver now, there is danger of leading to a silver basis, and I am opposed to coming to a silver basis because I am in favor of gold and silver both.

I wish to call attention to the fact that a gold and silver commission, consisting of twelve able men, was appointed to look into the change that had taken place in the relative values of silver and gold, and into the question of bimetallicism, and that, after that commission in England, consisting of six bimetallicists and six monometallicists, had considered the subject, they reported that—

Neither metal alone exists in sufficient quantities to serve as a sole standard without causing such a change in the level of prices as to amount to a financial and commercial revolution.

No settlement of the difficulty is, however, possible without international action. The remedy we suggest is essentially international in its character, and its details must be settled in concert with the other powers concerned. The essential features of the agreement to be arrived at are:

Free coinage of both metals into legal-tender money.

The fixing of a ratio at which the coins of either metal shall be available for the payment of all debts at the option of the debtor.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no desire to misrepresent the position of my friend or to do him the slightest injustice. But he has announced his purpose to vote for this bill which discontinues the coinage of silver and to vote against the amendments offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]; that is his present position, and it is, I insist, hostile to silver. My colleague says he voted for the Bland-Allison act, but that act was repealed in 1890, and one of the pending amendments proposes, if all propositions for free coinage are defeated, to substitute the Bland-Allison act for the present law, and my colleague will vote against that. I fail to discover anything friendly to silver in that position. On the contrary, it is precisely the position occupied by those who do not hesitate to say that they are opposed to bimetallicism and in favor of a single gold standard.

Mr. McCREARY. When we pass the bill now pending it will not change in any respect the \$700,000,000 of gold that we have in the United States or the \$600,000,000 of silver, or any of the other currencies. In other words, when we pass the bill known as the Wilson bill we still leave gold dollars and silver dollars and Treasury notes and other money exactly as they are now, neither reduced in value nor impaired in legal-tender quality. On the contrary, the bill pledges that we will maintain the legal-tender quality of the silver in the United States, and that we will preserve the parity of gold and silver.

I desire to make the further statement that conditions have changed.

Mr. ELLIS of Kentucky. Will my friend mention the changes, especially the changes that have taken place since 1892, when our party pledged itself to the free coinage of both gold and silver?

Mr. McCREARY. In 1884 the whole product of the world's silver was only \$90,000,000. The world's product of silver last year was \$190,000,000. The product of silver in the United States in 1884 was \$40,000,000. Last year the product was \$75,000,000. Now, I hold that as the product last year of the world's silver has more than doubled, and as the product of silver in the United States has about doubled, and as all those countries that bought silver from us have either suspended its coinage or demonetized it, there is now no market for our silver, and, therefore, if we adopt free coinage

the silver of the United States and of the world at large will come to our mints, and the result will be that we shall be put upon a silver basis, which I am opposed to.

I want to say again that I am as much the friend of silver now as I ever was. I am in favor of both gold and silver, and, while I know that my friend from Kentucky [Mr. ELLIS] is honest and sincere in his views, I know that I am as honest and as sincere as he is. I believe that the path I marked out, or tried to mark out, when I addressed the House last Saturday is the true one. I believe that in order to have free coinage of silver we must have an international agreement, or several of the leading nations of the world must agree upon free coinage at the same ratio and then it may be established and maintained. I believe that the United States with France and the countries that constitute the Latin Union can maintain that system, and whenever they agree to it then we shall have free coinage.

In 1884 I was in favor of coining \$2,000,000 of silver monthly and I am now in favor of coining this amount monthly. I believe that unemployed labor, shrinkage in values, closed banks, depressed condition of trade, and the hard times prevailing all over the country demand the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act. We should do this quickly.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague fails to point out wherein conditions have changed, but seems to have unlimited faith that an international conference can alone solve this financial problem for us, he evidently has no faith in the ability of Congress to do it. If an international conference is my colleague's only hope for the free coinage of silver, it is a hope which he will never realize unless this country takes the initiative, which it is able to do and ought to do, as I will try to show before I conclude.

Mr. McCREARY. How many of your colleagues are with you in your present position?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. ELLIS. I decline to yield further, but will reply to the inquiry of my friend by saying that I do not know how many of my colleagues stand with me on this question now, but I do know that ever since I have been a member of this body, all of my colleagues on this side of the House have uniformly voted for the free coinage of silver whenever that proposition has been submitted; and much as I would regret to part company with them now I am prepared to do it if they vote for this bill.

I have seen nothing in supposed changed conditions that would authorize me now to cast my vote for any proposition having for its purpose the demonetization of silver, and glad as I always am to be able to agree with my colleagues I can not afford to agree with them when to do so I am required to surrender a principle which I believe is right. I am glad I have the courage to stand for what I believe to be right, even though I should be obliged to part company with all my colleagues.

I am content to trust my course in this matter to the manhood and patriotism of my people, absolutely sure that they will justify it. [Loud applause.]

WHY SHOULD SILVER BE DEMONETIZED?

What fact has transpired, or what change in condition demands that the further use of silver, as money, should cease? Just a little more than a year ago it was the unanimous judgment of the Democratic party assembled in national convention that silver, equally with gold, was a valuable money metal, and as such entitled to coinage on equal terms with gold. I have not heard of any change in the situation since, that would either justify or excuse the Democratic majority of this House now, if it should disregard the solemn pledges and promises made in its party's platform last year.

One of the reasons assigned by my colleague and those who think with him why we ought to abandon the further use of silver seems to be based on the belief that the United States can not maintain bimetallicism except as the cooperation of the countries of Europe can be first obtained, and that an attempt to do so would result in putting this country on a silver basis. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] in his remarks the other day assumed the rôle of a prophet, and predicted that if we attempted to maintain bimetallicism the result would be that our gold "would take wings and fly away." If he had examined the record he would have discovered that precisely the same prophecy was indulged in by those who opposed the passage of the Bland-Allison act, of 1878. They said then that the coinage of fifty millions of silver dollars would have the effect to drive all the gold out of the country.

There was coined under the Bland act about \$378,000,000, and yet our gold failed to seek more favored clime; on the contrary we steadily accumulated gold. From \$312,199,979, the amount of gold on hand in this country at the passage of the Bland act, it increased until, on the 1st day of January, 1889, according to the report of the Director of the Mint, the amount of gold, coin and bullion, in the United States was \$704,608,169, an increase of \$392,408,190, in ten years. The average annual product of gold in the United States since 1878, excluding the amount used in the arts, is estimated at \$20,000,000. It thus appears that under the operation of the Bland law, we not only kept

at home all the gold we produced, but got from other countries about \$152,408,190 in addition to the amount we produced.

The gentleman from Tennessee, and those who agree with him now, must rely on something more trustworthy than prophecies which have already been demonstrated to be false if they expect to convince the judgment of others. Of course, it is the height of folly to attempt to maintain silver and gold at a parity as long as the former metal is deprived of the monetary functions accorded to gold. While gold is protected by the Government and as long as silver is boycotted and outlawed, the most hopeful bimetalist would hardly expect that the parity of the two metals could be maintained at any ratio.

This discrimination in favor of one and against the other metal is precisely what bimetalists complain of; what they insist upon is that both gold and silver shall be placed upon an equal footing before the law, and until that is done there can be no reasonable hope that the silver dollar will be equal in its commercial value to the coin value of a dollar in gold. But with a fair and equal chance, silver, if its past history proves anything, would at once come into use as money in the true sense and would prove as efficient and as powerful in quickening the pulse of commerce as gold. It would set in motion as many wheels, turn as many spindles, and move as many bushels of corn and wheat, as many bales of cotton, and give as much employment to labor dollar for dollar as gold.

Recent declines in the market value of silver bullion are also pointed out as additional evidence of the folly of any further attempt to maintain the parity between silver and gold. But those who rely upon this circumstance as justifying the character of legislation proposed by this bill ought not to overlook the fact that these declines in the market value of silver bullion are largely, if not exclusively, due to the unfriendly and discriminating character of the legislation which deprives silver of its function as a money of ultimate payment; for it must be remembered that under the present law silver is no longer money in fact, but only the representative of gold. But those who insist upon the use of silver claim and what they are justified in insisting upon is that if silver is restored to its legal-tender status and made by law a coin of ultimate redemption its commercial value would become its coin value, and that value would be equal to the commercial or coin value of gold.

It has been repeatedly stated here that any attempt on the part of this Government to maintain bimetalism and to keep silver at a parity with gold would require the United States to take all the surplus silver which other nations would certainly bring to our mints; and while professing great solicitude for silver and sincerely desiring to continue its use, these gentlemen tell us that the only hope for bimetalism is an international monetary conference, which may or may not be held at some indefinite period in the future, and that in the meantime the only wise policy we can adopt is to discontinue altogether the use of silver and join with the countries of Europe in a general scramble for gold. If gentlemen are in earnest about the use of silver and candidly believe an international conference is the only channel through which we may reasonably hope to reach a satisfactory solution to the financial problem, I ask them whether or not, as the speediest and surest means of bringing about such a conference, it is not incumbent on us to take the initiative and thus demonstrate in good faith our attachment to bimetalism and our purpose to maintain it by at once entering upon that policy.

How can we, having a larger interest in the silver question than any other nation, reasonably expect to secure the cooperation of others in the use of silver money as long as we refuse its free use ourselves? We must first make an honest effort by placing silver on an equal footing with gold before we can consistently ask other people to adopt a similar policy. Until we do this it is idle to talk about solving this problem by an international monetary conference. When we have acted in the matter ourselves other nations will be glad to treat with us.

In support of the correctness of this I cite the following:

A recent speech of Lord Balfour's, late prime minister of England, indicates clearly that other nations are hoping for our action in this direction. Surely we, who have a stronger interest than any other nation in sustaining the value of silver, ought to take the initiative in our own behalf. An international monetary conference can only be asked for with self-respect when the United States shall have shown other nations that she has the courage to act for herself in her own interest before asking their cooperation to help her help herself.

It is a trite old adage that "He who would be free himself must strike the blow." But we have appeared in three international monetary conferences as a party self-maimed; committed to an illogical policy of duplicity; asking help to steer toward a harbor of financial safety, after having sailed away from it of our own volition, and while continuing to sail away from it. No ability of our delegates, exceptionally able as they were, could extricate our Government from the humiliating position they occupied in such conferences. American ears have tingled with shame to hear from foreign representatives—"If your Government believes in bimetalism, why does not your Government vote for it and adopt it? None so much interested as yourselves in doing it."

But whether we secure the desired cooperation of others or not, this country is able to maintain bimetalism without the aid of outside influence, and this is the opinion of many of the ablest economists and best financiers of the country. Being able to do so, a refusal on our part to at least make an honest effort in that direction indicates either a fixed purpose on the part of the Government to

abandon bimetalism, or exhibits an absence of that independent spirit which has always characterized us as a nation. In the first place, all the dread apprehensions of those who profess to believe that an avalanche of Europe's silver would bury us beneath its ruin are without foundation. Those who express or entertain such fears are in dread of evils that will never occur.

The stock of foreign silver consists almost exclusively of coin and circulates freely at home, while silver abroad is coined at a less ratio with gold than it is here. To melt all this silver into bullion and bring it here to be received would entail ruinous loss on its owners, which fact is in itself a sufficient guaranty that none of Europe's silver would seek recoinage at our mints, if we should now throw them open to the world. Mr. William P. St. John, president of the Mercantile National Bank of New York, a gentleman of great learning and financial ability, discussing this very question in an address to the American Bankers' Association at New Orleans, 1891, clearly demonstrated how groundless were the fears of those who believed a flood of foreign silver would deluge us, should we establish bimetalism. He said:

Europe's only stock of silver is her money. Europe's primary silver money is the unlimited legal-tender equivalent of her gold. As such it circulates in settlement of every day's transactions. As such it constitutes a liberal share of the coin reserves which Europe's great banks accumulate for the liquidation of their vast liabilities, including the redemption of their circulating notes. This European standard coin values silver at 359.91 grains to the dollar. Our mints exact 371.25 grains of pure silver for our standard dollar. Thus, 11.34 grains would be Europe's first sacrifice, with loss of weight and transportation costs additional, in every dollar for dollar exchange of Europe's standard silver coin for ours. Or, more intelligibly: Europe's silver money which circulates at home at 100 cents would recoin at our free mints into less than 97 cents.

Next, if Europe's pursuit is presumed to be our gold, let it be understood that equally free coinage for gold and silver is only a promise of gold coin for gold, and of silver coin for silver. Therefore in order to obtain our gold for silver Europeans must bargain with the owners of our gold, after the recoinage of their silver into our standard silver dollars. In this contemplation, and in words now memorable: "Unless the Yankee has lost his quick scent of danger and forgotten his cunning * * * probably before the swiftest ocean greyhound could land her silver cargo in New York, the last gold dollar within reach would be hidden safely away * * * to be brought out only by a high premium on gold." Upon experience of high premiums on gold in the United States, 10 per cent would appear to be moderate, as a high premium. Add 10 per cent, as premium on gold, to over 3 per cent lost in the exchange of silver at our mints, and 13 per cent will be the premium first cost which Europe is to contemplate. Thirteen per cent of \$1,100,000,000, or \$143,000,000, will be Europe's sacrifice in contemplation, therefore, if she will thus exchange her silver for our gold.

If Europeans are to pursue our gold so ardently, our proposed measure, if enacted, will enable our Secretary of the Treasury to defeat them. He need only follow the course by which the Bank of France maintains the parity of their gold and silver coins acceptably in France. He need only exercise the option we propose for him, and redeem the United States notes in silver only, refusing gold, upon every slightest proof that foreign silver money threatens our reopened mints. But unless these Europeans differ altogether from Americans, they will not make the estimated necessary sacrifice, or any sacrifice at all, in order to exchange their equivalent silver money for our gold. Yet, if I may tax your patience with details, note further:

England will not seek our reopened mints with her coined silver, all of it subsidiary coin. She has increased its volume recently, to the profit of her Government, substituting silver coin for light-weight gold half sovereigns. This English subsidiary coin values silver at 348.3 grains to the dollar. One hundred cents of it would, therefore, yield only 93.8 cents of our standard silver coin.

Germany does not threaten our mints with silver. She too is minting subsidiary coin. Her only other stock of silver are thaler pieces, in all about \$107,000,000. These silver thalers are unlimited legal tender in Germany at about the French valuation of silver; at which 100 cents would recoin into less than 97 cents at our free mints. About \$55,300,000 of these silver thalers, together with about \$118,400,000 gold, constituted the legal-tender coin reserves of Germany's Imperial Bank at a recent date. When Germany sold silver it had been received as a part of a vast indemnity from France during 1871 to 1873. All except about \$5,000,000 of it, *i. e.*, about \$5,200,000 ounces, was sold before the end of 1879. The remaining sales, in dribbles, were made to clean up. Within two years after Germany's selling was completed it was reported that Bismarck sighed, repiningly, that "gold has become as scarce as a coverlet too scant for two persons, so that each must struggle for a share."

Spain does not threaten us with her silver. The Bank of Spain, whose charter was extended last July for thirty years, was then authorized to enlarge her issue of circulating notes to the gross sum of \$300,000,000, but under the requirement that her coin reserves are to be maintained strictly at not less than 33 1/3 per cent. Spain is now coining full legal-tender silver liberally, at the French ratio, on Government account. One hundred cents of it would recoin into less than 97 cents of our standard money.

The Netherlands and Belgium reported recently the following reserves of coin in bank: Netherlands, \$29,800,000 of silver, with \$17,700,000 in gold; Belgium, \$7,200,000 of silver, with \$14,500,000 of gold. Switzerland is not feared. Her difficulty is to keep a sufficiency of both gold and silver at home, as against the natural gravitation of both toward France in trade. Belgium suffers similarly in less degree.

Italy does not threaten us with silver. Her treasury and banks combined, showed a total stock of silver barely exceeding \$20,300,000, while her stock of gold exceeds \$88,200,000. The sum of her notes outstanding exceeding \$283,000,000. In 1883, under an act of 1881, Italy sold bonds for gold and silver, and redeemed with both a total of \$107,000,000 of her notes. Failing thereafter to complete her note redemption, or to maintain sufficient coin reserves to assure redemptions on demand, she has subsequently continued under a suspension of specie payments. She will need all her gold and silver, and more of both, in order to resume.

Austria-Hungary has been suspected of desiring to sell her silver. For answer, note that, while we are usually debtor to Austria in trade, Austria is invariably debtor to India. Her settlements range between \$9,000,000 and \$16,000,000 for a year. Yet Austria does not recoin her suspected "surplus silver" in British India; but settles in the equivalent of gold by purchasing council bills in London or kindred gold exchange. A recent press dispatch reported: "There is little prospect of the speedy establishment of a gold currency in Austria-Hungary. Dr. Steinbeck, the new Austrian finance minister, is opposed to any course that would tend to weaken or impair the confidence of trade."

The altogether safer dismissal of our fear of Austria's silver, however, is her financial condition reported recently as follows: Her bank's resources, against all its vast liabilities, were \$27,300,000 of gold with \$81,500,000 of silver. Her total note issues were \$229,500,000. No pretense is made of redeeming these paper is-

gues on demand. They are accepted for Government revenues, and are legal tender for private debts.

Russia is not threatening us with silver. A million dollars will cover her accumulated stock of silver; \$162,300,000 was her recently reported stock of gold. And Russia does not pretend to redeem her \$807,300,000 of rouble paper in either coin.

Lastly, France does not threaten us with silver. And yet the estimated sum of silver in bank and afloat in France exceeds \$700,000,000, together with \$900,000,000 gold. Her population is almost stationary at about 38,000,000. Her traders establish such relations to the foreigner that France is the accumulator of the money metals among nations generally, in her international trade. Unless M. Leon Say has blundered, France has adopted "a waiting policy" * * * being committed to the bimetallic standard." France can afford to wait and contentedly permit her merchants to establish title to foreign gold. If, by our legislation, supported by the aid assured us elsewhere, the United States enhances the market price of silver to a parity of value for the gold and silver contained in our gold and silver dollars, the inducement to continue a waiting policy on the part of France is made to disappear. The act of France will dictate the policy of her neighbors.

The stock of silver in the Bank of France has occasioned some concern. About \$25,000,000 of it is Italian coin and about \$20,000,000 is Belgian coin. Circulating in France by treaty it is accepted as French money, but is subject to demand upon Belgium and Italy, at the end of any year, for the redemption of it in gold at par. Our mints can not attract it at a discount, a discount of 3.05 per cent, and loss in weight additional. The total stock of silver in the Bank of France approaches \$251,300,000. Her stock of gold exceeds \$202,900,000. But if reasons, not evident, exist to necessitate the exchange of silver for gold by this Bank of France, or by the French people generally (the Government owns no silver), India's mints are open to their silver money at a premium. As remarked, 137.8 cents is India's mint price per ounce, and 129.3 cents is our mint price (stated in terms of our primary money).

France, too, is debtor in trade with India, invariably. Sometimes, to an amount exceeding \$40,000,000 for the year. During this current year, 1891, due to her short crop of wheat, France may establish a trade-debt to India exceeding \$50,000,000, or \$5,000,000 more than the total sum of Belgian and Italian silver in the bank of France.

But the entire stock of silver in the Bank of France is money. As such it is not governed as bullion is, by market price. As unlimited legal-tender money, it is as serviceable to that bank as her stock of gold is for the liquidation of vast liabilities. It has been accumulated to constitute, together with her gold, the coin reserves maintained to assure the liquidation of her liabilities, including redemptions of her circulating notes. Thus available for the liquidation of her debts at par, her stock of silver is not a burden but a buttress to the bank of France. With her total sum of circulating notes exceeding \$609,000,000, and a total stock of silver barely exceeding \$251,300,000, and all this silver applicable to redemptions of these notes at par, the Bank of France is not more concerned about the "bullion value" of her "lawful-money" silver, than the national banks of the United States are concerned about the paper value of United States legal-tender notes.

A vain search, therefore: The impending flood of Europe's silver at our mints!

But if imagination is still unsatisfied that Europe's silver will not denude us of our gold, recollect that Europe's money is deficient by 3.05 per cent for an exchange with us of silver coin for silver coin. Remember, too, that Europe's silver circulates in coin, and her coin is old. It will therefore shrink importantly in melting. The very moderate total shrinkage of 5 per cent of \$1,100,000,000 of Europe's silver would contract her currency by \$55,000,000. Think of this minimum contraction of her currency as Europe's entirely voluntary sacrifice in rejecting silver to obtain our gold. Remember that this sum exceeds by \$25,000,000 the entire world's aggregate annual increase of money, if gold is the only acceptable coin. Allot to Europeans about as little sagacity as we modestly accord ourselves. And, finally, if I mistake not, "The Impending Avalanche of Europe's Silver" will rank, hereafter, with "Alibaba and The Forty Thieves."

But assume, for the sake of argument, that all the silver of Europe, in the case of reopening our mints, should pour in upon us, what would be the result if we got it all? It is estimated that all the silver of the world, reckoned on the ratio at which it is coined here, is worth \$3,800,000,000. The population of the United States at present estimate is about 67,000,000, so that if all the silver, saved from the minings of all ages were suddenly turned loose upon us it would be only about \$54.28 per capita, just about the amount of money constantly in use in France. But the business of the countries of Europe can not be carried on without silver, and I do not suppose that even the most timid would estimate the amount of silver which could possibly come in any event at over one-half of that which is held abroad, but there is no foundation for the belief that any of it would come.

Whenever it is enacted by law that 371½ grains of pure silver shall command \$1 at our mints we insure the use of that metal in our rapidly developing domestic trade, which is by far of more importance to us than our foreign trade, and this domestic use of our silver, it is confidently asserted by those who are in a position to know, would maintain the money parity of our gold and silver permanently. It is a familiar doctrine in which the highest authorities all agree, that the value of money does not depend upon the intrinsic value of the material of which it is composed. This fact understood and appreciated, much of the confusion that exists and much of the argument against the coinage of silver, on account of its alleged depreciated intrinsic value, is disposed of.

The value of money, as such, is not in the metal, but in the stamp. "The logic of the situation and the reasoning of all the leading authorities on money lead irresistibly to the conclusion that its value does not reside in the metal, but in the stamp; in other words, on the legal-tender functions imposed on that material. It is an order for services." (Speech of Hon. JOHN P. JONES.)

Another high authority defines money as follows:

Money by itself * * * has value only by law and not by nature; so that a change of convention between those who use it is sufficient to deprive it of all its value and power to satisfy all our wants.

Another authority of recognized ability defines money as follows:

Anything which freely circulates from hand to hand as a common acceptable medium of exchange in any country, is in such country money, even though it cease to be such, or to possess any value in passing into another country. In a

word, an article is determined to be money by reason of the performance by it of certain functions without regard to its form or substance.

If the foregoing definitions of money correctly define it, both debtors and creditors ought to be satisfied that silver money, equally with gold, if placed upon the same basis, would be "good money." Creditors who insist that their obligations should be paid in "the best money" would at least find no room to complain that they were not paid in the money of the contract, for both gold and silver being a legal tender the one would be as good as the other and neither a cheap or a bad money.

It has also been suggested in the course of this discussion that the increased production of silver has rendered it impossible to further maintain the parity between gold and silver. We have already seen that mere intrinsic value is not the standard by which good money is measured. But the increased yield of our silver mines furnish no grounds for the apprehension that we would have an overstock of money if we coined and put into circulation every dollar of silver and gold bullion our mines yield. The increased production of the mines has not been in advance of the increase in population and business, an increasing population and developing business enterprises demand a corresponding increase in the volume of money.

When population and business are taken into account, it will be found that there is no foundation for the much talked of overproduction of silver, as illustrating this I quote from a paper recently prepared by Mr. St. John, of New York, in which the subject of overproduction of silver is exhaustively discussed and disposed of.

ALLEGED EXCESSIVE PRODUCTION OF SILVER.

Indisputable records prohibit the assumption of an excessive production of silver in the world. The entire world's coinage of silver during any period of five years, counting our Treasury absorption as coinage, has exceeded by average the annual production of silver. For the five years ending with 1889 the average annual coinage of silver has exceeded the annual production of silver by \$10,700,000. In 1889 the production exceeded the coinage; but in 1890 (for which I have not figures) our required Treasury absorption was enlarged. The world's records thus manifest a recoinage of foreign moneys by one or more nations, for which a sufficient explanation is India's and China's absorption of Mexican dollars.

Estimates, too moderate to be disputed, of the world's annual gross requirement of silver by average of the five years ending 1889 (ending 1890 for India), are as follows—all at our coin value:

Art consumption in Europe and the United States.....	\$32,500,000
Art and money use of silver in China, Japan, Ceylon, and Africa.....	17,000,000
Retained at home, of their annual production, by Mexico, Central and South America, exceeding.....	8,000,000
Spain and Austria's full-tender and subsidiary, and the subsidiary coinage of the other continental states.....	12,500,000
British India's net absorption, exceeding.....	35,000,000
United States mint absorption prior to 1890, about.....	22,500,000

World's average annual requirement of silver prior to our purchase act of 1890.....	137,500,000
Increase of United States requirement now 54,000,000 ounces, coin value \$70,000,000, less \$32,500,000.....	39,500,000

Total average requirement.....	176,000,000
World's greatest annual production of record.....	165,000,000

Average shortage of annual production of silver for present requirement.....	11,000,000
--	------------

This present yearly excess of gross requirement over the largest production of silver in the world seems to be verified by the record of the United States imports and exports of silver for 1891. During the nine months to October 1, our exports of silver have exceeded our imports of silver by \$5,526,846. It seems further to be confirmed by the year's decrease of about \$7,000,000 in the supply of silver bullion accumulated in New York. The New York accumulation of silver had been caused by fluctuations in the price occasioned by speculations upon the predicted legislation, and was greatest in amount before the act of 1890 became a law.

