

By Mr. EDDY: Resolutions passed at a mass meeting of the citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against the outrages committed upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: Petition of Boyd, Brown & Brunson and other citizens of Florence County, S. C., in favor of placing the Winyah Bay bar improvement under the continuous contract system—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of W. B. Poole and 200 others, of Noble County, Okla., praying for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GROW: Petition of Union ex-Prisoners of War Association of Altoona, Blair County, Pa., in favor of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Hezekiah Moore and other ex-soldiers and ex-sailors of the Union Army and Navy during the rebellion, requesting the passage of a pension bill granting a pension of \$8 to each man who served not less than ninety days—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of Emma S. Jones and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Busti, Chautauqua County, N. Y., urging the prohibition of the sale of beer and spirituous liquors at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island, and at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolutions adopted at a meeting of the citizens of Portville, N. Y., relative to atrocities perpetrated upon the Armenians—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Forestville, Limestone, Nile, and Dunkirk, N. Y., against the sale of liquors at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth and at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Whitman Agricultural Company and others, of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of House bill No. 2779, for the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of F. L. Coats and others, of Richburg, N. Y., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Two petitions of citizens of Sacramento and Oak Park, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill No. 58, restricting immigration, introduced by Hon. WILLIAM A. STONE—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KIEFER: Petition of George N. Morgan Post, No. 4, Minneapolis Minn., for the passage of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: Two petitions of William H. Ryan and 36 others, Josiah Thornton and 18 others, all of the county of Noble, Okla., for free homes in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAYTON: Resolution of the New York Mercantile Exchange, praying for the passage of a pending bill regulating the manufacture and sale of an article known as "filled cheese"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin: Petition of 64 ex-Union soldiers and inmates of Waupaca Soldiers' Home, asking for graded service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of members of Company E, Fourth Regiment Iowa National Guard, in behalf of House bill No. 2294, for the organizing and disciplining of the militia of the several States—to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. PRICE: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Nathaniel and William Offutt, deceased, late of the parish of St. Martin, La.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Binghamton, N. Y., in behalf of the Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petition of Thomas G. Brown Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Chaplin, Conn., favoring a service-pension law and a minimum rate for widow's pension of \$12 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers relating to removal of the charge of desertion in the case of George A. Daniels—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPKINS: Petition of George Eldridge, C. A. Freeman, George W. Bloomer, W. L. Nickerson, and others; also of the Boston Towboat Company, Boston and Philadelphia Steamboat Company, shipowners and masters of seagoing tugs and sailing vessels, for the establishment of a life-saving station at the extreme southwestern point of Mononomoy Beach, Chatham, Mass.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Petition of a large number of residents of the counties of Passaic and Morris, N. J., for more stringent regulations with reference to immigration, and for the passage of the Stone bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petition of 100 citizens of Ashland, Wis., asking for legislation to secure a better grade of immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of George E. Reid, for the passage of a bill granting him a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolutions of the Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, in favor of House bill No. 306—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of W. D. McLean, alias Donald McLean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Henrietta M. Freeman, Sarah E. Tiffany, and others, to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors at certain places—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of V. R. Harris and others, of Erin, Tenn., favoring the passage of the bill for the relief of book agents of the Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of Robert M. Woods and others, asking that protection be secured to American citizens on Turkish soil—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 6, 1896.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The VICE-PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously received the signature of the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

A bill (S. 708) to amend section 4 of an act to provide for the adjustment of land grants made by Congress to aid in the construction of railroads, and for the forfeiture of unearned lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1547) to extend the jurisdiction of the United States circuit court of appeals, eighth circuit, over certain suits now pending therein on appeal and writ of error from the United States court in the Indian Territory; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 23) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to use a portion of the appropriation for new iron roof for foundry at navy-yard, Washington, D. C., in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1896, and for other purposes," for repairs to the walls of said foundry.

SENATOR FROM OHIO.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present the credentials of Joseph Benson Foraker, elected a Senator to represent the State of Ohio for the term commencing the 4th of March, 1897. I ask that the credentials be read, printed in the RECORD, and placed upon the files of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.
The Secretary read as follows:

THE STATE OF OHIO, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Columbus, Ohio, January 16, 1896.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

I, Asa S. Bushnell, governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby certify that at the time and in the manner designated in the certificate hereto attached, Joseph Benson Foraker was duly elected to the office of Senator to represent the State of Ohio in the Congress of the United States for the constitutional term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed at Columbus, the 15th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1896, and in the one hundred and twentieth year of the Independence of the United States of America.

[SEAL.]

ASA S. BUSHNELL.

By the governor:
SAMUEL M. TAYLOR, Secretary of State.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that the accompanying paper be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered, in the absence of objection.

The accompanying paper is as follows:

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF OHIO,
Columbus, Ohio, January 15, 1896.

SIR: It is hereby certified that the senate and house of representatives of the general assembly of the State of Ohio did, in each house on the 14th day of January, A. D. 1896, that being the second Tuesday after the meeting and organization thereof, openly, by a viva voce vote of each member present, name a person for Senator to represent the State of Ohio in the Congress of the United States for the constitutional term of six years, commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897; that Joseph Benson Foraker received a majority of the whole number of votes so cast in the senate, and that the same was entered on its journal by the clerk thereof, and that said Joseph Benson Foraker also received a majority of the whole number of votes so cast in the house of representatives, and that the same was so entered on its journal by the clerk thereof; that at 12 o'clock meridian, of the day following, to wit, the 15th day of January, A. D. 1896, the members of the two houses convened in joint assembly in the hall of the house of representatives of said general assembly, whereat was read that portion of the journal of each of said houses, of the preceding day, relating to and showing the result of said vote.

Whereupon, it appearing from the journals of the senate and house of representatives, respectively, that Joseph Benson Foraker had received a majority of the votes in each house, the president of the joint assembly declared that said Joseph Benson Foraker, having received a majority of all the votes cast in said senate and in said house of representatives, was duly elected to the office of Senator in the Congress of the United States from the State of Ohio for the constitutional term of six years, commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1897.

ASAHIEL W. JONES,
President of the Senate.
DAVID L. SLEEPER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

A. C. CAINE,
Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN R. MALLOY,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

To his excellency ASA S. BUSHNELL, Governor of Ohio.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition of the Whatcom Board of Trade, of New Whatcom, Wash., in behalf of the bill introduced by me to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses. In the course of the statements of the petition it is set forth that there are fortifications in British Columbia in the immediate vicinity of the city from which this petition proceeds. It is represented that the city of Vancouver is fortified, also the cities of Victoria and Esquimalt, British Columbia, and that though placed in such a perilous position near the frontier there is not a single fortification on the coast of the State of Washington, nor a gun or man to defend it. The petitioners represent that the interests involved are very great, many populous cities line the shores of Puget Sound, that the interests of 200,000 people and a foreign commerce, excelled only by the ports of New York and San Francisco, are at stake, and that our national interests in that region require fortifications. I shall not comment at length upon it. The petition is a very earnest one, and is well expressed. It is signed by the members of the board of trade, the city council, and numerous other citizens. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE. I also present a petition signed by many citizens of the State of Washington, including the governor, judges on the bench, and prominent lawyers of the State, in favor of Senate bill 988, having for its object the removal of contests and litigations in the United States Land Department from that Department to courts of the United States. Among other things, it is stated that the rights of the settlers to their homesteads are often violated, owing to the inefficiency of the Land Department, in that it has no compulsory process for the attendance of witnesses, and that it is compelled under existing laws and circumstances to adjudicate the rights of contestants without the proper facilities and without the process or authority of the courts. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SQUIRE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Tacoma, Wash., praying for the passage of Senate bills No. 1173 and No. 1242, to amend section 4131 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to improve the merchant marine engineer service, and thereby also to increase the efficiency of the Naval Reserve; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the city council of Cosmopolis, Wash., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying that an appropriation of \$10,000 be made for the purpose of flax fiber experiments on Puget Sound; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SQUIRE. I present a petition from the city of Spokane, Wash., in which it is stated that in consequence of the near relations, commercial and otherwise, of the United States to the people of Cuba the citizens of the United States can not refrain from feeling a deep interest in the restoration of peace in the Island of Cuba. The petition also prays that the President of the

United States be requested at as early a date as possible consistent with due regards for the rights of Spain as a friendly nation to recognize the belligerent rights of the revolutionary party now existing in the Island of Cuba. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL presented the petition of Benjamin T. Clark and 105 other citizens of Bound Brook, N. J., and the petition of Luther Walling and 60 other citizens of Belford, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ALLEN. I present the petition of J. J. Boyle and 300 other private soldiers of the California Soldiers' Home, located at Los Angeles, upon the subject of discrimination in pensions. The petition is short and important, and I ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The petition will be read.

The petition was read, and referred to the Committee on Pensions, as follows:

SOLDIERS' HOME, Los Angeles, Cal., January 30, 1896.

Having seen with regret, if not alarm, the rapid formation of classes in our once free Republic, and noticed the constant tendency of the legislation to foster and encourage the same, it is with profound satisfaction we view the position taken by United States Senator ALLEN of Nebraska in opposing the granting of special pensions of extravagant and unreasonable sums to the widows of officers, while those ex-soldiers who sacrificed as much, if not more, are put off with a mere pittance, if not rejected altogether on some technicality.

We therefore desire to express our very highest admiration of the Senator in daring to stand up in the present United States Senate and oppose the principle being put in law that makes one citizen better than another in consequence of wealth or position. The following is Senator ALLEN's own language as delivered before the United States Senate on January 14, 1896:

"I want to go on record as opposed to any distinction between the widow of a private soldier and that of brigadier-generals, major-generals, or any other generals.

"It was the plain private soldier who met the blunt of the war."

Believing, as we do, that all men are born equal and are entitled to equal and exact justice, we desire that the above sentiments be immortalized—the Declaration of Independence must not be crushed.

Signed by J. J. Boyle and 300 other ex-soldiers.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Society for the Prevention of Criminal Malpractice of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to section 3893 of the United States postal criminal statutes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Massachusetts Commandery of the Naval Order of the United States, favoring the passage of the bill to erect a monument to John Paul Jones; which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the members of the Congregational Church of Hatfield, Mass., praying for the speedy interference of Christian nations to put an end to Turkish atrocities; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of Colonel Fred Taylor Post, No. 19, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Philadelphia, Pa., and a petition of Ellis Post, No. 6, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Germantown, Pa., praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Eucampment No. 73, Union Veteran Legion, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the bill forbidding the desecration of the American flag; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Catholic Central Organization of Erie, Pa., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted at a meeting of citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey, and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of Morgan Post, No. 4, Department of Minnesota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of House bill No. 306, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in so-called Confederate prisons; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GEORGE presented the petition of Eugenia M. Allen, of Nanachewaw, Miss., praying that she be granted compensation for loss of property taken from her plantations in the States of Mississippi and Louisiana by United States naval and military forces during the late war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition, in the form of resolutions adopted by the Congregational Club of Crete, Nebr., praying

for the enactment of legislation granting protection to American citizens in Turkey and extending sympathy to the suffering Armenians; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry soldiers of the late war, residing at the Soldiers' Home, Grand Island, Nebr., praying for the repeal of the arrears of pension act of June 29, 1880; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of 300 citizens of Omaha City, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Spokane, Wash., praying for the speedy recognition as belligerents of the Cuban patriots in their struggle for freedom; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Vancouver, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Columbia River between the city of Vancouver and the mouth of the Willamette River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the town council of Cosmopolis, Wash., praying for the speedy construction of the Nicaragua Canal under the control of the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the Construction of the Nicaragua Canal.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the erection of a bridge with spans across the Detroit River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CHILTON presented petitions of J. S. Garrison and sundry other citizens of Timpson, of George Harris and sundry other citizens of San Saba, of Volney Ellis and sundry other citizens of Hallettsville, and of E. C. Dickinson and sundry other citizens of Rusk, all in the State of Texas, praying for the enactment of legislation for the relief of the book agents of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE. I present the memorial of Mr. Austin Corbin, of New York City, in favor of the establishment of a free port at Fort Pond Bay, Long Island, in connection with Senate bill No. 561, introduced by me by request December 5, 1895. I move that the memorial be printed, together with the bill and the annexed papers, as a document, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY presented the petitions of George Fisher and 124 other citizens of Allegheny County, of Edward Weed and 59 other citizens of Allegheny County, of H. A. Carr and 44 other citizens of Flatwood, of George Wallace and 90 other citizens of Crawford County, of W. S. Chapman and 74 other citizens of Allegheny County, and of H. E. Dorwood and 90 other citizens of Carbon County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the repeal of the ninety-day divorce law of Oklahoma and Arizona Territories, and substituting in its stead the stricter divorce law of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the passage of a Sunday-rest law for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation raising the age of consent from 16 to 18 years in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Young Men's Christian Association of Chester, Pa., praying for the enforcement of the compulsory-education law in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of Encampment No. 73, Union Veteran Legion, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of the bill forbidding the desecration of the American flag; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. I desire to have changed the statement of a memorial presented as a remonstrance in my name on Tuesday. It is a memorial of the North Capitol and Eckington Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia and relates to the enactment of legislation granting to the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company the authority to extend their tracks in the city of Washington. The memorial contains suggestions as to the legislation proposed, and is in no sense a remonstrance against the extensions of the road sought for.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 347) to remove the charge of de-

sertion and grant an honorable discharge to Helmuth F. Soeckel, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment intended to be proposed to the Military Academy appropriation bill, submitted by Mr. VILAS on the 30th ultimo, reported it with an amendment, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 533) for the relief of Sidney W. Moss, of Oregon City, Oreg., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 532) for the relief of H. W. Shipley, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ROACH, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3009), granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1442) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," reported it without amendment.

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1820) for the establishment of a light-house and fog signal at or near Point Arguello, Cal., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 415) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Frank A. Land, of Natrop, Colo., reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 553) granting to Ira Bacon, of Company A, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteers, an additional bounty of \$100, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 54) authorizing the National Dredging Company to proceed with the work of dredging the channel of Mobile Harbor, under the direction of the Secretary of War, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McBRIDE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3964) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1764) to reorganize the customs collection district of Alaska, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. ELKINS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1102) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr., reported it without amendment.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1922) creating an art commission of the United States, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 16th ultimo, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had on bills pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 1973) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frederick A. Noeller; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 1974) for the relief of Mrs. Harriet D. Newson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Mrs. Julia Jones Duncan, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Samuel A. Duncan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 1976) granting a pension to Catherine E. O'Brien; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1977) granting an increase of pension to John C. Knapp; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1978) to provide pensions for freedmen, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1979) to improve the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. SQUIRE introduced a bill (S. 1980) for a relief light vessel on the Pacific Coast; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1981) for the relief of Herman C. Funk, late general-service clerk, class 1, United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1982) for the relief of Anna V. Ingerton, widow of William H. Ingerton, late lieutenant-colonel Thirteenth Tennessee Cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PEPPER introduced a bill (S. 1983) removing the charge of desertion from the name of James Richardson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WILSON introduced a bill (S. 1984) to authorize the Indian and Oklahoma Union Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian and Oklahoma Territories, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MANTLE introduced a bill (S. 1985) to provide for the disposal of the abandoned Fort Shaw Military Reservation, in Montana, under the homestead and mining laws of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. GEAR introduced a bill (S. 1986) for the relief of Enoch Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 1987) to provide street entrances for alleys in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 1988) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Joseph G. Marsh, of U. S. S. *Galena*; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1989) to authorize the payment to Rear-Admiral John H. Russell of the highest pay of his grade; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1990) authorizing the purchase of that portion of the unpublished correspondence and manuscripts of President James Monroe known as the "Gouverneur collection," which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1991) granting a pension to Mary Abercrombie Shufeldt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 71) authorizing the wearing of the distinctive badge adopted by the Sons of Veterans, United States Army, upon all occasions of ceremony; which was read twice by its title, and referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

CAPE LOOKOUT HARBOR OF REFUGE.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to inform the Senate of the United States as to the probable cost of providing a harbor of refuge at Cape Lookout, on the coast of North Carolina, said harbor of refuge to be capable of sheltering the largest vessels.

BIDS FOR BONDS.

Mr. HILL. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed at his earliest convenience to transmit to the Senate a statement of the bids for the bonds recently advertised for sale by him and opened yesterday, giving the names and residences of the bidders, the amounts bid, and any other detailed information which may be desirable for a proper understanding of said bids.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. I suggest to the Senator from New York that instead of saying "opened yesterday" he say "opened on the 5th."

Mr. HILL. Very well; let it read "opened on the 5th."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be so modified. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

CENSUS OF EX-SOLDIERS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit a resolution which I desire to have read, printed, and lie over under the rule.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas a proviso contained in section 17 of an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Eleventh and subsequent censuses," approved March 1, 1889, reads as follows:

"*Provided, however*, That said Superintendent shall, under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, cause to be taken on a special schedule of inquiry, according to such form as he may prescribe, the names, organizations, and length of service of those who had served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the war of the rebellion, and who are survivors at the time of said inquiry, and the widows of soldiers, sailors, or marines"; and

Whereas the said section further provides that "the only volumes that shall be prepared and published in connection with said census shall relate to population and social statistics relating thereto, the products of manufacturing, mining, and agriculture, mortality and vital statistics, valuation and public indebtedness, recorded indebtedness, and to statistics relating to railroad corporations, incorporated express, telegraph, and insurance companies, a list of the names, organizations, and length of service of surviving soldiers, sailors, and marines, and the widows of soldiers, sailors, and marines"; and

Therefore

Be it resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether the schedule relating to the names, organizations, and length of service of those who had served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the war of the rebellion was prepared and the information required taken; and if so, whether the said information was published as required by said section 17 of the act named, and if not so published, the reasons for withholding said publication.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN PRODUCTS.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and is hereby, directed to furnish to the Senate of the United States, at his earliest convenience, copies of all such laws, decrees, and regulations promulgated by the Governments of Germany, France, Belgium, and Denmark as in their present operation discriminate against the admission into the said countries of American cattle, meats, and other agricultural products.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and the District of Columbia; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE REVENUE BILL AND SILVER COINAGE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. QUAY that House bill 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee with instructions to report the original bill and the amendment as separate propositions.

Mr. TURPIE. I gave notice last Tuesday that at the conclusion of the routine business of the morning hour to-day I should call up the joint resolution (S. R. No. 66) introduced by me and move its reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that on the motion to refer I would submit some remarks upon the subject.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Indiana that we are still under the head of morning business. The resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania is a part of the morning business.

Mr. QUAY. Before the resolution is taken up for consideration I desire to modify it by striking out all after the word "committee," in the third line, and inserting in lieu thereof "for further consideration." I understand that it is the desire of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HANSBROUGH] to proceed with the consideration of his joint resolution to-day.

Mr. BERRY. I should like to have the amendment read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out of the printed resolution all after the word "committee," in line 3, in the following words: "with instructions to report the original bill and the amendment as separate propositions," and insert in lieu thereof "for further consideration"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 2749, reported by the Committee on Finance with an amendment, be recommitted to that committee for further consideration.

Mr. QUAY. I believe that under the rule I have a right to make the modification I have suggested.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be modified as indicated.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will not be kind enough to permit the resolution to lie over without prejudice, that the Senator from Indiana may address the Senate, after which I shall ask the Senate to take up Senate joint resolution No. 48.

Mr. QUAY. I have no desire to press the resolution immedi-

ately, and if the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber will agree to the arrangement, I will agree that it shall go over until Monday, at the conclusion of the morning hour, in order that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] may proceed with his remarks this morning, and that the joint resolution which the Senator from North Dakota has in charge may be disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator proposes to modify his resolution. I suggest to him that he present his modification now, so that it may be printed with the resolution.

Mr. QUAY. The modification has already been made.

Mr. HARRIS. I was not aware of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. It seems to me there can be no objection at all to recommitting the bill to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HILL. There is objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not see any necessity for delay. I imagine, as a matter of course, that this is a formal proceeding. I hope the resolution will be disposed of in that manner, so as not to stand in the way of other business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will submit to the Senate the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. The request is, I presume, distinctly understood. It is that the resolution shall go over until the conclusion of the morning business on Monday, and shall then be disposed of.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAY. What is the request?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will again submit it to the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. I may not object, but I want to know a little more about it. I do not see any necessity to put it off. There is certainly no necessity to recommit the bill in order to accomplish all the Senator from Pennsylvania desires, because if he wishes to have a vote on the silver amendment as a separate proposition, it can be offered as an amendment to the original bill as it now stands, and that amendment will take precedence of a motion to strike out and insert. The sense of the Senate can be taken on it just as well; there is no complication whatever about it. If you want a vote on the two propositions separately it can be offered as an amendment to the original bill, to perfect the original bill. You can then move to strike out. All the votes can be taken in the Senate the way the bill now stands that could be taken after recommitting it. I see no possible object in referring the bill back to have the propositions separated, when it is entirely within the power of the Senate in the ordinary way to reach a separate vote upon the questions.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to know what the request is.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state the request. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the pending resolution shall go over until the close of the morning business on Monday.

Mr. QUAY. That request, I will state, is made of the Senator from Pennsylvania by other Senators on this floor, and he acquiesces in it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORGAN subsequently said: I submit an amendment to the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY]. I ask that it be read and printed and lie on the table.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add to the resolution the following:

And with the further instruction, that the committee report the following as an amendment to the House bill No. 2749:

"That there shall be deducted from the customs duties that are or may be imposed by law upon articles imported from other countries into the United States for consumption, 10 per cent of such duties when such imports are made in vessels of the United States or in vessels of the country in which such imported articles were produced: *Provided*, That the country in which such articles are produced shall by law provide so that silver bullion the product of mines in the United States shall be admitted to coinage in the mints thereof on equal terms with gold bullion, and shall be received, without discount or discrimination, in payment for all customs dues on articles imported into such country, as full legal-tender money."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. If I remember correctly, there is a resolution on the table, offered by me on the 4th instant, which I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], coming over from a previous day.

Mr. TURPIE. I wish to make this point of order: I gave notice on last Tuesday that to-day, at the conclusion of the routine business of the morning hour, I desired to be heard on the joint resolution regarding the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and the resolution referred to by the Senator

from New Hampshire is not a part of the routine business of the morning hour.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator that the resolution is part of the morning business.

Mr. TURPIE. But the point I make is that it is not part of the routine business of the morning hour, which is the presentation of petitions, reports of committees, and whatever is in regular order as a part of the routine business of the morning hour. But the consideration of a resolution on the table going over from day to day is not a part of the routine business, although it is part of the business of the morning hour. I want especially, because I had asked it many days ago, the courtesy of the Senate to be heard at this hour.

Mr. GALLINGER. While I do not agree with the contention of the Senator from Indiana that a resolution which comes over under the rules does not become a part of the morning business of the next day, I have no disposition to press the matter, and will simply ask that the resolution in relation to pension statistics heretofore offered by me may go over until the next legislative day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. STEWART. The resolution of inquiry submitted by me ought to be passed at once or it will be of no avail.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution heretofore submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. STEWART February 4, 1896, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish the Senate an estimate of the probable increase of the revenue if bill H. E. 2749, entitled "A bill to temporarily increase revenue to meet the expenses of Government and provide against a deficiency," should become a law; and what would be the duty per pound in United States money on the different grades of imported wool according to the present market price; and is the proposed duty on wool provided for in said bill sufficient to compensate for or correspond with the increased duties proposed on woolen goods.

Mr. TURPIE. I now ask to have taken from the table the joint resolution introduced by me on Tuesday last and that it be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator in a moment. The pending question is on agreeing to the resolution which the Chair has laid before the Senate and which has been read.

Mr. GORMAN. I trust the Senator from Nevada will allow the resolution to go over. I desire to offer an amendment to it, and I have had no opportunity to prepare it.

Mr. STEWART. I have no objection to that, but I want to obtain the information which the resolution calls for.

Mr. GORMAN. Let the resolution go over without prejudice.

Mr. STEWART. Very well; I have no objection if it goes over without prejudice, so that it may come up to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the resolution will go over without losing its place.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Indiana, which will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. R. 66) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people of the United States, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc. (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely:

That section 3 of Article I be so amended that the same shall read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, who shall be chosen by a plurality vote of the people of the several States, for six years, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures, and each Senator shall have one vote.

"When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State may fill the same by appointment until the time of the next general election, at which a Senator may be chosen by the people to fill such vacancy."

This amendment may not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator who may be chosen before it becomes valid as a part of the Constitution.

Mr. TURPIE. I move to refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion submitted by the Senator from Indiana, on which he is entitled to the floor.

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, it is said that the present mode of electing United States Senators was provided by the counsels and was approved by the wisdom of our ancestors. In one point of view their wisdom excelled that of this generation. They adopted policies and made laws for their own day and age. They looked at the United States as it then existed, both as to the people and the Government. They made no provision touching the right of suf-

frage, except that the members of the House of Representatives should be chosen by the people of the several States having the qualifications requisite in each State for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That portion of the people who voted for such members of the legislature in each State were thus treated as representatives of the whole body politic.

The portion of the people thus entitled to vote was comparatively small—not numerous. Universal manhood suffrage, now grown so familiar to us, did not exist in any of the colonies at the time of the Revolution, nor in any of the States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. Other qualifications besides those of age and residence continued for many years to limit the number and to restrict the power of the electors.

It was doubtless the general extension of the right of suffrage in the several States which led to the gradual decline of the functions of their legislatures.

When the mass of citizens in a State first became voters voting only for members of the legislature and for Representatives in Congress, it was not long before they extended the use and application of the ballot to the choice of other officers. Governors, judges, the whole corps of administrative officers in the several States and in the counties and townships composing the same are now directly chosen by the people. In the older States one after another were made elective and the legislatures have been deprived of their former power of choosing these officers; in the new they have never been invested with that power. It might be said in a certain sense, even under these ancient forms of government now abolished, that the people chose the governor because they elected the members of the legislature who elected him, or that the people in effect elected the chief justice because he was appointed by the governor so chosen. But the history of political reform for more than a century makes answer that this condition of things did not satisfy the wishes of the people—did not satisfy the just demands of a free ballot or of civil liberty.

The system of election by proxy has been wholly abandoned and overthrown in the several States. The policy long and well established is that each citizen shall personally and immediately have his voice in the election of every public agent concerned in the administration of the Government. And if any man should in any State now propose that the governor, or the judges, or the auditor of public accounts should be chosen by proxy—that is, by the legislature—and should cite the practice of our forefathers as a model or example, he would be reminded that the wisdom of our forefathers was shown in adapting ways and means most suitable to their time and condition, that the wisdom of their descendants is to be shown in the same manner, and that the progress and growth of free institutions preferred and required the new and direct methods of election rather than the old. It is now time for us to pay a rational deference and respect to the memory of our ancestors, not by adhering to what they under different and other circumstances did, but by doing what they would have done under our present conditions.

Unfortunately, while the natural growth of the franchise has gone on—until it comprises in each of the States the whole number of male adults—the artificial polity, in respect to the composition of this body, continues unchanged. The ancient form of choice remains, but this form lacks now the substance. As compared with political conditions in 1779, we have in a very real sense a new people living and acting under an old system. A portion of the community, which had been formerly of small account in its direct influence upon the Government, has expanded and become strong, and it demands a place suited not to its former weakness but to its present power. We have already very perceptibly felt the pressure of the new wine in the old bottles in that continuous assault upon the constituent membership of this body, in the harsh denunciation of the action of legislatures in choosing the same, in that impatience and vehement expression of indignation at any action at all in conflict with that of the House of Representatives, and this doubtless not because the action of the two Houses may have been diverse but because the House is recognized as being of and from the people and the Senate is not of or from the same source. It may be said that these things are and always will be incident to our position in the public service, but this incessant disparagement of the conduct and action of the Senate increases daily in volume and severity and can not be disregarded. It is greatly enhanced by our refusal to submit the question of a change in the mode of our election, as it would be much diminished and allayed by the submission of this amendment, whether it were adopted or rejected. In some parts of the country it has already been mooted—publicly discussed—whether our present system of government would not be improved by an entire abolishment of the Senate.

I do not say that this overture has received the sanction of any considerable number of our people, but the fact of its agitation is not to be overlooked in determining our action herein. This suggestion is much aided by our attitude of hesitation and delay. Every reform necessarily implies a change in some existing method. All change is not reform. But the question of sub-

mitting a proposed change in our policy to the arbitrament of decision by the sovereign people may become almost as material and necessary to public order and to the general welfare as its adoption.

THE INVISIBLE EXECUTIVE.