Although the present relative production of gold and silver is in great disproportion, the disproportion is nothing like so great as it has been at various periods in the past; and experience has shown that the two metals can be maintained at a parity when the yield of each more widely differs than at present. The yield of silver today in proportion to the yield of gold is about 23 to 1. In 1803 and thereabouts the yield of silver was 50½ times the production of gold, and at that time we had no difficulty in keeping gold and silver at a parity at even a less ratio than the present.

As to the cheapened cost of producing silver it is hardly necessary to add anything further on that subject, except to say that the cost of production of a money metal is not and never was a material factor in determining a correct opinion on the subject. If either gold or silver could be produced in unlimited quantities, at a moderate cost, then the cost of production would cut an important figure, but with the fact of a limited production of the two metals admitted, the relation of supply to demand and not the cost of production will always govern the market value of both metals. This is the settled judgment of those who have bestowed the carefulest consideration on the subject.

CAN THE UNITED STATES MAINTAIN BIMETALLISM WITHOUT THE CO-OPERATION OF OTHER COUNTRIES?

I do not hesitate to express my entire confidence in the ability of this Government to inaugurate and successfully maintain its own financial system regardless of what other countries may do. Richer and more powerful than any other civilized nation it is the sheerest nonsense to argue that we are, so far as our financial system is concerned, at the mercy of the shrewd and selfish governments of Europe. Such an admission is enough to touch the pride of any

man calling himself an American citizen. As illustrative somewhat of the opinion which others have of our ability to adopt and maintain our own independent financial system, I quote the following extract from Sir D. Barbour, British financial secretary of India, in his official report for 1891-'92:

No doubt the people of the United States are warned in some quarters that the adoption of free coinage for silver would lead to the loss of their gold (reduce us to a silver standard) and end in financial ruin. But the same authorities not infrequently warn India that her prosperity depends on her retaining the silver standard. I know no reason why such different results in the case of the two countries should spring from the same cause. * * * The foreign trade of the United States is but a small fraction of its total trade, and there is no nation in the world that is more independent of the foreigner.

France has been often referred to in this discussion and her financial system much discussed. In support of the contention that we are amply able to adopt a financial policy of our own, the following extract, setting forth the success with which France independently of all other nations successfully provided for both the coinage of silver and gold, is not without interest:

During the sixty-nine years following 1803, while the mint laws of all nations differed independently, the mint law of France provided equally unrestricted coinage for the world's spare gold and silver, valuing the silver required for our dollar at 103 cents in gold. In the sixty-nine years \$1,447,329,208 of gold coin and \$917,735,863 of silver 5-franc pieces were emitted from her mints. By voluntary act of the owners of gold and silver France thus obtained so great a volume of coined money in circulation that embarrassments were not possible from occasional flights of either metal in settlements of her international trade. Thus in the period 1811 to 1820, while the world's aggregate production of gold and silver showed 75 per cent silver, \$110,907,676 of gold and \$149,752,376 of silver were coined in France. (In the world's present aggregate production of the money metals only 59 per cent is silver.) During 1841 to 1850, with the aggregate production showing 48 per cent silver and 52 per cent gold, only \$35,157,489 of gold with \$175,845,263 of silver were coined. In 1866 to 1870, with production showing 31 per cent silver and 69 per cent gold, \$227,777,130 of gold and \$51,954,842 of silver were coined.

A conspicuously noteworthy result of such an automatic operation of her mints, under the equally unrestricted coinage law of France, was that in the face of widely varying proportions in the world's relative production of gold and silver, the relative market price of both was thereby maintained at an average of between 1 to 15.48 and 1 to 15.80, her mint valuation being 1 to 15.50. Thus effectually by France alone, the value possessed by either metal in its scarcity was bestowed upon the other in abundance, by decree. Such were the means and the achievements by which France "put a dollar's worth of silver in the dollar," and for sixty-nine years maintained it independently at 100 cents.

With this historic experience of France, who was not producing either gold or silver, for the assurance of the United States—we producing now about 40 per cent of the world's annual output of silver and over \$30,000,000 worth of gold a year—I venture to predict success to the United States if we imitate her example.

What France has so successfully accomplished the United States should not hesitate to attempt. It is an example on which we can rely; a precedent we can not safely afford to ignore. Already we have had too much tinkering with the silver question. To prevent its complete restoration as a money metal, the creditor class, without regard to the interests or rights of debtors, have succeeded in blocking the way for years with mere makeshifts and experiments. The demand now comes from those who have toiled much and sacrificed much for the complete restoration of silver to its rightful place in our monetary system and from which it has been excluded for twenty years. It will not do to redeem a part only of the pledge contained in the Chicago platform and ignore the rest.

It will not do to simply repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, which is demanded by banks and commercial industries, and refuse to keep the promise made to those who toil in the shops, in the mines, and on the farms. We ought to redeem the whole promise in good faith, and no time so fitting in which to do that as the present. I represent a constituency largely engaged in agriculture, a constituency as intelligent and patriotic as any represented on this floor. In their name and on their behalf I protest against the passage of this bill which, while proposing a repeal of the Sherman act, not only fails to provide for the further coinage of silver on equal terms with gold, but which strikes it from our system as unfit for further use and as unworthy of a place in our financial system. [Applause.]

[Mr. MCKAIG withholds his remarks for revision. See Appendix.]

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the opening prayer of the Reverend Chaplain-elect of this House he said: "That this body had assembled in extraordinary session, had devolved upon them extraordinary duties, and had assumed extraordinary responsibilities."

The Chief Magistrate in his message advised us that "an extraordinary business situation, involving the welfare and prosperity of all our people, had constrained him to call us together."

For days, upon the floor of this House, I have listened to extraordinary men, logically and illogically, but always learnedly and eloquently, discuss the situation and offer a solution for the vexed problem that has presented itself for our consideration. The conditions that confront us are, indeed, alarming, and demand the wisdom, sagacity, and patriotism of this body. We find business stagnated, finances congested, values declined, confidence gone, and bankruptcy, ruin, and distress fast following each other; and an epidemic of doubt and distrust pervading every section, every vocation and business pursuit in this country.

There can be no effect without a preceding cause. The philosophy of present conditions must be inquired into, and the cause must be ascertained, if possible; and, when made known, it is the unconditional duty of this body to immediately remove the cause, if it is within the province or power of national legislation so to do. If the disease with which the country is to-day afflicted is beyond the reach of legislative remedies, then there is no balm, save in the virtue, integrity, industry, and patriotism of our citizens, and in these remedies I have much confidence. [Applause.]

The remedy prescribed by the pending bill I do not believe can effect the result hoped for by its friends unless it acted upon the principle of the medical practitioner who prescribed medicine that would throw his patient into fits, a remedy for which he had a certain cure. [Laughter.] This remedy, I fear, will throw this nation into such convulsions that it will linger long upon a bed of sickness, if dissolution does not eventually occur.

The importance of the question can not be overrated. In its ramifications its tendrils touch every interest of industry in this country, and seductively tempts and plays with every avaricious and selfish passion that, as individuals, we possess. It is a question upon which patriots may divide, and I approach its discussion and the mention of objections to the pending bill with trepidation and some doubt. I confess that my education and experience have not been in that line that should prepare me to speak authoritatively or prophetically upon questions of finance, and I concede that a partiality for bimetalism, superinduced by association, as well as the logic of truth, may cause me to unwittingly resolve every doubt in favor of the free coinage of gold and silver.

Reading the Constitution according to its print and letter, and construing it according to the teachings of the masters of the political school to which I belong, I find no express command that gold or silver should be coined, or that the coinage of either or both is inhibited; but I do find that our Constitution recognizes both metals of equal dignity and equal standard, and that, following and in obedience to or conformity with the Constitution, both metals went to our mints free until 1873; and I further find that if we are to put a construction by implication or intendment upon that instrument, and infer what its framers contemplated, we could fairly say, and prove it by the almost contemporaneous actions of the builders of the instrument, that they intended no discrimination between gold and silver in the coinage of currency for this country.

I am warranted in this conclusion because the Constitution expressly says that "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts," and expressly reserves the right to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." Following these declarations expressed in the Constitution in 1792, but a short while after its promulgation and adoption, Congress passed an act establishing a mint and regulating the coin of the United States, and this act provides for the free coinage of both gold and silver, and so continued the free coinage laws upon our statutes until 1873, when silver was outlawed and debased.

To place a different construction upon the language and meaning of the Constitution would imply and argue the possibility of a conflict of power and authority between the States and the United States. By the Constitution the States may make silver a legal tender in payment of debts, and if Congress destroys the money-bearing capacity of silver, and inhibits its use in a debt-paying capacity, it follows as a consequence that the provision of the Constitution would be meaningless and of no effect.

Therefore, am I not borne out in the assumption that gold and silver is the money of the Constitution, and was so intended by the builders of that sacred instrument? In my legislative action, at its shrine I first bow; by its commands and injunctions I expect to be directed. I revere the memory of those enlightened men who constructed it, and believe that inspiration controlled the pen that wrote it, and it shall be the cloud by day and star by night that shall direct my vote and voice in this assembly. [Applause.]

Next, most persuasive in affecting my action on pending legislation is the combined wisdom of the party to which I belong, expressed in their political pronouncements and party platforms. The pending question is one which should rise above partisan politics and sectional bias, and be considered only from an American patriotic standpoint. It is a policy, not necessarily a political principle, that is involved; and I am willing to surrender my partisan bias, save only that, all things being equal, the wisdom of the party with which I am aligned shall turn the scales in favor of my political bias.

Since this question has played a part in the history, policy, and political agitation of this country, the Democratic party has championed and advocated the free coinage of silver. Our recent national Democratic platform demands, in letter and spirit, "the coinage of both gold and silver, without discriminating against either metal." The Democratic platform of the

State from which I hail demands the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver on the ratio of 16 to 1.

In my canvass before the people of my district for nomination and election, I stood squarely and unequivocally upon these platforms, and gave to the people no uncertain expression as to my position on the free coinage of gold and silver; and, relying upon these platforms and my declarations from the hustings, the people chose me as their servant, and I would be faithless and recreant to duty as an honest servant if I failed or refused to obey the behests of my party and my sovereign—the people.

It is now claimed by some of the Democrats on this floor that the free-silver plank in the national platform is ambiguous and is a conditional and not an absolute free-coinage plank. In my canvass I interpreted it differently, and proclaimed it certainly as a free-coinage demand; and if it is susceptible of a construction now placed upon it by my Democratic friends who differ with me, I could not yield obedience to their construction, because my State has made no equivocal declaration touching this matter, and where there is a conflict of opinion or authority my duty is a plain, as well as a pleasant one, to stand by the wishes and commands of my own State and my own people.

I know that the platform demands that both metals be of "equal intrinsic and exchangeable value," to be adjusted through international agreement or legislative safeguards. The construction that I place upon the platform makes the repeal of the Sherman law and the free coinage of gold and silver handmaids compatible and capable of ripening into consistent laws. The construction placed upon it by Democratic adversaries makes the platform antagonistic, incompatible, and incapable of ripening into consistent laws. They know this, and acting under the law of the survival of the fittest, and believing the repeal of the Sherman law is the fittest, they are giving succor to that at the expense of free coinage of silver, and, I believe, the substantial interest of the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, eliminating all constitutional and partisan objections to the proposition, let us consider it from a just, equitable, and humanitarian standpoint, and test its value and soundness in the crucible of common sense, reason, and experience, and weigh it in the balance of justice. We know that money is a measure of value, a medium of exchange, and it is the equivalent of the thing for which it is given. It performs the further important office of being the representative of the basis of all credit, and credit is but the postponement of the delivery of things exchanged. If the value of money declines or increases, all contracts for future delivery are changed, and this change affects the debtor and creditor corresponding with the value and volume of the money of the country.

A contraction of the currency of the country injuriously affects the debtor class, and an expansion of the money of the country injuriously affects the creditor class. To adopt the single gold standard will contract the currency (the purchasing and debt-paying medium of exchange) from 20 to 50 per cent, and, this being done, it follows as the natural sequence that the debtor will have his burden increased from 20 to 50 per cent and the creditor will receive from the debtor from 20 to 50 per cent more than was stipulated in the contract creating the debt.

To adopt the bimetallic free-coinage standard the creditor can not be so injuriously affected, because by so doing the volume of money can not be so violently expanded. The bowels of the earth and the hillsides can not yield the bullion for coinage as rapidly as it can be destroyed and struck down by legislative action after having been coined.

But, for argument's sake, suppose the demonetization of silver or the free coinage of silver should equally affect the debtor and creditor, as the one or the other may be done, then the result of such action, unavoidable, however, would result for the benefit of a class, and, to that extent, would be class legislation; and, if class legislation is the only result that will be attained from any legislation on this subject, then what class of our fellow-citizens shall be the beneficiary of our action? Men become creditors always for the hope of profit or benefit. They become debtors sometimes for the hope of profit; but the rule is, they become debtors from necessity or through untoward and adventitious circumstances.

While it has been asserted upon the floor of this House that the poor and middle class are the creditor class in this country and that they will be the sufferers by the free coinage of silver, my experience and observation do not bear out this assertion. In the section from which I hail nineteen-twentieths of the poor are debtors, and there is not one out of a hundred that has deposits in savings banks; and I believe this condition of affairs will be found to exist in all the Southern States.

A large proportion of my constituents are agriculturists, and among that class of citizens are rarely found political or social agitators. The anarchist and communist find no encouragement there. The confusion and corruption of mercenary and selfish

political agitation does not exist among them. Their bosom at all times is the lodgment of virtue and patriotism. Their allegiance to their country; their cheerful support of their government; their patient and uncomplaining endurance of its burdens, and their heroic defense of its institutions, is a record that may be read in all history. They have been taught, and they have heretofore believed, that this is a "government for the people."

As a class, they are the largest element of our population, and are the producers of more surplus products than any other calling, and are the most numerous debtors of any other class of our citizens, and especially are they so in the South at this season of the year; and whenever and wherever I have talked with them on this subject I have found nine out of ten in favor of free coinage. They will not have the currency of this country contracted if they can prevent it. Their cribs are now bursting with corn; soon their sheds will be filled with bales of cotton. The willing hands of industry have filled this land with plenty, yet distress is everywhere. Would you add to misery another pain? Will you not stay the hand that gives the hurt?

The total outstanding indebtedness of the United States on the 1st day of December, 1890, was \$1,549,296,120, a per capita indebtedness of \$24.70. The total indebtedness of the States and Territories in 1890, as shown by the Census reports, was \$1,135,210,442, a per capita indebtedness of \$18.13. I have no means of ascertaining the indebtedness of individuals and private corporations in this country; but I think I can safely assume that, in the aggregate, it will equal, if not exceed, the indebtedness of the States and Territories, and I will place it at \$1,135,210,442. Add to this the mortgage debt of this country, which amounts to over \$2,500,000,000 (and remember this mortgage debt is principally upon the homes and farms of this country), and you may realize and appreciate the burdens that are upon the shoulders of the people of this country.

To recapitulate:

Debt of United States Government in 1890.....	\$1,549,296,120
Debt of States and Territories in 1890.....	1,135,210,442
Mortgage debt of United States.....	2,500,000,000
Individuals and corporations (estimated).....	1,135,210,442

Total..... 6,319,717,004

Per capita, about \$100.

As hereinbefore stated (and I think it will be conceded), the demonetization of silver would increase the value of gold not less than 20 per cent, and, possibly, as much as 50 per cent. I will, therefore, make an estimate upon the basis that the value of gold will be increased 25 per cent, and I think this low estimate will be accepted as conservative. An increase of 25 per cent on the indebtedness that I have heretofore stated will increase that indebtedness the sum of \$1,579,929,251; that is to say, that at the value of gold and silver now in relation to commodities, it will take in value \$1,579,929,251 more of commodities to pay said indebtedness than it can now be paid with.

Upon whom will this increased burden most heavily fall? Upon the money lenders? No. Upon the bankers? No. Upon those who are so circumstanced that they need not work upon a rainy day? No. It will fall upon the brawn and sinew of this country, the yeomanry of our land. The debt owing by the United States must be paid by the citizens, and how? By a system of unjust taxation. By a tax that is neither equitable nor uniform, a tax that is vicious in its methods and its exactions levied upon the consumers of this country.

The wealth of this country is protected by the valor and patriotism of all the citizens; but it yields no tribute to the United States to liquidate the debt incurred for its care and protection. The balance of the indebtedness is paid by the skill, industry, and sweat of the face of the people of this country; and, my Democratic friends, I again invite you to listen to the voice of your party, and I conjure you to heed its commands. I find in our national platform the following:

THE MORTGAGE BURDEN.

We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus, the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real estate mortgage debt of over \$2,500,000,000, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real estate mortgage debt averaging \$165 per capita of the total population; and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in other agricultural exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of the sheriff.

If you contract the currency of this country you abridge the means and opportunity to satisfy this indebtedness, and you indeed foster the sheriff's industry.

My friends from New England and the Eastern States, this indebtedness is largely due to you. My people are remotely, if not immediately, your debtors. You built our railroads, opened

our highways, constructed our factories, and started the wheels of mechanical and manufacturing industries in the South. When the briars cumbered our grounds, and our fields were waste places, and lone chimneys stood like monuments to mark the places, where once were happy homes, you came with your money and lent it to us.

With this money we rebuilt and removed the briars that cumbered the waste places, felled the virgin forests, and opened new fields of production. This money is still due you. We have only paid the interest and renewed our note. Will you vote to increase the principal and compound the interest upon us? Will you produce bankruptcy and ruin, and kill the goose that has been laying the golden egg? If so, your support of a measure that will contract the currency of this country will tend to do it.

Aside from the immediate injury that will result from the contraction of the currency by the demonetization of silver, an injury equally as hurtful, but one step remote, will ensue. When silver is stricken down to a commodity there will not remain sufficient coin to meet the demands of commerce and the business of the world. The population of the world to-day is estimated at 1,218,000,000 people, and the amount of gold is estimated at \$3,632,600,000, about \$2.99 per capita; and this estimate of the quantity of gold in the world, we have no assurance approximates accuracy, and the probability and better opinion is that it is overestimated.

If this gold is equally distributed throughout the world, will it be sufficient to do the business of the world on, or will it furnish a sufficient basis upon which the business of the world can be carried by exchange or otherwise? Strike from the population of the world the people of the countries that have no commercial relations with the balance of the world, and have no productive industries and follow no productive pursuits, and you have remaining a population of about 800,000,000 people. Distribute the gold of the world among these people, and it will be inadequate to supply the demands of commerce and trade.

Our population is increasing at the rate of about 2 per cent annually, and our gold production that has been minted into money for the past twenty years has annually increased about 1½ per cent. Basing our opinion on the belief that the same ratio of increase will continue in the future, we find that our gold diggings are not keeping pace with our increase in population, and there not being sufficient gold in the world for the needs of commerce and business, and gold relatively decreasing as compared with our increase in population, consequently the value of gold must increase and commodities must correspondingly decrease. And, as commodities in general are but the result of labor, then the toiling masses can not be remunerated for their energy, industry, and skill, and as the hands move forward on the dial of time, such a monetary system will undoubtedly make servants of the children of freemen, unless revolution should turn back the hand that now points to such a destiny. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it is urged upon this floor that by the laws of evolution the destiny of silver is fixed, and that neither man nor human agencies can prevent its being discarded as a money metal by the enlightened nations of this globe. If, in this country, such a change must come, will not some economic scientist, some political seer, some monetary evolutionist, devise some means by which the hurt to the debtor may be averted? I believe I would be willing to experiment with the single gold standard if the bimetallic system would be continued and the volume of money permitted to increase *pari passu* with the increase in population, until all existing contracts had been performed and discharged, and let all new contracts for future payments be based upon the single gold standard.

One of the chief virtues that the gold monometallists claim for their system is, that it will give a fixed and stable standard of value. In all contracts for future payment, justice is only attained when the purchasing power of the money paid the creditor by the debtor is of the same value as at the making of the contract. Will the single gold standard produce such a condition or cause such a result? I deny it. Gold is only money in the country in which it is coined or by law adopted. Elsewhere it is a commodity.

There is no universal money, and there can be no more invariable standard of value in gold than in both gold and silver; and, possibly, the variance will be as great in the one as in the other, for the consequences are dependent upon future conditions and circumstances. Gold possesses no attributes that make it sacred and invariable in value. When it is plentiful, it is cheap; when it is scarce, it is high. It is controlled by the same laws that govern other commodities, and varies and changes in value according to the forces that operate upon it.

This proposition is borne out by the experience of our own country within the last half century. When the gold mines of California were discovered and opened up, gold became plentiful, and more gold could be purchased with our products and com-

modities than could have been done before that, when gold was scarce. It is probable, and I think nearer the truth, that the standard becomes more uniform and stable under the bimetallic than the monometallic system.

Prof. Laughlin, a strong gold monometalist and an author on this question of distinguished ability, said "that the intimate connection of the two metals causes reflex changes upon each other;" though he further says, in the same connection, "that the action of silver upon gold is not the same as the action of gold upon silver." But his concession that the two metals cause reflex changes upon each other argues that a more certain and uniform standard of value can be obtained by the bimetallic than monometallic system.

There is much force in the argument that the two metals act as a balance wheel one for the other. They are handmaids, fixed by nature for joint and separate medium of exchange, and, when both are not actually on duty, one stands guard as a reserve, while the other fights the battles, and so they alternate in action as prejudice, bias, or circumstances may determine, and, by so doing, they preserve their joint and separate strength and unity.

It is asserted by those who favor the single gold standard that the object and effect of the free coinage of silver is, and will be, to enable the debtor to scale his debt, and to cheat and defraud his creditor, and that it is dishonest legislation. Can it not, with equal force, propriety, and truth, be asserted that to strike down silver as money and contract the currency of this country is a desire and effort on the part of the creditors to enhance the value of their debts and assets, and, by law, wring from the debtor payment of a larger sum than is due by the contract? Can you find excuse for such action? Maybe you can.

Nearly two thousand years ago that Christman said: "To him that hath shall be given, and to him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." Strike down silver and you fulfill this inspired statement.

Mr. Speaker, the weight and force of the argument of the gold monometalist is: 1 That the free coinage of silver will drive gold out of this country; (2) that the United States can not force the other countries of the world to adopt bimetalism. If perchance free coinage of silver would drive gold out of circulation, where would it drive it? It would drive it into the vaults of the banks of this country, where it would act as a reserve fund and basis upon which the business of this country is done, and by doing this the basis of our credit would be expanded with stability.

For three-quarters of a century we had bimetalism, and periodically the metals slightly alternated in purchasing value; but whenever this occurred and there was a displacement of the metals there was not a contraction of the currency. The one would temporarily serve and perform one function of money, while the other would perform another equally as important function, and the two metals are peculiarly suited to perform functions joint, separate, and variant.

Small transactions constitute the great bulk of the dealings, trade, and transactions of mankind, and silver is specially suited for this purpose; and these small transactions, when aggregated, compose more volume than all the banks, and demands the actual tangible use of more money than all the banks. It is the poor man's money, and the poor are largely in the majority in this country, and the inspired man said the poor will always be with us.

Can gold ever leave us as long as the balance of trade is in our favor? What the gold advocates here have been pleased to call the enlightened nations of the earth, such as England, Germany, Austria, Portugal, and others contiguous to them, single gold standard people, can not increase their agricultural productions one acre or one bushel. They can not feed their own people from their own soil. They are fed by us, by India, and other nations. They live by sending us articles of manufacture made from our raw material. Their people must eat or die. We need not dress in "purple and fine linen."

The world's product of gold last year was \$130,816,000, and the world's product of silver was \$196,000,000. Our exports of agricultural, manufactured, and other products from this country for the year ending June 30, 1892, was \$1,075,814,429, more than three times as much as all the gold and silver produced in all the world. For the same year we imported \$897,057,000 worth of merchandise and miscellaneous matter.

The difference between our exports and imports was \$216,227,032. So the balance of trade was in our favor, and for that year it would have taken about two-thirds of all the metal, gold and silver, produced in the entire world to pay for our surplus products, and there lacked in gold over \$86,000,000 being enough to pay for our surplus products. While in the last, and some other years, the balance in our favor has been less, there is no cause to believe or suspect that future ages will change the balance of trade against us. Our resources are seeming almost inexhaust-

ible. Our vast territory has a soil rich and productive. Buried beneath its surface and bursting from its hillsides are the greatest variety of the richest minerals. Standing and growing within our extended confines are vast virgin forests of the finest timber. On our immense plains vast herds of cattle grow fat without cost, and within these limits are millions of honest toilers, plowing the fields, delving in the mines, turning the spindles, and revolving the wheels of all character of industry.

With such resources, such industrious people, and abundant products, is it possible that by the free coinage of gold and silver gold will be driven out of this country? Such a suggestion is fatuous, illusory, and improbable.

Again, history gives us a precedent upon which we can safely base a conclusion. France has been carrying for years seven hundred to nine hundred million dollars of silver, and her gold has annually increased, and her money metals, gold and silver, upon a ratio of 15½ to 1, has been maintained at a parity. Silver did not and could not drive gold out of France, and I do not believe it will drive it out of this country. Next, Mr. Speaker, can the United States force the other countries of the world to adopt bimetalism? This is problematical and experimental, and can not be determined until it is tried; but I assume the affirmative. The future may be forecast by the events of the past.

In 1816 England demonetized silver and adopted the single gold standard. Anterior thereto all the commercial nations of the world, by law, recognized silver as money. Fifty-seven years after England had demonetized silver the United States outlawed the white metal. Following close on this act of the United States, many of the other nations of the earth actually or virtually demonetized silver. They either prohibited or suspended its free coinage.

Now, if it took England over fifty-seven years to induce or force the other commercial nations to adopt or follow her system of monometallism, and the United States by her action could drive into line so many other nations in so short a time, it certainly strongly argues the power of the United States over the nations of the world; and if she has the power to produce such results by the policy she has recently adopted, does it not follow that if she returns to the system of bimetalism, with her growing industries and wonderful resources and her commercial prestige, can she not force the other countries to reverse their policy, and stand side by side with her? [Applause.]

Now, let us follow this argument to its logical conclusion from the premises laid down by the monometallist. They say that a half a century ago no nation of any commercial importance had adopted the single gold standard, and that England, then the monarch of all commercial nations, launched out upon this uncertain sea, and by force of her commercial power, coupled with her ingenuity, brought almost all the commercial nations of the world to the actual or virtual single gold standard, and that such nations now being opposed to bimetalism, the United States can not return to it without an international agreement.

What has been done may be done again; and what one nation has accomplished another may accomplish, conditions being similar. If this be true, the United States, standing upon the commanding height she does, possessed of the forces, active and reserve, that she has, and being in the front rank of nations, can not she do for silver what it is claimed England has done for gold? Since silver was demonetized in this country, the gold countries of Europe, with England in the lead, to gratify their cupidity and greed, have turned their battering-rams upon the walls of bimetalism in America, and to-day the temper of this Congress indicates that they will be victorious. But if the fight is lost this year, the serried ranks and solid phalanx of the American people will be found in line of march later on, and the voice of the people will order a charge that monometallism can not withstand.

If the little sea-girt isle on the eastern shore of the Atlantic Ocean can accomplish so much, what might not the United States do if she had the courage to try? Representatives of America, behold the picture that is presented to us to-day: The United States again petitioning and supplicating at the throne of England, begging Europe for conferences and concessions! Such obsequious and servile conduct is enough to make the cheek of an American mantle with shame. [Applause.] It is enough to make the ashes of Henry and Washington and the patriots of the Revolution cry out from their hollow tombs.

This Government that placed the Goddess of Liberty upon her high perch, holding the scales of justice in equal poise; this Government that smote the rock of the science of government and let the living waters of equal rights, personal liberty, and national independence fill the channels that flowed to all the nations of the earth; this Government that traced power to its lodgment and found it in the voice of the people, now begging tottering monarchies to suffer it to adopt a financial policy. Ameri-

can manhood must be waning and our national independence and institutions fast decaying.

"Gresham's Law" has been held up to us to show the consequences that will follow bimetalism. The philosophy of the law, I predict, will find no application in this country with bimetalism. Money, monetary transactions, and speculative greed regularly obey no law and follow no rule. It is constantly affected by extraneous causes and changing conditions and forces. Money follows no fixed orbit. Like the erratic comet, it defies law and order. The bankers of the United States, if they desired, by concert of action could place silver at a premium in the face of any law. The eloquent financial economist from New York [Mr. HENDRIX] said that—

The banks of New York were now holding up the financial system of this Government by the neck.

I fear this is too true, and it may be that if the banks would loose their hands from the neck of our financial system this Government would breathe easier and this agitation would not have occurred. If the banks of New York are temporarily holding up the financial system of this Government, suppose the banks of the world should surrender their patriotism to their greed, then, indeed, would the future be cloudy with calamitous consequences.

Upon the question under discussion we daily have the opinions and advice of hundreds of successful and distinguished financiers throughout the United States. Bankers, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, *et id genus*, are earnestly importuning us to follow the English policy, and by so doing they say that we can still the troubled waters, speak peace to the dissatisfied and disturbed, restore confidence to the doubters, heal the financial afflictions, avert dangers, and restore prosperity to this country. This is a desideratum wished for and prayed for by every member of this body and every patriot within the confines of this Government.

I have an exalted respect for these people and their opinions. I am unwilling to believe that they are prompted by selfish and mercenary motives. They are a great, useful, and important factor in the country, and are American patriots and liberty-loving people. But they possess no peculiar prescience and are gifted with no superior sight-seeing into the future, and are not authorized and accredited prophets.

In the past they have made glaring mistakes, and their prophecies have not been fulfilled. When we were in the throes of a fratricidal strife, and a financial policy and system were inaugurated to carry on the momentous contention, the financial system then adopted and followed by the Government was condemned and derided by this same class of our citizens, and the direst prophecies as to its consequences and effect were then made. Time developed that they were in error, and were not good counselors.

Fourteen years after the close of the unfortunate struggle another financial policy was inaugurated by this Government. We found ourselves with seven hundred millions of paper currency—promises to pay—that were depreciated in value. By one stroke of the legislative pen we lifted this vast quantity of paper from its degraded bed and placed it on a parity with gold and silver, and did so with a depleted Treasury, or an apparent insufficient coin reserve. Like the other policy, we did this in the face of the adverse opinion of the financiers of the world; in the face of predictions and prophecies of chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and bankers' associations. We did it without the advice or aid of England, and we did it without international conferences or agreements.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a distressing panic. Like Coleridge's ancient mariner, who found "water, water everywhere, nor any drop to drink," we find money, money everywhere, nor any dime can get. In the South we are hungering for markets of money to purchase our surplus products, that we may pay our matured debts or exchange it again for the necessities and comforts of life. If this money agitation has produced this panic, our duty to our country is to at once remove the cause. But I can not admit that the cause, mediately or immediately, rests solely with this.

I do not believe any man can trace this panic to any single cause. Money panics of momentous proportions and disastrous results may arise from the slightest circumstances. Money is timid and is easily affrighted, and the slightest disturbance affects its most remote limit. Like the ocean's calm, a pebble dropped in the center of its surface produces a wave that touches the farthest shore; so a financial agitation once began may swell in volume until its force wastes itself upon the immeasurable sea of time.

It is charged that the position of the bimetalist tends towards class legislation, and is for the protection of silver, and that we are undertaking to pass a law for the especial benefit of silver mines and silver money. The reverse of this statement is more

nearly true. It is gold and gold owners that are asking for protection. Our law would be equal and uniform upon all the people of this country, while your law would strike down a large part of the people and a large part of the wealth and industries of this country.

The silver States are an integral part of this Union, and have rights, and vested rights. A few years ago, the now silver mines were rock-ribbed hills and barren wastes. Our people went there, and they underwent privations and hardships to develop that country. By their self-denials, courage, and energy, millions have been added to the wealth of this country, and thousands of our laborers have found remunerative employment. The wealth they produced percolated all avenues and flowed to all the States. The corn, wheat, and cotton alike shared the benefits of this development. And now it is undertaken to be said that this energy shall be wasted, these industries and investments destroyed, and their prospective growth in wealth shut off. I can not go with the advocates of such a policy, because it is protective and sectional legislation, and is not just and right.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] points us to the single gold standard nations, as the progressive, enlightened, and prosperous nations of the globe, and relegates the bimetallic to the pagan and heathen nations of the earth. He may be right; but the question is, what is progress, prosperity, and enlightenment? When the scales of paganism and heathenism dropped from the eyes of England in 1819, and she adopted the single gold standard, she had 165,000 land owners; now she has 30,000 land owners. This may be enlightenment, progress, and prosperity for her people, but I can not so understand it, and I am unwilling to believe it.

You take away from the people their debt-paying money, abridge their opportunities to lift the mortgages from their farms and homes, and you do it that they may become civilized, enlightened, and prosperous. What a travesty upon justice and what a commentary on enlightened humanity. In 1873 the light of prosperity went out from the homes of the agriculturists of this country. If you would again wreath their brow with the smiles of prosperity, again restore to them that which was wrongfully taken from them in 1873. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I say that the Democratic party demands the repeal of the Sherman law and the enactment of a law establishing the free coinage of gold and silver. The Constitution contemplates the existence of such law; justice demands it; humanity demands it, and the American people demand it. Gold and silver have been the universal money of the world as far back as history or tradition carry us. Silver was the money of Abraham, and Solomon "made gold and silver plentiful in Jerusalem."

History records no country on the face of this globe to have pained or perished because they had too much gold or silver, or too much gold and silver. Gold will not leave us. Untrammel our commerce with other nations, break down the barrier raised by a vicious protective tariff, then our whitened sails will empty our bursting granaries into the laps of the hungry nations of the earth, and our fleecy staple will thread the spindles and feed the looms of the factories of all countries, and be the warp and woof of the wear of all people, and gold and silver will be our pay. [Applause.]

Mr. DE FOREST. Mr. Speaker, that there should be any opposition from any source whatever to the repeal of the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman act under existing circumstances is, to me, the subject of profound astonishment.

The necessity for that repeal is so clearly written on the face of public distress, the demand for it is so distinctly heard in the voice of general calamity, that it would seem that no partisan rancor, no individual hobby, no speculative theory, no merely selfish personal scheme or sectional interest would dare to obstruct it by the slightest obstacle or the least delay.

The cry for this relief comes up to us not so much from the rich and powerful; not so much from the brokers and the bankers and the capitalists, whose names and occupations are harped upon here by the opponents of repeal as though in justification of their conduct; not so much from them as from the humble poor, from the worthy and industrious masses, upon whose patient shoulders are upheld the pillars of all our material progress and prosperity; from those men and women to whom the cessation of industrial activity through the operations of this Sherman law means the loss of employment, the sacrifice of hard-earned savings, the extinguishment of fondly cherished hopes—yea even cold, hunger, and nakedness, and all that penury implies.

Not from the ranks of any one occupation, not from any particular section, but from all pursuits and from every quarter of our territory the cry comes up to save these suffering countrymen of ours from a winter of unparalleled misery, not by any mere gratuity, not by any extraordinary or unconstitutional expedient, but by a simple act of justice, by rescinding a law that

ought never to have been enacted, that almost every one admits to be loaded with disaster, and that hardly any one to-day seriously attempts to justify.

In response to this appeal the President has convened us in this special session of Congress for this special purpose. All the vast business interests of the Union, tottering on the verge of destruction, believing that from us and by this means alone they can be rescued, are imploringly holding out their hands for succor. Why should it not be granted immediately, unconditionally, without hesitation, and without debate?

But, sir, we find there is opposition, and what are the reasons assigned for it? Does any one question the vicious character of the silver-purchasing law or the disastrous consequences that have resulted and are now resulting from it?

No one, I had almost said; but I do remember that the honorable, learned, and eloquent gentleman who first from the State of Louisiana the other day addressed the House upon this subject seemed to be contending that the Sherman act has not been so much as the least factor among the causes of the present crisis.

What—

Said he—

has the Sherman law to do with this condition of affairs? If men had been alarmed—

He argues—

by the legislation known as the Sherman act, and by the purchases of silver made under it, they would have gone to the Treasury with those silver certificates, those obligations of the Government, and demanded that universal money which the friends of the pending bill seem to be so fond of. There would have been a run upon the Treasury instead of upon the private banking institutions of the country.

But does not the honorable gentleman very well know that this is precisely what has occurred? Does he not know, is it not a matter of record, is it not laid before us in the message of the President itself, that there has been a run upon the Treasury, and of that exact character? That of the fifty-four million of silver certificates issued by the Government in the period between the 1st of May, 1892, and the 1st of July, 1893, \$49,000,000 have in fact been presented to the Government for payment and have, in fact, been paid in that same universal money, so far depleting the Treasury and impairing the ability of the nation to meet its ultimate obligations?

The argument of the honorable gentleman appears to refute itself. It seems to resolve itself into a conclusion predicated upon a false hypothesis. The testimony of all experience is against him. The testimony of the financial and business judgment of the world, based upon practical tests, and springing from wide observation and long familiarity with the subject, is against him; and, sir, in the light of all the evidence that comes to us from far and near, from high and low, from every rank and condition of life, I think I am justified in the assertion that in his skeptical interrogatory, "What has the Sherman act to do with it?" the honorable gentleman from Louisiana stands almost unsupported and alone. Now, is there anything in this law that commends it to our particular affection, that ought to prevent or postpone its abrogation?

I have listened patiently to hear some suggestion to that effect, but none has been presented. No one appears to be willing to befriend the act. The Democrats in Congress all voted solidly against it. Our Republican friends who contrived it and passed it now with commendable contrition acknowledge the error and stand ready so far as in them lies to make all suitable reparation. The Democratic party throughout the country has denounced it and promised its repeal. The boards of trade and exchange, the bureaus of commerce, the foremost men in financial, commercial, and manufacturing circles condemn it, the whole body of our laboring population, whether artisan or agricultural, arraign it as one of the chief causes, if not the only cause, of the present widespread, far-reaching, and ruinous monetary stringency. Why, then, should it not be repealed?

But opposition there is, and it comes in the form of proposed substitutes, containing provisions that no friend of sound finance or of fair dealing in public or private transactions can, from our standpoint, for a single moment favorably consider—provisions that, instead of quieting distrust, creating confidence, and reviving business activity, would in our judgment but aggravate and prolong the very evils we are seeking to escape.

There shall be no repeal of the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman act, they tell us, unless we will consent to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at ratios ranging from 16 to 1 to 20 to 1. And we are told that the principles and pledges of the Democratic party require it.

Again and again, sir, upon this floor during this debate and in the discussion of the silver question in the last Congress, have we listened to this and similar assertions, made by honorable gentlemen with great persistency, great emphasis, and all apparent sincerity. It is even intimated that our unwillingness to

concur in that proposition amounts to a species of party treason, which will ere long bring down upon our devoted heads the scathing wrath of disappointed and indignant constituents. "To vote for the repeal," they say, "and to refuse to vote for these substitutes is in violation of the pledges of the Chicago platform."

Now, what, sir, do these assertions amount to, and how much truth is there in them? Why, the platform is easily understood. It is clear, positive, and unambiguous, and I undertake to say—and say it without the slightest fear of successful contradiction—that there is not a syllable of the pending bill that is inconsistent with, and not in direct pursuance of, that platform, and that there is not a single substitute for that bill offered here that is not directly in conflict with that platform and with all the principles, doctrines, and traditions of the Democratic party.

Let us see if this is not so. The bill repeals the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman act, which the platform denounces and promises to repeal. The substitutes propose free coinage of silver at ratios not exceeding 20 to 1. The platform contains no such doctrine and no such promise. The platform, on the contrary, while declaring in favor of the free and equal coinage of silver with gold as the money of the country, at the same time and with equal emphasis declares that it shall be done only upon a ratio which coincides with the commercial value of the metals.

Now, it is a fact which no gentleman can fail to know, which no gentleman who is not disposed to quarrel with the laws of gravity or the axioms of mathematics will attempt to controvert; a fact as well established and as well understood as the existence of the building in which we are assembled, that not one of the ratios of coinage in any of these proposed substitutes expresses or fairly approximates to the commercial value of the metal.

There is not one of these proposed ratios that would give us (in the language of the platform) "a dollar unit of both metals of equal intrinsic and interchangeable value."

If the advocates of these substitutes were so concerned as they profess to be about the platform and the fulfillment of its pledges they would have offered us something themselves that would have complied with that platform, and that would not have been, as all these propositions that they have given us are, in distinct and flagrant violation of those solemn pledges.

What then, sir, I again inquire, is the motive that underlies this opposition? Gentlemen tell us with an air of great virtue and philanthropy that they desire to make money cheaper? But why do they desire it? What patriotic, humane, or honorable object is to be subserved by making money cheaper? If the phrase means anything it means that the dollar these gentlemen are praying for would have a smaller purchasing power than a dollar to-day; that it would take more of the silver to purchase a given amount of any other commodity than it takes to-day; that more weight of coin should be required to conduct the same commercial transaction than it required to-day.

If a man has a horse to sell which at the present value of silver dollars is worth \$100 to-day, and he desires to purchase with the proceeds of that sale a reaping machine which also is at the present price of silver dollars worth \$100. These gentlemen would so legislate that it should require \$200 in silver to effect the same exchange. That is cheap money. The man would then sell the same horse and would obtain the same machine, the only difference being that in the latter case he has the inestimable privilege of handling twice the quantity of silver. [Laughter].

If there would be any advantage in such a change, by precisely the same process of reasoning it would be an advantage to go back to barbarous usages and again adopt the ponderous and inconvenient media of exchange which were employed in the very infancy of society. [Applause].

It is utterly inconceivable to me that any constituency represented on this floor can fail to perceive that for all legitimate uses and for all honest purposes preciousness rather than cheapness is desirable in a circulating medium, and that so long as enough is in use to answer the purposes of commerce the more valuable the money is, the more economical, the more convenient, and every way better it is both for those who use it and the government that provides it.

Now, then, the gentlemen who ask for cheaper money do not, I think, contend that we have not enough already issued to meet all the usual requirements of business. The present stringency is not due to any deficiency in the volume of our currency, but to a paralysis that has fallen upon its circulation, a paralysis that no increase of that volume would relieve, but rather aggregate; a paralysis that owes its origin to a distrust occasioned by the improvident issuance of currency under the Sherman act. That the volume under normal conditions is now, as it has been in the past, adequate for all commercial purposes I do not think is seriously questioned.

No, sir, this demand for cheap money does not arise from any feeling that the necessary exchanges of commerce can not be effected safely and conveniently with the amount now on hand; it does not arise from any belief that either the people or the Government are made any richer or more prosperous by being obliged to employ a larger bulk and weight of coin in the same business transactions. Not at all, sir, but when we have looked the matter all over and have heard all that can be said, the invocations and the imprecations, the prayers and the tears, the graphic and the touching portrayal of the contest between riches and poverty, and of the conspiracy of Wall street and Lombard street, it all comes down to this, that the advocates of free coinage at the various ratios proposed desire cheaper money for debtors to discharge their obligations in, cheaper money in order that those who owe may free themselves from the claims of their creditors by the payment of less than is honestly due.

That appears to be the laudable object which elicits all this eloquence, which stands in the way of the relief that the country sorely needs, that legitimate industry on every hand is perishing for want of, and that we have been summoned here to furnish.

The advocates of cheap money have chosen the means best adapted to their purpose. They say they will have the Sherman law or free coinage of silver at ratios not higher than 20 to 1.

There is no doubt that either course, if followed out, would give them cheap money. Let the Sherman law continue in force without amendment and we shall soon have a 60 or perhaps a 50 cent dollar for the accommodation of these unfortunate debtors; or, on the other hand, let free coinage of silver be established at any of the ratios proposed, and a currency will speedily be produced sufficiently depreciated and debased to answer the expectations and gladden the hearts of all who have borrowed money and prefer not to pay it.

No argument is needed to establish these propositions. Any intelligent student of political economy is well aware of their truth; and certainly no argument is needed in this debate when the gentlemen who oppose us, with all their knowledge of the subject and with their consummate ability in adapting the means to the end for the accomplishment of their cherished purpose, and with the object of cheap money and the shielding of the debtor as against the creditor, openly avowed, have deliberately chosen for that purpose the continuance of the silver-purchasing law as it now stands or free coinage at the ratios proposed.

This, then, is the situation and such is the issue; and, sir, it is somewhat astonishing as well as amusing to listen to the floods of denunciation poured out upon the creditor class, as though the possession of property and the ability to furnish capital to those who need it, especially with the expectation of repayment, were an unpardonable crime against society. [Laughter.]

The holders of Government bonds appear to be the object of special detestation. The original purchasers of those bonds, most of whom are now under the sod and most of the survivors of whom have long since parted with all the interest they ever had in those obligations, are paraded before our vision as though in actual being they now stood at the Treasury like so many Shylocks demanding their pounds of flesh. It is said that they paid for those bonds in a depreciated currency and that Congress, by subsequent legislation, arbitrarily enhanced their value.

I shall not attempt to discuss the justice of that transaction. If such discussion had any relevancy to the present issue it might with some reason be said that those original bonds were issued by the Government in an hour of supreme peril, when no human intelligence could foresee the end of the awful contest for the prosecution of which the money was imperatively needed, and that the men who in that great national emergency stood in the breach and furnished the funds for the preservation of the Union were, perhaps, in the hour of victory, not entirely unworthy of some favorable recognition. But whether it were right or wrong, just or unjust, it has no bearing upon the present inquiry.

It must be remembered that these bonds are negotiable instruments; that their ownership is changing every hour; that long since all Congressional action upon them, long since the credit of the Government was solemnly pledged to their ultimate redemption in gold or its equivalent, and their market value was thus established at the figures that have since prevailed, they have passed from hand to hand at established quotations; they have been purchased by charitable and humane institutions; they have been selected by trustees and guardians of the fatherless and the dependent; and the debt-repudiator, who fancies that by the creation of cheap money these obligations of the Government can be scaled down, must not forget, and he must not expect the people of the country to forget, that it is upon the funds of such deserving institutions and the slender patrimony of such defenseless persons that he is proposing to lay the hand of wanton confiscation. [Applause.]

I have heard honorable gentlemen here descanting somewhat at length on the alleged grinding and avaricious propensities of the people of my section of the country.

New England and the adjoining territory seem to be regarded by them with particular aversion.

Well, sir, so far as I know, whatever success we have attained has not been due to accident or assistance. We have enjoyed no extraordinary natural advantages. We have not the spreading prairies of the West, with their inexhaustible fertility, which the settlers in that quarter have had bestowed upon them for a nominal consideration. We have not the mines of gold and silver with their incalculable treasures. The founders of New England came over a stormy sea to an inhospitable shore, and there, amid the dreary and dangerous surroundings of a wintry wilderness and a savage foe, they kindled those beacon fires of liberty that have enlightened the world and laid the foundation and devised the formulas for those institutions of freedom that have preserved and transmitted its practical fruits to all succeeding generations.

By hard labor and frugal living their children have wrought out from what seemed most unpromising conditions some moderate degree of material prosperity. Not so much by the aid of horse-power and improved mechanical appliances, which are poorly adapted to uneven surfaces, as by strained muscles and stiffened bones and hardened hands, the rugged hillsides have been subdued to the uses of agriculture. The returns of this labor they have economically, but wisely, administered. The church and the schoolhouse have never been forgotten. Highways and bridges have been adequately provided, the poor have been furnished with necessary support, and the laws have been fairly and decently executed without the aid of mobs.

And after all this has been accomplished some little money has, in many cases, been laid up as a provision against reverses of fortune or the infirmities of age. The people of the West have borrowed these savings for the improvement of the farms that the Government has given them, borrowed them when they were as good as gold, used them to very great advantage, and now the cheap-money crusaders are proposing that they shall pay it back to us in a currency worth 60 cents on a dollar.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to ask the gentleman from Connecticut what reasons he gives for the greater increase in the proportion of wealth in the New England States during the last ten years than in the Western States? Does he attribute it—

Mr. DE FOREST. I have not assigned any.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman be kind enough to assign a reason?

Mr. DE FOREST. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. BRYAN. Is it the greater industry and greater frugality of the people?

Mr. DE FOREST. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of that kind. I might have my opinion about it.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the gentleman please state it?

Mr. DE FOREST. That is a question of industry and frugality; it is a question of good management, too.

We have another class of alleged wicked men in New England, men who to-day by the thousands are walking the streets of my city and other manufacturing centers, out of employment for want of the relief which this Congress is asked to give them by the repeal of this silver-purchasing statute, men who at the benches of our workshop have patiently toiled from morning till night, year in and year out, supporting their families, educating their children, discharging faithfully all the duties of good citizenship, and who by self-denial and prudent management have been enabled to deposit in the savings banks small sums of money to their credit. Every dollar of it was as good as gold when placed there. Every dollar of it represents honest toil.

Every dollar of it stands for some pleasure sacrificed for which it might have been expended, and every dollar of it will be needed when the rainy day comes round. The cheap money crusaders are proposing that when the hour of necessity arrives these depositors shall receive their money back in a currency worth 60 cents on a dollar.

We also have people in New England who have not been so prosperous. There is many a farmer who, with all his efforts, has not been able to keep even with the world, and who perhaps in his declining years is haunted by the specter of mortgages upon his property. We have many in other walks of life who have been overtaken by misfortune and find themselves in debt.

The inconvenience, the apprehension, the discomfort of that thralldom I have no doubt are as keenly felt by them as though they resided in Kansas or Nebraska; but, sir, I am proud to say that I do not know of a man within the confines of my district, nor have I heard of one in all New England who would not hang his head in shame and feel that he was dishonored by his Representative in Congress if he heard that he advocated or voted for a law that would defraud a public or a private creditor out

of 40 per cent or 30 per cent or any portion whatever of his just dues.

When warned by honorable gentlemen that we shall hear from our constituents to our disadvantage unless we vote for cheap money, I am proud to say, sir, that, so far as I know, I have no such constituents; and, sir, if there is one lurking anywhere in the dark, sharpening the knife of his vengeance because of my course upon this question, I improve the present opportunity here and now publicly to notify him that I do not desire his vote.