It may be said without disparagement of our numerous fellow-citizens of other races that the prevalent and dominant type of our governmental institutions is in its origin Anglo-Saxon. The political history of that race for seven hundred years in England, the old home of our ancestors, may be summarized as a prolonged contest, sometimes with arms on the tented field, sometimes in the high debate of Parliamentary councils, between the prerogatives of the Crown and the franchises of the people. Very slowly but surely the people have overcome the Crown, until in these latter days the House of Commons, at first an unimportant and quite insignificant factor, has become the ruling power in the nation.

Many of the best men among our Revolutionary founders, having an intense sympathy with the people in this great historic conflict, entertained misgivings as to the effect of our own Constitution at the time of its adoption. They were jealous of the powers conferred on the Chief Executive. They said plainly the President may become, if not in name, in fact, a king. The power of the Executive, exerted through official patronage, always increasing with the growth of the country, might in the end result in serious menace to the liberties of the citizen. These grave apprehensions of the encroachment of the Executive authority have thus far not been realized. The intense devotion of our people to the autonomous freedom of the several States and the extreme detestation of the use of Presidential patronage to control opinion have checked this power, and we have been comparatively safe from its operation.

The danger to our institutions, and especially to the free exercise of our legislative functions, comes from another quarter. That levity of assent which we have used in the creation of corporations both in the State and in the nation has reared from small beginnings a power unnamed, unknown, not mentioned in the Constitution, which, like the famous genie of the Arabian tales, at first confined in a small space, but unwittingly released and let loose, overshadows the whole country with its gigantic form. This power is much greater than that of the constitutional executive—with infinitely larger patronage, with a proletariat composed of thousands of dependents; aiming at a dominion unrestricted by law, and despising liberty. Neither the dogma nor the practice of the division of powers is known to or recognized by this autocracy.

These numerous creatures of our own too facile legislation are wholly immaterial, gifted, as is said by Blackstone, with a sort of legal immortality by reason of their prerogative of perpetual succession.

These organizations are decided by the courts to be persons, residents, citizens. These residents never remove, these citizens never disappear, these persons never die. I have heretofore alluded to the enormous growth and number of our bodies corporate in my remarks of December 6, 1894, in the Senate upon this subject.

“Many appellations or epithets have been given to this time of ours. Perhaps one, as appropriate as any other, at least in our own country, would be the Age of Incorporations.

“The jurisdiction and province of these institutions is no longer confined to great enterprises, the construction of public works, the distant transportation of freight and passengers, the opening of mines or quarries. Gainful pursuits of any kind are seldom now undertaken by persons as such. We have companies duly chartered and organized for the manufacture of almost every article, utensil, implement, or commodity sold in the market.

“Not only the carrier, the wagoner, the brazier, the shoemaker, and the smith have disappeared—the workmen in every art and mystery have vanished. The company has taken their room and place; they are forgotten or wholly merged in the corporate life and service.

“Nor is this strange transformation limited to matters of gain or profit. This universal hunger for incorporation, this world-wide riddance of personality, this negation of private action, finds numerous objects for its exercise elsewhere. For the redress of every wrong that is done under the sun there is some society formed and duly chartered. For the cure of every ill to which our race is subject, for the diffusion of every benefit whereof it may partake, there is a body corporate, with its president, vice-president, and board of directors, duly appointed according to the statute in such case made and provided.

“Is a pervading sense of separate weakness the secret of this rushing movement toward collective effort? If so, the men of our generation must have been deeply touched by a sense of their own infirmity.

“Whatever may be the motive or the reason for this tendency or condition, it obtains.

"This deluge of incorporations has not only reached but covered every field, valley, and height of human enterprise."

Had these incorporated societies confined themselves to their legitimate business, the profits to be made by skill, diligence, and ingenuity in their several crafts and vocations, and had been therewith content, they would still have been accounted as among the most remarkable phenomena of the present century. But they are not thus content or satisfied. They aspire to control the political functions of the Government and to enlarge their gains by direct legislation having for its object the increase of the value of their shares and dividends.

To this end certain of these associations have formed an organism, representing the aggregate mass of incorporations having the same or like interests—which is called the trust—alias the pool—otherwise the combine or combination. The life and force of this organism is concentrated in what is known as the executive committee. This new executive assumes strange powers, uses strange methods, methods unknown before.

It resembles very much the Grand Council of Ten, so famous in the history of Venice. The members of that celebrated council were unknown, except to each other. The time and place of their meeting were unknown. No written record was kept of their orders or proceedings. Its power was supreme. Whomsoever they bound in Venice was imprisoned. Whomsoever they condemned died by the hands of the executioner. Whatsoever law of the Republic or decree of the senate stood in the way of their administration was suspended, annulled, or repealed.

The organic law of this country provides very carefully for a distribution of powers. This new executive of the trust will brook no such distribution. Its avowed purpose is to control the executive, to control the judicial, and wholly to supplant the legislative department of the Government in all matters appertaining to the province of the pool.

The Constitution of the United States declares that the Congress shall have power to levy taxes, duties, excises, and imposts, but the invisible executive of the trust dictates absolutely what merchandise shall be free, what articles shall be exempt from taxation, what things shall be subject thereto, and the rate and per cent of the levy. In this mysterious syndicate which decides upon the act and fact of taxation, the people are without any kind of representation.

Herein taxation without representation is now as real a grievance as in the days of the colonial era before the Revolution.

The Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States. This invisible executive declares with imperious and imperial fiat, "All regulations are mine."

The old Executive (I speak of the office, not of the person) has the power to veto a bill after its passage; the new executive claims and exercises the power to veto a bill or any part thereof before its passage. The old Executive holds a term of office lasting four years. The new executive holds a term in perpetuity, unlimited. This is a terrible power, an absolutism beyond that of the Czar or the Sultan, omnipotent, irresponsible, and irremovable.

Yet it is the offspring of a free Republic, born of those franchises granted so lavishly, a progeny deformed and monstrous which turns to rend the people who gave it life and being.

Herein lies our danger most manifest. Liberty is of little moment when it is thus dominated by a despotism unseen, impalpable—amenable to no authority.

It may indeed be asked how is all this related to the subject in argument? Most closely, very directly. For it is alleged, and has been now for many years bruited with every circumstance of notoriety and publicity, that the central bureau, the chief powerhouse of this malevolent and intriguing usurper, is located at the capitols of the several States wherever and whenever a member of this body is to be chosen. Destroy the scene of its operations, this arena of its exploits, and it at once disappears. Dissolve this incorporeal aggregate of the trust, with all its dependents, retainers, and procurers into the original units which compose it, and we shall restore the ballot of opinion unawed, unbought. An act of faith such as the choice of a United States Senator by the people at a general election would render this evil genius of the Republic powerless for harm.

There is a virtue in the movement of popular opinion induced by a general election akin to that found in the tidal movement of the waters of the ocean—it dissolves and destroys all impurities; the whole mass is cleansed in every part. Everywhere is felt the touch of the invigorating savor. There is that integrity, that fearlessness, in the greater not found in the lesser number, especially when the smaller number acts in a representative character. The mass of men do not share the bribes of the tempter, and they treat his menace with disdain.

INHERENT EVILS OF THE PRESENT MANNER OF CHOOSING.

As has been formerly stated in the discussion of this proposed amendment, one of the greatest evils of the present manner of choosing United States Senators is the inability of the State legis-

latures to perform this duty. The failure of the legislatures to elect is becoming more and more frequent. When, during the last session, the instance was cited of some of the new States in the far West whose legislatures had adjourned after holding a session and balloting unsuccessfully for the full constitutional term of their existence, it was answered that these States were new, that their legislatures were without experience in the function of Senatorial elections, and that these conditions had made their action unavailing. But what will be said in relation to the condition now existing in the States of Delaware and Kentucky, two of the oldest States in the Union, in which the legislatures have had a prolonged experience in the election of United States Senators, where there was every motive and reason for a choice, yet the difficulties found in the representative elements of the legislative bodies have proved almost insuperable?

In the State of Delaware the general assembly balloted every day of the session from the first Tuesday in January, 1895, until Thursday, the 9th day of May following, without an election, and on the last day and in the last hour of the last day left us only a contest instead of a Senator chosen. The present status in the State of Kentucky, where the legislature is so evenly divided as necessarily to impose upon a very small minority the power to determine the pending Senatorial election, is an instance of like difficulty. This equilibrium of parties in the State legislatures and consequent domination of minor sections of opinion therein is an increasing mischief, due to the present mode of choice, not inherent in our general polity. No one has any right to disparage either the existence or action of a third party, or to deny its legitimate proportional voice in the conduct of public affairs, but when, as in some cases it has already occurred and is likely to occur in many more, the third party has set aside on either hand the voice of existing majorities, has impeded or wholly defeated the action of the greater number, such a defect in our system must give us pause, room, and opportunity for grave deliberation.

An examination of our internal political history will show that ever since the organization of parties, at the close of the second Administration of Washington, there has always been a third party. Extremely variant in name, policies, and purposes, yet there has constantly been a mass of voters who entered a sort of interloquary dissent to the ideas and principles, whatever they may have been, of what were known as the two dominant parties of the country. This element of dissent has sometimes attained a representation in the House of Representatives; sometimes in the Senate; occasionally, though more rarely, it has reached the electoral college; but it has been much more frequently known and recognized in the legislatures of the States than elsewhere. There, if it have made any progress at all in public estimation, it is sure to be found. It has a right to be there, but it is owing to our present imperfect mode of choosing Senators that its presence becomes so potential, and that its power becomes vital, crucial, out of all proportion to the small number of voters who at the polls are known as its adherents.

A third party at the present time has somewhat of political representation in both branches of Congress, and in several States has a large number of followers. Sometimes it is said to be numerically larger than ever before, but this may be doubted. A third party from natural causes will increase as our population grows larger. Certain men will always prefer the byways to the beaten paths of political action, and the greater the number of men the more frequent will be the instances of departure. Judging the future by the past, it is quite certain that, although the third party now in vogue may disappear as others have done, a third party of some kind is to be accounted as a constant quantity in American politics, and, in defiance of all arithmetic and all rules of number and order, the third party becomes and has become in the history of this country the first or the second; and yet there is always a number sufficient to form another third party. Whether the state of political equilibrium in our legislatures, now so frequent, arises from the presence and action of a third party or from the personal divisions and private dissensions in one or the other of the principal parties there represented, the result is the same—the failure to choose, or the compulsory choice of some one not preferred by and not representative of the wishes and opinions of the greater number. The election of United States Senators by a plurality vote of the people would instantly remove this growing evil, and would immediately restore and perpetuate the legitimate rule of the majority voting.

To these evils more particularly noted must be added the complications which are liable to occur at any time from the death of one or more members of the general assembly, a mortality which would not disturb in any way an election by the popular suffrage; and also the perplexing and perpetual conundrum of legislative apportionment, becoming more and more intractable—both these causes of mischief constantly growing, not only in the frequency of their occurrence, but in the intensity of their operation, as the number of States and legislatures is multiplied. It is not, however, from the consideration alone of the grievous ills which beset the

present system that a change is argued and demanded. Had these manifold and pernicious ills of the old method no existence, we should yet insist, upon the grounds of the political sovereignty and moral supremacy of the people, that those for whom all laws are made should directly choose the lawmakers.

I wage no Parthian warfare upon the past. We turn to the past, not to traduce or to denounce it, but with the most loyal sentiments of reverence and admiration, yet gathering therefrom both the law and the lesson of real political development.

Forty-five senates in the several States are to-day elected by the popular vote. Every State in the Union has placed its legislative department directly under the control of the people. Why should not the Senate of the States united be chosen in like manner?

A free representative democracy, with a constituency of 70,000,000 of inhabitants, must of necessity be a government of legislative proxies, but these proxies ought to be chosen by their principals, the people.

There is no room, no reason for the functions of middlemen in a transaction of such momentous character.

Such a change would be in full harmony with the spirit of the Federal compact, would marvelously improve its symmetry, would establish that more perfect union which our fathers designed, not as finished, like some sculptured work of art in still life, but as capable of amendment, as susceptible of living growth, actual advancement, and continual progression.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

ARKANSAS AND CHOCTAW RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent to take from the table for present consideration the bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes. It will take but a moment to pass the bill. It is a very important bill, I will state, and a similar measure has been reported from the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. I desire that the Senate shall act upon the House bill instead of the Senate bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not object, but I shall be glad if the Senator from Missouri will state briefly the substance of the bill and from what committee it comes.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill merely authorizes this corporation to complete its railroad from Arkansas into the Indian Territory. It has now completed 10 miles of that part located in Arkansas, and the balance is under rapid construction—all of the ties, timbers, and steel rails purchased, and most of the rails have been delivered. It is believed that all of the line in Arkansas would have been completed, but it was deemed advisable by the promoters to await the survey of the whole line, as the survey in the Indian Territory might show that it would be better from an economical standpoint and in other respects advisable to change the location of the line in Arkansas from its present terminus to the Choctaw line.

A bill for this purpose was introduced in the other House and another in the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] reported the Senate bill, and the other House passed its bill. There are very few changes in the House bill from the bill as reported by the Senator from Arkansas. I have conferred with the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs and they agree to the passage of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the bill (S. 1579) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation, in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

INCLINE RAILWAY ON HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation. It is a little bill which will take but a moment, being practically in one section.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. If it is the intention of the Senate to act upon the joint resolution relating to the distribution of seeds, I hope we will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. BERRY. I appeal to the Senator from North Dakota. Senator after Senator on the other side has had permission for the passage of bills, and I have not asked for the consideration of any other bill during the entire session. It will not take five minutes, and I ask him to allow the bill to be passed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I have given repeated notice that I would call up the joint resolution. I have just yielded for a bill which it took almost a half hour to read, and I do not see that I can afford to yield further if I have any rights here in the premises.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from North Dakota can yield for five minutes.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator will lose more than five minutes before he gets the joint resolution through.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Then I shall have but twenty minutes left before the unfinished business is laid before the Senate.

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

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. LODGE. What is the bill?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The bill was read, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRAINERD AND NORTHERN MINNESOTA RAILWAY.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Having yielded to one or two Senators, I accord the same courtesy to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3009) granting to the Brainerd and Northern Minnesota Railway Company a right of way through the Leech Lake Indian Reservation and Chippewa Indian Reservation, in Minnesota. It is a bill which has been passed by the other House and has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill was read.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Minnesota if the usual clause is contained in the bill, that Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal the act?

Mr. NELSON. I think it is in the bill. The bill has been before the Interior Department and has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CALL. I suggest to the Senator that it has been the custom of Congress, as in the bill just passed a few minutes ago, to insert a clause to the effect that Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal the act.

Mr. NELSON. An amendment will simply delay the final passage of the bill. They are required to build the road within three years, and as a matter of fact almost all of the road is really built.

Mr. CALL. I think the Senator ought to add that clause, as it has been the custom.

Mr. NELSON. I hope the Senator will let the bill stand as it was passed by the other House.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. CALL. I move as an amendment, in accordance with the uniform custom of the Senate for many years, to add at the end of the bill as an additional section:

Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

Mr. NELSON. I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PROHIBITION OF PRIZE FIGHTING.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals and to provide penalties therefor in the Territories and the District of Columbia was read twice by its title.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to ask the Senate to pass that bill at once. I have examined it. As the members of the Senate are aware, the prize fighters after going from Texas to Louisiana and then into Mexico have been driven out of Mexico, and they are now proposing to have their prize fight in New Mexico. This is a proposed United States law to prohibit it there. It ought to be passed now, so as to become a law within a few days.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the morning hour to the Calendar.

SIoux INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3728) to amend section 21 of an act

entitled "An act to divide a portion of the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in Dakota into separate reservations, and to secure the relinquishment of the Indian title to the remainder, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1889. The bill was reported by me a few days ago from the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, in line 28, after the word "shall", to insert "be for a longer period than ten years, and shall"; so as to read:

Provided, That such leases shall be for a longer period than ten years, and shall not in the aggregate embrace or cover more than one-third the area of said land.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The amendment as stated is not what was intended. It should read that no lease shall be for a longer period than ten years. I wish to correct the amendment so as to make it read "that no lease shall be for a longer period than ten years."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified as indicated by the Senator from South Dakota. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893. The title of the bill does not disclose its real purpose. Its real purpose is to extend the time within which a bridge over the St. Lawrence River can be built.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 4 of the act approved February 9, 1893, authorizing the St. Lawrence Railway Company, of the State of New York, to build and maintain a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at some point in St. Lawrence County, State of New York, by extending the time for the completion of the bridge to February 9, 1898.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMISSION OF FINES AND FORFEITURES.

Mr. WHITE. I ask leave to call up the bill (S. 1740) to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to remit or mitigate fines, penalties, and forfeitures, and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, approved December 15, 1894, so as to read:

Sec. 5294. The Secretary of the Treasury may, upon application therefor, remit or mitigate any fine, penalty, or forfeiture provided for in laws relating to vessels or discontinue any prosecution to recover penalties or relating to forfeitures denounced in such laws, excepting the penalty of imprisonment or of removal from office, upon such terms as he, in his discretion, shall think proper; and all rights granted to informers by such laws shall be held subject to the Secretary's powers of remission, except in cases where the claims of any informer to the share of any penalty shall have been determined by a court of competent jurisdiction prior to the application for the remission of the penalty or forfeiture; and the Secretary shall have authority to ascertain the facts upon all such applications in such manner and under such regulations as he may deem proper.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from California to state the purpose of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. The bill simply adds the word "forfeitures" to the power already possessed by the Secretary of the Treasury to remit the penalties in certain cases, so as to obviate a technical difficulty experienced by the Department.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

R. G. M. BROWN.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1477) authorizing the President of the United States to nominate Lieut. Commander R. G. M. Brown, now on the retired list, to be a commander on the retired list. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Naval Affairs and is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FAULKNER. I move to strike out the preamble of the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution by Mr. DUBOIS proposing an

amendment to paragraph 1 of Rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add to the resolution:

All appropriations relating to the construction, purchase, or maintenance of public buildings and grounds shall be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Rule XXV shall be amended as follows:

"The Committee on Finance shall consist of 15 members."

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. QUAY. As the Senator from Idaho declines to accept the amendment, I will not press it.

Mr. DUBOIS. I could not hear the remark made by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. QUAY. When I offered the amendment yesterday I requested the Senator from Idaho to accept the amendment, as I thought it was in the line of the general idea of the resolution. He declined to do so, and I will not press it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania withdraw the amendment?

Mr. QUAY. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. FRYE. There was an amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], I remember.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notice has been given of that amendment. It may now be offered, but it has not yet been in order to offer it.

Mr. CALL. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Add at the end of the resolution:

After the appropriation bills shall be reported to the Senate by the several committees they shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations for consideration and report to the Senate of the total amount of the appropriations and such recommendations in relation to the amount of such appropriations and the changes in such bills as may be necessary to keep them within the revenues of the Government and adequate for its requirements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], upon which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to make some observations, not upon the amendment, but upon the resolution, at this time. Of course, I will yield to the Senator from Florida if he so desires.

Mr. CALL. I do not desire to take the floor from the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will proceed.

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me a moment?

Mr. ALLISON. With pleasure.

Mr. DUBOIS. On December 11, soon after the meeting of this Congress, I made a speech on the pending resolution. I was arguing as to the extraordinary powers of the conferees, and from what has occurred in the Senate since I am satisfied I used an illustration which would properly be considered as a reflection upon the conferees and upon the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I did not intend that at all, but I used the following language:

A provision was slipped into that bill—

Referring to the sundry civil appropriation bill—

by the conferees withdrawing all the public lands which were embraced within the arid region of the country from settlement until certain impossible conditions are complied with.

The facts were that that amendment was added in the other House to the bill; that the conferees on the part of the Senate endeavored to get it out; and that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] added another provision which modified the House amendment. I think this explanation is due, because I have no disposition whatever to reflect upon the Committee on Appropriations, much less its distinguished chairman.

Mr. ALLISON. I am much obliged to the Senator from Idaho for himself making this explanation, as it certainly was due to the conferees that it should be made.

Mr. President, this is not a new subject that we have in the Senate at this time. It has frequently appeared here before; but it appears now in rather an unusual way. The established custom and rule of the Senate has been and is that all questions of public importance or that relate to the organization of this body shall have, in the first instance, the consideration of a committee of this body. During a somewhat prolonged period in this Chamber I have never known a case where it was suggested by a Senator that a proposition should be referred to the appropriate committee for its consideration and report in the first instance that that has not been done. We have in this Chamber and have had

almost from the foundation of the body a Committee on Rules, whose duty it is to prepare or modify or change the rules of the Senate and bring into the body the reasons for such proposed change.

The Senator from Idaho, on the 5th day of December, the third day after the convening of the present session, offered this proposition and asked, not that it be referred to a committee, but that it lie on the table in order that he might make some observations respecting it. On the 11th day of December the Senator from Idaho expressed his views upon this subject, and then the resolution again went to the table. Day before yesterday the Senator from Idaho called up the resolution, displacing an appropriation bill of an urgent character, and asked the Senate to consider it. A large majority of this body, I agree, voted to consider the resolution, and I find no fault with that vote or with the consideration that is now going on, except that before it is disposed of and before we take a final vote upon it it is our duty, it seems to me, that it shall have the considerate care of one of the standing committees of this body. That will be necessary for the reason that the proposed amendment of the rules as it now stands is impossible of execution consistent with the other rules of the Senate which are to be left unchanged, as I shall presently show. If we adopt the resolution now it will be necessary for the Committee on Rules of itself to take up this question anew and deal with other rules that are inconsistent with the provision proposed by the Senator from Idaho. I think this is a question of importance to the orderly and necessary procedure of the Senate. But laying aside that question, believing as I do that this is an unwise provision, I shall endeavor to give some reasons, in my mind at least, why the proposed change should not be made.

I have before me Rule XVI, quoted yesterday by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], but which I desire to quote again for the reason that it shows how careful this body has been in the past to surround the question of the consideration of appropriations of public money from the Treasury of the United States. Rule XVI is a modification, it is true, but not a serious one, of the rule of this body from time immemorial which has thrown around the appropriation of public money such safeguards and restrictions as will guard the public Treasury.

RULE XVI.

1. All general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law, or treaty stipulation, or act, or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session—

The last clause was a modification of the rule; it was an innovation—

or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

“Or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments,” which, you see, gives a marked significance and distinction to the estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury, as the estimates are bound to be so made now by law. There must be the report of either a standing or a select committee, an estimate from the head of a Department, or the passage of a bill by the Senate at the session when the amendment is proposed which authorizes the expenditure.

In addition to that there is a second clause, which provides for amendments, as follows:

2. All amendments to general appropriation bills moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and when actually proposed to the bill, no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received; in like manner amendments proposing new items of appropriation to river and harbor bills shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Commerce; also amendments to bills establishing post-roads, proposing new post-roads, shall, before being considered, be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

We shall be in the anomalous position, I will say as I go along, if this resolution shall pass, of having all the other committees of this body reporting bills and amendments here, having had them considered in their committees, whereas all amendments to these bills coming from any other committee or any other source must, under this rule, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which has had no part in the consideration of the bills themselves. This illustration alone shows how important it is that amendments proposed to the rules of the Senate shall, before we are called upon here to finally vote upon them, have the judgment of the appropriate committee as to all the changes which are necessary in order to harmonize the present rules with those proposed.

But I read this rule for a wholly different purpose than to call attention to this situation; and I shall not stick in the bark as to the rule. The intent and purpose of this rule was to limit and restrict appropriations of public money in such a way that there

could not be forced upon appropriation bills legislation which might not be convenient or agreeable to either House of Congress, or especially to that House which refused to consider such proposed amendments. In other words, it was to throw around appropriations such safeguards and conditions that they would not be left, if I may use the word, to the caprice or the sudden consideration of a majority of any legislative body.

Why was this done as to appropriation bills? I have given the reason. It was that legislation should be considered with deliberation in both Houses, and that it should not be within the power of either House to say the Government will only be carried on on condition that you will accept the legislation we want. It was in effect saying to the Senate of the United States, “You can not put legislation upon an appropriation bill and coerce the coordinate body by saying to them ‘you must take this legislation as a condition of the appropriation of public money to carry on the Government.’” It was to throw around the House of Representatives the same restriction, because their rules are of the same character as ours, and they are more rigidly enforced than are the rules of this body.

Mr. President, what is the process under the law and under the rules of the two Houses whereby money is appropriated which has been gathered into the Treasury either by taxation or by selling bonds which are to run thirty years or any other length of time, taxing the present generation for the interest and the next generation for the principal? Early in the history of this Government one of the first laws which was passed by Congress, dating on the 2d day of September, 1789, soon after the Department of the Treasury was established by law, provided in the second section of an act to establish the Treasury Department, found on page 65, volume 1, of the Statutes at Large—

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the revenue, and for the support of public credit; to prepare and report estimates of the public revenue and the public expenditures; to superintend the collection of the revenue; to decide on the forms of stating and keeping accounts; * * * to make report—

I do not quote the whole section—

and give information to either branch of the Legislature, in person or in writing, as he may be required, respecting all matters referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives, or which shall appertain to his office.

So that in the first statute establishing the Treasury Department these estimates which come into our rules had a status and standing, giving the Secretary of the Treasury power to make estimates to both Houses of Congress. Under our rules, when so made, these estimates are given the sanction and power of a bill which may have passed this body. This was modified by the statute of May 10, 1800, found in volume 2 of the Statutes at Large, page 79, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to digest, prepare, and lay before Congress at the commencement of every session a report on the subject of finance, containing estimates of the public revenue and public expenditures, and plans for improving or increasing the revenues, from time to time, for the purpose of giving information to Congress in adopting modes of raising the money requisite to meet the public expenditures.

It is under that ancient statute that the Secretary of the Treasury now makes his report direct to Congress rather than to the President of the United States, as other departmental officers do.

There are some intervening statutes, but I shall not trouble the Senate with them. In the act passed August 26, 1842, it is provided in section 14, volume 5, of the Statutes—

That it shall be the duty of the several heads of Departments, in communicating estimates of expenditures and appropriations to Congress and to any of the committees thereof, to specify, as nearly as may be convenient, the sources from which such estimates are derived and the calculations upon which they are founded, and in so doing to discriminate between such estimates as are conjectural in their character and such as are framed upon actual information and application from disbursing officers; and in communicating the several estimates reference shall be given to the laws and treaties by which they are authorized, the dates thereof, and the volume, page, and section in which the necessary provisions are contained.

So the Book of Estimates since 1842 has been required to show not only that the estimates are authorized by law, but also the date of that authorization, the amount, and the volume in which it is to be found.

These provisions were changed by section 3 of an act approved March 3, 1875, page 370, volume 18 of the Statutes, as follows:

That it shall be the duty of the heads of the several Executive Departments and of other officers authorized or required to make estimates, to furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury, on or before the 1st day of October of each year, their annual estimates for the public service, to be included in the Book of Estimates prepared by law under his direction; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit, as a part of the appendix to the Book of Estimates, such extracts from the annual reports of the several heads of Departments and bureaus as relate to estimates for appropriation and the necessities thereof.

I have one other statute which I wish to read. All these statutes relate to the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury and heads of Departments respecting expenditures authorized by law. This is found on page 254, volume 23 of the Statutes at Large:

Hereafter all estimates of appropriations and estimates of deficiencies in appropriations intended for the consideration and seeking the action of any

of the committees of Congress shall be transmitted to Congress through the Secretary of the Treasury, and in no other manner; and the said Secretary shall first cause the same to be properly classified, compiled, indexed, and printed, under the supervision of the Chief of the division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations of his Department.

Thus curtailing the power of the head of any Department to make an estimate for any appropriation until it has been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, approved by him, and transmitted to the two Houses of Congress. Such estimates are transmitted, so far as the Senate is concerned, to the Senate from that desk, being addressed to the presiding officer of the Senate.

It may be asked why it is that I have quoted these statutes. I have quoted them for the purpose of showing that from the foundation of the Government it has been recognized that it was necessary that the greatest care should be exercised in order that the appropriation bills should be divested, so far as possible, of legislation, unless the legislation should appear to be necessary in making the appropriation.

Our fathers, the men who framed the Constitution of the United States, supposed that they had guarded carefully and well the provisions relating to the revenues and to the expenditure of public money. They deemed it wise, at least, to insert in the Constitution a provision restricting the power of Congress respecting the great questions of taxation and expenditure, drawing that provision from the custom of centuries in the English Parliament. They provided, it is true, only that—

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In other words, that the taxing power of the people should not, in the first instance, be a part of the power of the Senate of the United States, though, of course, we have the power of amendment in this body, for the constitutional provision further says:

But the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Then, although the language of the Constitution covers only "bills for raising revenue," it has been held from the organization of the Government that the constitutional power carried with it also the power of appropriating money. We have in this Chamber on three different occasions contested that power with the House of Representatives, one of them a most memorable occasion, wherein the Senate actually prepared appropriation bills and sent them to the House of Representatives; but that House laid them upon the table and paid no attention to them. Again, it was contended that we had power in this Chamber to originate appropriation bills, and a committee was appointed by the two Houses, called a committee of high privilege, wherein that question was debated for months, a report made in the House of Representatives denying that right, and a report made in the Senate asserting the right. But so well grounded now is the situation regarding appropriation bills that the Senate never undertakes to originate such bills.

So the appropriation bills which are dealt with in the pending resolution and in the present rule are not bills which originate here at all, but are bills which come to us from the other body, and come to us under their rules. Therefore it is necessary for us to adapt our rules to the House rules respecting the number of bills and what they shall embrace. So it has been that my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] and my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] have, temporarily at least, withdrawn the logical consequence of every argument that has been made in this Chamber for a change in the distribution of appropriation bills.

It is argued here that the appropriation bills ought to be distributed because the several committees have necessarily more knowledge of the subject matter of appropriations than can a separate and distinct committee have upon the same subject. If that be true, there is not a single topic of legislation that should not be divided and distributed among the several committees of this body.

It is true that my friend from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], in his kindness and generosity to the Committee on Appropriations, leaves to it a skeleton of three bills, one being called the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, another the sundry civil appropriation bill, and the other the deficiency appropriation bill, for all deficiencies. If the logic of those who argue for this change be correct, then these bills of all others should be divided and distributed among the committees of this body. If the argument be that the Committee on Appropriations can have no knowledge of Army affairs, or of the affairs of the Navy, or of the affairs of the Interior Department, why should they appropriate money for the War Department, or the Navy Department, or the Interior Department? It naturally follows, or would seem to follow, that if this bill should be sent to the Committee on Military Affairs, because that committee necessarily has more and better knowledge regarding the distribution of money appropriated for the Army, they will also have a better knowledge respecting the personnel of those who are in the War Department and the compensation that ought to be given to those who are there employed; and this applies to every other Department of the Government. If you strip the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill of the

provisions relating to salaries and compensation there would be practically nothing left of it.

I wish to ask some Senator who favors the pending resolution, if it be necessary that the expenditures which are made by the judicial department of this Government, including the expenditures in the Department of Justice, be made by the Committee on the Judiciary, why should not those made for all the courts of the United States also be considered by the Judiciary Committee, now so ably presided over by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and recently so ably presided over by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] who sits near me? The members of that committee are dealing with judicial subjects all the time; they are considering legislation in relation to the courts of justice, regarding the marshals and the district attorneys, and keep, as it were, an eye, and a keen one, upon all the subjects relating to the powers of the United States courts and their jurisdiction. That necessarily gives that committee a knowledge of these subjects. So I might illustrate by other heads of Departments and by other committees.

The argument made is an argument for the absolute dismemberment of the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, the Senators who have argued here, in my judgment, argued from wrong premises. Take the sundry civil bill, which is proposed to be left in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations. Let me analyze that for a moment, and see if the arguments which have been made here would not necessarily take the sundry civil bill practically from the Committee on Appropriations and distribute it among the various committees which have been named. They, it is said, are especially and distinctively qualified for the performance of the service required in making appropriations.

Take public buildings. I hold in my hand the appropriations for the current year. If there is nothing in this question of appropriations except simply how much the committees can have, or how much they think ought to be appropriated, surely the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which makes a special examination of all these topics, ought to have control of this subject. Last year we appropriated nearly \$4,000,000 for public buildings in the United States. Is there any reason why the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds should not have charge of that subject? If there is a reason, it is to be found in the logic of this whole situation, and that is that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds might be willing to appropriate ten or twelve million dollars, or \$20,000,000, if you please, and still appropriate it wisely and judiciously for the Government itself. In a country like ours, extended as it is in its area, with populations growing with immense rapidity, with cities springing up in a week or in a year, where the Government carries its power and its influence through its courts, through its postal service, and through all the ramifications of a great country such as ours, is the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to appropriate, and, I have no doubt, properly to appropriate, ten, fifteen, or twenty million dollars for public buildings?

Why do not those who favor this scheme treat these committees alike? It has been said on this floor over and over again that Senators are equal and States are equal. So they are; and so they ought to be; and so they will be in this Chamber; but the question of the division of labor among the committees is a question as to the wisest and best method of reaching true results; and therefore it is that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, although they might report in favor of the appropriation of ten or twenty million dollars a year, must be, in a sense, limited in their appropriations and in their power by the revenues of the Government in the first place, and, in the second place, by the necessary distribution of these revenues among all the departments of our Government, and the necessary expenditures to be made therein in order that our progress may be continuous.

Now, take the Committee on Commerce, so long and so ably presided over by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] who sits in front of me. For a good many years the Committee on Commerce has had charge of the river and harbor appropriation bill.

Mr. HILL. The Committee on Commerce has always had charge of that bill, has it not?

Mr. ALLISON. No, sir; not always.

Mr. HILL. When did it not have it?

Mr. ALLISON. I think it has had that bill since 1846. I may be mistaken as to the date, as I speak from memory.

Mr. HILL. It has always had.

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Commerce has not always had it. That is my recollection. If the Senator from New York knows differently I will be corrected now.

Mr. HILL. I am advised that the Committee on Commerce has always had charge of that bill, if not directly, then indirectly, it having been customary for the Finance Committee, which always had charge both of appropriations and finances prior to 1867, to refer the river and harbor bill to the Committee on Commerce. It was the constant rule to do that.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly. That is practically done with respect to every other committee of this body.

Mr. HILL. I will say—

Mr. ALLISON. I will come to that matter, if the Senator from New York will excuse me. Does the Senator wish to interrupt me for anything special? If he does I will yield, but I do not wish to proceed further with this branch of the subject.

Mr. HILL. I simply wish to call the attention of the Senate and the Senator to the fact that prior to 1867 the Committee on Finance had control of appropriations as well as the question of finance.

Mr. ALLISON. I am familiar with that.

Mr. HILL. And the change was made then, in 1867.

Mr. ALLISON. Then since 1867 the Committee on Commerce has had charge of the river and harbor bill. I was mistaken as to the date.

Mr. HILL. I do not state that. I say that prior to 1867 I think it was customary to refer river and harbor matters to the Committee on Commerce. That is my recollection.

Mr. ALLISON. The same custom was in existence then that prevails now; that is, consultation with committees as to appropriations affecting their particular duty.

Mr. HILL. It is not a custom now, but a rule with respect to the river and harbor bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. But now let us look into the sundry civil bill a little further.

Light-houses, beacons and fog signals, Life-Saving Service, Revenue-Cutter Service, Coast and Geodetic Survey—those are all attributes, if I may use that word, of the Committee on Commerce. All those subjects are under the jurisdiction and control of that committee, and the appropriation last year for the purposes I have just stated amounted to nearly \$5,000,000. If the logic of the Senators who argue for the resolution is correct, then the Committee on Commerce should have those items also.

Take the Fish Commission. Why is it that the Committee on Fisheries is not embraced in the resolution? Why should not it have control of the appropriations for fisheries? It is a separate and distinct committee and one of the most important and ablest in this body. Yet the appropriations for this branch of the Government are to be considered by the Committee on Appropriations, who necessarily know but little on the subject, according to the logic of our friends.

I do not wish to go into the details of all the questions in relation to the different appropriations, but here is the Committee on Public Lands, presided over by the mover of the resolution, recently made its chairman, and familiar with the whole topic. We appropriate for public lands \$1,200,000 annually. Why should not the Public Lands Committee take control of that appropriation and deal with it rather than that we should have a select committee specially devoted to that and kindred subjects?

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. If that appropriation were contained in a single bill, by the customs and usages of the Senate would it not be proper to send the bill to the Committee on Public Lands? Why not?

Mr. ALLISON. Under the argument of the Senator and those who are associated with him that is the logic of the situation; and the rules of the Senate are brushed aside, it seems, without reference to a committee. How long will it be before the Senator from New Hampshire himself will be clamoring for such a change of the rules as will authorize the distribution of which we are now speaking?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator does not wish to mislead anyone.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not.

Mr. CHANDLER. The resolution takes the appropriation bills according to the existing custom and makes a little different distribution of them from the present system. The Senator from Iowa is trying to prove, I understand, that because that is done therefore each appropriation bill should be taken and cut up into twenty or thirty pieces. That does not follow at all from the argument. There may be a little reform in this world without absolute destruction of all human institutions.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true, and it was stated two or three times yesterday that we are engaged at this time in a great reform, in a sort of evolution; and I suppose we are. I was only arguing the logic of the gentlemen who insist that this distribution shall be made for the orderly division of the work of the Senate.

Now, take the Military Affairs Committee, with my distinguished

friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] sitting near me, as its chairman and managing the affairs of the committee during his chairmanship with great ability, surrounded by other gentlemen of distinction and ability. If it be true that the appropriations should be thus distributed, I will ask my venerable friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]—not so venerable as I am, either—to tell me why we should make two bites at a cherry and leave the appropriations for arsenals, military posts, military parks, national cemeteries, and miscellaneous objects under the War Department, which embraces a variety of small and great things, including National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and State and Territorial Homes, amounting to three or four or five million dollars annually, to be provided for by a special committee designated for that purpose?

Mr. PROCTOR. Does the Senator from Iowa wish me to give a reason now?

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to give the Senator a reason in the line of the logic of those who support the resolution, which is that the other committees are better calculated to deal with those subjects than a committee whose only business it is to deal with appropriations of public money.

Mr. PROCTOR. One very good reason why they should not be changed, I think, is because the appropriation bills originate in the other body. They are sent here all framed, and it is not for us to tear them to pieces. The pending resolution contemplates nothing of the kind.

Mr. ALLISON. That is an answer, but it is not the answer that meets the logic of those who are arguing for the resolution, because the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL] day before yesterday introduced an amendment providing that those appropriations should also go to the Committee on Military Affairs, a logical movement.

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes; and he withdrew it on consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. He withdrew it on consideration, and I suppose after consultation, giving notice that a joint resolution was required for that purpose; and how long does it take my ingenious friend from Vermont to prepare a joint resolution to reach any purpose he has in hand?

So I could go on with the appropriations. Notwithstanding the fact that the Committee on Commerce has the question of rivers and harbors before it under the rules, the Committee on Appropriations is now bound to consider and does consider all appropriations for rivers and harbors where specific contracts have been made or where the appropriations run for a limited and specific period. Last year there were appropriations amounting to \$9,000,000 for river and harbor improvements in the sundry civil bill. I think by the resolution those matters are taken away from the Committee on Appropriations and that it will be necessary under the resolution now proposed for the Committee on Commerce to take charge of those appropriations. I do not see, of course, how they can be segregated from the sundry civil bill.

So I might go on and speak of these matters, but I mention them merely for the purpose of illustrating the logic of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], who says that the main reason for the resolution is to distribute the power of the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] is a little more discreet and a little more gentle to the Committee on Appropriations. He says he wants to destroy the monopolistic power of the Senate. He has gathered a phrase from my friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER], on that subject.

What is the power of the Committee on Appropriations? Under the rules it is to report appropriations authorized by law and nothing else. If all the committees which I have named have a better knowledge of what should be the appropriations which are authorized by law, then, of course, all the appropriations which are left to the Committee on Appropriations should be assigned to those several committees. Especially is that true of deficiencies. Here is the Army appropriation bill, and there is a deficiency in the appropriation for the Army or for the Soldiers' Homes or for some other branch coming properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs. Why should such a deficiency be sent to the Committee on Appropriations when the original appropriation, the source and origin of the deficiency, was considered by another committee? That is true of every other deficiency, and yet this skeleton of a committee is left with a view of dealing with and gleaning from those old appropriations the deficiencies which have been created or which are made necessary by reason of expenditures beyond the appropriations.

Mr. President, from the reasoning, then, of those who favor this sweeping change it would seem that it is easy to provide for all the appropriations without the Appropriations Committee. I think the philosophy, if I may use that word, or the reasoning which requires a separate and distinct committee to deal with appropriations is manifestly wise. Until 1867, as the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] has already called attention to the fact, the Committee on Finance dealt with these subjects. We went through the period of the war, expending millions upon millions of dollars,

raising armies to the extent of nearly 3,000,000 men, and during all that perilous period we, in this body, assisted in raising revenue and in appropriating money chiefly under the guidance and direction of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who is still familiar with those scenes and times.

In the House of Representatives it was never supposed that the Committee on Ways and Means would be deprived of this power until 1865. I was then a member of the House, and I can speak of what I know. Then under the exigencies of the election of a Speaker of the House it was found necessary to divide up the Committee on Ways and Means in order to form two other committees. And at that time the war was practically ended, because the division did not take place until December, 1865. Up to that time the Committee on Ways and Means of the other House dealt not only with the appropriations, but with the enormous internal and external power of taxation, and, in addition, with the power to raise revenues by the millions upon loans authorized to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. I repeat what I said a moment ago, that that division would not then have been made except under the exigency of enlarging the number of committees.

Now, the reason why the power of taxation and the power of expenditures were lodged in a single committee from the foundation of the Government for the first seventy-five years of its existence was that taxation and expenditure should go hand in hand, that revenues and expenditures should be within the control and direction of men who knew the aggregate of the revenues and the aggregate of the expenditures, so that a wise Government, which desired to maintain its credit, would not by appropriations expend more money than by taxation it raised for revenue. We had not then reached this modern system whereby a Government in a single year can expend \$69,000,000 more than it receives from its revenues and make the expenditure from money borrowed from the people upon the idea and the pretense that it is done to maintain the parity in value of the money circulation of our country.

I maintain, and I say it now as I may not think of it again, that a Government can not long endure if it borrows money in order to pay its current expenditures. In the last two and a half years we have expended \$130,000,000 more than we have received into the Treasury by means of our revenue laws. In the last month we ran behind three millions and a half. Is it not worth while, then, for us to take some account of our revenues as compared with our expenses? For one I want them to meet as nearly as we can make them meet, and I hope that before long we shall be able to replenish the revenues which were provided for in the act of two years ago through the income-tax legislation, but which were lost by virtue of a decision of the Supreme Court. Can it be that we will go on, upon this side or upon the other side of the Chamber, and appropriate \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 more than is likely to be received into the Treasury from taxation, and borrow money for the purpose of paying the current expenses of the Government at the rate of \$40,000,000 or even \$25,000,000 a year at 4 per cent, running for thirty years?

When our expenditures and revenues were supposed to be equal to each other, it was supposed by the men who preceded us that taxation and appropriation should go hand in hand. But in 1865 in the other House they changed that system, so that there were a Committee on Appropriations and a Committee on Ways and Means.

I may be mistaken, I may be wrong, but I think that a matter of this character—taking money out of the Treasury or putting money into it, either by appropriation or by taxation—should be in the hands of a single committee of this body. Now, why do I believe it? I believe it because I think the Committee on Appropriations, as a committee, should have no other charge than that of appropriating moneys provided by law.

I will recur again to the question of other committees, and I will illustrate it. Take, for example, the appropriations for the Army. The Military Committee has been organized and is organized for the purpose of framing laws and supervising regulations for the Army of the United States. If it also has thrown into its hands and under its control the appropriations of money for the Army there is no committee of this body to supervise the expenditure. Without reflecting upon any committee of this body or upon any department of the Government, it is the most natural thing for the committees which have care and control of these great subjects to think that liberal appropriations are wise and advisable respecting them; and probably they are. What is true of the Army is also true of the Navy. How often do we find appropriations far beyond the necessities or the power of the Government under existing conditions to expend the money? When I say that I am not speaking against an enlargement of the Navy or against an increased appropriation for fortifications.

By some division of power in this body we now have a Committee on Coast Defenses, which has taken from the Committee on Military Affairs a part of its duty as to new projectiles and new, important, and extraordinary inventions in guns, gun carriages, powder, etc. The Committee on Coast Defenses has taken charge

of many of those subjects. I believe, as I have no doubt we all believe, that we should improve and increase our coast defenses and provide liberally for the enlargement of our Navy; but we can only do it by carrying with it one of two things—either taxation or the power to borrow money.

So it seems to me that as to these two great branches of our Government, it is wise that their supervision should be in the hands of a separate and distinct committee, which can see, as it has hitherto done, how much we can afford to appropriate for these objects, unless we are to carry with the appropriations a provision that money shall be borrowed for that purpose.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question at this point? How would it be possible for the Committee on Military Affairs, for example, at a time when some extraordinary expense is thought desirable (I am not speaking of an emergency, but when the tendency was to increase the expenditure for the military establishment), to cut their coat according to the cloth, to use a homely phrase; in other words, how could they know what the Treasury would bear unless they sent around to all the other committees to whom the different appropriation bills had been distributed, and brought themselves into consultation with each one of them in order to form a rational and sensible view of what would be proper under the circumstances?

Mr. ALLISON. That is absolutely true, unless they were to provide by loan for expenditure.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is not that very thing done in the other House where these bills originate? Do not all these appropriations go to the Military Committee?

Mr. ALLISON. Oh, yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. So that where the bill originates the Military Committee has charge of the appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Where the bill originates that committee has charge of the appropriation. But that is no argument—

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa, before he proceeds, if that is not all the more reason for retaining in the Senate the present arrangement, that is, that there shall be a place where all the appropriations shall come under one head?

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for that suggestion. It is a very good one.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Iowa will allow me to suggest whether any committee now has supervisory charge of the appropriations for rivers and harbors in the Senate. We get along very well with that measure, do we not?

Mr. ALLISON. I think so. The Committee on Commerce has supervision.

Mr. HILL. Has any other committee supervision, I ask?

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations have every step in the river and harbor bill as a part of their duty. I mean the information which is given is always found in the room of the Committee on Appropriations as respects river and harbor bills and every other appropriation bill. If the Senator has watched the tables which have been printed from time to time, he will see they always embrace all questions respecting rivers and harbors.

Mr. HILL. It has no committee supervision?

Mr. ALLISON. Of course it has no committee supervision. I did not understand the Senator from Delaware to suggest that it was committee supervision; it is committee information that must be sought.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator to argue that there should be one committee having supervisory power over all appropriations, and therefore I suggested that when it comes to a question of logic the existing rule, which the Senator is commending, allows the Committee on Commerce to have power without restriction over the question of rivers and harbors. Therefore one is as illogical as the other.

Mr. GRAY. It is a question of degree. That is the only committee.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not judge of a great question by taking a single instance as an illustration. I am now upon the point, and I want to call the attention of the Senator from New York to it, that it does seem wise in the long years which flow on that the committee which originates legislation, whether it be to expend \$50 or \$50,000,000, ought to have some committee that is thoroughly independent in this body (I mean independent as respects that particular subject) to give the amount of money that can be appropriated for that expenditure this year and next year and the following years, if there is not money enough to provide for it in a single year.

Mr. HILL. I suggest to the Senator that if he entertains those views his duty would be best discharged by moving an amendment to the rules taking away from the Committee on Commerce this very power that it has so wisely exercised.

Mr. ALLISON. I am arguing now at large.

Mr. HILL. Quite at large.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not arguing from the single illustration

of the Committee on Commerce, which is a great committee of this body and which has jurisdiction of rivers and harbors under the rules and the law.

Mr. GRAY. Will my friend allow me to suggest, in reply to the question of the Senator from New York, that the example which he cites of the Committee on Commerce in regard to the appropriations for rivers and harbors is one exception to be taken out of the general jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations? I should like to ask him whether, that one exception having been taken out, it logically follows that it would be wise to take many more out? One being taken out for reasons that may be peculiar to itself, leaves that one committee segregated in its jurisdiction from the mass of appropriations, and with the Appropriations Committee, to whom it can always refer and obtain information as to all other appropriations which are to deplete the Treasury. It is a question of degree.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course; but the Senator from New York will answer that question.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing to answer. I venture the assertion that the Committee on Commerce has never sent a communication to the Committee on Appropriations asking how much the pension expenditures this year are going to be, or any other question pertaining to it. All those things are known to every committee, because they are published, and therefore not only every committee knows them, but every single member of the Senate has equal information in regard to them as the appropriations progress. The only point involved is simply this: The Senator was suggesting, in answer to our proposition to enlarge the jurisdiction of several of the committees, that you might go further; that the logic of the situation required you to go further. Our answer to that is that the logic is just as much at fault on the other side, because the argument in favor of having one committee supervise all the appropriations is not kept in view by the present arrangement, where you have a single great exception. Of course it is quite difficult now to draw the line, as it is sometimes difficult to draw the line at what age a party shall be permitted to vote, but some age has to be fixed. So in making this arrangement by the proposition of the Senator from Idaho some line had to be drawn, and this, in my judgment, is the best that can be made.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to make a single suggestion in regard to the point that more than one committee should have charge of the appropriations? The fact is that the Committee on Commerce every year brings a bill in here that is reduced by many millions of dollars; it brings in a bill in excess of what the majority of the Senate consider to be appropriate and necessary.

Mr. HILL. Allow me to say that shows that possibly the wisdom of the Senate is greater than that of any one committee.

Mr. CALL. It also shows that the Senator from New York is entirely wrong in his proposition.

Mr. HILL. That does not follow.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to say a word to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. GEORGE. That proposition shows that it is perfectly safe to leave to the Senate the amount of the appropriations to be made in any one bill.

Mr. CALL. Not to one committee.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, it is curious that I can not make myself understood by the Senator from New York. Of course I know, as he does, that the Committee on Commerce is a single exception; but the logic of his observation is that the Committee on Appropriations should not exist because all the things that can be done by that committee are to be more wisely done by a distribution of power in this Chamber among thirteen committees.

I have heard it said sometimes that we do too much in the Committee on Appropriations and that we are at times overrun and overridden with work. That is true, and I wish it were not true. It has been especially true since the change made in the House of Representatives, because under the rules of the House a single committee that deals with an appropriation bill has no concern as to when it shall come to the Senate. They hold it back sometimes until nearly the last day of a short session and then it comes in here, and these bills are necessarily thrown into our committee, and they are considered, I will not say hastily, but they are considered with considerable inconvenience to those Senators who happen to be members of the Committee on Appropriations.

But suppose the bills are divided up as is proposed. If that is done, I want to make a prediction, that when we reach the end of a short session there will be a struggle here between the twelve committees on the last day of the session as to which of them shall get in its report first. In other words, the orderly procedure in both Houses, it seems to me, has always required that this great subject of appropriation of money should be allotted to a single committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to ask my friend from Iowa a question. One of the plausible arguments made in favor of dividing up the appropriation bills is that each committee charged with the appropriation might then, without waiting for the action of the other House, prepare its bill, and then the two bills would be prepared as they are presented. The Senate has the same power of appropriation at the beginning of a session, and by its own committees, as the House.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SHERMAN. The provision in the Constitution that revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives does not apply to appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLISON. I touched on that question in the absence of the Senator. I have said that that is a mooted question, but the Senate never has passed an appropriation bill that has been assented to by the other House. So the power is exercised by the other House.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senate has undoubtedly power to pass an appropriation bill to the fullest extent that the other House has, and it does it. We pass every day bills providing for the appropriation of money, sometimes enormous amounts.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly; that is done.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to interpose, but will the Senator from Iowa allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I happen to have studied this particular question some time ago, and I think it is still fresh in my memory.

The phrase in the Constitution is that the bills for raising revenue must originate in the House of Representatives. Of course, the letter of that provision does not include bills for merely appropriating the moneys so raised, but the House of Representatives at a very early day contended, and has ever since adhered to the contention, that the spirit of that constitutional provision included general measures for the expenditure of revenue, the general appropriation bills, because in every appropriation bill, certainly in every general appropriation bill, it must be a germane amendment, but perhaps an amendment forming a new provision for raising the money which would be expended—that is, if you are to expend for a general Government purpose \$40,000,000—the Senate or the House might or might not agree to that bill, according as they found a practicable way of raising the money, and therefore the two subjects were inextricably connected.

Now, when that matter came up between the two Houses, Mr. Webster said from his seat in the Senate that, whatever might be his opinion, from the necessity of the case it was a subject which must be determined by the House of Representatives. As will be seen on a moment's reflection, whatever may be the opinion of the Senate, it is impossible that any view as to the right to originate an appropriation bill should prevail which is not the view of the House of Representatives. I think there were committees in both Houses that made written reports. The Senate acquiesced in that view and the House have maintained it ever since. I believe the first term I served in the House, from 1869 to 1871, when the Senator from Iowa was there—at any rate about that time—the question was again raised and the House of Representatives appointed a committee that made a new report; but the Senate again acquiesced in the view. So that practically, whatever may be the letter of the Constitution, it is as well settled as any constitutional rule in the country that the House must originate general appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLISON. That, I think, is well settled. Mr. President, it seems to me, then, without going at large into this question, because I do not wish to consume time, inasmuch as we have separated the raising of revenue and given that to one committee it is wise that we give the final supervision of the expenditure of money to another committee. That looks to me like a safe and conservative method of dealing with the people's money.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] yesterday dealt with some force upon the idea that here is an equality of States, an equality of representation, and to illustrate how badly certain sections of the country were treated as respects the Committee on Appropriations, he stated that not a single cotton State had a member upon that committee. The logic of my friend from Virginia would be that the money gathered in the Treasury is a sort of grab bag for the States, and that in its general distribution the States not represented on the committee were badly treated as distinguished from the States represented on the committee.

Mr. President, I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for twenty-two years. The State in which I live has as little interest as any State, and, I might say, perhaps a less interest, in all the appropriations that are considered by that committee than any other State in the Union. We have had a few public buildings, and that is all. But the appropriations treated of in the Committee on Appropriations are not marked by State boundaries. They are appropriations that have no relation to States. Take the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, covering as it does an average of over \$23,000,000. What

is it for? It is for the people who are carrying on the varied affairs of this great Government of ours chiefly in the city of Washington. What is the postal appropriation bill? It is a bill which carries the mails from every part of this country to every other part by land carriage and by water carriage. The expenditure of that Department is \$90,000,000 annually. The revenues that pay the expenditures are derived from 2-cent postage. If the constituents of my friend from Virginia write more letters than mine, then they pay more than do other sections of the country for this service. Here are two bills that cover \$113,000,000 of the \$400,000,000 that have been suggested by my friend as not justly and equally distributed among the States.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator suppose that the people who live in that broad stretch of territory between the Potomac and the Rio Grande do not know a little more about what is the necessity for appropriations for their postal facilities than those who live in California or in Iowa? Would he not rather represent his own State in telling its needs as to appropriations than have a Senator from Texas or from New Hampshire do it?

Mr. ALLISON. If there was any discrimination, that is true; but the postal service runs upon every railroad of Virginia, as it does upon the mountains. It runs upon every water craft in Virginia as it does on the Mississippi.

Mr. DANIEL. But the fast through mail, for which a special appropriation is made, does not.

Mr. ALLISON. If my friend will allow me, that is a most unfortunate illustration which he has adduced. The fast mail, called special mail facilities, began in 1879, and it was intended for the Gulf States, and old Virginia as well. It begins in the State of Virginia. That is the only place in that part of the United States where special appropriations have been made for fast mails. If I have been criticised for one thing more than another, it was because I supported and sustained for a long series of years a special appropriation for the benefit of the Senator's constituents against the protest of different Postmasters-General and public officers of our country.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Iowa whether it is possible to have every district of country represented on the Post-Office Committee any more than upon the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not see how it is possible. The appropriations that are considered by the Appropriations Committee are not like the rivers and harbors appropriations, where there is a distribution; they are appropriations that depend upon laws to execute the various branches of the Government service. I have given two illustrations, the postal appropriation bill and the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. Take the Army and Navy appropriation bills that in the aggregate, exclusive of rivers and harbors, because that is an army expenditure, amount to \$50,000,000 annually. Is it of any advantage to a man in a cotton State to have the privilege of voting the fixed salaries and compensation of the army officers and privates and the naval officers and privates? The question of the distribution of appropriations, the grab-bag principle, does not appertain to our committee at all.

It is necessary that the Committee on Appropriations shall be within reasonable limits as to numbers. We are told by gentlemen who are now active in the promotion of this scheme of my friend from Idaho that the difficulty with the Committee on Appropriations is that it is too small, and if we would enlarge it there would be no objection to continuing the plan which has prevailed since the Committee on Appropriations was organized.

Mr. DUBOIS. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to say distinctly that I myself never heard of any such proposition.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not saying the Senator did. I am only saying, if I may be permitted now to speak on these topics, that it is a curious thing that only a month ago we thought it necessary to relieve somewhat the burdens of the Committee on Appropriations by adding four to its membership, and now it is to be relieved still further by distributing its bills practically to all the other committees who can possibly take jurisdiction of the subject.