But, sir, there is another influence in the opposition to the repeal of this silver-purchasing law; an influence that moves in the dark and conceals its selfish designs under a profession of regard for the down-trodden masses and the general welfare; an influence that, vociferously declaiming against the demands and encroachments of the money power, is itself the most grasping and the most unscrupulous of all the agencies and forces that power has brought to bear in recent years on Federal legislation.

I refer, sir, to the vast, consolidated, organized, indefatigable, ever-watchful and ever-active forces of the silver-mining interests of America; a power that has flooded the mails with its preposterous literature and filled the land with its emissaries; that has laid its potent hand on primaries and conventions, on the organization of Territories, the admission of States, and the choice of legislators; and that, surrounding and pervading the walls of this Capitol to-day, is seeking again, as it has sought—and not unsuccessfully sought—in the past, to lead the lawmaking department of this Republic an humble tributary to its avarice.

It asks the Government to continue its purchases of silver, not that it is needed for purposes of coinage; not but that we already have on hand tons upon tons of it which we can not use and upon which we have already lost many millions of dollars, not that anyone believes it to be needed for any public use whatever, but only to help out these gentlemen in their private speculations, to furnish them a market which they otherwise would not have, to pay them a price which they otherwise could not obtain, and to add, at the general expense, to the stupendous fortunes which they have already acquired a larger increment than the laws of trade and production would justly entitle them to.

This is a power to-day that lays its murderous hand upon the throat of honest industry, and that in response to all the prayers of the people, and the patriotic call of the President, and the effort that is made by the friends of this repeal to save the whole country from financial ruin, says: "No; we will not consent. Banks may fail, factories may close, the wheels of commerce may stand still, the revenues of charity and dependence may be cut off, homes may be sold at the auction block, the products of the farm may mold in the fields, labor may starve in the streets, and incalculable loss and misery invade and shake the whole framework of society before the Government shall be allowed to withdraw for a single hour the bounty which we have already so long enjoyed."

This was the threat that was given out almost from the day the President issued his message. It is the threat which here in Congress at the present time, too cunning to disclose its real object, is seeking to accomplish its aim under other more humane and plausible pretenses.

Shall we yield to this impudent demand? Not, sir, I conceive, unless we are deaf to all suggestions of reason, blind to all considerations of justice, and recreant to every trust.

I do not know in the platform or principles of what party the silver-mining interest will pretend to discover the promise of its claim, this proposition that the powers of the State should be exercised for purely private purposes.

It may be Populistic, I am sorry to say that I think it is Republican, but one thing I am certain of, it is not Democratic. Very sure I am that the shades of Jefferson and Jackson, to whom such eloquent and pathetic allusions have been made, would find themselves shuddering with a strange surprise if invoked to subscribe to any such doctrine as that. It will not be found in the Chicago platform. It will not be found in any authorized declaration of Democratic belief, it will not be discovered in the teachings of the illustrious founders of the party.

Democracy stands for simplicity in public affairs. It insists that the powers of the state shall be confined within the narrowest possible limits and exercised only for strictly public purposes. Bounties, subsidies, class legislation, governmental favoritism of every kind it uniformly denounces as hostile to the spirit and foreign to the purpose of free institutions. It holds that these truths were the inspirations of our independence, the keynote of our declaration and our Constitution, the vertiable foundation stone of this grand structure of our civil liberty.

In the neglect of these truths it sees the pathway of national decadence, public functions indefinitely multiplied and extended,

the continuous growth of the office-holding army, the strife for party supremacy a thousandfold intensified, the danger of its tyrannous exercise a thousandfold increased, and, finally, upon the ruins of a once popular system the settled and perpetual domination of a governing class from which there would be no escape save through the portals of fiery revolution.

It is by a departure from these first principles of safe government that all the dangers of the past have been encountered. It was through such a departure that the law which now afflicts us was enacted, and it is only by a penitent and obedient return to them that we can hope to dispel the cloud that now hangs over us, and for ourselves and our children after us to preserve this, our sacred temple of human rights, from all the invasions and pollutions of despotic power. [Applause.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I come from a district, the largest in area and population of any within the Empire State of the Mississippi Valley, and from its plains in the east to its mountain tops in the west comes to me but one voice, that of earnest, solemn protest against the passage of the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON].

I should be untrue to myself, Mr. Speaker, untrue to the constituency I represent, and untrue to the people of that great State, did I not, here and now, oppose this measure which so vitally affects their interests.

Sir, I do not believe, in the entire history of our Government, a question so important has ever engaged the attention of Congress. The discussions of 1860, indeed, had their full and momentous space, but after all they related simply to a contest which was to be decided by the sword, and the result of which in no event involved Anglo-Saxon slavery. But to-day we are confronted with a proposition, in the far-reaching effects of which, as I stated in the last Congress, may be seen the financial serfdom of the American people.

All history shows that individual and political bondage follows financial subjection. The debtor is the slave of the creditor, and where conditions are created by law that make impossible the abolition of such relation, then indeed is despotism supreme and perpetual.

We had as well look this question squarely in the face. The people will not, this time, be deceived by any catch phrases and glittering generalities. Whoever shall in this contest by his vote strike a blow direct or indirect against silver, will be branded as a monometallist in letters that will stick to him as long as he lives. In season and out of season, in the darkness and in the light, in the populous city and the lonesome forest, he will feel and know that he has arrayed himself against silver as a money of final redemption.

Mr. Speaker, for more than eighty years prior to 1873 we were on the bimetallic standard. Silver was as good as gold. Hand in hand marched the two metals on their beneficent mission. Gentlemen have undertaken to show that during this period sometimes silver was worth a little less, sometimes a little more, than gold, but all their herculean efforts have simply resulted in demonstrating that the relative value of the two was not only practically equal, but that the standard was automatic and equilibratory.

Why it seems to me as plain a proposition as can be, that the value of money is determined entirely by the demand for it, and if for example the value of gold should rise superior to that of silver, there would then be no demand for it, but for the other metal, and *vice versa*. This is that constant automatic action which tends to form an equilibrium between the two metals at the ratio fixed, spoken of by Sir Guilford Molesworth.

On the other hand, a single standard is an impossibility. How shall a thing measure itself by itself?

But it is not my purpose to theorize. A few plain facts and practical suggestions are worth more than all the systems of finance in the world. This bill proposes a simple and unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act. It proposes not only to stop further silver purchases, but also further silver coinage. No substitute or measure of relief is offered in its place. Indeed, its open and avowed advocates plainly tell us that its intention is to place the country upon a single gold standard. That this is the full determination of the President is clearly gathered from the message he has sent us.

True, gentlemen on this floor, whose sincerity I do not question, and whose acumen I certainly recognize, have told us that the President is a bimetallicist and the fast friend of silver. He was elected upon a bimetallic platform; he could have been elected upon no other; but this message, I repeat, is an unequivocal declaration of war on silver. It is an Executive pronouncement that the time has now arrived when this Government should adopt the monetary system of Europe. A more straightforward document in the interest of gold as the sole monetary standard could not have been penned and sent out from Lombard or Wall street. It will bring joy and gladness to the financial vampires

that are ever sucking the life blood of the people, and sorrow and despair to the toiling and producing millions.

Mr. Speaker, the provision in the measure retaining the present silver circulation in our currency will deceive nobody. Gold will be the sovereign standard to which all other values must bow. The tremendous power now lodged in Wall street at its pleasure to contract the volume of money, thereby proportionately decreasing all property and labor values will be multiplied many fold. Push but the veil aside, and the abyss meets our vision.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a statement from the Treasury Department showing the amount of gold and silver coins and certificates in circulation in the United States up to the first of the present month, from which it appears that our stock of gold is \$604,000,000 and our stock of silver \$615,000,000. The per capita circulation of gold and silver combined, therefore, is in round numbers \$18, and of gold alone \$9.01. It is, then, proposed to put this nation, with a population of 67,066,000 upon a per capita circulation of \$9. For again let me repeat, all other kinds of money will be measured by gold. There will not then be even a Sherman law to protect silver from utter annihilation.

Mr. Speaker, I will not lend myself to this unholy scheme. To the already fast-moving march of the classes over the masses I will not by my vote add the momentum of law. Sir, I am no defender of the Sherman act. It is, indeed, as characterized in the Chicago platform, "a cowardly makeshift." But, sir, it is the only law within the statute books that at all recognizes silver as money.

Sir, I shall vote for all of Mr. BLAND'S substitutes; first, for the ratio of 16, and then on to 20. These all failing, I shall vote to restore the Bland act. Still failing, I shall vote first, last, and all the time against unconditional repeal, believing that the President will veto any subsequent measure favoring silver, and shall rely in confidence for approval upon my constituents, to whom alone I owe allegiance.

Sir, what reasons are given for this tremendous change in our monetary system?

Gentlemen glibly tell us that this step has become imperative by reason of the excessive silver production relatively to gold. It is on a par with other statements sent out by the enemies of silver. The silver production of last year was less in this country than in the preceding year, and the commercial value of all the silver produced in the whole world last year was only \$2,000,000 greater than the value of all the gold produced.

Here are the figures:

Gold production in 1892, \$130,816,600.

Silver production in 1892, \$133,054,000.

Where is that cataclysm of silver which is to bury the world deeper than plummet ever sounded? But this is hardly half the truth. The production of silver, relatively to gold, is now smaller than it was at any time from 1801 to 1840.

The following is the average production of both metals for each year of the present century:

1801-1820, 4 of silver to 1 of gold.

1821-1840, 2 of silver to 1 of gold.

1841-1860, 2½ of gold to 1 of silver.

1861-1880, 2 of gold and 1 of silver.

1881-1889, ½ more silver than gold.

Or, to put it in another form, for the first twenty years of the century we had in this country 300 per cent more silver than gold; the second twenty years 100 per cent more, and now only 16 per cent more. Let us not be blind to facts. The crusade that has been waged in the interest of gold has been a crusade of slander and misrepresentation.

But we are told, Mr. Speaker, that our silver coinage is becoming every year relatively greater than gold. This also is a misrepresentation. For thirty-three years after 1806 we coined more than \$47,000,000 in silver and less than twenty-three millions in gold. We had then more than \$2 in silver for every \$1 in gold. To-day we have less full legal-tender money in silver than in gold, and counting all kinds of silver money, including the seventy-seven million limited tender, our silver stock is only eleven millions greater than our entire gold stock. Thus this claim of the monogold metallist falls to the ground.

But it is said, sir, that the silver is a debased and depreciated dollar. In 1873 silver was worth more than gold. It commanded a premium in the money markets. What struck down its value? The fiat of law, the demonetization act of 1873, a measure that was passed clandestinely through Congress, that was signed by President Grant in ignorance of the poisoned chalice contained in the cup, and that received the careful revision and supervision of Ernst Seyd, a London banker, as evidenced in the report submitting that bill to the House. The law can create a demand for

money and thereby give to it a value, or it may destroy that demand and thereby destroy its value as money.

Sir, who does not remember, when the clouds hung dark and threatening in 1860, gold, true to its cowardly and unpatriotic instincts in all times of need or peril, fled and deserted the country, and the mighty power of law created a money which furnished the sinews of war in the most gigantic internecine strife of history. No; it was the act of 1873 that first depreciated silver as money. Afterwards, when the Bland-Allison and Sherman act respectively sought, as it was then supposed, to restore it to partial coinage, its price immediately rose, but almost as immediately fell when it was discovered that those measures were being executed in a way to discredit silver.

Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition here to quote the free-silver utterances of the present Secretary of the Treasury; they are a part of our history; they are recorded in the official proceedings of Congress, and they will stand there to confront him as long as he lives. But I want to say right here, from the day Mr. Carlisle entered upon the duties of his great office down to the present time, no act of his has been friendly to silver, or has varied in the least from the policy of his Republican predecessor. Our silver dollar is selling to-day at a premium—not because it is redeemable in gold, because there is not enough of that commodity in the world to redeem one-tenth of the tokens behind which it impudently pretends to stand.

No, that silver-dollar valuation is not based upon gold as its redeemer, nor, Heaven knows, upon any confidence in bankers, but upon something stronger, greater, and more honest than all these, the wealth and credit of the people of the United States. Had Mr. Carlisle recognized this fact, and known, as he must have known, that every dollar coined from the bullion purchased under the Sherman act could and would have maintained its parity with gold, if paid out for such purchases, by reason of the pledged faith and credit of the nation, we should never have heard of a gold scare. That mysterious gold reserve would not have been rising and falling like a thermometer with every pulsation of Lombard and Wall streets.

Mr. Speaker, remove the restrictions from silver coinage, make it a full legal-tender, debt-paying money, and it will immediately bound into new life and give relief to a people who are now suffering from a circulation contracted simply because under our suicidal policy we permit a few gold gamblers to bring on panic and business depression at their own sweet will. You can not relieve the people by making money still scarcer. You would strike down one-half our money metal; what, then, would follow? You increase twofold every form of indebtedness. Where the debtor now owes \$100 under this policy he would have to pay \$200.

Sir, the load of indebtedness is already weighing down the farming and laboring classes. How much greater do you intend to make it? Will nothing but the absolute ownership of the earth satisfy you? Take heed you do not go too far. The gradual absorption of all wealth in the hands of the few presaged the fall of Assyria, Egypt, and Rome. But remember we are an Anglo-Saxon race, who can not and will not be enslaved.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I have shown, the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act means a ruinous contraction of our currency and a fall in the price of all products of labor. Since 1873, since silver has gradually fallen in value, the staple products of the farm have kept pace with it in its downward course.

The following table will show the relative depreciation of silver, wheat, and cotton since that period:

Year.	Wheat.	Cotton.	Silver.	Year.	Wheat.	Cotton.	Silver.
1872	\$1.47	\$19.3	\$1.32	1883	\$1.13	\$10.8	\$1.11
1873	1.31	18.8	1.29	1884	1.07	10.5	1.01
1874	1.43	15.4	1.27	1885	.86	10.6	1.06
1875	1.12	15.0	1.24	1886	.87	9.9	.99
1876	1.24	12.9	1.15	1887	.89	9.5	.97
1877	1.17	11.8	1.20	1888	.85	9.8	.93
1878	1.34	11.1	1.15	1889	.90	9.9	.93
1879	1.07	9.9	1.12	1890	.83	10.1	1.04
1880	1.25	11.5	1.14	1891	.85	10.0	.90
1881	1.11	11.4	1.13	1892	.80	8.7	.86
1882	1.19	11.4	1.13	1893	.50	7.2	.75

These figures are eloquent. Let every farmer in the land study them. He will understand why it is that he is now selling wheat, corn, and cotton at ruinously low figures. He will find the reason to be in the steady appreciation of gold. What will the future of the farmer be if this system shall long continue? Gentlemen, these are the bread-winners, the hope and salvation of our country; destroy them and you destroy the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is said that we are lagging behind in the race of nations, that all the civilized governments have adopted the gold standard, and that we should adopt it as a means of self-

preservation. Sir, this is an insult to the American people. We have the greatest country on earth; our resources are practically inexhaustible, and our independence unquestioned. Buried in our mountains lie more silver and gold than in any other country on the globe, and yet, withal, we must receive our financial lessons from Europe. Could toadyism go farther?

Why, sir, we are no more dependent on England, France, or Germany than we are upon the Sandwich Islands. What is there, Mr. Speaker, in the economic conditions of England that we should envy? True, they have a landed aristocracy, privileged classes, and gilded royalty. There may be seen in its full perfection the extremes of wealth and poverty. But let us for a moment, if we can, withdraw our attention from her money center in Lombard street to her rural population. Let us see how the single gold standard has bestowed its blessings on that class. I read from report of Consul Howard, Miscellaneous Document No. 109, for the months of January to April last, inclusive, page 82:

Of all the industrial classes in Great Britain the tenant farmer is the most worthy of consideration and sympathy. Incredible as it may seem to American farmers, who are paying from \$18 to \$25 per month, with board, to a common farm hand, the agricultural laborer in England is paid on an average about \$12 per month, out of which he boards himself, shelters and feeds his family, and provides them with the alleged comforts of life. The rate of wages has saved the farmer from bankruptcy hitherto and made it possible for him to till the soil and pay the rent, but it has at the same time driven, and is driving, the agricultural labor to city and town, where it swells the constantly increasing current of common labor to a disastrous flood.

While the English farmer and laborer are thus striving to keep soul and body together, a gentleman of the same realm, not entirely to fortune and to fame unknown, Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, in his speech at the International Monetary Conference at Brussels, says:

I hold that wheat at thirty a quarter instead of forty-five is rather a blessing than otherwise.—*Senate Executive Document No. 82, page 69.*

Here is a man with the courage of his convictions. This Napoleon of Napoleons of finance boldly and characteristically states the desires and purposes of the money power to be financially to enslave the laboring people in order that the drones may live at their expense.

Let us look for a moment at Germany, another gold-standard country. I read from the same consular reports, pages 96 to 98:

The earnings of the average wageworker are pitifully small. It is certain they do not allow him any luxuries; it may well be doubted whether in many cases they are sufficient for the barest necessities.

It will be seen that the wages paid weavers and those engaged in the textile industries are among the lowest in the scale. The condition of this class is indeed most hopeless. Long hours in ill-ventilated and close quarters, and a minimum allowance of the plainest food, have so reduced the majority of artisans as to make them physically incapable of outdoor work of any kind. The usual fare for a weaver is a breakfast of thin coffee, with dry bread broken into it. Dinner consists of potatoes, potato soup, or meal soup, with dry bread. For supper there is either thin coffee, with dry bread, or soup. Meat is purchased in small quantities on Sundays and holidays by the better paid; for the great mass it is a luxury beyond reach. The character of the food never varies from year to year; winter and summer, it is always the same.

From two-thirds to three-fourths of the incomes of small wage-earners is spent for food—food little in quantity and inferior in quality. In a community of 8,000 factory hands the weekly expenses for food in a family of two (man and wife) were apportioned thus: Bread and meal, 181 pfennigs; potatoes, 35 pfennigs; vegetables, 13 pfennigs; biscuits, 12 pfennigs; milk, 6 pfennigs; butter, 110 pfennigs; bacon, 6 pfennigs; meat, 30 pfennigs; herrings, 8 pfennigs; salt, etc., 7 pfennigs; sugar, 11 pfennigs; chicory, 5 pfennigs; total, 426 pfennigs, or 60 pfennigs per day.

This is cited as a typical case among those whose average income is 400 marks—about 42 per cent of the entire population. In another instance the average yearly income of twenty-four families was 295.37 marks. Reckoning two children and one adult dependent upon this amount, the share falling to each would be 98.46 marks—in other words, a daily allowance of 27 pfennigs. Less than 7 cents a day is thus represented to be the limit to be expended by 46 per cent of the weaving population.

But, as abject as is the misery and privation revealed by such figures, the privations imposed upon those working in their own garrets are still greater. These unfortunates are for the most part women and young girls. In Lelsic, according to a recent monograph on social studies, the wages paid for a week's work of from eleven to thirteen hours daily in making paper lanterns is 4.50 to 9 marks; men receive from 10 to 12 marks. Women working for umbrella factories get from 5 to 8 marks weekly.

The week's wages of a man and wife working together twenty-four hours daily in the making of felt shoes amounted to 12 marks. Sewing girls working for dressmaking establishments receive from 4 to 8 marks per week. Instances of this sort might be multiplied. In many cases the average annual income is not over 150 marks by reason of the enforced idleness at certain periods. The very lowest weekly sum required to exist is estimated at 6.50 marks. This affords a suggestive commentary.

One more instance—that of France, which since 1873 has been under the single standard. From the same authority, page 11, I read as follows:

In spite of what official statistics may state, I am able to say that in this very large and important industrial community the average skilled workman earns less than \$400 per year. In round numbers 1,800 francs is what an expert weaver owning his own loom can earn. Unskilled labor is paid by the municipality 58 cents per day, and it is no uncommon thing to find scores of skilled laborers out of regular employment seeking work from town to town at 58 cents per day.

How can a man support a wife and two or more children when his total earnings, assuming that he works three hundred days in the year, amounts to \$174 per year? Yet this is the task thousands of human beings are called upon to face annually in France.

When one considers that in a population of 38,000,000 the number of people

engaged in agriculture, commerce, and other industries exceeds 30,000,000, and that there are only about 2,000,000 persons of independent means, it is not difficult to see how the majority may get the impression that they are oppressed by a very small minority.

These instances, Mr. Speaker, will give to the farmers and laborers of America an idea of what their condition, already bad enough, will be when they are placed upon this great commercial plane of the civilized nations of the earth. Evidently, so far as they are concerned, the monometallic gold standard is not a dispenser of all blessings and the all-in-all savior of nations. What would gentlemen have? Would they relegate our agriculturists of the West to the condition of those in England? Do you want still further to reduce the prices of agricultural products, and, therefore, all labor in that department of industry? Do you, with Mr. Rothschild, clamor for still cheaper wheat and cotton?

Sir, these are the natural and inevitable results of a monometallic gold standard, because the quantity of gold in the world, being confessedly insufficient to do its business, it follows, as a matter of course, that such scarcity appreciates its value, and that therefore they who control its supply likewise control the value of all labor or property and can depreciate it at their pleasure.

Now, under the bimetallic standard such a condition of affairs is not so easily brought about. Where you have the free and unlimited coinage of both metals, silver ever has been and, from the nature of things, ever will be the people's money, and will circulate among them, and thus make it harder for those who desire to corner the gold to do so, and thereby to control all other values. But we are told that this will be cheap money. I want to repeat, that whenever the law creates a use for a given article, thereby causing a demand for its use, value is added to it by reason of such use and demand.

That is just as plain as anything on earth can be. Take, then, your silver bullion, if you please; stamp it with the Government stamp, declare that it is a dollar, that it is 100 cents, that it is a legal tender for the payment of all debts, and that silver dollar will march on side by side with your gold dollar, and hold its own in the race of business in this country. [Applause.]

I want to call attention to another point. We are told that the Sherman law is the cause of the present panic. I have just about come to the conclusion, sir, that the people who assert that hardly believe it. If they do, I am almost tempted to say that they are not only monometallic men, but that they certainly must be monoidea men. You had read to you, gentlemen, the other day, a passage in which was depicted the fall of the Roman Empire by reason of the contraction of the currency. Did the Sherman law have anything to do with that? [Laughter.] Again, in 1816, England adopted the single gold standard. The same merciless depression that has always followed the effort to conduct the business of a country on a gold basis, followed there. It is graphically described by Alison, as follows:

The effects of this extraordinary piece of legislation were soon apparent. The industry of the nation was speedily congealed, as a flowing stream is by the severity of an Arctic winter. The alarm became as universal and widespread as confidence and activity had recently been. The country bankers, who had advanced largely on the stocks of goods imported, refused to continue their support to their customers, and they were forced to bring their stocks into market. Prices, in consequence, fell rapidly; that of cotton, in particular, sank in three months to half its former level. * * * The effects of this sudden and prodigious contraction of the currency were soon apparent, and they rendered the next three years a period of ceaseless distress and suffering in the British Islands. * * * The effect upon prices was not less immediate or appalling. They declined in general within six months to half their former amount, and remained at that low level for the next three years. Distress was universal in the latter months of 1819, and that distrust and discouragement were felt in all branches of industry, which are at once the forerunner and the cause of disaster.

Did the Sherman law have anything to do with that? Again in 1836 was the currency contracted in England. The same historian describes its consequences, as follows:

On, however, the tempest came, and fearful was its violence. With the steady "contraction of the currency" by the Bank of England, which began in July, 1836, prices fell during the whole of the ensuing winter, and in the spring of 1837 the panic was universal. Many bankruptcies took place, though fewer in Glasgow than might have been expected from the severity of the pressure, owing to the amount of solid wealth which had been made in the preceding five years. But as prices of all sorts of manufactured produce had sunk nearly a half, the manufacturers were under the necessity of lowering wages; and this soon induced strikes in nearly all the branches of skilled industry.

Why, sir, to contract the currency of a country is opposed to even the teachings of Alexander Hamilton, the father of the Republican party. He says to annul either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from the comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation.

And, coming down to 1873, De Lavelaye tells us that prices fell, and industry, losing money, limited its operations. Why, sir, in 1873, the criminal period of the centuries, almost universal depression reigned over England, the Continent, and the United States. Mr. Bright, in 1879, referring to the condition

of England, said, "I believe the agricultural owners and occupiers of land have lost more than £150,000,000." He attempted to attribute the misfortune to poor crops and seasons.

But, sir, those poor crops and seasons have been lasting for many years, with no signs of abatement. Deeper with each succeeding year has sunk the farmer in the scale of poverty, while the mortgage, daily growing more gigantic, swoops down upon his devoted home, and, like the bird of evil omen, "casts its shadow on the floor." Ah, the Sherman law had nothing to do with these depressions. Only the other day the Australian bank failed. So dire was the distress resulting that the newspapers stated, in order to preserve existence itself, the crown of womanhood was placed on the auction block and sold to the highest bidder. Why, we are beginning now to find out the whole truth about this panic. It belts the civilized globe. The Continent is not exempt from its baneful touch. Only a day or two ago nine stockholders failed in London and two in Liverpool.