Now, I want to say a word or two as respects another phase of the question that has been dwelt upon by Senators in this debate. It is that the Committee on Appropriations upon the part of the Senate has been guilty of increasing the appropriations over the bills as passed by the other House. I think my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] especially congratulated himself that the Indian affairs have been transferred from the ordinary committee to the Indian Affairs Committee in the House of Representatives, and that there has been a great improvement in the legislation in that regard, except that the Senate had put on

doubtful and illegitimate claims and swelled the appropriations. Without speaking invidiously or criticising any committee of this or the other House at any time, I want to say that as respects the Indian appropriation bills they were largely increased under the new régime.

They came to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with treaties and contracts innumerable that were put on in the House. Although they have a rigid rule there as to legislation upon appropriation bills, it was legislation to execute what they called existing treaties, and they were existing treaties. Therefore the Indian appropriation bills were swollen largely in the House of Representatives. They were swollen in this Chamber over the heads of the Committee on Appropriations by the Indian Affairs Committee of this body, in many instances, but I will not stop to name them. Whatever may have been the condition of appropriations as respects Indian affairs, that can not be laid to the door of the Committee on Appropriations, or to the fact that the Indian appropriation bill was not in the custody of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate rather than in the custody of a committee especially provided for that purpose.

Now, one word further on the question of increases of appropriations in bills. These increases of bills are inevitable for two reasons. I am not speaking of the present House because I am not authorized to do so; but the House of Representatives have uniformly made less appropriations than they ought to have made to carry on the ordinary business affairs of our Government. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] said the other day that they had made the appropriations for nine months and confessed that they had made them for nine months, leaving a deficiency for three months in order to show a small sum appropriated.

Mr. GEAR. May I ask my colleague a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. GEAR. Is it not generally understood that in some of the committees of the House they have recommended the appropriation of less money than was necessary and then they have come over to the Senate and asked for an increase?

Mr. ALLISON. That has often occurred, but I am not speaking of what occurs privately; I am speaking of the public record.

Take the judiciary appropriations, with which every member of the Judiciary Committee is familiar. It has become almost a settled rule in the House to appropriate for only six months. That has been done for two or three years. I hope it will not be done this year. The bill that is now on your tables, known as the urgent deficiency bill, is largely composed of deficiencies in the judicial department of our Government, because when those appropriations were made they were made with a full knowledge that there would be large deficiencies. I know how difficult it is to make accurate estimates for the judicial service, because, in the nature of things, no committee and no Attorney-General can make an accurate estimate of what will be the expenditures of the courts in any given year; but for the purpose of keeping down appropriations and for the purpose of going upon the hustings and dilating upon the extravagance of the Senate and holding us up here on the cross-roads of public opinion as appropriating the people's money beyond the just needs of the Government, they have in past years in the House of Representatives neglected to appropriate the necessary funds to carry on the operations of our Government.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] the other day criticised with severity the Committee on Appropriations because of their extravagance and appropriating money when it ought not to be appropriated. There may be illustrations of that, I know, and doubtless they will occur to Senators on both sides of the Chamber. I recollect very well in the closing hours of the last Congress that the Committee on Appropriations had a whole day of its time occupied in the pressure upon it to consider an amendment, which came to us from the Committee on Claims, appropriating, in round numbers, \$7,000,000 for the sugar bounty. We did not take cognizance of that question; we did not undertake to deal with it, but it was forced upon us under the sixteenth rule by a standing committee of this body, which sent it to us, and under the rule the amendment could have been offered on the floor of the Senate, and if it had received a majority could have been voted into the sundry civil bill. It came to us in that way, being in order under the machinery of this Chamber provided by the sixteenth rule, and we were obliged in the closing hours or days of the session to take up and ascertain the very right of the matter as to a great appropriation involving six or seven million dollars. The committee finally decided, it is true, by a bare majority vote, that that was a just and fair amendment, modified as the committee amended it, and it was proposed here in the Chamber by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] now absent.

So, whatever pressure there is upon the Appropriations Committee in the last days of the session comes from the fact that other committees of the body insist that measures which they have failed to secure and accomplish in their regular bills shall, in the

way of legislation, be put on appropriation bills. Therefore it is, that if these bills are distributed every committee of the Senate will have it within its power to legislate by and large upon all the great public topics which appertain to subjects within its jurisdiction and offer them as amendments to appropriation bills, and if they can get a majority of the Senate to agree that they are proper to be put on, it can be done.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I ask the Senator a question there?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will it not, then, be just as much out of order to legislate on appropriation bills as it is now?

Mr. ALLISON. It will. The point I make is that the Committee on Appropriations is obliged to deal with these questions, whether willing or unwilling, whether they ought to go on an appropriation bill or be kept off, the object being to secure these legislative provisions upon appropriation bills so that they may pass the other body without being publicly debated there.

It has been said and it has been believed that legislation and the appropriation of money should be segregated and kept apart so far as possible. There are instances, it is true, where the Committee on Appropriations, under the estimates of the Departments, provides appropriations which have not been previously authorized by law. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], having been chairmen of the Committee on Foreign Relations, know that as to our foreign service it is largely fixed on appropriation bills, so far as the salaries of our consuls and our ministers are concerned. The law upon the subject was passed in 1878. So, where it is necessary to enlarge our commercial or our diplomatic influence or power, these increases have generally been made upon appropriation bills.

The Senator from New York [Mr. HILL] yesterday put in the RECORD a table showing increases and diminutions of salaries and the expenses of officers as found in appropriation bills. I do not know why he went so far back as the Fifty-first Congress to find a table, when a similar table is annually prepared by the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. I have the last table which was prepared, and I call the attention of the Senator to it. It shows a large number of increases of officers. This was under the beneficent influence of a Democratic House of Representatives.

Mr. HILL. An increase of officers?

Mr. ALLISON. Both an increase of officers and an increase of salaries.

Mr. HILL. On appropriation bills?

Mr. ALLISON. On appropriation bills; some of them coming from the other House; none of them, I believe, put on in the Senate. I think my venerable and kindly predecessor will bear me out when I say that very rarely indeed have salaries been increased upon appropriation bills.

Mr. HILL. Where did the increase of the salary of the minister to Mexico come from? It crept in through the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. It was done through the Committee on Appropriations, after having been recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and it was a wise and just thing, so far as I know.

Mr. HILL. The point was, that it was said that the Appropriations Committee could not change existing law, and one of the arguments made was that they could not change salaries. My point was that while that was technically true, yet they were constantly doing it, and I cited numerous instances where they had. This gives them additional power, and virtually they have the control of the increase of salaries. Now it appears that the increase of the salary of the minister to Mexico was through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ALLISON. But the Senator does not draw the distinction between increasing and the increase going through the committee. This was a proposition made by another committee.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. ALLISON. Excuse me. I wish to make my own point and then I will listen to the Senator. The proposition is that the Committee on Appropriations, under the rules, can either sanction such an appropriation or can allow it to be presented in the Senate and agreed to. I do not know which was done in this instance, but I am not here to say to the Senator from New York that salaries are not increased and that salaries are not diminished on appropriation bills. There are certain salaries which have no other designation than on appropriation bills—that is to say, there is no statute, for instance, which says that a certain clerk in a Department shall have this or that salary. The clerks in the Departments are classified 1, 2, 3, 4, and now classified, I believe, downward to \$720.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me a moment?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I hold in my hand the act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the Fifty-third Congress, second session, and

I find under the office of Sergeant-at-Arms an amendment inserted by the Senate:

And \$500 additional while the office of assistant doorkeeper is held by Isaac Bassett.

I find in the third session, on the same bill, this provision inserted by the Senate:

For clerk to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage and clerk to the Committee on Mines and Mining, at \$2,100 each, for the fiscal year 1896 only, \$4,200.

Those must have been increases made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from New Hampshire undoubtedly was inattentive, or at least my observation escaped him, when I said there were certain salaries which were only fixed in appropriation bills. Notably so with the salaries of the officers and employees of the Senate. There is no law outside of the current appropriations from year to year which says what the salary of this, that, or the other officer here shall be. Those salaries are all found in appropriation bills.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; I agree to that.

Mr. ALLISON. I admit there are instances where persons well known to us here receiving inadequate compensation have received higher compensation in that way; but the great bulk of these increases—I am now trying to analyze the table inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from New York—do not come from either the House Appropriations Committee or the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HILL. How have they got in, I should like to know?

Mr. ALLISON. Through the statutes, through the laws.

Mr. HILL. Do the increases get in through the laws?

Mr. ALLISON. I am not speaking of increases just now. Take a new law—and there were numbers of new laws passed last year—the one in relation to the Steamboat-Inspection Service, for instance, which passed this body and the other House. We had to provide for that. Therefore the appropriations to carry out that law go into this table as increases of public officers and increases of appropriations. So as to the mineral lands in Montana, Idaho, and other States. We were last year confronted with such laws, and were obliged to provide for their enforcement in the appropriation bills. There was passed here, as Senators will remember, a statute as to the lands in those States. It was passed at the very last moment, and we put a provision in one of the appropriation bills for the compensation of those people aggregating \$30,000. I might give other illustrations.

Mr. COCKRELL. How about the light-houses? A great many of them were established by special act and had to be appropriated for.

Mr. ALLISON. Appropriations had also to be made for the Light-House Establishment. We never insert an appropriation for a light-house unless we have one of two things. One is that it has been established by law through the Committee on Commerce of this body and through the like committee in the other body, or else the Secretary of the Treasury says to us that by some accident of flood or fire the light-house in existence has been swept away, and therefore he asks for an appropriation to rebuild it. I do not see the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] here now, but not long ago a flood raged upon the Atlantic coast and around the Chesapeake Bay, which swept down nearly \$400,000 worth of public property. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] will remember it well; and, among other things, there were nine light-houses, if I remember correctly, which were swept from their moorings and carried out into the ocean. We were called upon in this Chamber, by an urgent letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, in the interest of the seamen and navigators of the ocean, that we should straightway appropriate a large sum of money for that purpose; and I think we appropriated \$200,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, in the Fifty-second Congress, second session, a statement of the appropriations, etc., develops the remarkable fact that 2,480 instances of increases are to be found, and 166 decreases. I think the Senator will not find that those relate to the Light-House Establishment or to any department of the Government such as that.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Senator calls my attention to page 314, and gives the grand total. Of course I have not the time to examine this in detail, but my eye has just turned upon it, and I will give him some information as to it. First sergeants, by the Army appropriation act, were increased from \$23 to \$25 a month, making \$430; and sergeants from \$17 to \$18 a month, making \$2,027. In other words, of those increases of 2,480 officers, 2,450 were sergeants in the Army, one portion of them having their pay increased \$1 and another \$3 a month. This amendment must come clearly to the memory of two Senators who sit near me, who were interested in the subject, one of whom, I think, offered the amendments whereby these appropriations were made, and said they were just to this meritorious class of soldiers.

Mr. GORMAN. They were reported from the Military Committee.

Mr. ALLISON. They were reported from the Military Committee, I have no doubt, and presented here.

So you may take these bills from year to year, and you will find the appropriations have had reasonable care, and that the committee has given reasonable attention to these great subjects.

Mr. GORMAN. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me to interrupt him there?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. Is it not a fact that nine-tenths of the increase of appropriations and of officers and their compensation come of necessity from the passage of laws passed during a session before action on the appropriation bills, for which we are compelled to appropriate?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly it is so in a very large number of cases.

Mr. FRYE. That was true especially in the case of the steamboat inspectors. That bill was reported by the Committee on Commerce, passed both branches of Congress, and while it increased a large number of salaries, it decreased others. It literally destroyed about a dozen or twenty offices of inspectors, and, taking the law altogether, it reduced the expenditure \$12,000 a year.

Mr. ALLISON. My eye falls upon another item in the table presented by the Senator from New York, of the salaries of lighthouse inspectors, Life-Saving Service, superintendents of the Gulf coast, whereby they have been increased from \$1,200 to \$1,500. I do not remember whether that was put on by the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FRYE. The Committee on Commerce reported it, and it became a law.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true, I believe.

I only mention these things for the purpose of showing to my friend from Louisiana [Mr. BLANCHARD] that under the rules and under the practice of the Senate the committees of this body have unlimited power to deal with appropriations at their sweet will by complying with the provision which gives them a committee endorsement and referring their amendments to the Committee on Appropriations.

How can the Committee on Appropriations monopolize the power of the Senate? It is within the power of every other committee to put gyves upon our wrists in this Chamber if we refuse to appropriate as they wish us to appropriate, by securing the adoption of appropriations if they are such as to meet the judgment of Senators upon this floor and can be met by the revenues of the Government.

When you come to analyze the system as to these appropriations, you find that there is no wrong; and yet it is proposed now, without reference to a committee, without giving a standing committee of the body the power to give us their judgment upon the question, to put the Senate to a ye-and-nay vote upon a single proposition which takes away from the Committee on Appropriations the jurisdiction which it has over these bills, and thus practically declare that the committee itself shall be disbanded.

It may be a wise thing in these modern days; it may be a wise thing in a Senate of 90 members to thus, without the examination of any one of its committees, upon the motion of a single member of this body, brought in here without much debate up to this time, to take a vote upon a proposition to divide among the committees of the body the great power of appropriating money in accordance with law, if it be a great power, or if it be one of the ordinary powers which appertain to this body, to take from the committee especially designated for that purpose, most of its members having devoted the greater portion of their term of service to membership upon it, the power of supervision and control, and divide that power among the various committees here proposed.

Mr. HILL. I understand the Senator from Iowa to complain because this resolution has not been referred to the Committee on Rules and reported upon by that committee.

Mr. ALLISON. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken. I do not complain.

Mr. HILL. The Senator makes the point and argues that the resolution ought to have been so referred. I simply desire to call his attention to the fact that no one has made any such motion, that no one made such a motion on the day the resolution was presented, and no one made any such motion after the argument of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS]. I desire further to call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are some ten or fifteen, and I do not know but more, amendments to the rules—good, bad, and indifferent—which have been referred to the Committee on Rules, and that committee has not made a report, either adversely or favorably. It has made no report in this Chamber in five years.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, this proposition has been before the Senate a number of times. In the speech which I made here on the 11th day of December I called attention to the fact that the Committee on Rules would not report back these proposed

amendments; and I gave the Senate notice in that speech that I wished them to consider the resolution on its merits, so that when they sent it to the Committee on Rules it should go there with the vote of the Senate showing how the Senate stood on the proposition. The distinct proposition was laid down in my remarks that the resolution was not to be referred to the Committee on Rules because we could never get a report from the Committee on Rules in regard to it.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly the Senator, before committing the resolution to the committee, asked the Senate to decide, and then have it referred to a committee. We all understood that. But the Committee on Rules, at the time the resolution was offered, and when the Senator's speech was made, was an imperfect committee, and not organized. That committee now consists of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who is chairman, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN]. Here are seven of the Senators of this body who are familiar to us. Is it a wise thing for us to deal with a great question like this, imperfectly presented to us, without the report of a committee? Are we to decide and judge first, and hear the evidence afterwards?

I do not complain; it is not a subject of complaint in this body; but we have provided a number of committees selected to deal with particular questions in the division of powers in this body, and here is a great Committee on Rules, familiar with all parliamentary rules of procedure, organized for the consideration of such a subject as this, and yet the Senate is called upon by a ye-and-nay vote to deal with the question, when it has never been examined, so far as we know, except by a single member of this body. Mr. President, this is an exceptional thing. You may ransack your records and you will find that no important question has ever been considered in this Chamber that met with discussion or debate which was not first referred to a standing or select committee of this body. Nothing is passed here without unanimous consent, unless it has been first referred to a committee and had the judgment of the men who are selected to investigate such questions as are submitted to their care.

I have occupied much longer time than I intended; but I repeat here is a great public question going to the very foundation of public expenditures, relating to the credit of this nation, that is sought to be dealt with here by Senators without reference to a committee. I may be wholly mistaken in my views regarding it; I may be wrong; but I believe where proposed legislation is projected into this body and an attempt made to secure its adoption here and in the other House, under which large expenditures of money would be made, it is wise that those expenditures should be supervised by a committee designated by this body for that purpose, and that those expenditures should, from year to year, and from time to time, have some relation to the condition of the Treasury of the United States, and its power to pay the expenditures authorized by the appropriations.

I know perfectly well—and I make no distinction in that respect—that the honorable Senators who preside over these various committees have probably greater ability and more knowledge of the special topics committed to their charge than has the Committee on Appropriations. But what I am undertaking to show is that if the argument upon which these changes are to be made is a sound one, it is an argument for the dismemberment and destruction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. What right has the Senator to assume in his argument, as he does, that any one of the committees named in the resolution is not as competent to deal with appropriation bills as a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, one of the last observations I made was that they are just as capable, and I have no doubt more capable than the Committee on Appropriations. I certainly do not impugn the ability or the capability or the power of any committee of this body. We are all equal here, thank God.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator assume that those committees will be more negligent of the laws than the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not. I have wholly failed in my argument if I have not shown that the wisdom in the consideration of these questions lies in the fact that when the law authorizes the expenditure of money and when that expenditure is authorized to be made there should be some committee having charge of all these appropriations, in order that we may see that the credit of our Government is maintained and continued, and that our appropriations are somewhere within the limits of our revenue. That is my argument, if it is worth anything.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Senator maintain that the only guardian of this matter is the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the efforts of the Senator and his allies remind me of a pamphlet, a very eloquent and able paper, which had much influence during the war. Its title was "How a free people conduct a long war." I perceive that the Committee on Appropriations is very earnestly opposed to this measure, and that it is prolonging a very able debate, I do not say beyond proper limitations; but in the meantime I hope it is not gaining any recruits from this side of the question.

The only thing about this proposition which gives me any sort of regret or hesitancy is that I am afraid some of the men whom I most love in the world do not like it, but I do not think that ought to stand in the way of my sincere judgment of what will be better for the Senate and for the legislation of the country.

The very wide field of appropriations still left open to that great committee covers some of the most important bills, carrying a multitude of items in which there is most likely to be extravagance. That is evident.

There are but eleven subjects of expenditure that are to be distributed, and the name is legion of the matters to be attended to outside of those eleven bills. I can not help supposing that it is better to give a great subject to a committee of men who ordinarily have some special reason for being on a committee than to give it to three men, which practically is the rule now. The upshot of it is the consideration of three men in the Committee on Appropriations, with whom I find no fault, with whom my intercourse has been agreeable.

I have been to them many and many a time to get slight changes made in appropriation bills, sometimes to add something to the expenditure; sometimes I was backed by the favorable judgment and report of some select committee. I do not complain of the reception given me there; but I have more than once felt that the two or three gentlemen, able as they were in general and in the general field of appropriations, did not know as much about some things as some other committees did, and I will give you one reason.

To speak of what I know most about, and not because I have any special reason for boasting at all, I sincerely think the Committee on Military Affairs could better consider and dispose of a bill to support the military establishment than any three gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee. One reason is that we are eleven in number, and that we are decently qualified you may perhaps infer from the tabulation which I have just made. There are eleven men on the committee. Eleven of them have been soldiers on one side or the other. Seven of them were bred to the law and have more or less given themselves to the practice of the law. Six of the eleven have been honored by their States with what with us in New England is the high office of governor; and two of them have been Secretaries of War.

I submit that the odds are that we can as speedily and with a better knowledge of the subject pass upon the details of the bill for the maintenance of the Army than can the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee.

I confess that one of my reasons for wishing this thing is that I would rather have the bill for the support of the Army for three or four weeks in the Military Committee room than to have it three days in the hands of three men of the Committee on Appropriations. I think there will be no danger of our being extravagant. I think we may be even a little wiser than the Committee on Appropriations sometimes are in diminishing the sums given some few things and raising the sums given to others.

I am not troubled, Mr. President, with a fear of the extravagance of the United States Senate. I do not apprehend that the eleven committees would rush the Government into a deficit of revenue, for I think we are as anxious to have wise appropriations and appropriations that come within the just needs of the public service as they are.

I am sure, speaking for the Committee on Military Affairs—other committees will speak for themselves—that it would not desire to unduly increase appropriations, and would have some regard for the general condition of the revenue and for the propriety of all subjects referred to them.

I am not prepared to make a long speech, and do not care to. I have practically nothing more to say. I shall vote for this change in the rules.

One thing further, however, occurs to me. The Senator from Iowa complains that this matter has not been referred to and reported upon by the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules, I hope, will forgive me—I do not mean to be discourteous—but if the Senator will read the list of members who constitute that committee I think he will find that every solitary man of them is opposed to the proposed change. If he will consult history he will find that this subject has been before the Committee on Rules more than once, and never has had the honor of being reported adversely or of being reported at all.

I admit that this proceeding is a little bit revolutionary, but I think we can forgive our friend from Idaho for learning something so early.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to ask the Senator from Idaho if he desires to press the resolution to a vote this evening?

Mr. DUBOIS. I do. I very much desire to have a vote on the resolution this evening.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to make one or two observations about the resolution before the vote is taken. I shall be brief, because the hour is late and I do not think the matter which I have to submit is very weighty anyhow.

This proposed change in the rules is not a new matter to my thoughts. I have long felt that the present arrangement, by which all these important matters were referred to one committee, was wrong in two aspects—wrong as a deprivation of other members of the Senate of their equal participation in the important legislation of the Senate, and wrong in another aspect, that these bills come to us very frequently from the House of Representatives at so late a period in the session that time is not allowed for one committee to give that calm and deliberate consideration which the matters deserve. So I am informed, and it has been so stated in the debate here to-day, that the committee has found it necessary to act by subdivision. Being a large committee, and it being impossible from the lateness of the season and the want of time for the whole committee to act, they proceed at once to divide out the various appropriation bills to subcommittees composed of three Senators.

Mr. COCKRELL. Those subcommittees report back to the full committee and the full committee considers their action.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very glad the Senator told me that. When any of the committees, if the resolution shall pass, shall have acted upon a matter, they will report to a higher body than the Committee on Appropriations for their final action and judgment.

So there seems to have been, so far as I have listened to the debate, a kind of tacit concession made on all sides that the Appropriations Committee possesses almost the power of legislation and of determining what shall be appropriated and what shall not be. I do not understand that to be the office of any committee. The Senate has committees for one purpose and for one purpose only, and that is to inquire into the subject-matter referred to them and then to report to the Senate their best judgment as to that subject-matter. If that is the condition, it seems to me there can be no dispute about the proposition that the various committees named in the amendment to the rules—I will call some of them: The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, the Committee on Indian Affairs, etc.—have better opportunities for discharging the duty which the Senate imposes upon them by referring to them a bill than this general committee.

The Committee on Military Affairs, as was stated by the honorable Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], taking it for an example, is composed entirely of men who at some time in their lives have been devoted to the military profession. That committee has charge of the whole military establishment. It is its duty to look into and inquire what laws ought to be passed, what regulations ought to be made, how many soldiers we ought to have, what kind of guns we ought to have, and all that sort of thing. It seems to me that on a bill providing money for the military establishment of the country the powers of that committee ought not to stop at the very point where they are most essential. The committee can inquire, it can decide how many soldiers we ought to have, what sort of guns we ought to have, and all that, but it can not decide how much money shall be appropriated for the purpose.

Mr. President, it seems to me that is not the right thing to do. So with the other committees. Every one of them, if they discharge the duty imposed on them by the rules of the Senate, ought to be familiar, and more familiar than anybody else, with the special subjects to which their duties relate. They have no power, as I remarked, except to recommend, and is not the recommendation of the Naval Committee, for instance, as to how many ships we need, what kind of ships we ought to have, how much money we ought to appropriate for them, better than the recommendation of a committee which is charged in this general way under our rules with a kind of supervision or jurisdiction over the whole affairs of the country? So on that ground, Mr. President, I favor the resolution.

But it is urged that if we divide out the appropriation bills no relation will be preserved between the money we appropriate and the money we have on hand to appropriate. Let us see how that is. In the first place I ought to observe that it is the sworn duty of every Senator here in the discharge of every office given to him by the Senate to perform the duties of that office with reference solely to the public good and not to be influenced by a kind of esprit de corps to favor the Department over which he has supervision in preference to any other Department. I will not assume,

therefore, that the Military Committee, or the Naval Committee, or the Post-Office Committee will be influenced by any other consideration than a desire to appropriate the exact money which is needed for the public service and which the condition of the Treasury will enable them to appropriate.

But it is said that each committee, not knowing what the report of every other committee is, may make extravagant appropriations, may make appropriations beyond the means of the Treasury. But the reply to that is as stated by the Senator from Florida in reference to the river and harbor bill, that the last and final tribunal to decide how much money is to go to this thing and to that thing and to every other thing is the Senate. When it was urged that the Committee on Commerce had appropriately discharged its duties in reference to rivers and harbors, it was suggested that very large appropriations, too large appropriations, had been reported; and the Senator from Florida very properly stated that the Senate cut them down and made them right and proper. The Senate can do that with reference to every other bill.

Now, one other observation, and I believe I shall have said all I desire to say upon the subject. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] seems to complain that the amendment is illogical; that we ought to have gone further; that we ought to have conferred upon the Judiciary Committee power to consider appropriation bills with reference to the judiciary; and other amendments were suggested. I desire to state, in response to that argument, that as the rule now is, as was well suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], we have departed from the rules of logic on the subject. We have already taken away one of the appropriation bills from the general Appropriations Committee and have given it to the Committee on Commerce.

I wish to state further that it is the chief excellence of Anglo-Saxon institutions that they are illogical. Those institutions have grown up according to the needs and according to the experience of the people who live under them, and there is nothing now more illogical than the Constitution of the United States. The very first section of the Constitution says that all legislative power is granted to a Congress composed of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and yet there is another provision which says that a bill can not become a law without the approval of the President. Another provision of the Constitution vests all judicial power in the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other courts inferior to that as may, from time to time, be established. And yet, in the very same Constitution, we have a provision that a very large part of the judicial power of the United States is vested in this body—the trial of impeachments, and a part of it in the House of Representatives—the preferring of articles of impeachment. Then in reference to the executive power vested in the President in another part of the Constitution there is an apparent contradiction. There is not the logical sequence of giving to the President, as the Constitution says in that article, all executive power; but we find this body associated with the President in the making of treaties and the appointment of officers.

Then in another part, when all officers are to be appointed by the President of the United States, it provides that those officers of the United States who happen to be officers of the Senate shall be elected by the Senate, and those officers of the United States who happen to be officers of the House of Representatives shall be elected by the House of Representatives.

So there is nothing in the argument that we are illogical or inconsistent. All Anglo-Saxon people when they have come to arrange institutions of government have not undertaken to pursue the rules of logic to their final conclusion; but they have adopted this thing and that thing or the other thing, sometimes a little contradictory and crossing the lines of each other, because experience and observation have shown that those inconsistent provisions in the Constitution and in our institutions are best for the Anglo-Saxon people. We are bound by the rules of logic only when we undertake to prove the truth of a single proposition, when we have legitimate and honest and true premises; but when we come to framing institutions for a people we are bound to follow the rules of common sense, the rules of experience, the rules of expediency—those things which our common sense, our observation, and our experience have shown to be best.

Now, what has experience shown in reference to a division of the appropriation bills? We are not without experience on that subject. The House of Representatives several years ago adopted about the same thing, I believe, which is proposed to be adopted here. Has any complaint arisen as to the practice in the House under the changed rule? On the contrary, we find every single member of this body who served in the House of Representatives under those rules testifying here to their excellence. It was said on the one hand, that if we divided out the bills it would largely increase the appropriations, and it was answered on the other that that had not been the experience in the other House, and we had the very extraordinary assertion that the House committees on purpose refused to appropriate the necessary amount in order that the Senate should take upon themselves the odium, if it be

an odium, and I do not think it is, of adding to the appropriation bills the amount necessary to carry on the Government.

Here let me make one observation in reply to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON]. He spoke of the large urgent deficiency bills as being made necessary by the parsimony of the other House. Does the Senator forget that there can be no insufficient appropriation by the House alone; that there must be the concurrence of the Senate as well as of the House in order that there can be a deficient appropriation bill? He seems to have forgotten that proposition. So if there be anything in the suggestion which was made, I believe, by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] that the other House did not make the necessary appropriations for some reason or other which was satisfactory to them, I answer by the statement that if they sent such bills to us we have failed to do our duty as to supplying the deficit.

Mr. CALL. We did our duty and the House would not assent to it.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I crave the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes. For the sake of brevity partly, but more for fear that my treacherous voice might give out and I would be compelled, following an illustrious example, to pass the penciling over to the Senator from New Hampshire to read, I have reduced what I wish to say to writing. The notes were made while the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] was speaking, and as he is not in his seat to be embarrassed by the remark I may say that the Senate will understand how very difficult it was while the smooth, mellifluous, and captivating flow of his eloquence was going on to give attention to anything else.

I can not see the danger of increased appropriations from this proposed change. It makes a number of committees who would naturally make common cause against amendments in the Senate increasing appropriations, while it is often the case that they now make common cause, and successfully, to increase them. Now, it is a proposition almost self-evident, and one that I do not think the members of the Committee on Appropriations will seek to controvert, that with a given fixed sum of money the committees on the subject-matter of the general appropriation bills could distribute this money to the best advantage, because they are constantly acquiring, session after session, a personal knowledge of the needs of their branches of the public service.

Take the \$5,000,000, for example, which is appropriated by the District of Columbia appropriation bill. That bill provides for the building and repairing of streets, alleys, sewers, aqueducts, support of schools, hospitals, prison, jails, etc. The District of Columbia Committee make many visits in the course of the year to the objects of the appropriation, and become personally acquainted with the situation.

The same is true in a great measure of the other committees. The Committee on Military Affairs is in constant communication with the Department and officers of the Army, who come from all parts of the country, and its members necessarily acquire in the course of their term of service, long or short, a large amount of information.

There is a large element of safety in this change, by reason of this personal knowledge. Personal observation is the best evidence; and parties naturally go to the committee having the subject-matter in charge with their views, pro and con, on any matter under consideration. So they are all the time accumulating information. On the other hand, the Committee on Appropriations can have little knowledge except what they acquire in the very brief and hurried hearing in the committee room. The hearing is so hurried necessarily that there is little opportunity to get adverse evidence. This gives the persistent beggar a great advantage.

Now, it being granted, as it must be, that the committee on the subject can make the best distribution of a given sum, then the only remaining question is, can they not be trusted to fix the sum? I fully believe they can. Every committee will take pride in keeping within proper limits. The several committees will naturally stand by each other in the Senate to resist an increase, while the present system tends to lead applicants for amendments to combine against the Committee on Appropriations. We have all seen this tendency and its resulting evils. If the change should result in increasing expenses, the Senate can be trusted to apply a remedy by limiting the sum of the appropriations and specifying the amount, if necessary, that each should have. That is an improbable event, but it is a remedy that would certainly be applied if the evil should be found to exist.

Mr. COCKRELL. How long would it take the Senate to come to a conclusion as to the amount that the respective committees should allow to each branch of the service?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do not think it necessary to cross that river until we come to it. I have no doubt means will be found to cross it if we ever reach such a river. But I do not believe we ever will.

The Senators coming here from the other body bear strong testimony that the distribution works well there. We hear of no

suggestion of its returning to the old system. I do not believe there would ever be any such suggestion here if the change was once made.

The opponents of this measure claim that it is a slight upon the Committee on Appropriations to make this change. Certainly there is no such feeling on my part. I have always been well used by that committee. I have never sought to go on it. The committee is a very able one, and has done its work as well as such a tremendous overburden of work could be done in the short time available for it.

I now come to a point to which I have been asked to refer. I should not have spoken at all except for it. The Committee on Appropriations, if the change is made, will, in my opinion, have more important work and be more desirable as an assignment than any other business committee, if I may use that term. Certainly I should prefer it to any other committee except Finance. I would gladly exchange, if this transfer of bills is made, any two committee assignments I have outside of a chairmanship. Why, Mr. President, a committee having the sundry civil bill in charge would have, I believe, with the 381 items of that bill, more work, if it gave proper time to its consideration, than any other committee of this body. Nearly all of its provisions require separate consideration. They cover the entire country and an infinite variety of subjects. Again, Mr. President, this committee will have, if this change is made, in my opinion, more to do than its entire work when this committee was first constituted. It has grown—especially the sundry civil bill—with great rapidity, and must continue to increase as the country grows and public wants increase. I have looked back to a period of twenty to twenty-five years ago, and I think anyone must be satisfied that more time should now be given to the three bills than was then required for all the bills.

I will refer to some of the appropriations. Take, for example, the appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1871. The sundry civil bill was then thirteen million and odd thousand dollars. It is now, in the last bill, \$46,000,000. The legislative bill has increased less, but it has increased from \$18,000,000 to about \$22,000,000. The entire appropriations for that year were \$161,000,000, and this included the deficiency bills, which were more than double what they were the present year. It also included the Army bill at that time, which was also considerably larger, as the military establishment has been reduced since. It was a third larger. The pensions were \$30,000,000. So it can be readily seen that, taking those items and considering that many of the appropriations, especially the Post-Office, which was then over \$26,000,000, the entire service then was decidedly less than would be required now, I believe, on a single bill; certainly less than would be required on all three, which aggregate \$80,000,000.

But, Mr. President, I did not intend to take so much time. I have, as I said, no criticism to make on the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe any can justly be made. But I believe in this change upon principle, that it is the truest system; that it will work well in practice, as it has in the other House, according to the great balance of testimony. I do not attach much weight to the scarecrows and prognostications of disaster with which the Senator from Iowa has favored us. He fights bravely, as he ought, to present his side of the case, to retain all the great powers and duties of his committee. I respect him for it. If any were needed, it furnishes another evidence of his eminent qualifications for the highest position in the gift of the people. I say that in his absence. I almost wonder, in view of the great trouble that he has imagined, that the Senator did not claim that the unprecedented low state of the barometer to-day was a protest from the very heavens against this change. But I have faith to believe that the skies will clear, and that the sun will shine, and that the atmosphere of this Chamber will calm down, whatever way this question is decided. The measure is right in principle, and there is no question in my mind but that the Senate will go on safely, easily, and harmoniously under it when once adopted.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to trespass upon the attention of the Senate, but I have been requested by several Senators, by reason of the fact that I have had the opportunity for many years in the House of Representatives to witness the practical working of a distribution of the appropriation bills, to say just a word in relation to it.

I happened to be a member of the other House when the distribution of the appropriation bills was made. It was resisted there at the time as it has been resisted here, and I believe it is a matter of parliamentary history that from the hour all appropriations were committed to one committee in the House of Representatives every effort to distribute appropriations and divide responsibility had been met with the severest opposition. It is but human. Men love power and will not readily surrender it.

The distribution of these bills in the House of Representatives occurred in the Forty-ninth Congress, at the instance of the Committee on Rules, composed at that time of the Speaker, Mr. Carlisle; the Representative from Pennsylvania, Mr. Randall, an ex-Speaker; Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, now on the Interstate Com-

merce Commission; Mr. REED, and Mr. Hiscock, a committee of five distinguished and experienced legislators and parliamentarians. After thorough consideration of the matter by that committee, they reported unanimously in favor of the distribution of the appropriation bills, with the single exception of Mr. Randall. The report was presented by Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, and I hold that report in my hand, from which I desire to read some brief extracts as showing the considerations which influenced the Committee on Rules of the House in making the proposed distribution, and in this extract we have a brief, but interesting history of the division of appropriations.

For nearly forty years—

This report says—

of our history the appropriations were made in one act, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Government."

One bill, it will be observed, covering the entire service of the Government.

The first separate bill for the expenses of the Post-Office Department was passed in 1844.

In 1847 the appropriations were made in nine separate bills, namely: Army, civil and diplomatic, deficiencies, fortifications, Indians, Military Academy, Navy, pensions, and Post-Office.

In 1856 the consular and diplomatic appropriations were for the first time embodied in a separate bill. In 1857 the legislative, executive, and judicial bill first appeared in its present form.

In 1862 the sundry civil bill was established, containing the various miscellaneous items not embraced in the other bills, and in 1880 the Agricultural and District of Columbia bills were established, the Agricultural bill being transferred to the Committee on Agriculture. With but few exceptions the river and harbor bill was prepared and reported by the Committee on Commerce until the creation of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, in 1883, when it was assigned to that committee.

As showing the great increase of appropriations for the support of the Government, it may be stated that each one of our principal general appropriation bills embraces as much money as the whole amount of the net ordinary expenditures of the Government during the first ten years of its existence, and the specific objects to be investigated and provided for in these bills have so greatly increased in number that it has become a very considerable task even to enumerate them. For several years past the various general appropriation bills have been reported at such late periods in the session as to preclude their careful and thorough investigation by members not on the Committee on Appropriations.

The committee is of opinion that the distribution proposed will enable all these bills to be reported at earlier periods in the session, will permit a more careful and thorough consideration of each bill by the committee having jurisdiction of it, and also by the House, resulting in more considerate and economic legislation, and will obviate the necessity for the passage of any of these bills under a suspension of the rules, which has been so frequently done in late years.

This proposition, as I said, coming from the Committee on Rules and reported unanimously, except for the dissenting opinion of Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania, was debated for several days in the House of Representatives and finally, at the close of the debate, with a view of testing the sense of the House on the single question of distributing the appropriation bills, a motion was made to strike out of the report that portion of it which distributed the appropriation bills to the several committees named, and upon a yea-and-nay vote the yeas were 70 and the nays 227—a most decisive vote. So the distribution was consummated, six bills remaining with the Committee on Appropriations and eight distributed to the several committees having jurisdiction of the subject-matter embraced in the several bills.

For ten years this system has been in operation in the House of Representatives, and I never heard during my membership in that body, after this distribution, the faintest suggestion from any source that it would be wise or desirable to return to the old practice; and I have no hesitancy in saying that in my judgment if such a proposition were made to-day in the House it would not command a dozen votes in that body.

There were several reasons which actuated the House in making this distribution. First, it was thought that it was a fitting thing to do. No one was then able to present any sufficient reason why, for instance, the Committee on Agriculture, having that subject particularly in charge, should not make the appropriations for that Department. Their attention is entirely given to that subject, and it was thought not only a fitting, but a wise and appropriate thing to do to allow the Committee on Agriculture to make the appropriations for that Department. So with the Committee on Foreign Affairs and all the other committees.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] the other day suggested that this proposition is more sweeping than the proposition of the House, because it proposes to take from the Committee on Appropriations the bill for fortifications. Let me suggest to the Senator that the reason why that bill was not taken from the Committee on Appropriations at the time the distribution was made was because under the House rules there was no committee on fortifications. Had there been such a committee at that time I have no doubt it would have been given control of the appropriation for coast defenses.

But without going over each of these committees—

Mr. HALE. That is not the only difference between the pending proposition and the practice in the other House.

Mr. BURROWS. No; pensions and the District of Columbia were left with the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALE. There were six bills, were there not?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. And there never has been any proposition since the Committee on Fortifications was provided for for sending the bill to any committee except the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BURROWS. No; there is no committee in the House on fortifications, so that the bill had to go from necessity to the general Committee on Appropriations. But there is a Committee on Fortifications and Coast Defenses of the Senate, and I allude specially to the propriety of a reference of that bill to such committee not because I happen to be a member thereof, but it will serve as an illustration of the propriety of distributing our bills to the several committees clothed with jurisdiction of the subject-matter to be considered. The Committee on Coast Defenses has, from my knowledge, been investigating that great and important question for the last month or six weeks. It had before it a large number of experts from the War and Navy Departments, and has gone into the subject thoroughly. At its head is the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mr. SQUIRE, with whom is associated the Senator from Connecticut, General HAWLEY, the Senator from Georgia, General GORDON, and the ex-Secretary of War, Senator PROCTOR, and other gentlemen of long and distinguished service, and I submit that the Committee on Coast Defenses thus constituted will be able to make the appropriation for coast defenses and fortifications wisely and with a just appreciation of the needs of this service.

This was one of the reasons which actuated the House in making the distribution of the appropriation bills. There was another reason which, I presume, possibly does not affect the Senate. It had grown to be the practice in the House that the Committee on Appropriations used its power to defeat other legislation. The Committee on Appropriations were in the habit of retaining these bills in committee until toward the close of the session, although prepared and ready to report at any time, and then when any measure came up which in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations ought to be defeated, the Committee on Appropriations would bring forward an appropriation bill, thrust it upon the attention of the House (such bill having the right of way), and insist that they must proceed with the appropriation bills or the wheels of the Government would stop.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator from Michigan whether he has ever heard from any source any intimation that ever in any single case in the history of this body an appropriation bill has been held up for that purpose, either for delay or to antagonize other measures, or for any purpose whatever?

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator, if he observed what I stated a moment ago, will recall that I said distinctly that I did not know what the practice was in the Senate; I was stating one of the reasons which actuated the House in making the distribution; but whether that practice has obtained here I am not advised.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator from Michigan ever heard it intimated?

Mr. BURROWS. Oh, I have made no inquiry on that subject. I was confining myself to the reason which actuated the House in making a distribution of the appropriation bills. The Senator knows better than I can possibly know whether the appropriation bills are ever used in the Senate to thwart or impede the consideration of other measures, or to interfere in any way with other and important legislation.

Mr. HALE. I think I may say with entire confidence, appealing to all members, that in all the discussion and urgency with which this proposition has been pushed that has never been claimed.

Mr. BURROWS. The Senator will bear me witness that I have not so stated. On the contrary, I disclaimed any knowledge upon that subject.

Mr. HALE. On the contrary, the Committee on Appropriations has prepared and reported and pressed the bills as fast as it could be done.

Mr. BURROWS. But the evil grew to such magnitude in the House of Representatives that the practice became frequent of holding these bills back to prevent other legislation and then passing great appropriation bills, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, under a suspension of the rules.

There is another reason given for the distribution of these bills in the House of Representatives, and that was that it would create more general interest among the members of the body. I hazard nothing in saying that if we had a rule in the Senate that all proposed legislation of every character should be referred to one committee, it would be impossible to keep a quorum of the Senate present. The more general the distribution, and the more the labors of the body are distributed among its membership, the more general will be the interest, and the greater will be the attendance and attention to public business.

But it is suggested that if we are to make the distribution of these bills among the various committees, why not assign to the

Committee on Patents the appropriations for patents and to the Judiciary Committee the appropriations for the judicial service. A sufficient answer to that proposition is that there is no such scheme proposed. These fourteen general appropriation bills cover in fact every conceivable branch of the public service. It is simply proposed to put these bills with committees that have the subject-matter embraced in those bills under special consideration.

These were some of the considerations which influenced the House in distributing the appropriation bills. There were other reasons assigned, which I will not detain the Senate to enumerate.

But it is said, among other things, that it is necessary that these appropriations shall be in charge of one committee, that such committee may confer with the Committee on Finance and ascertain the probabilities as to revenue, so that they may make their appropriations to conform to the receipts of the Government.

I remember the statement of General Garfield in the House that it was important that the distribution should not be made; that the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means should stand "back and back," the one facing the resources of the Government and the other its expenditures. One would judge from the argument that it is the habit of the Committee on Appropriations constantly to confer with the Committee on Finance, to ascertain how much money there probably would be in the Treasury, and for the Finance Committee to confer constantly with the Committee on Appropriations with a view of advising that committee how much money could be expended. Judge Kelley said a word in regard to that, to which I beg leave to call attention, which, I think, is quite pertinent. Judge Kelley, in reply to that suggestion, said:

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman from Georgia seems to have fallen into an error as to the functions of our Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee report at long intervals, according to the history of our country, bills for raising revenue, and then until the season comes for reporting another bill, changing the scope or system of revenue, the Ways and Means Committee have nothing to do with it. The idea that each year the Ways and Means Committee provides as much money as the Appropriations Committee wants to appropriate or Congress wants to expend is a fanciful theory. It has no foundation, or at least has had none during the sixteen years I have had the honor to be on the Committee on Ways and Means. We have never heard of the Appropriations Committee intimating to the Committee on Ways and Means what amount of money they were likely to appropriate, nor have I heard, on the other hand, of the Committee on Ways and Means saying to the Committee on Appropriations, we will not give you more than so much money. I am quite sure the business men of the country would be frightened from their propriety if they were to hear it was now to be so arranged that the tariff should be changed by each Congress to meet the opinions of the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees. The theory is a purely fanciful one.

Judge Kelley said further on, in reply to another suggestion, which I try to quote in this connection:

Sir, it may be that the wisdom and honesty of the House are concentrated in a single committee thereof, but I do not believe it. I find myself one of 325 chosen Representatives, who, I believe, present a fair average of the prosperous and intelligent men of their respective districts. If it is true that we need but 15 men to determine what appropriations ought to be made, what existing offices ought to be abolished or reduced in consideration under the plea of economy, and what laws ought to be repealed or enacted, why not change our laws and save the pay of the other 310 members? If, sir, you have a better guaranty of integrity and intelligence in the case of a committee of 15, operating, so far as the public is concerned, in the dark, with a guardian at the door of the committee room to prevent intruders from spying into the procedure, than you have with 325 men, each directly responsible to an intelligent constituency, operating in the broadest electric light, with the representatives of the press eyeing them with the microscope and the telescope in order that every constituent may judge of the wisdom and integrity of their acts—if the secret committee offers the better guaranty I have miscalculated probabilities.

Mr. President, the chief objection urged in the House at the time this distribution was made, and the chief objection presented here to the distribution of these bills, that the membership of the Senate may participate in the great work of this body, is that it would increase expenditures, and that it would not be safe to trust to the other committees of this body the appropriation of public funds. That was combated at the time in the House of Representatives, but of course it could be answered only as a matter of speculation. But we have now had the practical working of this distribution in the House of Representatives, and I have taken occasion to have prepared a statement showing the aggregate of appropriations for ten years previous to this distribution and the ten years since, the appropriations carried by the bills retained by the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriations made by the committees to whom the bills went after distribution. The bills referred to the other committees in the House of Representatives aggregate in appropriations, ten years previous to the distribution, \$955,000,000, and after the distribution, during ten years, the same bills carried \$1,470,000,000, in round numbers, or an increase of the appropriations by the committees to whom these bills were distributed of \$533,000,000.

The six bills left with the Committee on Appropriations during the ten years preceding the distribution carried \$1,256,000,000, and after the distribution the committee retaining these six bills made an increase of \$878,000,000. The increase of appropriation in the eight bills not reported by the Committee on Appropriations during the ten years of the distribution was \$533,000,000 and the in-

crease in the bills retained by the Committee on Appropriations was \$878,000,000.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator—

Mr. BURROWS. In a moment. Of course it is fair to say that the expenditures of the Government in all branches greatly increased, but it demonstrates the one fact that with the bills the Committee on Appropriations retained the appropriations increased to \$878,000,000, while the other bills were increased only \$533,000,000.

Mr. HALE. Now, is it not a fact—

Mr. BURROWS. Allow me to conclude the statement.

Mr. HALE. Very well; I will wait.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to say one thing further. The only instance of a decrease in appropriations on any bill is that of the Army bill, which was taken from the Committee on Appropriations and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The decrease in that committee during the ten years after the distribution was nearly \$19,000,000. I cite this simply as tending to show that the claim of Senators that the distribution of these bills will tend to increase expenditures is not borne out by the history of the appropriations.

Mr. HALE. Now will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BURROWS. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Is it not the fact that when the Senator adds together the items of appropriations on the bills left in the hands of the Appropriations Committee and compares them with the bills reported by the several committees, the great increase in ten years that is charged to the Committee on Appropriations comes from the consideration that is always occurring to us here, and that is, the overwhelmingly large pension appropriations? That bill was retained by the Committee on Appropriations, and they are made subject to the charge that their aggregate appropriations had largely increased when a great portion of the increase was attributable to the immense and constantly growing aggregate of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. From thirty to one hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. BURROWS. If the Senator will allow me one word there I will yield the floor and the Senator from New Hampshire can reply, or I will yield to the Senator in just a minute.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; the Senator will cover it all.

Mr. BURROWS. Possibly I will not cover it as the Senator from New Hampshire can, who is so familiar with the pension question. What is said by the Senator from Maine is true, that the pension appropriations have largely increased. That bill was left to the Committee on Appropriations; and while I include in this statement the increase of pensions, the Senator will observe that I also include in the other statement the increase in the appropriations for the Post-Office service, amounting to \$319,000,000. If you will eliminate \$319,000,000 from the Post-Office appropriations on the one hand and strike out the increase by reason of pensions on the other, you still have an increase of \$195,000,000 under the bills distributed, and an increase of \$137,000,000 by the bills retained by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I have submitted reluctantly all I care to say on this subject. I rose simply for the purpose of stating that, so far as the House was concerned, this distribution has worked well; it has contributed to the general interest in legislation in that body; it has facilitated the consideration and the report of the appropriation bills; and I believe that the proposed distribution, if made here, would increase the general interest of the individual membership of this body in matters of vital and common concern, facilitate the business of the Senate, and promote the public welfare.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Senator from Michigan takes his seat I would be glad to ask him to state again the aggregate amount of the increase of appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations in those ten years. What was the total?

Mr. BURROWS. The total was \$878,000,000.

Mr. ALLISON. Although these figures are somewhat illusory, if I may add a word, I will state that I have a document before me which shows them in detail, and of this increase \$719,648,000 was for pensions alone. So nearly the total increase of the six bills of which the Senator speaks was owing to increases of pensions, certainly to the extent of \$719,000,000 in ten years.

Mr. BURROWS. That is true. The increase of pensions was \$719,000,000; but, leaving out the increase in pensions, the increase aside from that was \$138,000,000, while the increase carried by the bills assigned to the other committees, leaving out the Post-Office appropriations of \$319,000,000, which, of course, increased very largely year by year, was \$195,000,000.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Michigan, who comes to this body as a veteran of the House, is most interesting. In the reasons he gave why the House adopted the system of distribution he struck upon one which was, as I be-

lieve and know from long service in the House, the great and prevailing reason that brought about the radical change adopted there. It became a necessity. The conduct and management of appropriation bills, in the manipulation by which they were made to antagonize other measures, the delays to which the body was subjected, with the result that appropriation bills carrying millions of dollars, after having thwarted the purposes of the House and turned aside other legislation, were passed under a suspension of the rules, became intolerable.

I know from my service in the House of Representatives on the Committee on Appropriations that there was a world-wide difference between the condition there and what it is here. There was there constantly occurring what never occurs here, the question whether or not the House would take up appropriation bills. Those bills were antagonized to at one time and destroyed the right of way and turned aside a great revenue bill which was being presented. In my day—and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] will bear me out, and I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], in the statement—there were constantly those conflicts until it became the settled conviction of men in the House that the only remedy was to destroy the evil, and the only way to destroy the evil was in the manner indicated. That never obtains here. No man, however long he may have been in service here, has ever known an appropriation bill to be used for any purpose except to expedite business. The Committee on Appropriations, in dealing with these bills, sits day and night and reports them here at as early a day as possible, and at a very early day after receiving them from the House of Representatives, and by common consent and the rule and practice of the Senate they have the right of way over everything else and are pushed at once to a passage, and thereby got out of the way of other bills.

There is another thing to which the Senator has referred, a belief that appropriation bills would be matured more quickly, sent to this body at earlier dates, and thereby expedite early adjournments. The result is found to be precisely the opposite. I have tables here—I did not have the pleasure, as I was called out, of listening to all the Senator from Iowa said, and it may be that he put them in—showing that since this change, instead of the appropriation bills in the House, which are in the hands of the individual committees, coming to this body earlier than they did when they were prepared and put through by a single Appropriations Committee, they are later now. So that, interesting as the Senator's statement is, and well conceived and presented as it was, attracting the attention of this body, the two great reasons which he has furnished disappear absolutely, one great reason not obtaining here, and never has, and the other, the expedition of the bills, not being borne out by the facts.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I do not propose at this late hour in the afternoon to undertake to contribute anything of consequence to the discussion. I have listened to it as one of the most interesting and practical discussions which has occurred in the Senate for many years. It has been argued with great earnestness and ability and fullness of information and argument on both sides; but I have listened in vain, having heard nearly every speech which has been made, for any answer to, or any attempt to answer, the one important argument which has been adduced against making this change—if one has been made it has been when I did not happen to hear that part of the debate—and that is, if this change be adopted, there will be no responsible body or organ or authority anywhere to graduate the total expenses of this Government with a consideration of what the Government can afford in each year. Every item of expenditure is to be made, so far as this change goes, by gentlemen interested in a particular subject, for I take it that it is the mark of a good committee, as well as the old maxim of law says it is the mark of a good judge, to expand its jurisdiction. Every committee which proposes one of these great appropriations of public money is to do it without the slightest consideration of what the total expenditure of this year can be or ought to be.

Take the Committee on Commerce, which has the separate jurisdiction of an appropriation bill now, and has had for a good while, and I therefore take that for an illustration. The river and harbor needs of this country, according to the estimates, would require an annual expenditure of seventy or eighty million dollars. It would be money well spent; it would be money which you and I, being business men—if we had the responsibilities and the properties and the duties which this Government has—would rightfully and wisely expend upon rivers and harbors alone, if we had the money and could afford it, in any particular year; and yet Congress never expends more than from 20 to 25 per cent of the amount which the War Department has recommended as required by national and international commerce.

So take the matter of coast defenses. It would be a wise thing, if we had the money, to expend \$100,000,000 this year in defending our coasts.

Mr. HAWLEY. That is utterly and absolutely impossible.

Mr. HOAR. I understand it is absolutely impossible. It is impossible considered in relation to the revenues of the Government; but if we had a hundred million dollars in the Treasury which we could apply economically and profitably to that subject and could get a complete system of coast defenses to-morrow in this country, it would be a reasonable and wise expenditure to make. We could not enter into a foreign war, as everybody knows, this year, if the necessity for one came, except at the risk of having our great commercial cities bombarded and laid under contribution.

So in regard to the Navy. Everybody knows that the public desire for a complete and fit navy to patrol the seas and protect our commerce could not be gratified in one year or in ten. So of the matter of public buildings and of a great many other things. There ought to be and should be somewhere a committee or other authority whose duty it is to take every one of these expenditures and see what can be fairly and conveniently afforded in any one year, without bankrupting or discrediting the Government or putting undue burdens upon the people.

What householder, what farmer, what business man makes his annual expenditure for desirable objects without counting the cost, adding up all the expenditures, and considering what that year can spare or can afford?

Now, it is said that the House of Representatives, formerly having a committee whose duty it was to make that estimate and consideration there, has changed that policy. For that reason so much the more the Senate ought to adhere to it. The House could not safely or wisely have made such a change in its policy unless it had known that elsewhere all these expenditures were to be brought under a single eye, compared with each other, and their comparative importance considered in relation to the resources and the capacity of the Government.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. HOAR. For what purpose—to ask a question or to make a speech?

Mr. HILL. To ask a question.

Mr. HOAR. I will hear the Senator.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator whether he thinks that the few appropriation bills which have already been reported by the Appropriations Committee have been made with an understanding of what the House committee is going to report hereafter?

Mr. HOAR. I will answer the question. They have been made with an understanding as to what the Senate committee intends to report hereafter, however the House committee may report.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the Senator, further, how can the Senate committee know what they are going to report on bills which have not yet reached them from the House? Have they predetermined the question?

Mr. HOAR. Our Appropriations Committee is made up of men whose minds have been soaked with this knowledge and information, who have been in the habit of doing this thing year after year. They are absolutely cognizant; they know what is coming over from the House of Representatives; they know what is going to pass in that House in all the general items of appropriation just as they know what is likely to happen in the Senate or to happen in their own committee.

Mr. HILL. How could the Senate Committee on Appropriations know that the District of Columbia appropriation bill was going to be defeated yesterday?

Mr. HOAR. There will be a District of Columbia appropriation bill here before this session is over. The Senator need not be frightened about that. The Committee on Appropriations deal with every one of these appropriation bills with a full knowledge that whether it passes before or after a certain time there has got to be \$6,500,000 appropriated for the expenditures of the District of Columbia.

That brings me to the only other point which I ought to make, and that is that this is, as it seems to me, a very bad time in the session and in the year to make this proposed change. The Senator from Idaho, it is true, introduced this resolution at the very beginning of the present session, as hundreds, and I do not know but thousands, of resolutions and bills are introduced by Senators to bring the matters to which they refer before the body. He called it up two weeks after, made some remarks upon it, and dismissed it again. It has now got to be within three weeks of the end of winter, within three weeks of the time when, in the short session of Congress, Congress is ready to adjourn. Now the Appropriations Committee consists of men who, by an experience of years, are thoroughly familiar with this subject, and with this subject in the aspect in which I have endeavored to state it, and they are prepared to take up and deal with this year's expenses by the experience they have had and the expectation they have had up to within a day or two, that, of course, they were to discharge this function. On the other hand, the membership of these various committees is made up very largely of new men, of men who have not special experience in the subjects committed to those very committees which men of long service on those committees have.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. Let me finish this point, and I shall then yield to the Senator from Idaho.

I have looked over these various committees, and the Senate will be surprised to see on each of them how many gentlemen there are who are altogether new to the subjects proposed to be committed to those committees; some of them new to service in the Senate; none of them, even the elders, having had the responsibility of dealing with these subjects with reference to making appropriations.