It is criminal in such a calamity to falsely assign the existing evils to a cause in no wise responsible for them, simply as a pretext to place the country upon a gold standard. It is that and nothing more. A cruel, heartless conspiracy on the part of the banks. They have the country by the throat, and refuse to loosen their grip, unless they are given still further power over the people. But the Sherman law is responsible for it all. Why, Banker Clews sings a different tune in his financial review of August 5:

He gets up off of the Sherman law and the "fool people who are hoarding their money," and jumps on the Chicago speculators. He says their "withholding of grain and other kinds of produce from the usual course of export for several months was largely the cause of the heavy drain of gold." He says "the stringency which they so largely helped to create has at last compelled them to realize at ruinous losses."

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HENDRIX], a national banker, to whose able speech I had the pleasure of listening the other day, says in relation to it, "Why, God Almighty himself could alone bring about such a condition as involves the whole globe to-day."

No, this war on the people's money commenced in 1873. The present attack is the final onslaught of the enemy. It is Plutocracy vs. Democracy. It is Lombard and Wall street united for a common purpose. For my part, as a humble Representative on this floor, I shall cast my lot with the common people. To all influences that would hold me back, I say with the Seminole, "Blaze with your serried columns, I will not bend the knee."

Mr. Speaker, for years and years has Congress legislated in the interest of the select few. The creditor alone receives attention. Let us now do the debtor justice. Let us not add to his burdens. One more word and I have done.

We have been told, Mr. Speaker, that this question rises superior to party. If by that declaration it is meant that the issues involved in this discussion will reach to every fireside in this land, then, indeed, it is true. If it is meant that we are brought face to face with a proposition to impose the financial slavery of Europe upon the American people, then, again, is it true.

But if by that declaration it is meant that it is the duty of Congress to legislate upon these lines, then it is not true, but beneath party. For, Mr. Speaker, the behests of the money power are seldom tempered with mercy or with justice. From the day when Dives lifted up his eyes in hell, down to the present time, has this unrelenting oppressor of mankind marched steadily on, crushing, as a modern Juggernaut, all within his reach. And he is marching on now over mercantile and manufacturing interests and even over his allies and confederates, the banking institutions. Nor would he halt here appalled at new fields of conquests. He would invade every home in this fair land; yes, he would trample upon the prostrate forms of despondent fathers and weeping mothers, woman in her beauty, man in his strength, budding childhood and prattling infancy, on all, to accomplish his end.

But it may be well, Mr. Speaker, for these men to remember that there is a time when forbearance ceases to be a virtue. They should not become oblivious of the fact that a new light has dawned upon the western world. The spirit of intelligence is there abroad. As the children of Israel in their weary march of old were guided by a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, so we in this struggle of the centuries shall have as our pillar of cloud by day the Constitution of our fathers and our pillar of fire by night the patriotism of the people. Nor shall we reckon without our host. We are not representing Old World constituencies, but a people brave, intelligent, and patriotic, who have solved this problem, and who will be quick to act upon the maxim, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Mr. Rothschild, at the international monetary conference at Brussels, said:

So far as agreeing upon a universal standard is concerned, no two nations are alike as regards their individual wealth, resources, and expenditure:

and therefore no universal agreement can be made with respect to a general currency.

Then, sir, let this Congress declare, when this discussion shall have ended, that Mr. Rothschild for once at least in his life spoke the truth. Let it legislate upon the same independent line of policy and action. Let it declare, in language unmistakable, that the United States, the central star of the nations of earth, shall not be plucked from its proud eminence to become a satellite of England; but rather, on the other hand, moving along its appointed course, aloof from the jarring elements beneath, it shall continue to perform its great revolutions within the orbit of national independence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say this, and in no spirit of threat or of prophecy: If the highest duty of this Congress shall consist simply in repealing the Sherman law, then let the tidings go forth, as assuredly they will, that on this proposition the Republican party and the Democratic party are one. If the issue upon which the last campaign was fought and won be a delusion and a snare, again and again let the tidings go forth, as assuredly they will, that on these two propositions the Democratic party and the Republican party are one. If the condition of the tariff, as suggested, is by no means critical, and in the sweet by and by it may possibly receive homeopathic treatment, again and again, and again let the tidings go forth, as assuredly they will, that upon these three propositions the Democratic party and the Republican party are one.

But if, as I believe, the Democratic party is still the party of the people, if it would remain true to its traditions and its teachings, if it would go beyond the narrow confines of the money-changer's office and listen to that voice, deep toned as thunder, coming from the teeming millions of this broad land, then indeed shall it re-write, but this time in letters imperishable as our mountains of silver and gold, resistless as our rivers rolling down to the sea, and majestic as the grandeur of our free institutions, that old, old Democratic doctrine, "The free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1." [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS, of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I feel keenly the ridiculous attitude in which I am placed of undertaking to speak here and now, and I feel, as other gentlemen have perhaps felt before me upon their first plunge into the political world at Washington, like rising in my seat simply to thank the Speaker sincerely for the magnificent opportunity which he has given to me, as sixth upon the night list, to speak to a lot of pages and empty benches. [Laughter.] And I felt, in justice to the dignity of the district I represent, the largest in the State of Mississippi and the most Democratic, inclined to decline with thanks the honor. But, sir, upon second thought, it occurred to me that all of us were very small people in the city of Washington, and that it was best to be submissive to the will of the House; and besides that there was a duty due to the people I have the honor to represent; that it was due them not alone to publish in the RECORD, but to stand on the floor of this House and to voice the eternal warfare which they now inaugurate and will never end against a policy the ultimate result of which would be to reduce the free farmers who constitute nine-tenths of the population of that district to the condition of German Bauern, of Scottish crofters, or of Irish tenant farmers.

It struck me that I would not be doing my duty to them to allow even the ridiculous situation which surrounds me to prevent me from expressing their voice and views. Therefore, without apology, which will necessarily consume time, and with the modesty which is becoming in one who has had no legislative experience here or elsewhere, who, furthermore, has had no official experience of any sort, never having held or sought an office in my life, coming here from the people, fresh from the agricultural people of the country, voicing the wishes of the great agricultural Democracy, which, I submit, is as respectable and just as much entitled to weight as are boards of trade or the commercial exchanges in this broad land, having no vantage ground at all, unless it be one (and I hope for the sake of the American people and the honor of Congress that it is not)—unless it be one to occupy the ground of entire sincerity of conviction and honesty of purpose, I shall undertake to plunge into this great debate.

The first step that I shall take will be to request the Clerk to read an extract from a paper which I now send up—the Boston Traveller. The Clerk read as follows:

[Special Dispatch to the Traveller.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., Aug. 14.—President Cleveland has determined to apply his most heroic influence to bring about the speedy adoption of the silver repeal bill. He has issued instructions to all of his Cabinet officers that there shall be no more appointments made upon the recommendation of men in Congress about whose vote upon the silver problem there is any doubt.

He has gone even further, and has directed that there shall be extended no official courtesy whatever to anyone in Congress until it is known how his vote is to be cast upon the silver question.

Two Senators from the far West called upon Secretary Hoke Smith the other day and asked to have enforced certain laws adopted by the last Congress relating to Indian reservations, and they were surprised to be informed by the Secretary of the Interior that the Department would take no action upon the request of men in Congress until after the Sherman law was repealed.

The Senator attempted to explain to Secretary Smith that there was not the slightest partisanship or personal favor to them in the request made, but the Secretary of the Interior replied that he was carrying out instructions, and there would be nothing done except the routine of the Department until after the silver question was disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had that article read and I desire to make no comments save to say two things: First, that I do not believe a word of it. I believe that it is a base calumny upon the leader of the Democratic party and the President of the United States. I do not believe and can not believe that an administration headed by a man whom I have revered and admired, and taught the people whom I represent to reverence and admire, headed by a man who has made himself dear to the American people not alone by saying that "public office is a public trust" but by acting it; who has carried that principle farther than I would have carried it, so far that he has declined to use official patronage for the purpose of rewarding the men who have carried the cause of sound political principles to a successful issue or of punishing the common enemy, the Republican party; I decline to believe that an administration headed by that man for whom I have demonstrated my respect and reverence now for three Presidential periods, by advocating his cause to the best of my humble ability, not alone after nomination but before it, could change its position and sink to the base and contemptible littleness of using official patronage to disrupt the Democratic party, for that is the purpose if it were to be done. [Applause.] For, Mr. Speaker, men ought to be affected with the natural consequences of their acts.

That is one thing that I wanted to say. The other is this, in behalf of the Southern men who sit here: Even if I believed that, it would demonstrate to my mind but one thing, and that would be the woeful lack of knowledge of human nature which must exist in the mind of the author of such a policy.

You, a Southern man, Mr. Speaker, just think of the attitude in which this places you, for a moment. For ten long years we, the gentlemen of the South, bore on our lances the cause of local self-government and civil liberty on the American continent, with no aid from any quarter except now and then a random shot from old New York (God bless her; although she is wrong now on this question) and the persistent musketry of little New Jersey. But can it be that any man of common sense believes for a moment that that magnificent cohort of Southern gentlemen, who stood out manfully for self-government, with the charge of treason palsying every nerve and oppressing them in every effort, could be controlled and cajoled at this late day by a few pitiful post-offices. [Applause.]

During that entire period, amid darkness and clouds, with no break in the monotony of the gloom, save now and then a lightning flash accompanying a thunderbolt hurled from Washington; when legislatures were dissolved at the point of the bayonet and good men torn from their wives' sides at dead of night and hurried to Sing Sing—without so much as one ray of the gentle sunshine of official favor in nation, State, or county—we fought fiercely on and at the end conquered a peace and renewed position.

And I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the men of the West, free born and manly, are as courageous as we are, and are as firm in their convictions; and I know that the magnificent race from which we spring, armed with the sense of mastery that it has always been able to exert, with the spirit of domination that has made it master wherever it went, is not to be controlled in that sort of style, wherever else may be.

And, Mr. Speaker, if there were a man upon this floor so contemptible as to be induced by such reasons to take a position contrary to his convictions, I would ask of his constituents, if they be a Southern constituency or a Western one, that when he goes home they may meet him at the border, and kick him in a westerly direction through the northern tier of counties, then in a southerly direction through the western tier of counties, then in an easterly direction through the southern tier of counties, then in a northerly direction back to the point of beginning; and then give him one grand boost and land him in the town of Quincy, Massachusetts [applause], where there exist gentlemen who are willing to rise upon this floor and say "Put me down as one of the President's gentleman ushers." [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, in the old country, where maids of honor, amid the scented perfume of the court, are glad to be prostituted to the pleasure of the executive, and are not ashamed of the bastards which result, there are men who yet consider it an honor to be gentlemen "flunkies." [Laughter.] In God's name, may the taste not spread in America!

Mr. Speaker, I wish in the next place to insert in my remarks in the RECORD an article from the New York Recorder which expresses so nearly my opinion in certain respects that I shall make it a part of the RECORD, because I believe that a record is now being made, and partially even by as humble an individual as myself, which in 1896 shall be made a part of the war material of the battle, a part of the war material necessary then. The article from the Recorder is as follows:

GIVE US FREE SILVER.

The Recorder believes that the time has come when the will of the people must be enforced alike upon Congress and the President, and the mints of the United States be thrown open to the free coinage of silver.

The financial and business situation is admittedly bad. There is no need to exaggerate it. It might be worse. It will become worse, much worse, unless Congress and President Cleveland can get together and relieve the existing commercial congestion by prompt and adequate legislation.

The President admits in his recent message that the repeal of the silver purchase law of 1890 will not fully meet the exigencies of our situation. It is confessed on all hands that to simply repeal the Sherman act and stop there will not leave our currency upon a satisfactory basis, or provide for a safe and sufficient circulating medium.

The business of this country can not be done upon a purely gold basis. There is too much business to be done, and too little gold to do it with, to justify the experiment of a currency based wholly on one metal, and that one the scarcer and dearer of the two. The total disfranchisement of silver as a money metal, which seems to be the aim of the gold extremists at Washington, means a violent and ruinous contraction of values. The mere threat of it has already given the first sharp twist to the screws of contraction.

To persist in the total elimination of silver from our currency is madness. The lead of the gold monometallists has been followed far enough. It is time to call a halt, and demand that silver shall be put back in the place it held for eighty years, from the formation of the Government down to 1873, and be made again one of the two main pillars of the American system of currency and coinage.

It is evident that his party in Congress is not fully with the President, and will not act upon his initiative unless he will assent to a provision by which silver shall be retained as a partner with gold on a just and fair ratio in the metallic basis of a nation's money. Congress is not ready and willing to repeal the act of 1890 until the President on his side is prepared to give his assent to a new law based on bimetallic principles restoring silver as a money metal and reestablishing the double standard.

This is the perilous feature of the situation at Washington. If the President and Congress can not harmonize their views and act together without long debate and delay, the crisis through which the trade and industry of the country are passing must and will grow more acute. Is there any way of bringing them together? Only, as the Recorder thinks, by putting such a pressure of public opinion upon them both as will compel them to meet on middle ground and take decisive action.

The President is not justified in asking for the unconditional repeal of the present silver law. To postpone the definite readjustment of our currency laws, leaving silver demonetized and its use as a standard money metal wholly prohibited, would, in the Recorder's opinion, precipitate a financial and business catastrophe compared with which all past panics would seem to have been mere bugaboos.

Absolute gold monometallism spells ruin, universal and unsparing ruin, for the people of this country.

Congress is right in demanding securities for the silver already coined and represented in our paper circulation, and a guaranty for the permanent retention of both metals and the historic double standard, at a ratio to be fixed with a due regard to the existing conditions of the currencies and coinages of the world. Congress stands for the American people in this matter. It is their dearest interests which it is defending in defending their constitutional currency—gold and silver.

The single gold standard has never been sanctioned or desired by the people of this country. Their will has been over and over again expressed to the contrary at every election and in every Congress for sixteen years past. Their determination that silver shall not be outlawed at the mints has been clearly and forcibly shown by overwhelming majorities in both branches of Congress. It never was stronger than it is to-day.

The clamor of the money-changers, the usurers, and the stock gamblers, inspired by the English influences that radiate from Lombard street, and which represent the organized rapacity of the world, has not shaken the faith of the American masses one iota in the honesty, the justice, the fairness, and, above all, the vital necessity of maintaining silver side by side with gold in their national money system.

There may have been a change in the relative measuring values of the two metals. That has often occurred in the course of history. But that change, whatever it may be, can be corrected by a change in the ratio of coinage from the present 16 to 1 to, say, 19 or even 20 to 1. It does not justify the total abolition of silver as a standard money metal. England is reported to be at this moment exchanging her gold for Indian silver on the basis of 22 to 1, showing that even the leading gold standard country recognizes that silver possesses an exchangeable value with gold at some ratio that can be fixed. And we may be sure that the Bank of England, in fixing it at 22 to 1, has been as unfair to silver and as partial to gold as it has dared to be.

The Recorder earnestly calls for a general expression of the popular will loud and clear and general enough to make the President and Congress understand that the people demand immediate relief from the stifling and stagnating currency conditions from which they are now suffering; and that, while they want the act of 1890 repealed, they also want the free coinage of silver restored at such new ratio as the wisdom of Congress may see fit to fix.

The money power has spoken for gold monometallism, and Mr. Cleveland seems to be its executive echo. Now let the people be heard and Mr. Cleveland be clearly informed that Congress, and not he, represents the national will on this matter of admitting silver as well as gold to the mints.

Gen. Grant once said, speaking from the same chair now filled by Mr. Cleveland: "I have no policy to enforce against the will of the people." The Recorder recommends Mr. Cleveland to adopt the same attitude on this money question, for it is the only one that is worthy of an American President. Congress is the repository of the people's lawmaking power, and it correctly represents them in resisting the single gold standard crusade, at whose head Mr. Cleveland has apparently placed himself. He can do the nation no better service at this grave crisis in its financial and business history than to yield gracefully and say with Grant: "I have no policy to enforce against the will of the people."

It is of the very first importance that the present state of affairs should not be long continued. Business is benumbed in every branch, currency and coin are alike in hiding, exchange is difficult to effect for want of money to do it with, perfectly sound banks are embarrassed themselves and can not give ordinary accommodations to their depositors, trade is clogged and hampered at every turn, mills and workshops are closing in large numbers, and even the most solvent and flourishing firms find it hard to draw on their deposited moneys in such forms as to meet their weekly pay-rolls in the usual way.

This is the situation, and it is not improving, but growing worse with every day's delay at Washington.

Bad as it is, it would become infinitely worse if Congress were to yield to the single gold standard movement and surrender the cause of silver. Such a surrender would mean disaster to all classes except the vultures that always flesh their beaks deepest and gorge themselves fullest on a field that is strewn with the victims of a vast commercial and industrial calamity. The merchant and the manufacturer, the big business man and the small tradesman, the great mass alike of employers and employed, the professional man, the brain-worker and the brawn-worker, and, more than all, the laborer and the wage-earner in every occupation, will all be drawn down together in the vortex of contraction if silver is outlawed.

To make gold the sole standard and the only currency is to diminish the volume of our money by one-half. That is contraction; and contraction means the com-

plete paralysis of all enterprises, the utter collapse of credit, the complete prostration of trade from New York to California, and the consignment of myriads of working people in every city and State in the Union to illness and starvation.

The Recorder pleads with all its power that this whirlpool of contraction may not be opened. President Cleveland and Congress must get together and prevent it. The people must raise their voices now and demand their own salvation. If silver be not restored quickly to free coinage, the most optimistic man can not look forward six months without fear. Millions of unemployed, wageless men, with their wives and children crying for bread that can not be earned for them, will be hard to reason with. But they will have to be reasoned with if silver is outlawed from the mints. And it will be idle to tell them that it was thought best to starve them in order to place the country on the same gold-standard footing as England.

Repeal the act of 1890, readmit silver to free coinage at a new and reasonable ratio, and do it quickly. That, and nothing less than that, will put the business of the country firmly on its feet again, give new heart to capital, new hope to labor, and restore good times throughout the land.

If this be not done and the antisilver madness prevail, the prosperity of the country can not be recalled, and its peace will soon be in serious peril.

Think of it! A few years ago there was a sort of nondescript known as a protection Democrat. Do you remember him? Where is he now? At home or on the other side of this chamber.

And I will tell you, in the name of the agricultural classes and in the name of the yeomanry of America, who do not live in cities of a hundred thousand population and over, that four years from now they are not going to step out and beat the old Democratic party because a minority here join hands with an almost solid Republican party and defeat the will of the people, but they are going to capture and hold the machinery of the Democracy; and the "monometallic Democrat" will be where the protection Democrat is to-day. [Applause.]

Now what strange postures are we in, gentlemen, politically speaking? A majority of the Democrats in the Senate, nearly a two-thirds majority, and a majority of the Democrats in this House stand here in favor of carrying out that plank of the platform at Chicago which said:

We hold—
Mark the language—
to the use—
Not the certification—
of both gold and silver—

As what? not subsidiary coin—
as the standard money of the country, and we believe in the coinage of both metals without discrimination or charge of mintage.

I was surprised to hear my learned friend from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] the other day liken his position here as a representative of the people to that of a lawyer who had misadvised his client. We occupy no such attitude. I know not what he may have said to his people upon the stump. I know not what you may have said to yours. Your contract is there. I have no criticism to make of it so far as that is concerned; but a man does not occupy toward his constituent the attitude of an advising counsel. He is a public servant, sent here to obey their mandate, a servant in the truest sense, where it is an honor to serve, but still a servant, and he stands in the attitude of one of two contracting parties who have entered into a covenant.

I am in favor of the free coinage of silver from honest convictions, and so told my people; but if I had changed my mind now I would not change my vote. As a gentleman, I would not until I had first resigned and gone home to my people and given them the pitiful opportunity to answer the question, "Have you changed yours?" [Applause.] It is a covenant, a bargain, a contract, and an honorable man keeps it. I understand in the particular case of the gentleman from Tennessee that he told his people upon the stump that he did not know whether he was in favor of free coinage or not, and they sent him here anyhow. I want everybody to understand—

Mr. TRACEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TRACEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?—and as he is the last speaker he will have the time—when the gentleman from Mississippi refers to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] is he not aware that the gentleman from Tennessee in the last Congress did vote against the free coinage of silver.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Just a moment ago I stated that I understood that on the stump the gentleman from Tennessee told his people that he was not in favor of the free coinage of silver.

Mr. TRACEY. He voted in this body against the free coinage of silver before he appeared on the stump before his people.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not care for that. I was simply stating that what I had said would apply to the attitude which I would occupy if I changed position, and that the gentleman from Tennessee I understood did not occupy the same attitude, because he told his people before he came here that he was not in favor of the free coinage of silver.

Mr. TRACEY. Now, you do not care whether he told the House or not?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You know I have only thirty minutes.

Mr. TRACEY. You are the last speaker and have plenty time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Very well, then.

Mr. TRACEY. I wished, in the absence of the gentleman from Tennessee, to call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that in the last Congress the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. PATTERSON) voted against the free coinage of silver, on the floor here, and then went before his people and was sustained.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York evidently has not understood me. I have just undertaken to explain that, although that what I have outlined would be the attitude which I would occupy were I to vote against the free coinage of silver, I understand that was not the attitude occupied by the gentleman from Tennessee, because he did tell his people, as I understand, upon the stump, that he was not in favor of the free coinage of silver, and, if so, that is his covenant and contract, with which I have nothing in the world to do. I threw it out generally for fear it might be thought I was impugning the motives of an old and valued friend.

Mr. TRACEY. Well, now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. He might be, furthermore, justified by his people, and I will admit that as a fact.

Mr. TRACEY. Now, the gentleman from Mississippi has spoken about the minority of the Democratic party being in accord with the Republican party on this question, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi whether, in the event of the majority of the Democratic party voting for the unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the so-called Sherman act, that will satisfy him, and if the members of the party on this floor will then be justified in having favored the unconditional repeal, and whether they would be justified before the people for so voting in case, on Monday next, the majority of the Democratic party vote in favor of unconditional repeal?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will answer that question by saying that if a man said to me, "Suppose the moon was made out of green cheese?" I would answer by saying, "But it is not made out of green cheese, and never will be." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TRACEY. I will predict that on next Monday the majority of the Democrats in this House will vote for the unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Never, sir, while the world holds.

Mr. TRACEY. You will see.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, what else do we see when we take notice of the peculiar posture of things. That nearly 100 votes will be found on the other—the Republican—side, which are looked to by the gentleman from New York and by the President, as necessary to carry this legislation through. But, I find another thing. I find, Mr. Speaker, that the entire Southern and Western delegation here, except a few gentlemen who are the representatives of large metropolises in which strong banking and creditor interests control, are on one side, and I find upon the other side the representatives of the money-lending and creditor interests of the Northeast.

The exceptions on our side are gentlemen who represent Memphis, Tenn., New Orleans, La., Vicksburg, Miss., Jacksonville, Fla., etc.

Mr. Speaker, I think that things have come to such a point that it is not unparliamentary for me to give a definition of Congress. Congress, in the new dictionary which I propose to write, shall be defined thus: "A court of appeal from the decision of the common people, the appeal being always preceded by a motion for a new trial upon the alleged cause of newly discovered evidence." [Laughter and applause.]

Now, I will go further in answering the gentleman's question and say, that even if it were possible that a majority of the Democrats on this floor can be cajoled or coerced into voting as he predicts, if the alleged representatives of the great Democratic party of this country should so vote, they would not reflect the will and wishes of a majority of the Democracy, and I propose to stand by the majority of the Democracy. [Loud applause.]

Why, gentlemen, why was it that the pressure came to call this House together a month earlier than originally contemplated, do you suppose? Why do you suppose they got up this great pressure all at once? It was for fear the panic would cease of itself before they could get their work in. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BRYAN. So stated by a New York banker.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It was stated by Mr. Clews, the great banker; and Mr. Jacob Strauss or Isadore Strauss came right along down to see the Chief Executive; and although representatives of the people had been writing time in and time out from April last, trying to get an extra session of Congress in order to stop the infernal robbery of the McKinley tariff bill, and could never get even so much as the courtesy of a reply to their letters, yet when Jacob Strauss came in the game was up and the thing was settled. [Laughter and applause.] In other words, gentlemen, you have reached the point where you have got the debtor and the farming classes on the one side and the banking and creditor classes on the other. We can carry the war into Africa but you can not. [Laughter.] You can not come down into Mississippi and get any converts who are interested as you are, because, thank God, I live in a State where there is not a millionaire nor a pauper. [Applause.] We

have neither the one nor the other, and you can not convert any of your class down there because they do not exist there. But, gentlemen, I do not thank God for the opposite state of affairs which exists where you and your brother banker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HENDRIX] who first addressed us, lives. By the way, on looking into the Congressional Directory I find that he is not a banker, he is the president of a Trust Company, the very kind of thing that the Democratic party says it wants to put down. [Laughter.] I repeat, you can not make any converts in our part of the country; but when we get up just within the shadow of your palaces in New York we can, with perfect ease, find the men whose interests lie on our side of this question. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, there are two classes of people who have been discussing this issue. I admire the courage and consistency of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SPERRY] who spoke to us the other day, and who said: "I want for my people the best money, the most valuable money." That means, if it means anything at all, the money which will purchase the most of service or of commodity; and very relevant indeed was the interruption of the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. BOATNER] when he asked him:

But, sir, you do not desire that your people shall be paid back in better money than they lent, do you?