It seems to me that, if the resolution passes, it ought not to take effect until another session of Congress; that it will be a very bad thing indeed for us to make this sudden change, wrenching the proceedings of the Senate all awry, committing these subjects to men who have not expected to take them up until within the last two or three days of the present session. At this time, when we are so eager to have a short session, and both parties are so eager to have an economical session, I think that it is very unwise indeed to make our appropriations and go before the people with appropriations made without any common oversight of the whole, and made by gentlemen who have not even during the present session of Congress been preparing themselves to deal with the subjects proposed to be committed to them.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. President, I desire to interrupt the Senator from Massachusetts to make the statement that at the close of the last session of Congress I introduced this resolution. It was not allowed to be considered then. That would seem to have been a very proper time, according to the Senator from Massachusetts, for its consideration. At the very beginning of the present session I reintroduced it, having given notice at the previous session that I should do so. There has been opportunity at all times to consider it, but no time seems to have been a fitting time. I should have been glad to have it considered earlier, but I was put off by one pretext and another until the bond bill came in, and pretty soon the tariff bill will come up. So it does not seem as though there was any fitting time for this resolution.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator understood, and the Senate understood, that I did not make that observation as imputing any laches to the Senator, but only as pointing out, however the fact may have occurred, that the committees of this body, the Appropriations Committee and the others, have not been expecting to have any change of jurisdiction in the middle of the session. I think the matter ought to go to the Committee on Rules. I think so for the reasons stated by the Senator from Iowa, among others, that this resolution cuts into a great many rules that are not named in the resolution. That was one reason for the rule, which was debated when the matter was taken up, which required notice to be given of every rule and part of a rule to be affected by a proposed amendment. Here are a great many rules that will become totally inoperative, or at any rate difficult of construction and application if this amendment shall pass.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Maine yield to a motion to adjourn? It is now twenty minutes to 6 o'clock.

Mr. HALE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLS. Let us have some understanding about this matter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DUBOIS. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANTLE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] on the main question. I do not know whether it is proper for me to vote on this question or not.

Mr. BERRY. If my colleague [Mr. JONES of Arkansas] were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MANTLE. Then I withhold my vote and announce that, if he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PETTIGREW (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY].

Mr. VILAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], but I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], and I vote "yea."

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. QUAY. If my colleague were present, I have no doubt he would vote "yea."

Mr. WALTHALL. I vote "yea," then.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DUBOIS (after having voted in the negative). I ask if the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted, the Chair is advised.

Mr. DUBOIS. I am paired with that Senator, but will transfer

my pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], and let my vote stand.

Mr. FAULKNER. I suggest that that Senator would vote the same way as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Wyoming asked me to do this, and said to me a few days ago that he wished me to protect his pair.

Mr. FAULKNER. The Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] asked me to protect his pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. CLARK. On the main question I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea" on this vote and I should vote "nay."

Mr. FAULKNER. I think there is some mistake by the Senator from Idaho in reference to the pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY]. He is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], and I so stated to the Senator from Wyoming some time to-day. I understand that there is a letter here from the Senator from New York making that statement.

Mr. NELSON. I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DUBOIS. I became a little confused. There is no question about how the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would vote. His pair and mine have been transferred and the senior Senator from New Jersey stands paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I think they would both vote "nay." I am quite certain the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. FAULKNER. I question that very seriously. From information I have, I think the Senator from Idaho is mistaken.

Mr. LINDSAY (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. Not supposing the pair extended to a motion to adjourn, I voted. I transfer my pair to my colleague [Mr. BLACKBURN], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I rise to assist in this matter if possible. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] is absent and not paired on this question. He would vote "yea," if present, and so the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL], who has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania, was at liberty to vote on this question, and voted "yea," as both Senators would vote the same way.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I could be permitted to make the statement, I am quite sure I should get it right.

Mr. GEORGE (after having voted in the negative). I desire to know if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] has voted.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. He has not voted, the Chair is advised.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LINDSAY. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] and will let my vote in the affirmative stand.

Mr. GALLINGER. As I am somewhat responsible for the pairs on the Republican side, and as I am frequently called to account the next day by Senators saying that their pair had not been protected, I desire to call attention to the fact that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] has a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], who, I think, has voted.

Mr. FAULKNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], but I am thoroughly aware of the obligations of a pair and my duties under it, and I am voting in accordance with what I regard as my understanding with him.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from New Hampshire has charge of party pairs, but this is in no degree a party question. The pairs which are arranged on political questions are not applicable in the least to this question. I am paired generally with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], yet he and I agree on this question. So the arrangement does not apply here in the least.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the two Senators from West Virginia would vote differently on this proposition. However, I accept the little lecture from the Senator from Maine with all due humility.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ought to have objected to debate on the part of the Senator from Maine, and I do object to debate on the part of my colleague. [Laughter.]

I voted "nay." I am paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] on all political questions and on any other question where he sends me notice. He sent me notice by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who did not give it to me. Am I right, I ask?

Mr. GORMAN. I received notice from the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY] requesting me to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to his pair, and asking him to

observe it on all votes on this question. In the press of matters I failed to give the notice to the Senator from New Hampshire until after he had voted.

Mr. CHANDLER. Therefore, I now withdraw my vote.

Mr. DUBOIS. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] would vote "nay" if he were present. I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] that the Senator from New York [Mr. MURPHY], if he is not paired, be paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE].

Mr. QUAY. Mr. President—

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from Idaho be responsible for that statement?

Mr. DUBOIS. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. Then I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] had recorded his vote before I could obtain the floor. I was about to say, in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS], that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], my colleague, is also absent. He would vote "yea," if present, and it would seem to me that it would be proper to pair him with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE] instead of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], who is present.

Mr. ALDRICH. Two pairs have been announced with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. VILAS (after having voted in the affirmative). I was about to correct that, if the Senator from Rhode Island will allow me for a moment. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], and he desired me to protect him upon this vote. I transferred my pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], but inasmuch as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] says that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] has a special pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], who is absent, it is unnecessary that the transfer should be made, and my vote can stand because I am at liberty to vote irrespective of the pair.

Mr. HILL. The difficulty with that arrangement is that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] and he has transferred his pair and voted.

Mr. PASCO. That is the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired on this question with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN]. I transferred my pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. If that stands I have a right to vote. Otherwise I shall withdraw my vote.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right. Let it stand.

Mr. VILAS. I suggest that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY] transfer his pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES].

Mr. LINDSAY. Then I will transfer my pair so that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] and let my vote stand.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the result be announced.

Mr. HARRIS (after having voted in the affirmative). There has been a good deal of controversy about pairs, which induces me to announce the fact that I have a standing pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. But as he and I always agree upon questions of adjournment and absolutely agree upon the question lying behind this adjournment, I voted "yea," and I elect to let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. I desire simply to say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] has a perfect right to vote, because the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] is paired on this question with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] by an arrangement made to-day.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the result be announced. I insist upon proceeding in order.

Mr. VEST. I have a standing pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]. He and I agree on this question, but at the personal request of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] I announce a special pair upon this particular vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. HILL. A pair has already been announced for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY].

Mr. VEST. I understand; but the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] agrees on this question with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from New York is right as to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], of course I do not wish to be—

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] to state how it is. He has charge of the pairs on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] being ill—

Mr. PETTIGREW. If the Senator will allow me, I will state that I am paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY].

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] to state how it is.

Mr. ALLISON. At the personal and special request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], who asked me this morning to secure a pair for him on every phase of this question, I asked the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] to pair with him, and I hope that pair will stand unless some other Senator is paired with him.

Mr. PASCO. I will state, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from New York [Mr. HILL], that the arrangement was made as he states, but the proposed change is entirely fair, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. IRBY] is left paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].

Mr. HILL. I made the arrangement at the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO]. I did not suppose any other arrangement would be made without his consent. The only way to keep the pairs straight is to have one man look after them.

Mr. VEST (after having voted in the negative). I withdraw my vote under my special pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 29; as follows:

YEAS—34.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hoar,	Quay,
Allison,	Faulkner,	Lindsay,	Sewell,
Bacon,	Frye,	McMillan,	Thurston,
Bate,	Gear,	Mitchell, Wis.	Vilas,
Berry,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Walthall,
Brice,	Gorman,	Pasco,	Wetmore,
Caffery,	Gray,	Perkins,	Wolcott.
Call,	Hale,	Platt,	
Cockrell,	Harris,	Pugh,	

NAYS—29.

Baker,	Davis,	Martin,	Squire,
Blanchard,	Dubois,	Mills,	Tillman,
Brown,	Gallinger,	Nelson,	Turpie,
Burrows,	George,	Palmer,	White,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Peffer,	Wilson.
Carter,	Hawley,	Pritchard,	
Chilton,	Hill,	Proctor,	
Daniel,	Lodge,	Roach,	

NOT VOTING—26.

Allen,	Gordon,	Mitchell, Oreg.	Stewart,
Blackburn,	Irby,	Morrill,	Teller,
Cameron,	Jones, Ark.	Murphy,	Vest,
Cannon,	Jones, Nev.	Pettigrew,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	Kyle,	Sherman,	Warren.
Clark,	McBride,	Shoup,	
Elkins,	Mantle,	Smith,	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 7, 1896, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 6, 1896.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY M. COUDEN.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the regular order.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will withhold that for a moment, I have a matter of some importance which will take but a few moments—

Mr. DINGLEY. I regret very much that I can not withhold the demand; but more than 50 gentlemen have just such matters, and I have been compelled to refuse all such requests.

Mr. BAILEY. This will take but two or three minutes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I regret very much to be compelled to decline; but if I grant this request, I would have no ground on which I could refuse it to others. I think under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must demand the regular order.

I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2904.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 1464) to amend chapter 76, laws of 1893;

A bill (H. R. 2175) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation;

A bill (H. R. 3812) to authorize the Arkansas and Choctaw Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Choctaw Nation in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 5566) to prohibit prize fighting and pugilism and fights between men and animals, and to provide penalties therefor, in the Territories and District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 1591) to extend the mineral-land laws of the United States to lands embraced in the north half of the Colville Indian Reservation; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

BOND REDEMPTION FUND.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PAYNE in the chair.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I was recognized last night just before the termination of the session, but the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] desires to occupy ten minutes this morning, and with the permission of the Chair I will not take the floor until after he concludes.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take any part in this debate. When the bond bill was before the House a few days ago I fully expressed my views thereon.

The silver question has been so thoroughly discussed that it is not now a question of argument. It is a question of brute force and money on the one side, and of manhood and votes on the other side. A reference, however, to the State which I have the honor to represent, by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON], renders it necessary for me to say something in addition to what my friend and colleague, Mr. TALBERT, said last evening on the spur of the moment.

In the first place, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] speaks of South Carolina "carrying us into a new secession movement."

Mr. Chairman, it is a useless task to discuss the motives which led to that terrible war. Neither the right nor wrong belongs to one side alone. But I want to say here, that our people acquiesce in the result of the war; and that to-day there is not a State in this Union whose people are more loyal, more devoted to our common country, than the people of South Carolina. I venture the assertion that should foreign aggression threaten us no more loyal sons would be found in any section of this Union.

Our people fought not for slavery, but because they believed that the principles of local self-government, equality in taxation, and all those fundamental questions which have lain beneath every contest for freedom were at stake; and, Mr. Chairman, to-day we are just as devoted to the principles of liberty and of justice as any people. It is time, Mr. Chairman, when the last vestige of bitterness should be wiped out, when the only memories left, is pride and glory for those of both sides who fought, bled, and died for principles which they believed were sacred. Our people are glad, sir, that the Union was preserved. The time has come when the people of South Carolina, are prouder of these United States, more loyal to a nation's flag, than they are to any State, whose star is but one of those constituting the bright galaxy, which makes America the grandest and greatest among the nations of this earth.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when Representatives on the floor of this House, who for cheap applause would revive the bitter recollections of thirty years ago, should be frowned down by the great, the generous, and the forgiving American public. God speed the day!

It comes, sir, with poor grace for a Southern man to refer to his own section, his own people, a sister's children, as the gentleman from North Carolina did last evening. I yield to none in love for this great country, and my patriotism is not bounded by State lines, not cramped by partisan bigotry, nor yet paralyzed by race prejudices. But, Mr. Chairman, I love my native home, the soil which gave me birth. I love my people, hot-headed, impulsive, but loyal and true. Their faults I would condone, their virtues I would extol. And, Mr. Chairman, I shrink in horror from the "bird which would befoul its own nest."

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PEARSON] refers in bitter terms to a speech made by Senator TILLMAN in the Senate as "hoisting the red flag of anarchy or the black flag of dynamiters in this country," and as trying "to carry us over into a new secession movement." I am not here to answer for Senator TILLMAN; he is fully capable of taking care of himself; but, sir, it would have been better had some Senator possessed the nerve and courage to reply in an arena where he could be fitly answered, not behind these walls and through the eloquent mouth of the gentleman from North Carolina. In my State, when I thought Senator TILLMAN wrong I have said so, and opposed him; where

I thought him right, I defended him. Let me tell the gentleman from North Carolina that the manner in which this speech is received is an omen of trouble. Those awful words were but the echo of unexpressed thought in the bosoms of millions of American citizens. Instead of referring to Senator TILLMAN as an anarchist, let my friend turn his abuse upon those who rendered it possible for such utterances, to go unchallenged in the United States Senate. I was present, sir, and witnessed the shock to "Senatorial dignity," and when all eyes turned toward the "David" from New York he failed to produce his "sling" and smooth rocks which have slain so many Goliaths. There are all sorts of anarchists in this country; the poor devil, shivering with cold at a switch crossing, the maniac in the legislative gallery, and the fat, round anarchist, robed in power, who, by changing the unit of value, has robbed the toiler of his just reward, and the producer of the fruits of his labor.

Oppression and extortion in high places, breed the most disastrous forms of anarchism. Rid us of this class, and the former will disappear and the upper House recover its normal "Senatorial dignity," which of late has been so rudely disturbed. [Laughter and applause.]

[Mr. WHEELER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE was recognized.

Mr. BRUMM. I would like to have the gentleman from North Dakota resume the floor for the purpose of answering a question for information. I am sure that the House will extend his time, because this is a matter of a great deal of importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had yielded the floor and the Chair recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRUMM. I hope the gentleman will take the floor—

Mr. JOHNSON of North Dakota. May I resume the floor for the remaining eight minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been recognized.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Chairman, I have on former occasions so fully discussed the general propositions involved in the free coinage of silver by this country alone that I had proposed at this time to largely confine myself to some observations on the subject of prices of certain commodities, but on that topic the very able argument and demonstration of the gentleman from North Dakota, just concluded, seems to have produced so much feeling and excitement that, as a matter of prudence, to allow the blood to cool, which now seems somewhat heated, I propose first to present briefly an answer which seems conclusive to the question which has been repeatedly asked in this House and elsewhere as to the reasons for the passage of the act of 1873, if confessedly by friend and foe the silver dollar was then worth 103 cents. It would seem that if such were the fact that it was a vain and useless thing, and in the interest of accurate history upon a subject about which there have been so many loose statements and so much reckless misstatement I ask the attention of the House for a few moments. We were in 1873 on a paper basis, there being no gold in circulation, nor silver, and our currency consisting at that time only of irredeemable paper.

Why, then, was it necessary to legislate upon the subject of coinage? It was because the friends of honest money looked forward to the time as not far distant when we should resume specie payments, and the legislation in relation to the mints was in such a discordant condition that it seemed necessary to codify and systematize it. In doing that it seemed desirable to put it upon a basis which should be permanent, which should be adapted not simply to the conditions of 1873, but to the conditions of 1879, of 1880 and succeeding years.

The recommendation for the passage of the mint act was made to Congress by a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury early in 1870. Accompanying it were communications alluding to the fact that the dollar of silver was then worth 103 cents, but that bill was pending in this House and in the other House for nearly three years. It was under consideration while times and circumstances and conditions were changing, and when the Forty-second Congress met, in December, 1872, it was confronted with a different condition of affairs than existed when the bill was first presented in April, 1870, and the Secretary of the Treasury, in communicating to Congress under date of the 2d of December, 1872, called attention to the changed condition of affairs. I read from the report of Secretary Boutwell, and from that part wherein he speaks of this very act, the passage of which he recommended.

In the last ten years the commercial value of silver has depreciated about 8 per cent as compared with gold, and its use as currency has been discontinued in Germany and some other countries. The financial condition of the United States has prevented the use of silver currency for more than ten years, and I am of opinion that upon grounds of public policy no attempt should be made to introduce it, but that coinage should be limited to commercial purposes and designed exclusively for commercial uses with other nations.

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

If the policy should be adopted of issuing silver coin irredeemable, but whose intrinsic and nominal value should correspond to gold, the time must come when the country would suffer from the presence of a depreciated silver currency, not redeemable by the Government nor current in the channels of trade.

These were words of almost prophetic wisdom.

At the head of the Treasury Department then was one of the ablest and most accomplished financiers that ever occupied that position in the history of this nation, a straight-forward, hard-headed, broad-minded Yankee, trained in the school of practical business affairs, who looked, not simply at the conditions that were present, but at the causes which produced those conditions.

Now, let us see what they were? On December 2, 1872, he made that communication to Congress, written presumably in November. I have before me a statement of the Director of the Mint of the price of silver, month by month, during the year 1872. Commencing in January, it was \$1.33 an ounce, and the silver dollar was worth \$1.03. In November, when this report was written, and the attention of Congress was called to the fact, the price of silver was \$1.30 an ounce, and the silver dollar was worth less than \$1.01.

During those few months it had depreciated 2 cents on a dollar, and everything indicated that the depreciation would continue as it did. Why? The Secretary of the Treasury looked undoubtedly at the production of silver. When his recommendation was first made in 1870, the production of silver in the United States was \$16,000,000, coinage value. In the next year it had increased nearly 50 per cent, and was \$23,000,000. The following year it was \$28,000,000, and the next year it was \$35,000,000, a constant and progressive increase in the production. The production of the world showed a practically similar increase, rising from \$51,000,000 in 1870 to \$65,000,000 in 1873 and to nearly \$82,000,000 in 1874. So that when this act was last presented and the attention of Congress was asked to it by the careful financiers who were watching history and watching the economic forces that were at work they presumed that these causes would continue, and they desired to place this Government upon a basis, when it resumed specie payments, where it would not be confronted with the necessity of using but one metal and having no gold. That that was understood by Congress I desire to demonstrate by quoting from the speech of the chairman of the Coinage Committee, Hon. William D. Kelley, of my own State. I quote from the Congressional Globe of 1872. He says:

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

This is what I wish to call attention to—

The values of gold and silver continually fluctuate. You can not determine this year what will be the relative values of gold and silver next year. They were 15 to 1 a short time ago. They are 16 now.

So I say that the careful student of history will see that that act was passed for a proper and wise purpose, based upon the conditions existing at that time and future conditions that must inevitably result from forces then in full play.

When the new Congress assembled, in December, 1873, the Secretary of the Treasury made reference incidentally to the fact that this country had "adopted the gold standard and demonetized silver," and spoke of "the depreciation in the market value of silver as compared with gold, which has been going on for some time," and of the purchase by the Government of "as much silver bullion as could be conveniently used in giving employment to the mints," thus clearly indicating the conditions existing and the governmental policy being pursued. The Director of the Mint, in his report under date of November 1, 1873, discusses the effect and operation of the act of 1873 at great length, under the heading, printed in capital letters, "Gold the standard or measure of value—silver subsidiary."

I hold here in my hand that report. With that official statement and explanation before them, with the fact that at that time, when the new Congress assembled, in December, 1873, the price of silver was only \$1.27 an ounce and the value of the silver dollar only 98 cents, was any movement made to repeal that act? In this House were such eminent bimetalists as Richard P. Bland, of Missouri, who has only just closed his long and distinguished service in this House. At the head of the Democratic membership of the Coinage Committee was the present eminent Senator from Texas, ROGER Q. MILLS. In this House were the now venerable William S. Holman, of Indiana, and Senator Beck, of Kentucky, all ardent bimetalists.

With the facts stated in that report before them, with the value of silver less than the value of gold in the dollar, was any move-

ment made to repeal that act? In former history, in 1864, when Congress made a mistake and undertook to regulate the value of gold, and the mistake was discovered, in less than fifteen days the same Congress which passed the bill had blotted from the statute books their own work. Did they do it in 1873 or 1874? No. On the contrary, the eminent Senator from Nevada—and Nevada was represented then by those two distinguished and able champions of silver, JOHN P. JONES and WILLIAM M. STEWART—the eminent Senator STEWART from Nevada said, on the 11th day of February, 1874, in the Senate of the United States:

I want the standard gold, and no paper money not redeemable in gold.

And less than ten days later he said:

Gold is the universal standard of the world. Everybody knows what a dollar of gold is worth.

Will gentlemen undertake to say that the act of 1873 was clandestinely passed without purpose? If it was, let me submit to you a practical question. In 1876, when the Democratic national convention assembled and sought with a fine-tooth comb to find all the sins of transgression and omission committed by the Republican party, did it make the least mention of this terrible crime against silver? In that convention were such eminent silver champions as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], who was on the committee on resolutions, and who had been a member of this House in 1873, when this bill passed. The subject of finance was so thoroughly considered in that committee and convention that there were two reports and a heated discussion on it.

In that convention sat my genial friend whose seat I now occupy, Mr. LESTER of Georgia, one of the vice-presidents of the convention; his colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Judge TURNER; the aggressive champion of free silver from Tennessee, Mr. RICHARDSON, and that eminent Democrat, prominent then, prominent often in this House and elsewhere, the Hon. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Yet in that memorable arraignment of all the sins of the Republican party, real and fancied, no man undertook to charge to it the "enormous, monstrous crime of 1873." Why not? No man who reads the arraignment of the Republican party embraced in that platform of 1876 will believe that this charge would have been omitted had there been any basis on which to plausibly rest it.

But now what has been the effect of that act? If it has reduced prices, as alleged—if the demonetization of silver has sent down the prices of the products of this country, of the wheat, of the cotton, and the other products—if that is true, it is worthy of serious attention and ought to be carefully considered. Gentlemen said last night, and gentlemen frequently say, "Here is a list of 26 articles, and the depreciation has been so much." Do they name the articles? Certainly, they name two articles. We have been deluged with charts, not as illustrative and not as accurate as the charts that have been exhibited in your sight to-day by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]; but in former years we have been deluged with charts showing the prices of what? Silver, wheat, and cotton. Nothing else.

Now, then, is there any connection between them? If the reduction in the price of wheat and the price of cotton was due to the appreciation of the money metal or the medium of exchange, the same law and the same force would apply to all the other products, unless there are exceptional forces which make a difference in particular cases. If the appreciation of the money standard has caused a depreciation in the price of wheat, it would cause a depreciation in the price of corn, oats, potatoes, and tobacco. Certainly it would. But it did not. No, sir; the reason why wheat depreciated in price was because the cost of production had been lessened; the productive power of a day's work had been marvelously increased, as demonstrated to you by my friend from North Dakota, and because the cost of transportation had been wonderfully reduced. I read briefly from Schoenhoff's "History of Money and Prices," just published, and you will find in the Statistical Abstract for 1894 the tables showing that in the single element of the cost of transportation there had been a reduction of 20 cents per bushel in the rates between Chicago and New York between 1873 and 1894.

Schoenhoff says:

The through freight charges on grain by the leading roads from Chicago to New York averaged about \$1.20 per 100 pounds from November, 1865. They had fallen in 1870 for the same month, to 60 cents, and averaged at that rate till about 1873. Thence, in 1874 to 1880, the rates fell to 40 and 35 cents, and from thence came down to rates varying between 20 and 25 cents in 1890.

What is worthy of note is that rates of freight, when once lowered, have never come back to old positions. * * *

But taking the six months from July to January, when the bulk of the harvest is being shipped, we average for 1870, per bushel, 15½ cents; for 1873 even, 25½ cents; for 1876, 16 cents; for 1880 we have 14 cents; for 1884 we have 10 cents; for 1888 we have 8 cents; for 1890 we have about 4 to 5 cents, which is the average for 1892 and may be considered as the general average rate now. * * *

If we go back no further than 1873 we can state that a difference in freight charges from Chicago to New York of 20 cents per bushel over the present rates has accrued to the Eastern consumer and to the Western farmer alike. A further benefit to the Western farmer and the European consumer is in the fall of ocean freight of fully 10 cents in this period of about twenty years.

We in America certainly have to take this margin into consideration (about 30 cents per bushel, the saving of freight to the consumer of the farmer's surplus) when we speak of the fall in the price of his wheat.

Subtract 20 cents from the price of 1873 and you will see how it affects the average price of wheat in these years.

But let me call your attention to the contrasts in the matter of culture and prices between wheat and corn. Both are food products. Wheat is mostly produced on large farms, by the employment of great amounts of capital, by the application of improved machinery and power; produced in exceptional localities. Corn is produced in every State in this great Union. It is consumed generally where it is produced. The element of the reduction in the cost of transportation does not enter into its value. The employment of power increasing the productiveness of individual labor does not materially enter into its value. The small farmer grows corn just as he always did and pursues practically the same methods in Maine, in Pennsylvania, in Oregon, and all over the country. He follows his own plow, behind his own team, cuts his own corn, husks his own corn, and disposes of and frequently eats his own corn. There has been no material change in the methods of production. There has been no material change in the element of transportation, for corn is an article of home consumption; and there has been no material change in price. I have before me tables of prices furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture, which I will insert in the RECORD. The price brought by a bushel of corn in 1872, immediately prior to the demonetization of silver, was 39.8 cents a bushel—the average price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not desire to interrupt the gentleman, but I desire to ask him for information—at what place?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. That is the average price throughout the country, given by the statistician of the Agricultural Department. In 1872 it was 39.8; in 1892 it was 39.3 cents per bushel. The average for the decade of 1870 to 1880 was 44.17 cents per bushel; for the decade between 1880 and 1890, 40.75 cents per bushel; for the first four years of the present decade, 41.25 cents per bushel. Allowing for the fact that there was some appreciation, some inflation of paper prices in the first decade, and you will find a wonderful stability in average price, because there were no exceptional influences affecting the price.

Take oats, produced largely in the same way. I am not going into details, but the prices in 1872 were 33.6; in 1892, 31.7, and the average for the first decade was 36, for the second 32, and for the third 33. Take potatoes, in which there is no special improvement in the methods of cultivation. You plant them as you always did and you dig them as you always did. They were worth 59 cents in 1872, 67 in 1892, with the average price corresponding from year to year.

Referring briefly to the other commodity so frequently mentioned, the price of cotton, which has depreciated during these years; and why? There have been improved methods of cultivation and handling. I remember something of the rather primitive methods that were in vogue thirty years ago, when I was trying to raise cotton, and pretty unsuccessfully. With respect to that commodity, also, you will find that the cost of transportation has diminished just as the cost of transportation of wheat has diminished, the conditions being the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I understand him to say that there have been some improvements in the methods of production of cotton. I wish he would state to the House just one.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. In the application of power to ginning, and the application of power in baling and compressing. When I was raising cotton we ginned by hand and pressed by turning the long lever with a mule, and you do not do it so now. Then enormous fields of extra production have been opened.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the gentleman if he is not aware of the fact that the great mass of the cotton crop is ginned and pressed in that way to-day?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am not aware that the vast majority of the crop is produced in that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And does not the gentleman know that the ginning has nothing to do with the production?

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. I am aware that the application of steam power has made a good deal of a revolution in many localities, though possibly not in the gentleman's section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. If it had made a revolution anywhere it would have made it in my section, because that is a great cotton region.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. It is possible, Mr. Chairman, that there is some section in this great country where the possibilities of modern improvement and progress have not reached, and if so I make the necessary exception.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but—

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. And I do not want the gentleman to interrupt me, because my time is limited. Now, Mr. Chairman, the element of transportation in determining price is a very

important one, and has changed materially since 1872. I read further from Schoenhof on Money and Prices:

In cotton the rates by steamer from New Orleans to New York, in 1873, averaged 60 cents per 100 pounds; in 1880, 45 cents; in 1892, 32 cents. The all-rail rates from Atlanta, Ga., in 1886 were 85 cents; in 1893 they were 67 cents. Ocean rates have followed a similar course as in wheat.

Then, sir, another element in the question is that cotton seed is now worth about half as much as the staple, and was practically valueless in 1872. So that for the cotton crop, seed and staple, about as much is received now as in earlier years.

Again, take tobacco. What is the reason why the same forces which apply to the price of cotton should not apply to that of tobacco? The methods of the production of tobacco have not been materially changed, and the element of transportation is not involved to the same extent as in the case of cotton. Now, what has been the price? I have here the average price of tobacco for the decades I have been considering. For the first the average price has been 8.87, for the next 8.41, and for the third 8.01, showing a remarkable stability of price.

The fact is that exceptional influences, cheapening the cost of production and lessening the cost of transportation, have materially affected the prices of wheat and cotton, and have not operated to nearly the same extent on other agricultural products. They have, however, operated even more strongly on silver. The field of production has been vastly increased and the methods of mining, concentration, and reduction have been wonderfully cheapened and increased in effectiveness. This was fully explained by William H. Beck, a practical miner, in his testimony before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the Fifty-first Congress, in part as follows:

In my observation in the far West I see causes there that I think are tending very much to depreciate the value of silver. When I went to Montana in 1886 it cost us to transport our ores from Dillon to Omaha \$24 per ton. That transportation now costs \$10 per ton. It cost us then to treat the ores \$17 a ton. Now it costs \$8 and \$10. Mining powder cost us 50 and 60 cents a pound. We can buy it now for 20 and 22 cents a pound. It cost us then to board a man \$1 a day and more. We can do it now for a less sum. Machinery is better, and improvements in mining machinery are being continually made. Concentration of ores is extending very largely. Many of our ores that were considered of no value a few years ago are now quite profitable.

When I first went to Colorado in 1878 the superintendent of a silver mill at Georgetown told me that he could not afford to treat ores that assayed less than \$20 to the ton. By concentration ores can now be profitably handled that yield as low as \$5 a ton. By using scientific processes of treatment low-grade ores, running 2 or 3 ounces of silver and 3 or 4 or 5 per cent in lead, will yield a good profit.

So you have similar causes operating on wheat, cotton, and silver, and necessarily producing similar results. The price of each has fallen, but in different and varying degrees. Neither has any relation to the other nor influence on the other in matter of price, but each yields to the influences operating on itself, which, as I have shown, are effective to produce the result found, and a result not found in other commodities not subjected to these influences. Prices of many have remained stable, some have fallen, some have increased. No one disputes the marked increase in the rate of wages of labor, which enters as the most important element into the value of all commodities.

But, gentlemen say give us an increase in the amount of the circulating medium, give us, in other words, an inflation of the currency, and it will raise prices. Now, is that necessarily a fact? If it is a fact, why have not prices increased while we were increasing the amount of our currency by injecting into it over four hundred millions of silver dollars, as we have done since 1878?

But it is said, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] has eloquently dilated upon that point, that in 1873 we took the burden of sustaining the circulating medium of this country, which had previously rested upon two metals, and imposed it on one alone, and that the consequence was the appreciation of the metal that was retained and the depreciation of the one that was rejected. Was the gentleman candid in that statement? Did he mean to say that in 1873 the circulating medium of this country rested on gold or silver or on both? He knows, and every man knows, that at that time the currency of this country was an irredeemable paper currency, and that it so continued for six years thereafter. He knows, and every man ought to know, that when we did come again to a specie circulation we came to it with silver as an important element, and that our currency system then rested more heavily upon silver than ever before in the history of this nation.

He knows, and every man ought to know, that when we returned to a specie basis in 1879 we coined more legal-tender silver dollars in that one year than we had coined in the whole eighty-six years of the previous history of the Government—aye, sir, double the amount. What was the proportion of gold and silver in our currency in 1873 and prior to that time? I have before me a statement of the Director of the Mint showing the figures. From the foundation of the Government until 1873 we had coined \$795,091,690 of gold currency, and we had coined \$143,813,598.70 of silver currency, of which \$8,031,238 was in standard silver dollars.

Up to that time, then, the burden of sustaining the circulating

medium of this nation had rested upon gold and silver in the proportion of 8 to 14. How has it rested since? Why, you have got practically in circulation to-day approximately equal amounts of silver and gold. You have got in this country to-day more nearly a typical bimetallic currency—not a bimetallic standard, but a bimetallic currency—than can be found in any other great nation of the world. And where is the complaint? With four hundred millions and over of standard silver dollars, with a subsidiary silver currency approximating half that amount, where and how is silver unjustly or unfairly treated? What more can you do unless with the cooperation of other nations?

But the gentleman from Colorado says—and it is the old hackneyed illustration which we have heard for years and years—if you should take two kinds of grain—corn and wheat—both used for food, and the Government should stop the grinding of the one and confine the people to the use of the other, would not that inevitably tend to appreciate the price of the one that was kept in use and to depreciate the price of the one that was rejected? I answer that question put to us so often by saying that if the gentleman will make his illustration conform to the facts, if he will assume that the Government had been receiving wheat and corn, storing the wheat and issuing obligations for it, issuing storage certificates, if you please, for it, until the accumulation had reached 400,000,000 bushels, while there could not, by any possibility, be forced out among the people 60,000,000 bushels of it for actual use, while all the corn was freely used, if the proposition were then made to the Government, not simply to resume grinding wheat for use, but to accept every bushel of wheat grown in the United States, or in the world, and guarantee for it to the owner \$1, when it was really worth only 50 cents anywhere else, and force every man in this nation to take it for \$1 when he could buy it for 50 cents elsewhere, I would say that the Government ought not to do that. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, silver is a national product, relatively unimportant when compared with our great agricultural staples or the production of our manufacturing industries, but still a national product, and the men who mine it should be fairly treated; but I can not aid in the effort to double the value of their product at the risk of cutting in half the wages of the laborer, the pension of the soldier and his widow, and the accumulated savings of our people. The credit and power of this nation are great. It can sustain at par its present stock of silver coin, greater relatively to that of gold than that of France, of Germany, of Great Britain, of Russia, the other great commercial nations; but it has reached the limit of safety. Further advance in that direction, solitary and alone among the enlightened nations of the world, it can not take without inevitable disaster.

Now, sir, I have just one word more to say and then I shall be through. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ALLEN] asked the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] during his very able speech—and asked the question as if it were one that was difficult to answer: "What is the condition of the Mexican people to-day?" That question I shall answer, in connection with the statement that by Mexican law there is in that country a complete system of unlimited coinage of both gold and silver upon practically equal conditions, the charge for the coinage of silver being a trifle less than the charge for the coinage of gold, but the mints being open to both metals without limit or restriction; and the result has been that Mexico is under a flood of silver and has coined practically no gold.

The question is asked, "What is the condition of the people under that system of coinage?" In answer I will ask the Clerk to read from the Bulletin of the American Republics, entitled "Mexico," pages 105 and 106—a publication issued by our State Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

Labor is abundant in Mexico; in some places the supply is greater than the demand, and as the laboring classes can live on such frugal diet and need so little clothing, wages, except for imported skilled labor, are small.

Speaking of these classes a Mexican newspaper says: "One of their greatest evils at the present time is the existence of a scale of wages which defies all power of reduction; which robs the laborers of all sense of dignity or of feeling of association with the rest of their fellow-citizens, and having reduced them to a condition of abject debasement, deteriorates to a like extent their productive power and the measure of their utility. Instead of claiming and occupying the position of an important and essential element in the process of the development of the country's resources, they, the laboring classes, are content to regard themselves as a plant, or machinery, which moves by extraneous aids only, and has no power of volition, and no desire to exercise it if it had."

Mr. John Bigelow, late minister to France, once said that the laborers of Mexico lived at a less expense than a farm horse in a New England State.

The hacendados, as the large landowners are called, own immense tracts of land, and the hacienda, or manor, is a congregation of buildings forming at times quite a settlement, and is generally fortified.

The hacendado usually works his possessions in accordance with the traditions handed down from the time of the Spanish conquest—a veritable feudal system. He is not only a landowner, but he is a dealer in provisions, clothing, etc. His peons, as the laborers and tillers of his soil are called, are descended from those his father had before him, and they are paid, live, and work as their progenitors were and did. The peon is born under the shadow

of his master's house, grows up, and remains under him, following his father's steps in everything; using his same implements and receiving the same pay, generally from 27 to 37½ cents a day.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that if the condition of affairs there shown is prosperity I trust the day is far distant when such "prosperity" shall come to the United States. We want no such cheap wages; such cheap civilization; such cheap methods of living; nor such cheap money. [Applause.]

ADDENDA.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
DIVISION OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1895.

SIR: In compliance with your request of recent date, I send you herewith a table giving the annual average farm price for the United States of corn, wheat, oats, potatoes, and tobacco, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, for the years 1870 to 1893, inclusive.

Respectfully,

HENRY A. ROBINSON, *Statistician.*

Hon. CHARLES W. STONE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Annual average farm price for the United States of corn, wheat, oats, and potatoes per bushel and of tobacco per pound, from 1870 to 1893, inclusive.

December 1—	Corn.	Wheat.	Oats.	Potatoes.	Tobacco.
	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>
1870.....	54.9	104.2	43.3	72	10.6
1871.....	48.2	125.8	40.1	59.6	9.8
1872.....	39.8	124	33.6	59.9	10.4
1873.....	48	115	37.4	70.5	8.3
1874.....	64.7	94.1	52	67.7	13.1
1875.....	42	100	36.5	38.9	8
1876.....	37	108.7	35.1	65.5	7.4
1877.....	35.8	108.2	29.2	44.8
1878.....	31.8	77.7	24.6	58.9	5.6
1879.....	37.5	110.8	33.1	43.6	5.8
1880.....	39.6	95.1	36	48.3	8.2
1881.....	63.6	119.3	46.4	90.9	9.6
1882.....	48.4	88.2	37.5	55.7	8.4
1883.....	42	91	33	42	9
1884.....	35.7	64.5	28	39.6	8.2
1885.....	32.8	77.1	28.5	44.7	7.7
1886.....	36.6	68.7	29.8	46.7	7.4
1887.....	44.4	68.1	30.4	68.2	10.6
1888.....	34.1	92.6	27.8	40.2	7.7
1889.....	28.3	69.8	22.9	40.3	7.1
1890.....	50.6	83.8	42.4	77.7	7.7
1891.....	40.6	83.9	31.5	37.1	8.4
1892.....	39.3	62.4	31.7	67.3
1893.....	36.5	53.8	29.4	59	8.1

From this table the following averages for the several decades are compiled:

	Corn.	Wheat.	Oats.	Potatoes.	Tobacco.
	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>
Average:					
1870-1880.....	44.17	106.35	36.49	58.14	8.87
1880-1890.....	40.75	83.44	32.03	51.66	8.41
1890-1894.....	41.25	60.18	33.75	60.18	8.01

Average London price of bar silver 925 fine during the year 1872, by months, and the equivalent value of an ounce 1,000 fine in United States money.

Months.	Pence.	United States money.
January.....	60.875	\$1.3945
February.....	60.9375	1.3958
March.....	60.8125	1.3931
April.....	60.5625	1.3890
May.....	60.28125	1.3214
June.....	60.0625	1.3166
July.....	60.125	1.3181
August.....	60.125	1.3181
September.....	60.375	1.3235
October.....	60.125	1.3181
November.....	59.50	1.3043
December.....	59.6875	1.3082
Yearly average.....	60.2801	1.3218

BUREAU OF THE MINT, January 27, 1896.

R. E. PRESTON, *Director.*

Average price of silver, by months, during the calendar year 1873.

January.....	\$1.3118
February.....	1.3118
March.....	1.3111
April.....	1.3097
May.....	1.3070
June.....	1.30022
July.....	1.3088
August.....	1.29634
September.....	1.28581
October.....	1.28786
November.....	1.27143
December.....	1.27221
Average.....	1.298

[From Statistical Abstract of 1894.]

Freight rates on wheat, by lake, canal, and rail, from Chicago to New York, 1857 to 1894.

[Prepared by Mr. J. C. Brown, statistician New York Produce Exchange.]

Calendar year.	Average rates per bushel.			Calendar year.	Average rates per bushel.		
	By lake and canal.*	By lake and rail.	By all rail.		By lake and canal.*	By lake and rail.	By all rail.
	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>		<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>	<i>Cents.</i>
1857.....	25.29	1876.....	9.58	11.8	16.5
1858.....	16.28	1877.....	11.24	15.8	20.3
1859.....	17.59	1878.....	9.15	11.4	17.7
1860.....	24.83	1879.....	11.6	13.3	17.3
1861.....	26.55	1880.....	12.27	15.7	19.9
1862.....	26.33	1881.....	8.19	10.4	14.4
1863.....	22.91	1882.....	7.89	10.9	14.6
1864.....	28.36	1883.....	8.37	11.5	16.5
1865.....	26.62	1884.....	6.31	9.55	13.125
1866.....	29.61	1885.....	5.87	9.02	14
1867.....	22.36	1886.....	8.71	12	16.5
1868.....	22.79	29	42.6	1887.....	8.51	12	+15.74
1869.....	25.12	25	35.1	1888.....	5.93	11	+14.5
1870.....	17.1	22	33.3	1889.....	6.89	+8.7	15
1871.....	20.24	25	31	1890.....	5.85	8.5	14.31
1872.....	24.47	28	33.5	1891.....	5.06	8.53	15
1873.....	19.19	26.9	33.2	1892.....	5.61	7.55	14.23
1874.....	14.1	16.9	28.7	1893.....	6.33	8.44	14.7
1875.....	11.43	14.6	24.1	1894.....	4.44	7	12.88

* Including canal tolls until 1882, but not Buffalo transfer charges.
† Averages of officially published tariffs.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1896.

Statement of the coinage of gold and silver from 1793 to 1873.

Description.	Value.
Gold coinage.....	\$795,091,690.00
Silver dollar coinage.....	8,031,238.00
Fractional silver coinage.....	76,734,964.50
Subsidiary silver coinage.....	59,047,396.20
Total silver coinage.....	143,813,598.70

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] is recognized for forty minutes.

[Mr. McRAE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I favor the provisions of this Senate bill. I shall vote for it. In giving the reasons why I propose to vote for that bill I shall not attempt to fill you with statistics or to please you with a map. I shall attempt to give you some reasons which seem to me strong enough to induce every Republican on this floor to vote in favor of concurring in the Senate bill.

It is related in the chronicles of old that at one time a cunning artificer in metals hung over the road a most beautiful shield, one side of it embossed in gold and the other side embossed in silver, and both elaborately carved.

Two knights coming in opposite directions, one from the east and one from the west, stopped at a short distance to admire the shield. He of the east said, "What a glorious golden shield I see before me." The knight of the west responded, "Sir Knight, it is a beautiful shield; but it is silver." He of the east responded, "Do you mean to say that I lie in reference to it? Sure it is golden." The knight from the west replied, "I know it to be silver." From words they came to blows; and they killed each other in defense of the opinions that they had. While lying weltering in their blood and breathing their last, an honest peasant came along and, looking on both sides of the shield, said, "What a beautiful shield it is, with gold on one side and silver on the other." And the knights said, "God forgive us for killing ourselves; that we did not look on both sides of the shield before we fought, and thus save our valor and our blood for our common enemies."

And so to-day the American people are fighting among themselves because they do not look on both sides of this question of the money of the country. The men from the East are for gold and the men from the West, like knights in legend, are for silver. The Republican party and the Democratic party alike are divided among themselves upon this question. I have no right to speak for the Democratic party. They enjoy internecine strife, they thrive on factional quarrels, and they are most dangerous at election times after they have broken each other's heads at primaries and conventions beforehand. [Laughter.] But I do claim some right to speak to the Republicans of this House and these United States.

I deprecate the manner in which this discussion has been carried on in the newspapers, and to some extent upon the floor of this House and in the other House, with reference to the epithets that have been bandied between one side and the other. On one side you will hear expressions of "gold bugs," "emmisaries of the Rothschilds," and on the other side we hear the expression "silver lunatics," and "silver cranks." To call names is no argument. It amounts to nothing. I am willing to admit that the gold men commenced calling names, and I am of the opinion that they followed the example set them by a young lady who heard her mother having a row with a neighboring woman. She thrust her head out of the window and shouted, "Hurry up, mother, and call her a thief before she calls you one!" [Great laughter.]

These gold gentlemen commenced calling names for fear the silver men would commence that game first. I will admit that if they did commence to call names, the silver men made a very good second in the race. [Laughter.] Now, all such bandying of epithets, and such talk as that, to my mind, is worse than time wasted. Particularly is it unnecessary and unsuitable for us Republicans. We can not afford it—and I am speaking to Republicans now as a Republican—we can not afford to have dissensions in our ranks. Titus would never have planted the Roman eagle over the streets and temple of Jerusalem but for the dissensions and factional fights that kept the Jews cutting each others' throats and expending more power in that than in fighting the common enemy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And so to-day, when I meet Republicans on the outside, I say what is the good of fighting in the party; we must not fight ourselves. The Democratic party is like Joe Bagstock, "tough, very tough, and hard to kill." [Great laughter.] I attended the funeral of the Democratic party in 1872. I saw its estate administered upon. I saw the auction of the effects of the decedent, with Belmont of New York as auctioneer, to a syndicate composed of so-called liberal Republicans. Horace Greeley, Charles Francis Adams, and Carl Schurz conducted the negotiations and made the purchase, and the result of the election of 1872 was disastrous alike to buyer and to seller.

The Democracy was worse beaten that year than ever before, and the fumes of the bargain killed poor old Greeley, made Charles Francis Adams an imbecile, and reduced Carl Schurz to the faded condition of a civil-service reformer. [Great laughter.]

And yet in 1874 the Democratic party, for the first time in the history of probate courts, came fresh and undiminished in estate out of the probate court and, through some strange transmigration of souls that would puzzle Buddha himself to explain, aroused the American people and elected a majority of the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And they have made a Democratic desert of this House ever since, except for two Republican oases, the Forty-seventh and the Fifty-first Congresses. [Laughter. Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, it is wise to look at these things. It is wise to remember also that in 1876 this same party, that is now supposed to be dead and buried, scared us almost to death when it came to the election of a President, and since that time every good Democrat has said, and no doubt if you will strip the clothing from our Democratic friends here you will find inscribed on their bosom the legend, "Tilden was de jure President and Hayes was only the de facto President of the United States." [Laughter.] We can not afford, then, to underrate their strength. We can not afford, then, to omit or refuse to do anything that is necessary for the purpose of bringing our ranks together in order to win the election, for in the campaign of 1896 we shall find the Democratic party, in the language of the prize fighters, "slightly disfigured, but still in the ring," and an antagonist worthy of our best endeavors. This House is very strongly Republican, but is our majority permanent? We can not tell until after the election of November, 1896. Therefore we must not be unduly enthused over our 130 majority in the Fifty-fourth Congress.

We can not win this year by a do-nothing policy. A do-nothing policy is unworthy of our party, unworthy of its history, unworthy of its membership, unworthy of its aims, and will as surely result in defeat as the election in November, 1896, comes around. Censuring Ambassador Bayard is not enough [laughter]; seconding Cleveland in Monroe doctrine ecstasies is not enough [renewed laughter]; cheeseparing on appropriations is not enough [applause]; denouncing the Democratic party and the President of the United States and drawing parallels between what they did in reference to the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill and our own action on that subject is not enough. [Applause.]

If we wish to win we must give the people something besides a do-nothing policy. Our self-appointed and our duly elected leaders of the party say to us, "Oh, do nothing, gentlemen; just pass the appropriation bills and go home. Wait until we elect a Senate and a President that are in accord with our party, and then just see what we will do for the people." But, Mr. Chairman, that policy will not win this year in my opinion. We must give the people some substantial fruit from the tree of Republicanism,

now so strong in this House. Mere words, mere promises, for next time will not do. We must act for ourselves and for this body. For four years we have belabored the Democracy because they did nothing, although in power, and we at the same time promised to act, to do something, if the voters of the country would turn the Democrats out and put us in. Hence a do-nothing policy is worse for us than usual, and will not satisfy the hunger of the masses of our constituents, who are clamoring for remedial legislation.

What have we to do with the Senate or with the President? Let us do our duty as we find it before us, and leave the Senate and the President to work out their own salvation. [Applause.] I am reminded of a story of an old colored preacher who, speaking of the Bible, said that he believed in it. "Whatever is commanded in this book," he said, "I will do. If I should read in this Bible that it was my duty to jump through a stone wall, I would try. Jumping at the stone wall belongs to me; going through it belongs to the Lord." [Laughter.]

So I say let us do our duty as the House of Representatives and leave it to the people to teach the Senate and the President to do their duty and to pass the wise bills that we send them. [Laughter and applause.] I am a Republican. I want to see a Republican President elected. I believe we shall elect him. But I wish to avoid all question; I wish to make assurance doubly sure. I believe this is one of the turning points in the campaign. I may be mistaken. You may say that I am throwing cold water on the party that I love. You may say that I am wrong. If so, my only excuse is that I am uttering in public the sentiments I utter in private; that I am appealing to my fellow-Republicans in the only manner that I can to get their ear and attention to do something for the people, to act in such a way as to hold the party together in every State, and to recognize the appeal of hundreds of thousands of Republican voters.

I have no fear of the consequences to the Republican party if it does its duty and if its representatives fully understand all the questions before it. [Applause.] But I say to my Republican friends, looking at this political campaign as I do—and I have gone through many a campaign, sometimes successful, sometimes beaten, but always ready to fight [laughter]—I say to you that if the Democratic party of this nation has the courage of its convictions and, when it meets in Chicago in July, adopts a free-silver plank in its platform, if it does not beat us next November we shall at least be worse scared during the fight than we were in 1876. [Laughter and applause.]

I make no prophecies. I indulge in no threats, but I wish in time of fair weather to prepare for storm; I wish to keep peace in our own ranks. I wish to do right by our voters. I wish to do right by the people, and I wish that we would do something in regard to this question. The silver question will not be suppressed. It raises its head in every State, yea, in every county of our nation. It is the most discussed by the plain people of the land of any question before them. It must be met. The cries of its friends must be answered. It is the part of good generalship to increase our army and to cement our forces.

I do not believe in the policy of certain United States Senators who have made the cause of silver a stink even in the nostrils of its friends. I do not believe in the motto of the old Roman who ended every speech by saying, "Carthage must be destroyed." I do not believe it is right or proper to stick a silver amendment upon every bill. No man who is a real friend of silver will act as some men have acted in the Senate. As a friend of silver I repudiate such conduct. I am in favor of free silver. I am in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. I am ready to work for it, to speak for it, to vote for it, but I do not want it thrust upon me in the morning and at noon and at night. I do not want to be waked up in the dead hour of the night and called to a caucus, in order to put a free-silver amendment upon every bill that is brought before the House of Representatives, and no true friend of silver does. [Applause.] But I do believe in my party doing something for the cause of silver.

I feel that it is absolutely necessary. I feel that we need the votes of the silver men. To gain those votes honorably should be our aim. We should not make improper bargains or enact any measure not in full accord with Republican principles. But in the strict line of our duty to our party, in direct accord with Republicanism as enunciated from every Republican platform save one in the United States, we should recognize silver as entitled to aid at our hands and should do something to cause its rehabilitation as money of the nation. This is all I ask. This is what I am pleading for in my feeble way without going into the history of metals or furnishing you with tables of weights and measures and values and prices.

Have you gentlemen who so glibly talk about your majority on this floor and the certainty of electing a Republican President this fall—have you gentlemen who so glibly talk about the strength of gold monometallism—have you gentlemen who talk and feel so strongly in reference to sound money, as you call it, ever thought

that there are 9 States of this Union, polling 37 electoral votes, that are solid for free silver—Republicans, Democrats, and Populists alike? Are those men not entitled to some recognition? Is not such a large portion of the United States to be considered in legislation? Are its interests to be ignored, its wishes disregarded, its appeals to be ignored, and its people told that they are like children, knowing not their own wants?

One other State ought to be solid for free silver. Its conventions are solid, but its Representative votes against the platform on which he was elected. But there are 9 States, with 37 electoral votes, solid for silver. Are the people in those States all crazy? Are they all "cranks"? We people in California consider ourselves reasonably well informed. Speaking for the other six Congressmen in California, I will say we are reasonably nice men. Of course I am willing to be counted anything; but I am speaking of others. [Laughter.]

But our people are united as never before on this question. Every State convention in California—Republican, Democratic, Prohibition, and Populist—passed resolutions in favor of free coinage of silver. Hence all the voters of California—proud, golden State of the Union—are together on this question, and I speak for them all here to-day.

Are they all crazy? Are they all lunatics? Are they all mistaken? Perhaps they are. If they are cranks, if the people of these nine States are lunatics, remember that Oliver Cromwell's Ironsides that won every battle, that gave freedom to England, that made the commonwealth of England respected all over the world, that carried the British flag in triumph wherever they went—remember that Cromwell's Ironsides were three-fourths crazy on religion; and they were irresistible in battle. So if we are "cranks," we are rather more dangerous than sensible people, and should be cultivated as friends, not ignored. [Laughter and applause.]

The Republican national platform of 1892 was for silver; there is no question about that. Why, sir, we could no more have carried a single State in 1892 upon a gold platform than we could carry this Congress in opposition to the will of a certain four or five men here. [Laughter.] Thirty States of this Union in their Republican State conventions passed resolutions in favor of silver. I have not time to read the platforms, but with the permission of the committee I will print them in my speech with the names of the States. I simply call attention to a few of those States; and the reason I do so is because I want to understand how any human being from North Dakota, or Indiana, or Illinois can vote against silver on this floor; and I want to hear some explanation when we come to a vote.

I want to understand how anybody from Delaware, or from Iowa, or from Kansas, or from Michigan, or Minnesota, or Missouri, or Nebraska, or North Carolina, or West Virginia can vote against silver on this floor. There is not anybody here from South Carolina or Alabama who represents the Republicans of those States [laughter]; but I should like to know how any man from those States is going to vote against silver when all the parties that speak therein have announced themselves in favor of free silver. [Laughter.]

How is it in the State of Mississippi, where you recently had a Senatorial election? Every candidate for the United States Senate was for free silver except one, and he was so badly beaten he did not know he was in the race. How, then, is any man from that State going to vote against free silver? How are any of these Republicans from Tennessee, from Texas, or from good old Vermont, and how, I would like to know, is even a man from the State of Maine going to vote in favor of gold monometallism, when the Republican platform of the State of Maine in 1894, the platform upon which all four of these men were elected, declared openly and squarely that the Republican party was opposed to monometallism, either gold or silver. Yet I presume that some of them, perhaps all of them, will vote against silver.

Only one State, and that the State of New York, has apparently declared against silver. That is not to be wondered at. "Ephraim is joined to his idols." [Laughter.] The State of New York believes in Wall street; and so far as New York is concerned, if the Democrats want the State of New York to lead them to defeat again, I am perfectly willing that they should have the State of New York. [Laughter.] I say that that is the only State that is apparently against silver. Every other Republican State in this Union has either passed resolutions in favor of silver (and the States that have done so number 30) or has passed resolutions in favor of bimetallicism, which was intended to make the voters believe they were in favor of free silver, and hence I have a right to claim from the record that the Republican party of the United States, barring New York, was in 1894, when we were elected, practically unanimous in favor of silver and its remonetization.

I might remark right here that there are 25 Democratic States—solidly Democratic—that have pronounced for free silver. I am sorry to be compelled to say right here—and I say it to answer a possible claim that may be made that we do not need

to carry the West to elect our President because we can get electoral votes in the South—that I take no stock in the hope of carrying a single Southern State at the Presidential election except West Virginia. Particularly is our case worse than hopeless if we refuse to recognize silver and stand upon a gold monometallic standard. Do you suppose that those gentlemen who control elections down South propose to allow anybody to carry those States for the Presidency except the Democratic candidate? If you do you are very badly fooled. The State of West Virginia perhaps may be carried by us, but that is the only one.

Twenty-five Democratic States, I repeat, have pronounced solidly for free silver. The Populistic party is also for free silver. There is a large number of them, although they do not make so much show here. Are these people, thus numbering millions of voters, located in every State of the Union, representing all shades of business and thought—all parties and creeds—all crazy, as I asked before? Why not, then, do something for silver, when its friends are so numerous, its demands so slight, and our Republican party platforms have so uniformly recognized it and pledged relief? It is in the mouth of every orator; it is inscribed upon the platform of every political party in this nation; it is recognized as a money metal by all these States; and even the States that have pronounced against silver have pronounced in favor of a bimetallic convention with foreign countries, thus squarely proclaiming in favor of silver as a money metal of the country, but seeking merely to postpone its rehabilitation, not because it is not right, but for fear we could not do it alone and must ask help of foreign countries to manage our own financial affairs and settle upon our own money.

For one I do not believe in foreign influences in this country either in a matter of money or anything else. I am in favor of the Monroe doctrine, not merely when it comes to the onslaught made on the little Central and South American Republics, but I am in favor of that doctrine when it comes to defending the United States against the onslaught of that mightier power, stronger than any army even that marched under Napoleon, the men that control the money markets of the world. [Applause.]