And, Mr. Speaker, that question was not answered, and it never will be answered satisfactorily to the people, nor at all until the crack of doom, unless gentlemen on the other side should be brave and bold enough to come out like that grand old man in England, Mr. Gladstone, who stated the other day that he represented a creditor nation. That is where you really stand and you had better come out and take your position like men. Do not pray "Good Lord; good devil." [Laughter.] Do not say "Good President," and in the same speech "Good people;" but come right out and tell what the interests of the people on your side are. [Laughter.] And, gentlemen, if your constituents have that interest, I do not blame you a particle for representing their interest. Not at all. On the contrary, I admire Mr. Gladstone, who, when he was interrogated on the floor of the House of Commons the other day as to whether he was going to send the delegates back to the monetary conference, replied:

What is the use? What do we want with a bimetallic convention? I am afraid—

Said he,

to undertake to state what the amount is, but a very large amount of money is due to people who live within the United Kingdom from people who live without the United Kingdom. I should estimate it at not less than two billions of sterling—ten millions of American dollars. I admire the philanthropy of gentlemen who would make a gift to our debtors of that amount, but I do not see what cause we would have to congratulate ourselves, though I may perhaps see some reason why the rest of the world should congratulate itself.

Now, my friends, I have referred to this incidentally, but understand me, I take no part in these flings at the mother country. Grand old mother country, who sits there in her islands and rules the world, as she is ruling it to-day financially, and ruling you New York people amongst a good deal of the rest of the world. Had I stood in Mr. Gladstone's place I would have taken the position that he took, because it was for the interest of his people. It is no reason why we should do a thing because England desires us to do it. Neither is it any reason why we should not do it because she desires us to do it. Her interest may be ours in any given matter, or it may not. To say that England wants a thing is no argument for it or against it; and I believe in my heart that anglophobia is just as stupid as anglomania. I want gentlemen to understand, therefore, that I am taking no stock in any arguments of that sort. Nor am I taking any stock in another argument that has been used here, the theory that there has been a conspiracy; because I believe that there are a large number of people who are as honest as I am and far more intelligent than I am, who sincerely believe with all their souls that if this country adopts the free coinage of silver it will sink to a monometallic silver basis—people, I say, who are just as honest as I am, and among them chief stands Grover Cleveland. I do, however, believe there has been a combination, not a conspiracy, but a combination, and that combination has been formed by those people in their own interests. Nor do I blame them, the world being so full of selfishness, for combining in their own interest. The natural trend of the banking business is in the direction of dearer, or as they call it, "better" money—a money which will buy more when they get it back than it would have bought when they lent it out.

From a purely selfish "business" standpoint, and they do not pretend to be ruled by other than business motives—they do not assume to be philanthropists—they would be stupid not to operate to the best of their ability with that end in view. Why should they not want the principal to grow as well as the interest? Why should not their great and intelligent chieftains in England, Germany, France, and America cooperate to that end? They would do it unconsciously. And thus there came about "combination" everywhere without "conspiracy" anywhere—without need for "conspiracy."

Mr. Speaker, gentlemen speak of silver having been demonetized because of its overproduction; yet until the year 1881 there never had been a single year since the American and Australian discoveries of gold in which the production of silver measured by weight was sixteen times the production of gold measured by weight; in other words, there never had been a year up to 1881 when the basis

of the real comparative value of the two metals, which is their comparative rarity, equaled the American ratio of 16 to 1. So that, when gentlemen say that silver has been demonetized by the civilized countries because it was getting too cheap and too abundant they either show great ignorance indeed or they assume great ignorance on the part of their auditors.

I am not going back to England's initiative in 1816, because England at that time adopted a gold standard for the avowed reason that gold was the cheaper of the two metals, not because it was the dearer. England had come out of a great war with a great amount of debt upon her shoulders; she was not then the great creditor nation of the world that she is to-day; and when after coming out of that war she consummated the resumption of specie payments she did it in gold, because gold was then the cheaper of the two metals at a ratio of 15½ to 1, which was the ratio in England.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TRACEY. As I interrupted the gentleman, and as he is the last speaker this evening, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended so long as may be necessary to enable him to finish his remarks.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended indefinitely. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I intended to say was this, that the facts in regard to demonetization disprove the theory that the cause was the overproduction of silver. Watch the dates while I run over them quickly. Germany took the initiative in 1871; Scandinavia followed in 1872; the United States came along in 1873; then there came limited coinage in France and the Latin Union in 1874; then there came an entire cessation of coinage in France in 1876 or 1878. Now, Mr. Speaker, at the time the United States demonetized silver it was worth four mills more than gold in the dollar at our ratio. Germany consummated the demonetization in 1873 by putting her silver coins upon the market (I am not mistaken about the date), but she took the initiative legislation in 1871. At that time the amount of silver in a silver dollar was worth 3 cents more than the amount of gold in a gold dollar. Silver was not demonetized because there was overproduction. In those countries where demonetization took place there were two motives leading to it, one peculiar to Germany, the other common as to Germany and all the other countries. The motive peculiar to Germany was that it was thought demonetization would cripple her old enemy, France. It was a military measure for Germany to go to a gold basis and dump her silver into France. It turned out to be foolish, because France upon her bimetallic basis stood there solid and paid out one billion of gold dollars—five milliards of gold francs—and when she got through with this payment she was in a more prosperous condition than her neighbor who had received the money.

Mr. TRACEY. Will the gentleman permit me—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. TRACEY. The gentleman will allow me to suggest that he is inaccurate in the statement he has just made as to the quantity of gold paid by France to Germany. The indemnity paid by France to Germany after the Franco-German war did not include the quantity of gold which the gentleman has stated. A great portion of the payment was made in silver—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is not my recollection.

Mr. TRACEY. Only a small percentage of the payment was made in gold. A very large percentage was paid in silver and paper.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. My recollection, Mr. Speaker, is that the payment was made entirely in gold and in paper, and that paper was paper for which gold was afterward given; so that, in fact, the entire payment was made in gold.

Mr. TRACEY. I will ask the gentlemen to refer in his published speech to the data in support of his assertion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand that the gentleman's recollection of the matter does not accord with mine. I am frank to say that very possibly he may be right and that some of this amount was paid in silver; but that is not my recollection. I was in Europe about that time and I heard it constantly said in Germany where I was a student that there was five milliards of gold francs to be paid by France. I do not get my view from any historical account, but from my recollection of then current events. The other reasons common to all governments were that such a course was to the interest of the ruling or so-called better classes, and that the people had really nowhere a voice in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another thing that strikes me as peculiar about this situation (if you will excuse me a moment) is the air and bearing of my friends who take the position that the only sensible thing is a gold monometallic currency. You all heard the first gentleman who spoke from New York [Mr. HENDRIX]; you marked his manner; his eyes "in a fine frenzy rolling" from gallery god to gallery goddess; his brow arched over his eye; his chest thrown out; his head thrown back, overlooking this House as a set of contemptible pigmies, whose opinions were not worth consulting. [Laughter and applause.] His *ipse dixit* comes like a Papal bull—*ex cathedra*.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that nobody in the world, except an assistant Secretary of State, the negro that stands guard at the Postmaster-General's anteroom, or a sleeping-car porter, have a

right to that sort of bearing. [Laughter.] The first two have it by the customs of the city of Washington and the last has it by the common law of America. [Laughter.]

But it struck me, gentlemen, that perhaps this gentleman, coming from the same State, thought he had fallen heir to the manner and bearing of the late distinguished Roscoe Conkling. If so, I could tell him two things in that connection; first, that the manner was not that of Mr. Conkling, for although Mr. Conkling was a man who spoke his mind, he at all times treated his opponents, both in word and deed, with the utmost courtesy. He never called his enemies or his opponents in debate "jibbering idiots." He never put them in lunatic asylums. [Laughter.] He never told them that they were afflicted by "midsummer madness" and all that sort of thing. Although he might have thought that all the rest of the world (in his own mind) were fools, he never allowed them to see that that was his opinion. Another thing: even if it were the manner and bearing of Mr. Conkling, which the gentleman from New York assumes, I can tell him that it would require the superb eloquence and the magnificent intellectuality, the keen, cutting sarcasm, the wit and the incisive logic of Mr. Conkling to carry it off, here or elsewhere, outside of a counting house. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Speaker, if you will excuse me for a few moments longer, the gentleman from New York made some allusion to the evolution business before he got through with his remarks, and I want to tell you a little about that matter. He said this was a process of evolution, and that we might as well bare our breasts to the avalanche, I believe it was, and try to hold it back as to stand athwart the path of the world's evolution. Now, I take it from what I see of the gentlemen—I find that he was a newspaper editor first and later on the president of a trust company—I take it that it never fell in his way particularly to study the scientific theory of evolution, and that he needs information as to what it really is. I will take the liberty of informing him. Evolution, as I understand it, is the gradual consummation of a natural end by or through a process of the survival of the fittest and the extinction of the unfit. To illustrate: An acorn drops from an oak tree and a magnificent oak under peculiarly favorable circumstances is grown. It spreads its boughs and its shade in every direction over the adjacent country. Owing to its favorable environment it grows up a better oak than that from which the acorn originally fell. Acorns drop from this second oak and these are better than the acorns from the parent tree, and oaks continue to grow under the new and more favorable environments, and these also continue to improve until we have at the end of a period an improved oak, not much like the parent tree from which the acorn originally fell, and the acorn from that oak is different from the acorn of the parent oak, just as the Irish potato is now superior to and different from the original plant discovered in Peru.

But another illustration, Mr. Speaker. It is said that the monkey was the father of the man, and that he lost his appendage because it ceased to be useful. Not being needed it was not used, and therefore an extinction of the unfit followed. You know it takes use to develop the muscles of the arms and the legs, and so, too, a prehensile appendage or attachment of that sort requires use to develop its growth. [Laughter.] But there being no use for it, the monkey under new environments, not having to use this part of his anatomy, it became weaker and weaker and less and less in size and usefulness as a tail, until finally it dropped off and left nothing but a rudimentary appendage. [Laughter.] That is evolution. But if a man had gone and got a monkey out of a menagerie and taken a broadax and cut his tail off little by little, that would not have been evolution. That is just what has been done with silver. There has been a creditor broadax at work, first in Germany, then Scandinavia, then France, and then the United States, and then the miserable wielder of the instrument declares that he believes that this broadax is God's principle of evolution. [Laughter and applause.] As the gentleman has evidently never had evolution explained to him I thought it best to give this information.

Now, gentlemen, there is one argument that has been made in this Congress in the trial of this great cause before the people which I want to notice. Gentlemen say, O, well! Repeal the Sherman act now—repeal it now and trust to the common sense of Congress for a future remedy. I am with you. I am a bimetalist. I will vote for a free-coinage bill later, but not as a condition to repeal the Sherman act. My reply is this: If that magnificent, sturdy, and very honest gentleman who is Chief Executive of this nation will trust the common sense of Congress we will trust it, and you can repeal the Sherman act, gentlemen on the other side, in an hour, by the watch, whenever you are ready to give us assurance of his willingness to trust us and approve our future action.

If there is any sincerity in that argument, bring us here a pledge from the Executive that he will not veto a free-coinage bill later on, and then I will be with you. But you are not going to get the pledge. Why? Because the President is too honest a man to pledge himself to do a thing which he is not going to do. And, to be perfectly plain—I do not understand parliamentary usages, but I hope I am not unparliamentary—to be perfectly plain, you will never get from him the approval of a free-coinage bill unless it goes as an adjunct to the repeal of the Sherman law. You may not get it in that way, but you certainly will not get it in any other.

And I find it hard to believe in the sincerity of gentlemen who appeal to me to throw aside the only vantage ground we have. Why, Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy, if I undertook to run and catch-as-catch-may with another boy, and wrestle it out, if I got the underhold I thought it was ridiculous for him to turn and say: "Well, here, let us quit and give me the underhold and then call it a fair wrestle!" [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, I come to the discussion of this question first by stating what I favor. I favor the repeal of the Sherman law, the purchasing clause of it or all of it—I do not care which. I favor that, because that bill was never anything and is not now anything except a miserable silver bullion subtreasury scheme, and no more respectable from the standpoint of sound governmental practice than the subtreasury scheme which was advocated by our friend from Kansas here, which was to issue certificates of the Government to pass as money, upon the deposit of cotton, corn, and tobacco. I favor the repeal of the Sherman bill because it was a Trojan horse cunningly intruded into our fair city of Bimetallism, from which the enemies were to come, as I thought then and as the event has since shown, to try to overcome the city.

I favor the repeal of the Sherman law because I have had love for its enemies and hatred for its friends; but I favor the free coinage of silver because I think we have come now to a plain issue, and that there is no use trying to dodge it; that for this House of Representatives the issue is, Shall we have gold monometallism or shall we have bimetallism? And the thing to be argued is, "Is bimetallism practicable or possible?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, in that connection, let me say this: Gentlemen say bimetallism will necessarily bring us to silver monometallism. I do not really believe it, but if I did believe it, and if I were put to the choice and had no other choice, if the sole alternative which faced me was to accept either gold monometallism, a dishonest gold dollar, or silver monometallism, a dishonest silver dollar, the former dishonest to the debtor of the country and the latter dishonest to the creditor of the country, if I could conceive of being placed in the attitude where I had no other possible alternative but to put my hands into the pocket of one or the other and rob him, I would ask heaven's forgiveness for the deed, but I would rob the richer, so help me God. [Applause.]

But I do not take it there is any such issue as that. I take it that we have got to come down and get a right money. Now, gentlemen, starting off at that basis, I want to give a definition of money. It is not my definition, or it would not be worth a copper cent. There is nothing new in finance. When you have found anything new it is not worth talking about. It is like religion in that respect. Mr. Edward O. Leech, the last director of the mint, in an article in the North American Review in April, 1891, I believe, gives a definition of money which he has boiled down from the best authorities, and it is this:

Money is an instrument used in the exchange of services or commodities, which is at one and the same time a measure of values and an equivalent of values.

It must be both; and all the money fallacies, the two extreme fallacies which have grown up in this country, have come about by the disregard of one or the other necessary attribute of money. The fiat money man totally disregards the equivalency attribute of money, totally disregards the fact that money in order to be right money must be something beyond human control, beyond the control of politicians to increase or decrease at their sweet will, because, gentlemen, after all, government is a government of politicians. There are three hundred and fifty odd in this House and eighty odd I believe in the other, but it is a government of politicians. The fiat money man loses sight of the fact that money must be made out of something which can not be controlled, infinitely increased, or largely decreased at mere human will; that it must be a something which God has naturally fitted to act as money, just as God has fitted wheat to be turned into bread, or cotton to be turned into cheap clothing; that in order to possess the attributes which are necessary, it must be a something found within the storehouse of nature, which even human industry and human invention can not produce at will by increased human exertion, a something which must be found and in limited amount and with tolerable constancy. It must be something which will grow in production *pari passu* with the growth of population and wealth and transportation, and all the other instrumentalities of civilization.

On the opposite extreme is the gold monometallist. He loses sight entirely of the measure of value feature in his sole contemplation of the equivalency feature. He forgets that it must be sufficient in volume to answer the purpose of a measure; that it must be sufficient to measure things with the assistance of other things redeemable in it, and not too much of the other things to be currently redeemed in it. He loses sight of the fact that it must be something not too precious, but which can be divided and brought down, so that it will measure the smallest commodity. Both lose sight of the fact that gold and silver were money many years, not by law, but before there ever was a law, and that they were money because they were precious metals, and became more precious metals because they were money.

The question has been frequently asked, "Are gold and silver precious metals because they are money, or are they money because they are precious metals?" The question is a stupid one. They

became money because they were rare and precious, and they became still more precious because of the increased demand for them in use as money. They were money, as I said, before ever law or statute book made them such, before a mint or coinage existed, and if you were to-day, all over the world to rescind every coinage law upon every statute book in the world they would both remain money. The only difference would be that they would pass by weight and assay instead of by tale. Why? Because God made them—not legislation, not government, not man's ingenuity fitted them for it. And how did He do it? He gave them the attribute of rarity and preciousness; the attribute of infinite divisibility, and the attribute of comparative indestructibility and that of malleability; the quality of easily taking and permanently retaining stampage; so that men came to use them just as they came to use oats to feed horses with, and wheat to grind for bread, because they were naturally adapted to that purpose. It was a natural use. There is evolution; not the broadax sort of evolution, but the right sort of evolution—nature's *Entwickelung*.

Now, all that the silver men ask you in the world is, to "take the law off of silver;" treat the two natural money metals alike; that is all. They ask me, "But can the United States cure an evil which has been existing, if by demonetization at all, then by the demonetization of other nations besides our own?" I answer them entirely and completely, "No." But we can undo our part of the wrong and set the example for other people to undo their part. In proportion as the wrong is undone, the divergence now existing between the two metals, instead of widening, will close up to some extent, but to what extent we can not say.

But gentlemen say there is a large intrinsic-value difference. My reply is, you do not know what intrinsic-value difference there is; and when you use the expression in connection with gold and silver you use a double middle. When you speak of the intrinsic value of gold metal, you mean the intrinsic value and bullion worth, its use as money considered and accounted for; and when you speak of the intrinsic value of silver you mean its value as bullion, independent of its use and any prospective demand for it for that purpose. Intrinsic value, gentlemen, is value in use. You can not, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] said, fix the price of things by legislation. You can not pass a law saying that wheat shall be worth 50 cents, or a piece of paper shall be worth a dollar, and then make it so; but you can fix the value of things by any law which increases or decreases either demand or supply.

If I believed, as some gentlemen do here, that if there is to be bimetallism it must be had by international agreement and that this is attainable only by our joining western Europe in further demonetization, and thus convincing ourselves and them by a great "object lesson," I still would not be in favor of doing what they wish as the first step. They say that you must convince the world that gold is not to be had in sufficient quantity to carry on the business of the world. That was the argument of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER]. How will you convince the world? How will the world receive the demonstration in this way or any object lesson be sufficient to convince the world? What would bring about this demonstration? It would be a knock-down argument indeed! An "object lesson" of universal bankruptcy, suffering, misery, accompanying tumult and riot. As much as I love bimetallism, I do not want to reach it that way. But I furthermore hold that that is not the best way to reach it. I say there exists not upon the face of the globe to-day one single institution or law which came about as the result of international convention unless some great and strong nation first set the example or unless the "convention" came about as the result of war. Gentlemen on the other side may delve in all the history books and find not one instance.

Now, think a moment. Away back yonder, over one hundred years ago, people thought it would be useful to try to get a given point of longitude for universal use. Nobody was concerned in the matter; no vested interests were at stake. You could take the very point on which I stand now as your starting point, and it would do just as well as Washington or Paris or London, and it is a great convenience to science and to mankind that there should be a single point of world-wide acceptance. But mere national jealousies and inertia have prevented it, and to-day England starts her longitude from Greenwich, America from Washington, Russia from St. Petersburg, France from Paris, and Germany from Berlin, and the State of Massachusetts would start it from Boston if it was not too small a part of the Union. [Laughter and applause.]

Take another matter. There is no man of common sense in this wide world but agrees that a metric system is the best for weights and measures, and ever since Thomas Jefferson undertook to bring it about, and had some influence upon the statesmen of the French Republic in bringing it about there—I do not know how much—scientific congress after scientific congress have sent out their pronouncements urging it; yet the two most intelligent peoples of the world, the head and front of civilization, the one civilizing the islands of seas and the other civilizing the continents, England and the United States of America, still measure molasses by the gallon and wheat by the bushel, and subdivide them not into tenths and hundredths, but into quarters and eighths and thirty-seconds, to the confusion of youth and old age. [Laughter.]

Now, my friends, I learned when I was a boy that it has been a

truth ever since the day when the woodman dropped his axe into the stream and prayed to Hercules to recover it, ever since the day when, as we are told in another fable, he prayed to Hercules to lift his wagon out of the rut, and Hercules told him to first put his own shoulder to it, ever since that day it has been true that in national as well as individual undertakings you can never accomplish anything until somebody makes the start. [Applause.]

There is no consummation without an initiation. All are not going to complete what each in turn is afraid to begin. You can't inaugurate a great industrial enterprise on the credit of a wish to see it succeed. You must "show your faith by your works," and first take stock yourself.

And who is better fitted to take the start than we? All the nations now see the bad effects, but each one is standing waiting for the others, as we are. Each one says: "If I throw myself into the breach I must take the risk of not being followed and the responsibility on behalf of the nations of the world must rest on me."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I began by saying that I felt the ridiculousness of speaking at all under the circumstances, and I find, to my astonishment, that I have made it still more ridiculous by making a serious speech to a row of still half-empty benches. [Cries of "Go on!"] No; I shall stop now, with that degree of forbearance and politeness that has always characterized me. [Laughter.] If there is anything in the world that I am, it is a sympathizer with the sufferings of mankind [laughter], and, in deference to that feeling, I shall stop now and load the people of my district with the remainder of this speech through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. [Laughter and prolonged applause.]

I had just said that we must take the initiative. Are we in a condition to do so? Can we afford to coin more silver? If so, at what rate and for how long a time can we persist in it? The best argument is always an inductive one—one drawn from our own experience or from the experience of others.

Our own situation first, then.

It is not true that "we have too much silver," nor that "the people do not want silver," nor that "silver is driving out gold," nor that the certificates under the Sherman bill are driving out gold, nor, in fact, that gold is being driven out at all now. These statements made, or assumed, as the base of arguments are simply false in fact, and that is the long and short of it. A premium is being paid to-day at New York for the despised silver dollar, and gold is pouring by the millions daily into this country, there having been forty millions to come within twenty days.

Listen to the following statement of Watson & Gibson, brokers, of the condition of things in Wall street. It is not the utterance of politicians, but of business men for the guidance of their clients:

The Clerk read as follows from the St. Louis Republic:

[Special to The Republic.]

NEW YORK, August 13.

The following is a carefully prepared statement of the situation in Wall street by Messrs. Watson & Gibson, brokers, 55 Broadway, New York:

"Where is all that fear of our 65-cent silver dollar? We were told only a few months ago, by the urgent advocates of the abandonment of silver by this country, that the preference for gold would lead to its hoarding and withdrawal from circulation, and that everybody would want to pass his silver dollars on quickly to his next neighbor, as they used to pass 'wild-cat' currency from hand to hand lest it depreciate in the keeping. There is a hoarding of gold, but only by those who can not get the more convenient form of legal-tender paper money.

"Further than this, more gold is now paid into the custom-house and more paid out by the Treasury and the banks than in years. Instead of leaving our shores, gold is coming this way by every steamer; and, since its loss by export last spring so greatly disturbed the public peace of mind, conversely the return of this gold ought to, and indeed does, encourage the financial community. But why not go further and say that, if the gold critics were right last spring in attributing the outward movement of gold to the silver law, they should now ascribe the return flow to the same measure? The silver bill is a nondescript, but it is the neutral ground between free coinage and the introduction into this country of the sole gold standard, which would have a cramping and contracting influence, and, therefore, it is a sort of ark of the covenant.

"No man can gauge the probable measure of legislation on silver. Congress was called together to rule silver out by what President Cleveland and the ultra-gold men would do—namely, to unconditionally repeal the silver bill. One man's guess may be as good as another's, but that is no reason why we should be so modest as not to guess at all. Our guess is a long struggle, a great many speeches, parliamentary moves and rumors, with the final result of a free-coinage bill on a changed ratio, say 20 or 24 to 1, possibly with a provision for a gradually descending ratio, if the open market price of bullion shall rise.

"The presentation of such a bill to Mr. Cleveland would be a curious picture of the whirling of sentiment and events. Things do not often come out as they are planned, they 'gang aft aglee,' and those who are so sure of a repeal of the silver bill without substitute may come to realize this very effectually.

"On Tuesday everything went down after the President's message appeared, except silver, which was 74½ bid, but not offered below 75½, as against 73 bid Monday. On June 30, the day Mr. Cleveland issued his call for a special session of Congress, silver sold as low as 67 and as high as 69, and on Thursday it sold at 78½, or 11½ cents per ounce higher. This shows the inherently strong position of silver in the market."

These gold shipments are continuing. I will read these extracts from the commercial reports of 17th and 18th from great metropolitan journals:

[Washington Post.]

MORE GOLD FROM EUROPE—LARGE CONSIGNMENTS OF THE YELLOW METAL COMING TO THIS COUNTRY.

LONDON, August 17.

Gold to the amount of £314,000 was withdrawn from the Bank of England to-day for shipment to the United States.

The Hamburg-American line steamer Columbia, which sails to-morrow from Southampton for New York, will take consignments of gold valued at \$1,440,000.

SOUTHAMPTON, August 17.

The Trave, from Bremen, sailed hence for New York at 4 p. m. to-day. She carries \$910,000 in gold for American houses.

NEW YORK, August 17.

The steamer Lahn, which arrived last night, brought \$672,055 gold from Southampton and 1,047,500 francs from Paris. There is £57,370 consigned to the Canadian Bank of Commerce in transit to the Bank of Nova Scotia of Chicago.

[New York Press, August 19.]

The gold stream does not seem to be interrupted in the least. The Spree made the record for a merchant steamship carrying gold with its cargo of \$2805,000, which arrived last week. Now the Fuerst Bismarck comes in with \$4,200,000 to fourteen different consignees, and it is evident that some of it will go to Chicago.

As there is no attempt to report with accuracy the shipments from the other side, it will be noticed that every steamship brings more than is reported. The Etruria, which is due to-day, has, it is reported, \$1,850,000, which will bring the total for the week perhaps up to \$10,000,000. La Touraine also has a considerable amount. The Trave, from Southampton, on Thursday had \$910,000; the Columbia, from Southampton, yesterday, \$1,440,000; the Campania, from Liverpool, to-day, \$800,000 that is known of, and the Elbe, from Bremen, to-day, \$300,000. In addition to all this, Chicago engaged yesterday \$950,000, and Kidder, Peabody & Co., \$50,000. Then the Bank of England yesterday paid out 362,000 sovereigns for shipment to this country, and 60,000 more for Toronto, whence they will quickly find their way to Chicago. There is little wonder that this makes the stock market flat abroad.

And notwithstanding all this, people have been wanting silver and needing it so much more than gold that they have been demanding silver in preference to gold at United States subtreasuries in exchange for the Treasury notes issued under the Sherman bill. In proof whereof listen to this statement of Secretary Carlisle, made officially in response to inquiries of the Senate:

[August 18.]

Secretary Carlisle sent to the Senate yesterday the following communication in reply to a resolution passed by the Senate on Wednesday requesting certain information as to the redemption of Treasury notes issued under the Sherman act:

In response thereto, I have the honor to say that during the present month Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, amounting to \$714,636, have been redeemed by the Government in silver dollars. While I do not pretend to have knowledge of the degree of information possessed by the holders of the notes so redeemed, I am of the opinion that they were fully advised at the time of such redemption that they could have gold instead of silver if they so desired. I base this opinion upon the general publicity which has been given to the terms of the act, no less than upon the instructions of this Department to the Treasurer and assistant treasurers of the United States. I am also supported in my belief by the fact that in the circular of this Department issued to the public for their guidance in their dealings with the Treasury, and containing the regulations which govern the issue, redemption, and exchange of the paper currency and the gold, silver, and minor coins of the United States, there is a paragraph which reads as follows:

Gold coin is issued in redemption of United States notes in sums less than \$50, by the assistant treasurers in New York and San Francisco, and in redemption of Treasury notes of 1890 in like sums by the Treasurer and all assistant treasurers.

In further response to the resolution, I have to say that recently gold coin has been presented at an office of this Department and silver dollars asked in exchange therefor, and that the exchange was not made for the reason that all the silver dollars in the Treasury at the time were required under the provisions of the laws relating to the currency to be held in the Treasury to cover outstanding silver certificates and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890. At present the Department would not and could not exchange silver dollars for gold coin if requested to do so by holders of gold for the same reason; but if the conditions of the Treasury were such as to afford a margin of silver dollars in excess of silver certificates and Treasury notes outstanding, such exchange would be made.

So much for the actual condition; that we need more silver, or else something equally good in its stead.

Now how much more can we usefully absorb, even granting for the sake of argument that the contention of our opponents is correct in this that free coinage at any given ratio would neither close up nor materially diminish the existing difference between the bullion value of the two metals? How much silver can we support even as token money—discredited and virtually redeemable in gold? The answer to these questions must be drawn from the experience of other nations.

Let us see how far we can go, even treating silver thus unfairly, and presuming beforehand for the sake of argument, that not a nation on the globe will join us in the step we take—how far before our silver could or would drive out gold? It will be admitted that no country is on a sounder monetary basis than France. With its constant political upheavals—its Wilson and Panama scandals, everything to betoken uncertainty, it seems impervious to panic or monetary disturbance.

It has not been long since France saved England from crash, and that Gibraltar of financial institutions—the Bank of England—from suspension. The figures which I shall use, as a basis of computation, are taken from an article written by Edward O. Leech, late director of the mint, and published in the April number of the North America Review for 1891.

They would be, of course, slightly different to-day, but not enough so to affect conclusions.

France had \$700,000,000 of silver with a population of 38,000,000, or a per capita allotment of \$18.42. It is true, that France is now coining no silver. But she did not stop coining until she reached the above figures, and has never had the slightest trouble or question even about maintaining parity between her gold and her silver. The United States had, at the date of Mr. Leech's article, \$469,262,000 of silver and 64,000,000 of population, making a per capita allotment of \$7.33. Population and coinage have both increased since and about equally. The difference is \$11.09 per capita. We must still issue, say, \$11 for each man, woman and child in the United

States to be on an equal footing with France, as to silver currency, or a gross additional sum of \$704,000,000 silver.

But has not all this silver driven gold out of France? Not a whit, for France has, in round numbers, \$200,000,000 more of gold than we, and it is increasing, having \$900,000,000 as against our \$700,000,000, in round numbers.

But you say "can we be expected to stand as much silver circulation as France can and does?" Answer me frankly, why not? There are, indeed, two reasons why the "danger line" for us would be farther to seek than for her, first our coinage ratio is 16 to 1, and hers only 15½ to 1, and, second, France must make her calculations for virtually stationary figures, she is at a standstill as regards population, and her growth in commerce—in money needs—from decade to decade is very slight. We grow in population about 25 per cent (or one-fourth) each decade, and industrially, and in opportunities for the use of money, very much more. If we should happen for awhile to overshoot the danger line, which may be somewhere beyond where France stands, we would soon, like Topsey, "grow up to it." A coinage of \$288,000,000 the decade, or \$28,800,000 each year, or \$2,400,000 each month, would barely keep pace with the increase of population at the rate of \$18 per head of increase for the next decade, even if we did not coin the \$704,000,000 to establish the French allotment for our present population.

How long would it require to coin \$700,000,000 of silver, in dollars, quarters, halves, dimes, keeping in mind and coining each month \$2,400,000 to keep up with the increase of population and business?

The present full capacity of United States mints, working day and night, and coining nothing but silver, is \$5,000,000 (five millions) per month. Working regular hours, \$3,500,000. If run day and night, full time, it would require of the \$5,000,000 possible monthly coinage the sum of \$2,400,000 to keep pace with population, leaving \$2,600,000 to go on the count as part of the proposed \$700,000,000. This would require two hundred and sixty-nine months or twenty-two years. If present mint capacity were doubled it would require eleven years. To make the calculation differently—this time leaving the growth of population and commerce out of the count—to issue \$700,000,000 silver would require running the present mints day and night and coining nothing but silver the period of eleven years eight months, by which time the population of the country would have increased 18,000,000 of souls, requiring for them \$324,000,000 more of silver to be coined in order to put us on equal footing for the then existing population as to silver with France, leaving us \$200,000,000 behind her in gold.

Stating it differently yet—doubling the mint capacity—working day and night, coining only silver, we could coin the \$700,000,000 in five years ten months, and the population having increased in that time say eight millions of souls, we would still require \$144,000,000 of silver and \$200,000,000 of gold to be on an equal coin basis with our sister Republic.

Either of these periods—twenty-two years, eleven years or even the shortest five years ten months—would give them ample time for negotiation with foreign powers.

Moreover, it would be an admonition to our Government and an invitation to others to negotiate seriously.

Hitherto "negotiation" has been a pretext to side track free coinage.

We have either not negotiated at all or else with hope of failure, or at best with fear of success on the part of our negotiators.

All these calculations are made with a view to the context of the "Bland substitute" for the "Wilson bill," now before the House.

The substitute is a coinage act pure and simple—"first come, first served," with no provision for certificates on deposit of bullion. The only certificates provided for in it, or contemplated by it, are certificates on the deposit of coin.

There must first be the actual coinage, before a single certificate can issue.

There is not now and there never was any just fear of danger to the monetary system of the United States from too much coin of any sort. There has been in the past, and there is now, impending danger from too much uncovered paper, which is money only in so far as the "measure of value" side of money is concerned, in no sense as an "equivalent." Pure "measure of value" money is worth as much as either gold or silver in times of peace, prosperity, and universal confidence in the giver out of the promises to pay. But in days of gloom, public distrust, or war, an approximation to an "equivalent" money will be needed.

It is curious how people howl about an "honest dollar"—"only 80 cents" and all that, when they regard complacently a circulation of \$500,000,000 of uncovered paper—rich man's money. Where, pray, is its value as an "equivalent?" It is merely good as peace and prosperity money. But they say "faith in the Government" is behind it. So it is; but nothing else. That is behind the silver dollar, too. Besides that there is at least 65 cents behind it, even when demonetized, in actual use, and used chiefly for spoons and waiters.

Fully one-half of this enormous sum of \$500,000,000 of uncovered paper had best be put into gold or silver, or both. Even then we would have more uncovered paper afloat than any other solvent nation, except Belgium and The Netherlands, than any other government on the face of the globe that pretends to maintain specie payment, except the two named above; for England has only

\$64,000,000, France but \$96,000,000, Germany only \$160,000,000, insolvent Italy only \$211,000,000, and worse insolvent Austria only \$260,000,000.

But they say paper money is so much more convenient. Convenient to whom? To the man who has to carry it, I suppose. The average citizen is not bothered with over \$10 at a time. The statistics, which would show how many men had ever handled a \$50 bill would be a miracle of astonishment to most people who have never seriously thought of it. I am no enemy to a sound paper currency. The Government's note is just like anybody else's. Just so long as there are not enough of them out to arouse suspicion of non-payment with those who have dealings with it, it is good. But need rich men, who for their own convenience or to prevent the actual circulation of cheap money (for most paper money being in large denominations does not actually circulate at all) bring all their influence to bear to discriminate against silver on the ground that it is worth only 65 cents as an "equivalent" and to favor national bank notes, treasury notes, and other "rich man's money," which possesses no value as an "equivalent" at all, need these men be astonished, when poor ignorant men are deluded by their examples into fiat money crazes and into demanding an issuance of "Treasury certificates" on the deposit of cotton, corn, onions, or green peas, as well as on the deposit with the Government of silver bullion? Can you expect them to make the distinction? To be frank about it, do you not find some trouble in making it yourself sometimes when your head is not over clear?

So I say we can stand \$700,000,000 more of silver, \$2,400,000 per month, on top of that \$200,000,000 more of gold on top of that, and \$200,000,000 more yet of gold and silver to take the place of fully that much uncovered paper.

Before we shall have coined enough to approach the danger line, as historically and inductively demonstrated, coining, if you choose, day and night with double our present capacity of mintage, and coining nothing but silver—a ridiculous supposition—we shall probably have a monetary convention with the states of South and Central America, through Great Britain with India, with France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Italy and Austria-Hungary, and Roumania—all naturally bimetallic countries, and, possibly, even with Germany and Russia—not naturally hostile to bimetallicism. But they say we will be the dumping ground for all the world's silver. What country on the face of the globe which has coined silver now floating at par at the ratio of 15½ to 1 (the universal ratio except with us and Mexico) would go through the folly of re-coining at 16 or 20 to 1, at our mints? Remember, under the substitute the Government buys no silver; it merely coins it and hands it back to the owner.

But, even if it came, it would come in exchange for something we had to sell.

The silver would be worth more to us than the product or else we "wouldn't trade." If it was worth more, we would trade and would make our profit. There is no very serious danger, I take it, of somebody's giving us their silver. And, if they did, "need a body cry?"

Mr. Leech says that the entire value of all the silver mined in the world's mines, in 1889 was \$161,318,000 and estimates that of the product of 1890, not then fully reported, at \$168,000,000. This being the case, then, if all the silver from the world's silver mines came to us, it would require us, in order to coin \$700,000,000 at the rate of \$168,000,000 a year (the world's product), as estimated by him, considerably over four years. The administration would still have ample time "to negotiate"—four years—before we could possibly be on the ground that France has demonstrated not to be dangerous. But, of course, such a supposition is absurd. Not over half of the world's product could possibly come to us. All nations, even monometallic ones, use silver as fractional currency; much is still required for "limited legal tender" silver in quasi bimetallic countries. India and China, the great "silver sinks of the world," would want and get their share, for no English legislation can change the hereditary and traditional attachment of the Hindoo for silver. Mexico, Central and South America, which have virtually no coin but silver, would want and get their share. Silver spoons would not cease to be used as wedding presents, nor would duds and dudesses cease to hand around cigars, tooth picks, and green apples on silver waiters. The Connecticut watchmakers would still inclose the right or wrong time of day behind silver cases, to hide it from "curious mortal eyes." We could not, as a fact, receive over \$120,000,000 per annum of the annual output, at the outside; \$96,000,000 would be a safer estimate. With the first figures we could give very nearly six years and with the last considerably more than seven years "to negotiate," without approaching the danger line. If there is anything wrong about these figures, it is the fault of Mr. Leech or of the North American Review. Mr. Leech was director of the mint; the North American is, I believe, monometallic and Republican.

I have thus far argued the question on the monometallic's assumption that silver is and must remain mere token money, subsidiary coin relying upon a backing of gold for its value.

This is an unwarranted assumption, however.

I have a little doubt, very little, however, about the power of the United States, conjointly with the other silver-using and bi-

metallic countries of the globe, being able to maintain the bullion parity of the two metals at a ratio of 16 to 1. I have no doubt whatsoever about our ability to do so at an increased ratio, 20 to 1, that being, if anything, too high.

Free coinage will not have so much effect on the bullion value of silver, because of the present increased demand, though much in that way, as because of the status of silver prospectively. I lay down the proposition that silver answers every end of money as well as gold. As an "equivalent" of values it is the equal of gold. As a "measure of values" it is superior, because more stable and less liable to violent fluctuations of production.

Mr. Leech says in the article in the North American, which I have already referred to:

Time was when silver possessed the conditions necessary to fit it to serve as such a "measure" and "equivalent." It does not possess them to-day.

If it does not, and if, furthermore, its inadaptability to one or the other end has grown out of the nature of things, that is, if it has not been produced or brought about by legislation, by human interference, then the author has made a strong argument against any effort to cure the defect by repeal of legislation or counter human interference. His own article, however, furnishes proof positive that the so-called depreciation of silver has not been altogether, nor even mainly, the result of natural laws, but, on the contrary, is the direct result of human interference. If the series of total and partial demonetizations which have decreased the demand for and thereby depreciated the value of silver had taken place in the case of gold, does any one doubt but there would have resulted a great depreciation of gold as an "equivalent?"

Does any one doubt, that if all this legislation had had its genesis in Great Britain too long ago for one of my age to remember distinctly, in Germany as far back as 1871, in the United States in 1873, and if such a combination of the creditor nations and creditor classes had been consummated fifteen years ago and was being daily urged further now, does any one doubt that in 1893 the subject of discussion with the American people would be "is gold fit to serve for money," is it or can it be made (which is the right statement) at once a "measure" and an "equivalent?"

Does any one believe that the demand for gold for plate, jewelry, gilding, etc., could possibly have kept the metal up to its present value, the great demand for it as money, its chief natural use, being thus curtailed? It must be remembered that, if coin is an "equivalent," it is because of its intrinsic value. This intrinsic value is due, as in all things, to its value in use, its capacity for being used for valuable purposes, its present and prospective use.

It is peculiar capacity for use in subserving certain purposes which gives value, "intrinsic value." If gold and silver were not limited in production, indestructible and yet malleable and infinitely divisible, capable of receiving and retaining stampage, not easy to rust, in a word not peculiarly adapted to use as money, neither would have ever been used as money and neither would, for other purposes solely, be so useful and hence would not have the intrinsic value, as mere metals, of either copper, nickel, or iron.

What I have supposed as happening in the case of gold is actually what did happen in the case of silver. The history of the happening, the how and when and the where of it, you all know.

We know that in 1873, the year of silver demonetization by the United States, the value of the silver in a silver dollar was one dollar and four mills. This was after England and Germany had done their worst, but before the United States had struck the fatal blow.

To answer the purpose of a measure of value, especially with a view to deferred payments, the chief essential is stability of value in the measure itself. That means—taking a series of years—stability of supply, relatively to the supply of other things. The measure must be something which increases approximately at a pace with the average of commodities.

Deductively reasoning you would naturally expect less fluctuation in the production of silver than in that of gold, because silver comes from deep mining, and is somewhat dependent upon steady industry, gold from surface findings, a matter chiefly of pure accident; and historically and statistically you find just what you might have expected to be a fact.

I hand to the Clerk, to be printed in the RECORD two tables, marked A and B.

Table A is a table of variations or fluctuations from year to year in the production of each metal from 1849 to 1891, inclusive. You will note that the greatest fluctuation in the production of silver from any one year to the year succeeding was in 1861, when it increased 10 per cent. You will find gold decreasing one year 18 per cent, increasing in other years by bounds of 16, 55, 63, even 96 per cent.

I have said that a right "measure of value" metal ought to increase gradually from year to year *pari passu* with population, trade, transportation, etc. Note from Table A that while silver has done just this thing with tolerable uniformity, gold has positively decreased in production during nineteen out of the forty-two years. You will also note that there is being less gold produced yearly now than there was yearly from 1852 to 1860, inclusively—the entire amount of gold produced in all the world's mines in 1891 being 125,000,000, and over half of this, as a matter of fact, being used in the arts.

But the monometallists say there is a new and different order of things now. "There is an unheard-of overproduction of silver." Examine table B.

TABLE A.—World's yield of gold and silver, with percentage of annual variation in supply.

Year.	Gold, in millions of dollars.	Variation from previous years.	Silver, in millions of dollars.	Variation from previous years.
1849	27	39	0
1850	44	63	39	0
1851	68	55	40	2
1852	133	96	41	2
1853	155	16	41	0
1854	127	-18	41	0
1855	135	41	0
1856	134	+7	41	0
1857	134	0	41	0
1858	133	41	0
1859	130	-2	41	0
1860	127	-2	41	0
1861	122	-4	45	10
1862	119	-3	46	2
1863	119	0	49	6
1864	122	52	6
1865	126	+3	52	0
1866	127	+1	52	0
1867	127	0	54	4
1868	126	57	6
1869	125	61	7
1870	123	-2	64	5
1871	119	-3	68	6
1872	113	-5	71	4
1873	112	-1	75	6
1874	111	-1	79	5
1875	111	0	82	4
1876	111	0	88	8
1877	116	+4	93	4
1878	120	+3	97	4
1879	114	-5	99	2
1880	108	-5	101	2
1881	104	-4	106	5
1882	100	-4	111	5
1883	97	-3	115	4
1884	100	+3	120	5
1885	106	+6	125	4
1886	106	0	130	4
1887	106	0	136	5
1888	110	+4	146	7
1889	120	+9	159	9
1890	120	0	174	9
1891	125	+4	186	7

TABLE B.—World's production of gold and silver.

Period.	Mean annual product.		Ratio of silver to gold (weight).	Ratio of gold to silver (value).
	Gold.	Silver.		
1545-1560	Kilos. 8,510	Kilos. 311,000	36.6	11.30
1561-1580	6,840	299,500	43.8	11.50
1581-1600	7,380	418,000	56.8	11.80
1601-1620	8,520	422,900	49.6	12.25
1621-1640	8,300	393,600	47.4	14
1641-1660	8,770	366,300	41.8	14.50
1661-1680	9,260	337,000	36.4	15
1680-1700	10,765	341,900	31.8	14.97
1701-1720	12,820	355,600	27.7	15.21
1721-1740	19,080	431,200	22.6	15.08
1741-1760	24,610	533,145	21.7	14.75
1761-1780	20,705	652,710	31.5	14.73
1781-1800	17,790	879,060	49.4	15.09
1801-1810	17,778	894,150	50.3	15.61
1811-1820	11,445	540,770	47.2	15.51
1821-1830	14,216	460,560	32.4	15.80
1831-1840	20,289	596,450	29.4	15.75
1841-1850	54,759	780,415	14.3	15.83
1851-1855	193,388	886,115	4.4	15.41
1856-1860	201,750	904,990	4.5	15.29
1861-1865	185,057	1,101,150	5.9	15.41
1866-1870	185,026	1,339,085	0.9	15.50
1871-1875	173,904	1,969,425	11.3	15.98
1876	165,956	2,323,779	14.0	17.88
1877	179,445	2,388,612	13.3	17.22
1878	185,847	2,551,364	13.7	17.94
1879	167,307	2,507,507	15.0	18.40
1880	163,515	2,479,998	15.2	18.05
1881	158,864	2,592,639	16.3	18.16
1882	148,475	2,769,065	18.6	18.19
1883	144,727	2,746,123	19.0	18.64
1884	153,193	2,788,727	18.2	18.57
1885	159,289	2,993,805	18.8	19.41
1886	159,741	2,902,471	18.2	20.78
1887	159,155	2,990,398	18.8	21.13
1888	159,809	3,388,606	21.2	21.99
1889	185,809	3,901,809	21.0	22.09
1890	181,256	4,180,532	23.1	19.76
1891	189,824	4,479,649	23.6	20.92
June, 1893 (average)			18.6	30.18

NOTE.—The figures for 1493-1862, both years inclusive, are Soetbeer's; those from 1882-1881 are from the reports of the Director of the Mint.

From it you will see that in 1891 there was by weight 23.6 times as much silver as gold produced from the world's mines; and our friends, the enemy, say you can not have bimetalism with such a huge disproportion of production.

Their ignorance is only equalled by their assumption of wisdom. Go back further with your dates on that table and you will see that for three hundred years (from 1545 to 1840) the disproportion was greater than now. And this was when so-called "evolution" had not produced a single gold bug. You will note, that in one twenty-years period, from 1581 to 1600, there was over fifty-six times as much silver produced as there was of gold. In the ten-year period, 1801-1810, the weight of silver produced was over fifty times that of gold; in the next decade over forty-seven times; and yet, during all that time, we had bimetalism at a less ratio than the present one. Note also, that when silver was demonetized in 1873 there was no relative overproduction, nor did the production after that year exceed 16 of silver to 1 of gold until 1881.

Note another thing in connection with the new proposed ratio of 20 to 1, viz, that the average comparative production from 1881 to 1891, inclusive, has been less than 20 to 1, has been 18.6 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold. How a few plain facts and figures dispose of asinine expert assumptions! I hold in my hand a little pamphlet compiled by Mr. H. Emerson, of Germantown, Pa., in which he has collocated, from Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics, the Encyclopædia Britannica, and the Engineering and Mining Journal, some instructive tables of comparative statistics. As far as I have been able to verify them they are exact in every particular. I shall make a part of my remarks the portions of the pamphlet and the tables under the respective headings: Fact one, fact two, fact three, and fact four.

FACT ONE.

The total production of silver between 1871 and 1892 relatively to gold is little more than half what it was during the three hundred years preceding the California gold discoveries.

Period.	Years.	Gold.	Silver.	Ratio of weight.
		<i>Kilos.</i>	<i>Kilos.</i>	
1545-1850	306	4,427,900	146,347,000	33.12
1871-1892	22	3,727,966	63,764,534	17.14
1561-1660	100	796,200	38,024,000	47.75
1661-1780	120	1,944,800	53,031,700	27.27
1781-1840	60	1,650,360	67,420,000	40.85
1891	1	190,000	4,480,000	23.6

FACT TWO.

The fluctuation of silver supply between 1545 and 1892 has been less than that of gold.

Annual production of silver.

	Kilos.
Minimum, 1561-1580	300,000
Maximum, 1891	4,500,000
Increase, 15 fold.	

Annual production of gold.

	Kilos.
Minimum, 1561-1580	6,840
Maximum, 1853	234,000
Increase, 34 fold.	

Sudden fluctuations in gold.

Ten-year interval:	Kilos.
1831-1840	20,289
1851-1860	201,138
Increase, 10 fold.	
In dollars, increase, \$120,000,000.	

FACT FOUR.

The annual increase of gold and silver since 1860 has not been as great as the annual increase of population, of commerce, of railroads, of cotton, of grain, of pig iron in the United States for the same period.

	1840.	1860.	1870.	1889.	1890.	Increase.
Gold and silver (world's supply)		\$167,000,000			\$311,000,000	86
Population		21,400,000			62,600,000	100
Railroad mileage		30,626			166,702	444
Leading railroads of the United States:						
Mileage			15,501		63,477	300
Freight movement tons			396,000,000		4,938,000,000	1,147
Passenger movement			1,732,000,000		6,421,000,000	277
Banking power	\$450,000,000		\$2,200,000,000		\$5,150,000,000	390
Grain product bushels	1,240,000,000			3,454,000,000		178
Cotton pounds	1,836,000,000				3,629,000,000	98
Pig iron tons		821,000			9,200,000	1,206

* First period.

† Second period.

The table published under the head of fact four is especially important, as showing the danger of relying on one metal only when both put together do not keep pace with the world's growth in population, nor transportation, nor banking power, nor grain, nor cotton, nor pig iron.

Assertions that silver fluctuated violently and is depreciating rapidly from natural causes grow out of the fact that the assertors have reference to the price of silver in gold.

But in addition to the fact that necessarily silver does not fluctuate any more in terms of gold than gold does in terms of silver,

Four-year interval:	
1849	\$27,000,000
1853	155,500,000
Amount	128,500,000

Increase, 5.8 fold.
Sudden fluctuations in silver have not occurred in the last three hundred years.

Ten-year interval:	
1801-1810	\$894,000
1821-1830	460,000
Decrease to one-half.	
In dollars, decrease,	\$19,117,600.

Four-year interval:	
1887	\$136,000,000
1891	186,000,000
Increase	49,000,000

Increase, 1.4 fold.
At a ten years' interval, 1881-1891, the increase of silver was \$80,000,000, the increase in gold 1841-'50 to 1853, was \$122,000,000, or one-half more in dollars.
At a four years' interval, 1887-1891, increase of silver \$49,000,000, and of gold 1849-1853, \$128,000,000, almost three times as much, and for a one-year interval, 1889-1890, increase of silver is \$15,000,000, while 1851-1852 shows a gold increase of \$55,000,000.

Whether, therefore, we take intervals of time long or short, remote or recent; or whether we consider percentages, or absolute amounts, or value in dollars, the production of silver has been incomparably less fluctuating than that of gold.

FACT THREE.

The added stock of silver since 1872 (twenty years) to the total world's supply of both metals to the world's money has been neither absolutely nor proportionately as large as the added stock of gold to the previous world's supply of both metals in the twenty years 1850-1870.

Total amount of gold and silver mined, in million dollars.

	Gold.	Silver.	Total.
1492-1850	3,160	6,000	9,160
1852-1871	2,573		

Increase through gold to previous supply of gold and silver, 23 per cent.

UNPARALLELED PROSPERITY.

	Gold.	Silver.	Total.
1492-1872	5,836	7,000	12,836
1873-1892	2,362	2,430	

Increase through silver to previous supply of gold and silver, 19 per cent; increase through gold and silver to previous supply, 27 per cent.

Stock of precious metals in the world.*

	Gold.	Silver.
1850	\$2,535,000,000	\$4,880,000,000
1890	6,175,000,000	6,065,000,000

Percentage of increase: Gold, 142 per cent; silver, 24 per cent.

* Mulhall, page 306.

steadily going down, but also that the prices of the forty-five articles, as expressed in terms of gold, have been steadily going down all the time, and almost, if not quite, at the same pace with silver. This shows the comparative stability of value of the two metals as compared with the value of commodities, and also demonstrates an appreciation of gold gradual, growing, and constant, everything becoming cheaper and cheaper in terms of gold, which means that gold is becoming dearer and dearer in terms of everything, which means, in turn, that it is becoming yearly more and more difficult to obtain a given amount of gold in return for service or products—more and more products must be given to get the given amount of gold.

If the use of silver as money is still further curtailed and the demand on gold to perform that function still further increased, this movement will of course be accelerated and its already grinding effects accentuated.

Mr. Sauerbeck's index numbers.

Year.	Index numbers of 45 principal commodities.	Index number of silver.
1874.....	102	95.8
1875.....	96	93.3
1876.....	95	86.7
1877.....	94	90.2
1878.....	87	86.4
1879.....	83	84.2
1880.....	88	85.0
1881.....	85	85.0
1882.....	84	84.9
1883.....	82	83.1
1884.....	76	83.3
1885.....	72	79.9
1886.....	69	74.6
1887.....	68	73.3
1888.....	70	70.4
1889.....	72	70.2
1890.....	72	78.4
1891.....	72	74.1
1892.....	168	165.4
1893*		

*Lowest price of wheat on record; lowest prices of stocks since 1884.
 †June and July, lowest price of wool in its history.
 ‡Lowest price of silver on record.

Between 1850 and 1870 there was a slight rise in the value of commodities, and during the same period silver was at a slight premium compared with gold.

The still more eminent statistician, Mr. Soetbeer, has published a table of comparative gold prices of silver bullion and of one hundred and fourteen articles in the free port of Hamburg, leading inevitably to the same conclusion and demonstrating the same facts.

I shall also insert this table in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

Year.	Index number of general prices.	Price of silver per ounce in gold.
1871.....	127.03	\$1.326
1872.....	135.62	1.322
1873.....	148.28	1.296
1874.....	136.20	1.278
1875.....	129.85	1.246
1876.....	128.33	1.156
1877.....	127.70	1.201
1878.....	120.60	1.152
1879.....	117.10	1.123
1880.....	121.89	1.149
1881.....	121.07	1.138
1882.....	122.14	1.136
1883.....	122.24	1.110
1884.....	114.25	1.113
1885.....	108.72	1.065
1886.....	103.99	.995
1887.....	102.20	.978
1888.....	101.93	.939
1889.....	106.13	.935
1890.....	108.13	1.046

And yet in the face of facts and figures like these gentlemen will continue parrot-like to repeat the stereotyped cry taught them by the money-lenders, that bimetallicism would lead to a silver standard and the "dishonest silver dollar."

In the first place it would not lead to the single silver standard, and in the second place, if it did, the dollar reached would not be as dishonest as the gold dollar, which is now the measure of value.

But our opponents say, the general fall in prices and the universal depression which set in in 1873 and still continues is due to improved processes cheapening production, and not to the appreciation of gold.

That this is in many things to a great extent, and in all things partially, true, I do not doubt.

Listen to the voice of the celebrated monetary commission of Great Britain, twelve illustrious men, one-half gold standard and one-half double standard advocates. They unanimously report as follows:

We are of the opinion that the true explanation of the phenomena which we

are directed to investigate is to be found in a combination of causes and can not be attributed to any one cause alone. The action of the Latin Union in 1873 broke the link between silver and gold, which had kept the price of the former as measured by the latter constant at about the legal ratio, and when this link was broken the silver market was open to the influence of all the factors which go to affect the price of a commodity. These factors happen since 1873 to have operated in the direction of a fall in the gold price of that metal.

And further on in their final report, on p. 95, I find these words:

In India, in the opinion of nearly all the witnesses whom we have examined, the purchasing power of the rupee continues unimpaired and the prices of commodities measured in silver remain practically the same. We have no evidence to show that silver has undergone any material change in relation to commodities, although it has fallen largely in relation to gold; in other words, the same number of rupees will no longer exchange for the same amount of gold as formerly, but, so far as we can judge, they will purchase as much of any commodity or commodities in India as they did before.

And six of them, in a separate report, use this unanswerable language, which I find published by Mr. David A. Wells in his incomparable work, Recent Economic Changes, on page 190, at bottom.

We are not insensible to the fact that facilities for production are habitually increasing, and the cost of production is constantly becoming less. But these factors have always been in operation since the world began; and while we recognize their tendency to depress the prices of commodities, they are not, in our opinion, sufficient to account for the abnormal fall in prices, which has been apparent since the rupture of the bimetallic par, and only since that time.

My friend from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] in one breath accounted for the fall of silver by the diminished demand for it as money, caused by the series of demonetizations which have taken place, and in the next breath denied that anyone could show that there had been any appreciation of gold!

A given cause will produce a given effect, but the reverse cause has no tendency to produce the reverse effect!

Such is the absurd and illogical position. Just in proportion as the demand for silver, in present and prospective use, has been lessened by legislation, just in that proportion has the demand on gold for present and prospective use to fill up the vacuum been increased. The demand increased, the supply remaining the same or less, and yet no appreciation of price!

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] went further, and in the heat of debate and paucity of thought absolutely denied that there had been any appreciation of gold. In this connection I quote from a very valuable work, published by the Appletons in 1886, with the title "Class Interests," p. 68 et seq.:

Now, what is the fact in regard to the relative value of the gold and silver dollars for the last eight years? The production of gold has steadily fallen off, its consumption in the arts has steadily increased, its function as money has been weighted by the demonetization of silver, and prices have steadily declined. These facts conspire to show that the value of the gold dollar has increased—how much, it would be difficult to say. I will quote J. Barr Robertson, in the Economist, February 23, 1884: "Mr. Goschen's select committee, all of them gold-standard men, produced a large volume, in which they satisfied themselves that they had shown the causes of the 'depreciation in silver,' but the Indian government immediately produced incontrovertible evidence to prove that silver had not depreciated in purchasing power, and last spring Mr. Goschen gave a long and able address at the Institute of Bankers to show what the bimetallicists had abundantly shown for the previous seven years, namely, that the disturbance in the gold price of silver was chiefly due to the appreciation of gold; so that Mr. Goschen, by no means a very courageous investigator, has come over to the bimetallic view, that the monetary troubles of the past ten years have been mainly caused by the rise in the purchasing power of gold, while silver has remained comparatively stationary in purchasing power, and has therefore been during that time far more completely a standard of value than gold."

Later, Dr. Giffen, the statistician, has come to the support of the same view. The prevailing opinion is that silver has depreciated because it has been demonetized; but this very act of demonetization of silver has caused a greater demand for gold and raised its value. Mr. W. Westgrath says in the Economist: "As gold has been (in the United States especially) so largely substituted for paper as well as for silver, I agree with your correspondent (Robertson) that the result has been decidedly more an appreciation of gold than a depreciation of silver, and that the effects upon our trade, and I may add, upon the incidence of our public debt, have thus far been very serious indeed." In speaking of the efforts to get silver out of the way, Mr. H. R. Greenfield, ex-governor of the Bank of England, says: "By these processes the states of England, Germany, and France have created an artificial demand for gold, which has upset all prices, enhanced the property of all creditors, and diminished the means of all debtors." (The Economist, March 1, 1884.)

Now, what is there to show that, since 1877, the divergence in the bullion values of gold and silver has been wholly due or mainly due to the depreciation of silver? I am somewhat conversant with current references to this subject, and I know of nothing except the eternal reiteration, "the fall of silver," the "dishonest silver dollar," and "the danger of getting down to the debased silver standard." If the bullion in the silver dollar will buy as much now as it would in 1877-'80, while the gold dollar will buy more, which is the more honest dollar? Or, even if silver has depreciated as much as gold has appreciated to make the difference that has taken place between them within the last few years, and the silver dollar is, therefore, dishonest, is not the gold dollar equally dishonest? Herein appears the assumption of these who are shouting so lustily about the dishonest dollar. The trouble with this business is that the creditor class, the money-owners, and the fixed-income class, are the people whose views are mostly voiced in our great journals and it is the bias of these classes to regard the dear dollar, constantly growing dearer, as the truly honest dollar, simply because it is growing heavier in their pockets. A few years ago an eastern journal had a heavy editorial to prove how much more honest the people are in the East than in the West, in this country. We can not censure classes for seeing to their own interests; they have done so from the beginning, but none the less it is the duty of the great body of the people, whose real interests are thus threatened, to organize for the encouragement of a higher sort of "honesty" than that which has been so fulsome of late in its own praise. I have no doubt that there are editors, South and West as well as East, who reiterate the catch phrases of the monometallists without having given any careful attention to the real points at issue. Gold appears to be fixed in value and central in importance, as the earth appears to be fixed in the center of the heavens; and, giving the matter no careful thought, they are altogether sincere in assuming that the gold standard is uniform and silver fluctuating, and they join in the chorus, "the dishonest silver dollar!" With them it is as if the earth stood still and the heavens moved.

I also quote from the same work, as bearing on the general effect of the monometallic policy, beginning on page 64, as follows:

The mines are adding nothing at present to the stock of gold for money purposes. Its consumption, as well as that of silver, in the arts and manufactures is very great and rapidly increasing. It is now three times as great as it was twenty years ago, four times as great as it was thirty years ago. On the other hand the production of gold is steadily falling off. From 1856 to 1860, the annual production of gold was 137 millions; in 1879, 107 millions; in 1888, 94 millions. It is estimated that the annual consumption of gold in the arts is steadily increasing; so it is to be expected that in a short time, taking the last twenty years as a guide, the consumption of gold will be greater every year than its production. This, together with the wear and loss of coin, will draw upon the present stock of money gold, and draw upon it largely; and yet, in the face of these facts, known to all who have given the subject study, we have classes in the community who want gold alone to be the measure or denominator of values.

If this movement were to be carried out, how would it operate on the various classes in society? In the first place it would increase the relative wealth of certain classes, and diminish the relative wealth of other classes, with no corresponding merit in the one class or demerit in the other. All whose property consists in credits and moneys, all whose incomes are fixed annuities and Government salaries, and salaries not readily adjusted to the changed conditions, all these would gain directly by the general adoption of gold monometallism. What they gain others would lose. All prices would fall, all property would be bought and sold at lower figures; and all who own such property, all producers, would have to do with less than before. All indebtedness would be increased. Enterprising business men who had borrowed a part of the capital they used, would be crippled. The farmer still having payments to make on his home would be weighted. The same number of dollars having in all cases to be paid, and those dollars having increased in value, the debtor would have to pay more, and the creditor would receive more value than he loaned or sold. And yet we have classes in society that are laboring in season and out of season to establish monometallism. But this form of insidious and unjust redistribution of wealth is not all we have to look out for. Our monometallists are quite concerned for the poor laboring men. They say, if we get too much silver—and we are always right on the eve of getting too much—prices will go up, and wages will not buy as much, greatly to the disadvantage of laborers. Usually, however, pretty soon after prices go up, wages rise, and laborers are quite sure to have all the work they can do. A good deal of unnecessary alarm is shown about the high prices work-people may have to pay. One would suppose that a little of this alarm might be reserved for the contingency of loss of employment and lower wages under the crushing operation of constantly increasing scarcity and dearth of the gold dollar. But this is precisely the side of the shield that our Argus-eyed monometallists never see.

Under advancing monometallism, if the movement can not be arrested, money must become constantly dearer and prices constantly lower; with what results? With a steady discouragement to business. When prices are falling business is always dull. Buyers hold off, and the competition of unsuccessful sellers sinks prices even lower than would be indicated by the reduced volume of money. As purchases made on falling prices are always small and consumption economical, production has necessarily to be limited, and there is a constantly diminishing demand for labor. Workmen are thrown out of employment or have to work on reduced time or reduced wages, so that, even on falling prices, laborers are worse off than they were before. Under progressive gold monometallism, with the lessening supply of gold all consumed in the arts, with the wastage and loss in coin going steadily on, and the stock on hand absolutely diminishing, this depression of business is not merely a temporary thing; it must continue from year to year with the effect of casting down the great middle class relatively lower and lower, and sinking employes to the borders of beggary and slavery. Monometallists never discuss these permanent features of their system; they merely refer in a partial way to what can only be immediate and temporary results, relying, like advocates, on the safe mental inertia of those they mean to influence.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], wrapped in a cloak of monometallic self-sufficiency, went further still and positively denied that the depreciation of silver had been caused by demonetization, denied that demonetization had any effect on the price of silver, and as an inference from that position denied that remonetization would have any effect.

Refer to tables and prices of silver.

But no reference to statistics ought to be necessary. The gentleman is old enough to remember that in 1890 the prospect alone of a free coinage bill becoming law in the United States sent silver up 20 cents on the London market (from 43.625 pence to 54.625 pence).

He is also old enough to remember that two months ago, in June last, merely closing the mints of India to private account caused silver to decline in one day nearly 10 cents (from 77 to 68½ cents) and caused a fall before the decline ended of nearly 20 cents. "None so blind as those who will not see."

The greatest curiosity in the way of an argument came from the lips of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. COOPER]. He said, "that as a lawyer he had learned the value of expert testimony and that all the 'experts,' the 'financiers,' were opposed to free coinage and wanted unconditional repeal."

I can tell the gentleman two things; first, that though courts avail themselves of expert testimony, a man is not called to testify in his own behalf as an expert; he might be too expert. Second, that the world, with its finances, commerce, and religion, would have gone to the "demonition bowwows" long ago, had it been guided by experts and their biases.

When Adam Smith created the science of political economy he found in existence the so-called "mercantile theory" of trade and finance. It was held by all traders, bankers, and experts. Not a merchant belonging to a London guild but laughed at the Scottish professor. They did not answer him, but laughed at and ignored him. And for many years the world imitated them, for surely "the trade" knew "business" better than anyone else.

When Andrew Jackson and Thomas H. Benton reformed the finances of this country and emancipated the people from the National Bank thralldom, they found not only the United States Bank, but successful bankers everywhere and all the commercial classes in all the large cities, everybody, in short, except the "common people"

(who, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PATTERSON] is to be believed, "do not understand these things"), against them.

Leading statesmen of "national reputations," also of every party, including Clay, Calhoun, and Webster, and the "Metropolitan press," with scarcely an exception, were against them, because forthright they thought too "surely the experts know."

But the horse sense of "Old Hickory" and the plain common sense of the "common people" triumphed and to-day there is not a reader in the United States fool enough to say they did not triumph deservedly.

Later on when we wanted to reform the tariff all the "experts" in that line cried out against it.

Again for a season they fooled the people.

But we are here now with the power and the will to do just what the experts don't want done.

And the ultimate effect of our doing it will justify its having been done.

When Luther came, theological "experts" were against him; when Christ came, theological "experts" crucified him.

The expert intellect runs now and has always run in grooves; the "present status," whatever it is, having been long studied and being intimately understood by the "expert," and his mind having become molded to the clay he works in, is precious to him.

Of all forms of government, the most ridiculous and unfortunate would be "a government of financiers by financiers," which would also be a government "for financiers." The bourgeoisie understands its own interest with a view to the immediate future. All history shows that beyond that it is incompetent.

What is the condition confronting us? First, scarcity of money in actual use. How do gentlemen propose to remedy it? Make it scarcer.

Second. A divergence constantly widening between the two metals. How do gentlemen propose to remedy it? Make it still greater by increasing the demand for that one whose price is already too high and by lessening the demand for that one whose price is too low.

That is "expert" statesmanship!

There is no lack of confidence among the people of the Union in any form of its currency.

Lack of confidence in currency makes it go out and get about, each man getting something in exchange for it as soon as he can.

People do not hoard things which they fear will become valueless. The trouble is lack of confidence in investments.

And this has come about because men see nothing in which they can put their money which has not been falling in price with more or less constancy for twenty years and which does not threaten to continue indefinitely to fall. Men do not like to buy on a falling market.

And what, in turn, has produced this?

For twenty years the world has been madly and uselessly endeavoring to get on a gold basis, thereby making gold more and more valuable and other things, as expressed in terms of gold—the only metal recognized as real money—cheaper and cheaper.

And now we are requested not to throw our great power and influence abreast the current to try to stem and check it, but to accelerate the movement!

I will not join the "expert" movement of still further grinding the masses, robbing the debtors, and depreciating the agricultural produce of my country.

Coin both gold and silver, or else deprive both of governmental aid. As I have said, they would both pass as money, only by weight and not tale. Of course nobody is seriously in favor of having no coinage laws.

Coinage is convenient if all can have access to it, if government will confine itself to its legitimate functions, which are to declare the weight, the fineness, the ratio, and the device.

But when Government goes further and attempts to restrict the supply of coin, it takes from money its most desirable quality and attribute—its elasticity; and moreover depreciates the intrinsic value of the bullion whose coinage is restricted. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] said that the volume of money makes no difference—that nations are not prosperous in proportion to their volume of money.

If he had used the word currency instead of money I should have agreed with him.

But the proposition as laid down by him is absurd. Real money, gold and silver, have intrinsic value, and a country is richer and more prosperous for every ounce of gold and silver it has, as it is for every additional pound of iron or bushel of wheat.

Moreover, the richer a nation is the more money it will have. If it has no mines, it has valuable products and precious energies, and these will draw gold and silver. All that is needful is that Government should not hamper the operation by preventing coinage and use as coins.

The countries which have the most money, *real money*, are to-day the most prosperous, and those which have the least are the least prosperous.

In interrogating the gentleman from Ohio the other day, I did not use the word currency, as the RECORD makes me do, but money.

In support of the drift of my question then and of my assertion now, I insert the following names of countries and amounts per head of money and paper currently redeemable in money, *i. e.*, on demand at any hour.

In the order of greatest volume.

France.....	\$40.56
Netherlands (Holland).....	28.88
Belgium.....	28.53
Australia.....	26.75
United States.....	25.15
Great Britain.....	18.42

I have dwelt upon the monetary prosperity of France. It has long been an axiom among men of information that Holland is the country of the world where prosperity among the common people is greatest, distribution of wealth most nearly even (except in France), and where the smallest percentage of people either hunger or shiver.

In the order of least volume.

China.....	\$1.75
Turkey.....	2.88
India.....	3.64
Japan.....	4.90
Mexico.....	4.91
Russia.....	6.03

Comment is needless. The figures are from the World Almanac for 1893, p. 142.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HENDRIX] calls it "gibbering idiocy," "stark midsummer madness," to believe what we believe, viz, that the two metals can be maintained as money on a parity with each other at a ratio to be fixed by law, with due regard to intrinsic values.

Did this gentleman, who says he was born in the West and left there, and who, in my opinion has been getting further and further away ever since, until now he thinks the western boundary of the United States is the Hudson River, did this gentleman believe that when he consented to run and be elected on a platform which asserted that this very thing could be done and promised that it should be?

If not, he should be more charitable to us, who but stand where he a short while since stood. If he did so believe, however, how can he successfully plead "not guilty" to the charge of obtaining a thing of value—to wit—an office, under false pretense?

Now to address myself to this absurd proposition that the Sherman bill, vicious, silly, as it is, is the cause of the present condition of things.

The only undeniable fact and sound utterance in the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HENDRIX], is contained in these words, the italics are mine:

I do not assert here that the Sherman purchase law is the cause of all the woe from which this country is suffering at this moment. *No intelligent man talking to intelligent men would undertake to make an assertion of that kind.* The Sherman silver law was not responsible for the failure of that Federal bank in Australia in January, 1893, nor for the tumble there of fourteen great banks, nor for the rebounding force of the distress which has gone round the world since that time like a boulder bouncing down a mountain side.

No; the wave of distress has encircled the globe. The Anglo-Saxon race has overdone the business. It has gone on conquering and populating the far distant isles.

(See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 13, 1893, page 63.)

The gentleman "gives away" the whole case now before the court, but he is right. I will not join him in the utterance: "No intelligent man talking to intelligent men would make an assertion of that kind." The President "makes an assertion of that kind" in his message, and I am not willing to deprive him of the quality of intelligence, nor am I willing to believe that the Congress of the United States, to whom he addressed that message, are not a body of "intelligent men."

This trouble has been brewing for long. The crash in Argentina, the Baring Brothers' failure, the Bank of England on the verge of temporary suspension, and only saved by \$15,000,000 of gold from silver-using France, the widespread wreck of Australian banks and industries, all these things are current history. English capitalists then found it necessary to draw in their business—to sell their securities to get money for liquidation at home and in the colonies—ours among the first, and chiefly for obvious reason.

Extensions could not be offered, securities must be protected and be taken, as they came over by millions, requiring the gold.

Unfortunately just at that moment Austria-Hungary was trying to get \$75,000,000 of gold for resumption. What condition did this unprecedented coincidence find us in?

Why, we had been "overdoing it," like our English cousins. Boom towns everywhere; inflated "industrials," overcapitalized and sometimes fictitious, doing business on a basis of 6 per cent money and currency and 94 per cent credit appliances; boasting of it even as an evidence of civilization, forgetful of the fact that credit and credit appliances are only necessary evils of commerce and civilization, and not things whose growth requires or should receive encouragement. Added to all this, it found us, owing to the operation of the McKinley bill, which had made the cost of imports greater and the price of exports less, with a balance of trade against us, requiring shipments of gold on our own account.

To it all and more than it all, add that it found us sharing our part of the evils accruing from the slow pressure of a twenty-year effort on the part of Western Europe, and partially on our part too, to do business on a still narrower cash basis by making gold the sole standard and measure of value. This had sapped our energies and left our financial constitution open to attack.

I think the only wonder is that we have stood it so well. But we did stand it, until agricultural exports came to draw back our lost wealth.

What did the Sherman bill have to do with all this?—a bill under which 50 millions of paper certificates are issued in a country which collects and spends 500 millions a year?

The Sherman bill had but one effect: It enabled the gold exporters to draw their gold from the Federal Treasury, instead of from the banks. It *had to go*, and I don't see that it makes much difference to the country whether it was taken from the Treasury or from the banks.

But I think the Treasurer ought to be armed with power to protect the gold in the Treasury.

Give him the power which the Bank of England has, of controlling export movements by rate of exchange, or, better still, let him, like the Bank of France, pay out the metals half and half. My constituents want the Sherman bill repealed, but they do not want its repeal used as a club in the hand of "financiers" to drive us to gold monometallism.

Its repeal is well enough, but more must be had.

Do not listen to the siren voice of international bimetalism. Its voice is always raised when a free coinage bill is about to become law. It is the voice of the Lorelei. We will have it in time. But we must first have national bimetalism. The South and West will never rest until we get it.

Even the East, it seems to me, might see that the country can never have rest from the agitation of this question until the functions of money—coequal money—have been restored to silver. It is the only thing which will prevent a worse panic than this—a world panic.

On motion of Mr. BRYAN, the House then (at 11:40 p. m.) adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, August 23, 1893.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FAULKNER presented a petition of the West Virginia Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union, praying for the free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STEWART. I present resolutions adopted by the Franklin Club of Cleveland, Ohio, and the Central Labor Union of Cleveland, Ohio, with a membership of over 17,000, and a mass meeting of ten or twelve thousand unemployed citizens of Cleveland, remonstrating against the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act and the issue of bonds, favoring the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and urging the passage of Senate bill No. 3, to supply the deficiency in the currency, a bill introduced by myself a short time since. I move that the resolutions lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of sundry business men of Philadelphia, Pa., indorsing the resolutions of the Trades League of Philadelphia, praying for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the so-called Sherman silver law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. POWER presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Montana, representing 2,340 members, praying for the repeal of the Geary Chinese exclusion law; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VOORHEES. I present the petition of John Overmyer, who is the president of the Second National Bank of North Vernon, Ind., and a very prominent citizen of that State. He petitions Congress to enact a law to levy a moderate tax on the average deposits of national banks, to be collected by the Treasury Department at Washington, for the purpose of providing a fund out of which the depositors in any national bank that may fail shall be paid in full any residue that may be due them, after exhausting all the assets of such bank, including the individual liability of the stockholders; and that the present tax on the circulation of national banks be repealed. I move that the petition be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.