Why not support the Senate bill, Mr. Chairman? Why do you not support it? Why will you not give us something for silver? I would for one, answering my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], not care one brass farthing whether the bill is an answer to the House bill or not. I do not care whether it is polite to us or not. It is for silver; it is a legal bill, and I favor it because it does something for one of our great interests, because it answers the appeal made by Republican voters through conventions and elections. I do not want the House to be so very polite, as was a young lady of whom I once heard, who, when the house was on fire, when she was cut off by the flames and stood at a window, the only mode of escape being by means of a ladder, when a brawny, grimy fireman came up through the smoke and the flames, with the ladder crumbling under his feet, and offered to save her, said: "No, sir; you can not take me down that ladder. I have never been introduced to you, and I can not get into your arms; I prefer to burn." [Laughter.]

I am not so awfully polite that I can not accept the bill simply because it is not an answer to ours. This is a bill for silver, and I accept it on that ground. If you think it too much for silver, then do not throw it aside, but amend it; modify it, change it. Show us some middle ground, some bill on which we can all agree. Give us some measure of relief. This on the face of it appears to be a relief for silver, and we are for it on that ground. If it is too strong a bill, then dilute it; give us something, though, that will help the silver cause. It is needed by the country. It will aid our party and the people alike.

Mr. Chairman, I do not regard this Senate bill as a bed of Procrustes, upon which every man must lie, and if he is too short he shall be pulled out by machinery until he fits the bed, and if he is too long that he shall be sawed off until he is of the required length. [Laughter and applause.] I do not regard it as the sine qua non of legislation, but it is for silver, it is in the right direction. You may amend it, but give us, oh, give us something, and make the bill, if it is not satisfactory to you, better by your own amendments, and we will accept it. [Laughter and applause.] But give us something which will legislate in favor of silver.

Some of us think this bill is a good one. Some of us are going to vote for it. Some of you think it a bad one and are going to vote against it in its present shape. If so, and perhaps you have a majority, then your majority will enable you to change it and make it better, but gives us some remedy, some relief under the circumstances. Do not wrap the mantle of criticism around your shoulders and say about this bill, "It is all wrong," and then fade away into the heavenly realms of your own greatness and refuse us any relief. [Laughter.]

Something should be done for silver. We are like the three little boys who hid under a tree during a thunderstorm. Said one, "Bill, can you pray?" "No." "Tom, can you?" "No." "Neither can I," then said the boy, "but, by George, something has got to be done!" [Laughter.] So, if you think this is not

a good prayer, and if you are not satisfied with it, give us something for silver that will bring relief; something that will legislate for silver, for something should be done. [Applause.] Do not turn your back and say that "it is not good"; it is not the "original Jacobs"; it is not the "original Pond's Extract"; that it is diluted and needs modification, and then content yourselves with such condemnation and refuse to do anything except find fault with this bill. Do as you please with it—modify it, amend it, reform it, but give it to us in some shape or other. If it is not right, give us something that is right, in your estimation, and we will accept it. Every man here says he wishes to do something for silver. Now is your accepted time. Arrange some bill if not pleased with this one, and show your faith by your deeds. "Actions speak louder than words"; hence I beg you to act for the interest of silver, and not merely talk sweetly, promise much, and do nothing.

Mr. DINGLEY—no; I beg pardon; I believe that it is proper to say the gentleman from Maine. My friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] says the proper way is to keep still and do nothing; that time will work out its own solution; that relief will come by waiting, as I understand it. Perhaps it will; but you all remember, and permit me to call attention to the fact, that when the Dutchman undertook to teach his horse to live on nothing he said that no sooner had he succeeded in getting the animal down to one straw a day than the fool up and died. [Laughter.] So it is with this country. You cut us down to a straw a day, and that straw a mere promise to do something for silver; and the first thing you know we will be in very great trouble, almost financial death, and you will then have to supply some sort of a remedy, that can be much easier and safer administered to-day.

You say that this bill is not right. You listened for two hours yesterday to the remarks of the eloquent and distinguished gentleman from Maine, which I suppose from your standpoint were convincing. Did you tender us, I ask the gentleman, anything at all as a remedy? You said the medicine was bad that we wanted when you took the chalice from our lips, but you tendered us nothing in its stead. This is not right. We silver people are entitled to something; we silver Republicans are entitled to something. Give it to us. No, you reserved simply the right to object, as I have heard gentlemen say frequently upon this floor. That is all you did. Is that the way to treat this question? You said it was our duty to convince you, or rather the people who sympathize with you, in reference to this silver question, that something was needed to be done for silver, and that the demonetization of silver was wrong.

We say no. We say that the gold men began this war; that they caused all the trouble; they disarranged matters, and must explain why satisfactorily or be forever estopped from denying our position. We say that they began it in 1873. In that year times and people were reasonably prosperous. Silver was at a premium, as you yourself have stated, in 1873. The records of United States history may be searched in vain for the utterance of any man or any set of men, for a single word in any paper or pamphlet or magazine; may be searched in vain for any meeting or assemblage or convention, for any resolution or any platform, for any public speech or private utterance, in favor of the demonetization of silver in 1873. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask unanimous consent to continue my remarks.

Mr. BOWERS. I ask that the gentleman have fifteen minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will consent to an extension of the gentleman's time if I can have the floor when we commence the session to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not make that promise, as the time is already parceled out.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, I am entitled, as a member of the committee—

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I believe I have been recognized as entitled to the floor, to speak immediately. If I can have my time I shall not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the time of the gentleman from California be extended fifteen minutes?

Mr. SETTLE. If this arrangement is to deprive me of the very limited time which has been allotted to me, I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. It certainly will.

Mr. SETTLE. Then I object.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am entitled to fifty minutes as a member of the committee, and I yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. It can not be done under objection.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe I am entitled to that time, as I understand it, as a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McLAURIN. I should like to know if the objection of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE] extended to my granting a portion of my time to the gentleman from California?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE] had been promised recognition at the end of the half hour accorded to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER]. If the time of the gentleman from California is now extended, of course that will take away the time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SETTLE].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Why, no; it will not. We have got all day to-morrow and all day Saturday.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon this question is out of order. Objection has been made. [Cries of "Regular order."]

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman rather than have this discussion go on all night.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] yields to me, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is not in order. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] desire to be recognized?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] has yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I desire to have thirty minutes to discuss this question. If I can not have it at any other time, I want it now.

Mr. McLAURIN. I will yield time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] myself.

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. I will yield all my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], with the understanding that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McLAURIN] is to give me his time. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAURIN. Yes; I will give the gentleman my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. What portion of his time does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALKER] yield?

Mr. WALKER of Massachusetts. All of it—thirty minutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McLAURIN. And I will return the same amount to the gentleman from Massachusetts out of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for thirty minutes longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, during this debate the silver Republicans, as they are called, have unanimously been willing to extend the time for debate asked for by any member upon this floor. When the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asked for further time he was given an hour; and yet these men who call themselves Republicans and who want to disrupt the party upon this question, refused one of their own members an opportunity to close his remarks. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his courtesy in giving me his time, and I will assure him that is something that neither my friends nor myself will forget; and I want to say to the other gentleman that I never forget a favor and never forget an injury. [Applause.] And if it means war, and they want war, I want to say, for one, that the silver Republicans of this House are willing to take up the gauntlet at any time and set the lance in rest with any of them upon this question. [Loud applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was saying at this time, in 1873, when silver was demonetized, no human being asked for it. You can search the records of the United States in vain to find one solitary utterance in favor of the demonetization of silver. The pages of history are absolutely barren in that regard. No mortal man at that time had the hardihood to advocate the demonetization of silver. But it was accomplished. It is a fixed fact; and we have had to meet it and face it ever since. Now, all that the silver men want, speaking so far as I understand the voice of the silver Republicans, and speaking so far as I understand the voice of the silver Democrats, all that we silver men want is to put the United States back in the same position it occupied in 1873, when silver was coined in the mints of the United States without let or hindrance. [Applause.]

This is all that this bill proposes to do. If you think that is too much, change it, amend it, and we will accept it for the time. Ever since 1873 times have been hard; labor has been unemployed; strikes have been frequent in the United States. Wheat—notwithstanding the claim of my friend and namesake from North Dakota—wheat has sunk so low that it needs the sound of the trumpet of some financial archangel Gabriel or the statistics of MARTIN N. JOHNSON to bring it up to a fair price. [Laughter and applause.] The United States has been a constant borrower of

money since 1873. The United States borrowed \$162,000,000 last year, in time of profound peace. The United States has just recently offered a loan of \$100,000,000 more; and right here, Mr. Chairman, let me interject a remark: If ever I was proud of the United States of America; if I ever felt proud to be an American; if ever I felt proud that the Stars and Stripes float over a reunited country, a common American country, it was when I read in the papers this morning of the offering from the people of the United States, North and South, East and West, of \$500,000,000 to take a loan of \$100,000,000. [Loud applause.] It spoke volumes in favor of our nation and its wealth and stability, and it made me proud to be an American. [Applause.]

Now, this money has been borrowed by the United States since 1873, for what? To keep up a gold reserve, not to keep up any silver reserve. No such borrowing of money was needed prior to the demonetization of silver. No such bond issue was then needed. They have continued to borrow money ever since to keep up this gold reserve. We are borrowing it every day, but nobody is happy. The country is not doing well, and we say that the principal cause of it is silver demonetization. Perhaps silver demonetization is not entirely the cause, but silver demonetization is admitted by all to be one of the causes, and I believe all will also admit it is the main cause of the trouble now upon the country. Now we ask you to put this country back to where it was in 1873, nothing more. It is not an unreasonable request. It is made by many millions of voters. It should be heeded. We need those votes next November.

We ask you to quit trying the Keeley cure upon the United States. [Laughter.] We ask you to go back to silver. We ask you to put the nation back to where it was before you got to doctoring the United States with a single gold standard. Why, in 1873 Uncle Sam was healthy and was doing well in all particulars. The country was prosperous. We did not need to borrow money in time of peace. You commenced doctoring him in that year with your vaunted gold standard, and I am afraid if you keep up with your gold cure and your gold bonds you will find that the epitaph that was placed upon the tombstone of the man who died in Maine many years ago, and which reads—

I was well; I wanted to be better; I took physic and died—

will apply to the people of the United States under your financial management. [Great laughter and applause.]

So we say now that we want you to quit doctoring in that way; we want you to adopt the same rule for the nation that you would adopt for your own family. If your family physician failed to effect a cure or to benefit the patient, you would discharge him and try another doctor. You have tried Dr. Gold for this nation for twenty-three years, and the result has been trouble. Try Dr. Silver now. Give him a chance and see if the condition of the patient does not improve; at least take him into consultation with the other physician; let him assist. Every man understands the condition which existed in our nation in 1873, and we simply ask you to go back to that condition.

Gentlemen say they are in favor of bimetalism, but that they are opposed to free silver; that they are in favor of bimetalism, but they are opposed to the coining of silver. They remind me of a man who was a candidate for the legislature in the State of New York at a time when the question of the adoption of the Maine liquor law was before the people. He said:

Fellow-citizens, I am in favor of the Maine liquor law; I believe it is a good law; I believe it would promote temperance; but, fellow-citizens, I am opposed to the enforcement of the Maine liquor law because it interferes with personal liberty.

[Laughter.]

You gentlemen who say that you are in favor of bimetalism and yet refuse to vote any relief to silver are like that man. You are in favor of the law but opposed to its execution. You are in favor of silver but opposed to doing anything for it. [Laughter and applause.] If you think that the free and unlimited coining of silver is too much, give us less. Amend the bill. Provide that the silver of the United States alone shall be coined in the mints of the United States and put a prohibitory tariff upon foreign silver and I will gladly accept that and thank you in behalf of the people for it. It will not be enough, but it will be something, and will do good and keep our promises to the people.

Give us some relief in this matter and we shall be content. But do not turn a deaf ear to, as we think, the wishes of the majority of the people of the United States. Do not turn a deaf ear to, as we think, the opinions of nine-tenths of the farmers of the United States. Do not turn a deaf ear to, as we think, the opinions of three-fourths of the people of this country, as exemplified in party platforms. Do not turn a deaf ear to the opinion of three-fourths of the Republican party of the United States, as exemplified in the Republican party platform. Do not refuse to do something for silver. Silver and gold are the money metals recognized by the Constitution. Silver was once the unit of money in the United States. Silver was once coined in the mints of the United States.

Silver and gold both were, prior to 1873, the money metals of the United States, and we ask you to restore that condition of things.

In the history of Rome, one of the legends of that old empire and republic was that at the battle of Lake Regillus, when the Romans were nearly driven to defeat and when it seemed as though the republic must go down before the power of their invaders, the spirits of Castor and Pollux, the deities that ruled over the fate of Rome, came down from heaven, drew swords in behalf of the Roman army, and led it to victory. So to-day we can say to you, if you give relief to silver, on the one hand the spirit of the gold mines of the United States will come forward, bearing the rich and yellow metal that enables the world to move, and on the other hand will come the spirit of the silver mines, bearing the white metal so necessary to the world, and, like the shades of Castor and Pollux, that carried the Romans to victory, these two spirits, these two metals, working hand in hand, will make this nation strong, prosperous, and forever happy, united, homogeneous, and free. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. SETTLE. Mr. Chairman, I listened throughout the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and was highly entertained from the beginning until the end. I understood him to say at the start that he proposed to give the House some information on the subject of the coining of silver and to deprecate the fact that too many of the discussions upon this floor did not deal with the true inwardness of the question. I expected him, therefore, to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] who, in his remarks yesterday, asked those gentlemen who think as does the gentleman from California—

Can we, by the action of the United States Government alone, independent of all foreign countries, put the world's product of silver in the attitude of a yokel with gold?

I expected, I say, that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would have answered that question, and his great ability warranted me in entertaining the expectation that he would keep his promise and would offer some argument showing how that could be done. But the gentleman's answer has been mere rhetoric, mere assertion, filled with a great deal of denunciation of those who differ from him.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the gold standard. I am in favor of just as much use of silver in the money of this country as it is possible to maintain under existing conditions, holding the silver coin upon a parity, equal in purchasing and in debt-paying power with gold, but I do not believe that this country, by its individual, independent action, can assimilate into the currency that we have the world's product of silver, either at the ratio of 16 to 1 or at a larger ratio. I favor the use of silver in our system, but I agree with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that under existing conditions it is not possible for the United States to adopt a policy other than that of the limited coining of silver until we can reach an international agreement among the commercial nations of the earth.

What limit would I favor placing upon the coining of silver? I would like to see a measure offered which would assimilate the entire product of the American mines. I do not believe that that can be done without auxiliary legislation. I do not believe it can be done and silver maintained upon a parity with gold unless means are adopted which will give this Government a regular gold revenue, and on that line I should like to have an opportunity to vote for a proposition requiring the payment of not less than 50 per cent of the customs dues in gold.

Representing in part the State of North Carolina, let me say to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], in response to his remark that he does not pin any faith upon the idea that one single Southern State will give its vote to the Republican candidate for President at the next election—let me say to him that if he represents a constituency and a people who think and talk as he does, North Carolina and other States of the South will be found more loyal to the cause of the Republican party than he or his people. [Applause.] Professing to be a Republican, professing love for the organization of the party, the utterances we have heard from his lips, if carried to their legitimate conclusions, mean nothing more nor less than that while professing loyalty, love, and affection he is strangling the very life out of the organization for whose success he declares himself so anxious.

I recognize the fact that in North Carolina, and in every other State of this Union, perhaps, there are wide differences of opinion among citizens with regard to this question of the coining of silver. As to this substitute from the Senate, I agree with the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that the Senate should have made some specific response to the proposition which was offered by the House. There are some things in this substitute with which I am in full sympathy. I should like to see the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury restricted and limited. I voted in the last Congress for the coining of the seigniorage; and I should like to see such a measure as that passed. I would like, under the other proposition, to see an amendment offered which would limit

the coinage of silver to the production of mines located within the borders of the United States; and I should like to see an additional amendment which would provide this Government with a gold revenue, so as to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain these coins upon a parity with our other coins. Every child in this country knows that the commercial value of gold and silver is wide apart from their coinage value.

We hear much said about the union in political battles between the West and the South. It is urged that they have a joint interest in these questions. I know of no silver mine operated within the borders of any Southern State that is producing a sufficient amount of silver to make it an item worthy of consideration by the Southern people or the nation. When we say that the Southern people want free coinage of silver, I understand that they are not actuated by any sentimental attachment to silver as a metal. The breadth, the length, and the scope of our demand is that we want the volume of money increased; but, for one, I do not want to see the volume of money increased by the substitution of a fluctuating and depreciating currency; for I concur with those eminent statesmen who have declared the idea that of all curses that ever befell the laboring class of our people none is greater than that of an unstable and fluctuating currency. Always the cheaper money finds a resting place in the pockets of the laboring and agricultural classes of our people.

The South, therefore, having no silver mines, is not interested in the cause of silver personally or directly as are the gentleman from California and his constituency. He has mines in his State. There are mines of silver in the West; and I can well understand how it is to his benefit and to the benefit of his people that the Government of the United States should by law be compelled to accept every ounce of silver which is mined in his State or other Western States at double its value, receive 50 cents of bullion and stamp it as \$1, and allow him and them to make their purchases with it as such.

The Southern people have no such direct interest as have the Western people in this coinage question. Therefore I say the South in this controversy is not an ally of the West. Hence all this talk of a union between the South and the West in political battles is farfetched and has nothing in it. So far from being allied, the South and the West stand to-day in the attitude of rivals. The West is a largely agricultural country; the South is an agricultural country. The West therefore is, in the markets of our own country, not our ally but our rival. We of these two sections have no union in point of interest by virtue of being agricultural countries and communities. I believe that the future prosperity of the South lies not in the direction of the future prosperity of the West, in agriculture and in mining, except so far as iron ore and coal are mined in the South. Our future lies in the direction of stimulating and encouraging the growth of manufacturing establishments.

Thus much in reference to the talk of a union between the South and the West in behalf of labor. I prophesy that so far as my own immediate country is concerned never will such a union be brought about. In North Carolina and other Southern States there are thousands and thousands of intelligent and patriotic people who believe that the Republican party is broad enough and able enough to solve this question, not on sectional lines, but with a patriotic intelligence that has regard for the welfare and the prosperity of every section, North, South, East, or West. The Republican party, which was originated in a spirit friendly to the laboring classes, stands to-day unwilling to commit itself to a financial scheme or theory which would inflate the currency by the substitution of depreciated money, which would be the greatest curse to the American laborers and farmers that ever befell them, not even excepting Democratic rule.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the cause of our depression is not the refusal to open the mints of the United States to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Some Democrats say that it is; some Republicans say so, and almost all the Populists make that claim. The President of the United States sends a message to Congress in which he says that the condition of our country is due to the existence of the greenbacks in our circulation, and advises their retirement. If the President is right, if the greenbacks are a threatening menace to our country's prosperity, pray tell me why it is that that evil which exists and which you say is inherent in the greenback lay dormant until the Democratic party came into power in this country? [Applause.]

If there is an evil which is inherent in the greenback, and which lay dormant throughout all the Republican Administrations, never did you discover it until the Democratic party came into control in the Government. Under Republican rule, when our revenues were equal to our expenditures, when the credit of the Government was unassailed and unassailable, the greenbacks performed an important function in the finances of the country. They passed at par, and we never heard a word against them. But when the Democratic party came into power disaster followed,

and they hunted around for some excuse to account for it. The Administration says that the greenback is the cause of it. I believe with the Republicans, who say that the cause of our trouble is that our revenues are insufficient to meet the expenditures of the Government. [Applause.]

I am, Mr. Chairman, therefore opposed to the retirement of the greenbacks according to the suggestion of the President of the United States. I am in full sympathy with the measure which passed the House, and is now pending in the Senate, for the increase of the revenues of the Government by raising the tariff duties; and I believe that should the Senate prove patriotic enough to pass that bill, and the President of the United States himself give an exhibition of that patriotism to which he has invited the House so frequently, and rise above party and approve the bill, or allow it to become a law, that the atmosphere will be so cleared that prosperity will return immediately to our country. [Applause.]

One other word I desire to submit in this connection. Since this Administration came into power we have sold \$162,000,000 of United States interest-bearing bonds running for thirty years. We closed out the first deal with a syndicate, and but for the agitation in this House I believe, but for the provision in the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and promptly passed here, which directed the President when he issued bonds to offer them first as a popular loan, the subscription to the second lot would have been closed out, as was the first, at a rate of about 104. Reluctantly, after much discussion and dissatisfaction, and against his will, finally the President offered the bonds as a popular subscription.

The Administration papers, from one end of the country to the other, and Democratic officials began to prophesy that the loan asked for would be a failure; and yet we are informed in the papers that the bids for these bonds aggregate \$558,000,000 and over, and that the bids for them are not at 104, but that they range from 110 to 120, the average saving to the Government by this popular loan being estimated on this issue of bonds of \$100,000,000 at between seven and ten millions of dollars. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the bidding upon these bonds is a confirmation of the wisdom of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. I repeat it is a confirmation of the wisdom of the Ways and Means Committee as well as of the House in requiring the Secretary of the Treasury not to be allowed to close out the bids or deal with a syndicate, but that he should be compelled to offer the bonds to the people as a popular subscription.

Now, Mr. Chairman, speaking for myself only, I propose to vote against the Senate substitute unless it can be amended in conformity with the suggestions that I have thrown out in my remarks. Unless we can restrict the coinage under this bill to the American product, unless we can at the same time provide the Government with a revenue enabling it to maintain a parity between these coins, it is my purpose to vote against the substitute. I am not an enemy of silver. I am a friend to the metal, and I want to see it coined to the very fullest extent consistent with safety. But never will I consent to or vote for the free coinage of silver except under an international agreement or unless we can have limited coinage of the American product alone. [Applause.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to very briefly call the attention of this House to one feature of this bill that in my opinion is not receiving sufficient attention, and that is that by its provisions there does not appear to be any intention of using these silver dollars when coined. They are to go into the Treasury along with all the other silver dollars, and certificates are to be issued.

Why buy all this silver that no one wants? Why not print fiat money and have done with it? It is pure inflation anyway, and the more there is of it the less is its purchasing value. I believe to-day the worst feature of our monetary system or lack of system is these certificates.

If silver is desirable to be coined into money, by all means let us use it to the fullest extent that it can be absorbed in the channels of trade. But do not let us deceive ourselves into thinking that we are assisting the silver industry or promoting the use of that metal or increasing its value by purchasing it to the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars and storing it up in the United States Treasury.

These certificates which we issue against this silver pass as money by virtue of an act of Congress. They would just as readily pass if there was not a dollar of silver in the Treasury. In their present use they take the place which should be filled by our legal-tender notes. They thus drive these notes out of use and place them in a position where they are the more readily available to draw gold from the Treasury.

If there was not a superabundance of paper notes in circulation greenbacks would be in constant use and could not be spared from daily use for a run on the Treasury.

These so-called certificates, actually warehouse receipts, whether issued for gold, silver, or currency, should be called in and canceled, and that for which they were issued paid out.

If silver is such a good thing, there can not be the least objection to its use in daily transactions, and I am satisfied that its use in this way would very soon convince the most enthusiastic silver advocate that quite enough of it had been coined. [Applause.]

Under the consent given, Mr. LONG submitted the following as an amendment to be proposed to the bill:

At the end of section 1 of the Senate substitute add the following: "Provided, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only."

Mr. MCCALL of Tennessee submitted the following amendment:

At the end of section 1 add the following: "Provided, however, That this section shall apply to the coinage of the silver mined in the United States of America only."

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, unless some gentleman desires to be recognized, I will move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. If any gentleman desires to be recognized for five minutes, the Chair will recognize him. [After a pause.] The gentleman from Maine moves that the committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

The Speaker accordingly resumed the chair; and Mr. PAYNE reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration House bill No. 2904, had come to no resolution thereon.

GAINESVILLE, McALESTER AND ST. LOUIS RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk (S. 879), to amend an act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory."

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 9 of the act entitled "An act to grant to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railroad Company a right of way through the Indian Territory," approved March 1, 1893, be, and the same hereby are, extended for a further period of three years.

SEC. 2. That section 1 of said act be so amended as to make the city of Fort Smith the terminus of said road on the western border of the State of Arkansas.

The Committee on Indian Affairs recommended the following amendments:

SEC. 3. That section 3 of said act be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That a right of way of 100 feet in width through said Indian Territory is hereby granted to the Gainesville, McAlester and St. Louis Railway Company, and a strip of land 100 feet in width, with a length of 2,000 feet, in addition to the right of way, is granted for such stations as may be established, but such grant shall be allowed but once for every 10 miles of the road, no portion of which shall be sold or leased by the company, with the right to use such additional grounds where there are heavy cuts or fills as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of the roadbed, not exceeding 50 feet in width on each side of said right of way, or as much thereof as may be included in said cut or fill: *Provided*, That no more than said addition of land shall be taken for any one station: *Provided further*, That no part of the lands herein granted shall be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railroad, telegraph, and telephone line, and when any portion thereof shall cease to be so used, such portion shall revert to the nation or tribe of Indians from which the same shall have been taken."

SEC. 4. That section 6 of said act be amended by striking out all after the word "Provided" and inserting the following: "That a map of definite location showing the entire route of said road through the Indian Territory shall be filed and approved by the Secretary of the Interior before any part of the said road shall be constructed."

Mr. FISCHER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas whether this bill has been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. BAILEY. It has, and it has been favorably reported.

Mr. FISCHER. Certain amendments have been suggested. Have they all been adopted?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; the amendments are indicated in the bill and in the report.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. This is not a bill for a new railroad through the Indian Territory, as I understand it, but it is simply to grant an extension of time to a company already possessing a right of way through the Indian Territory.

Mr. BAILEY. Simply to extend the time.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I doubt whether there is room in the Indian Territory for any more new railroad rights of way.

Mr. BAILEY. There might be some question about that. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. As the Chair understands, the amendments proposed are House amendments to a Senate bill?

Mr. BAILEY. This is a Senate bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs. The committee have reported it back with a favorable recommendation, and with the amendments which are printed in italics in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BAILEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION SERVICE.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Accounts to present a privileged resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be, and the same is hereby, authorized and directed to visit Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, for the purpose of inspecting the immigration service and of ascertaining in what respect any existing laws or methods may be so amended as to fairly carry out the objects and purposes of such laws; and that the sum of \$560, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the objects of this resolution, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated from the contingent fund of the House to defray the expense of this inspection and investigation, and the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to advance said sum to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire in this connection, if the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, to obtain leave to print in the RECORD a statement of the relative force of the last House and of the present House, inasmuch as there was some confusion in the minds of several gentlemen the other day, perhaps, in respect to the matter. This statement is prepared by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I do not know that I shall object, but I think we ought to see the paper.

Mr. DOCKERY. Very well; let it go over.

The resolution reported by Mr. LONG was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LONG, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. HAGER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 173) to provide American registers for the barks *Minde* and *Johan Ludwig*; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 103) to authorize the Attorney-General to transfer to William Henry Clifford a portrait of the late Mr. Justice Clifford, now in the Department of Justice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. HULING, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. TYLER, for three days, on account of sickness in his family.

ORDER OF MEETING.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House may now take a recess until 7.30 o'clock this evening, the House to continue in session until 10.30 o'clock; that at 10.30 o'clock this evening another recess be taken until 10.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, the time to be occupied exclusively in debate upon the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks unanimous consent that the House now take a recess until half past 7, the evening session to continue until half past 10; that then a recess be taken until half past 10 to-morrow morning, for debate only upon the bill now before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DINGLEY. And in connection with that I ask that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman further asks that during that time the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] to act as Speaker pro tempore this evening.

LEAVE TO SIT DURING THE SESSION OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WANGER. I ask unanimous consent that committees having meetings to-morrow at half past 10 may sit from that hour until 12.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent is asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER] that committees may be allowed to sit during the session of the House to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

And then, in accordance with the order adopted by unanimous consent (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House took a recess until 7.30 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by Mr. HEPBURN as Speaker pro tempore at 7.30 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate is in order upon House bill 2904, to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Mr. ARNOLD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, gain by any individual or any nation at the expense of honor is irretrievable loss. It is well, I believe, to keep this in mind as we consider the proposition of free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. To such a proposition I am unalterably opposed for many reasons. I am opposed to it because I have the honor to represent a district in which reside many thousands of laboring men, and I demand that when any one of them earns a dollar he shall not be paid with 50 cents; we must remember that the drops of sweat which gather on the honest brow of toil are of much greater value than the very best dollars that we can make.

I am opposed to it because it would very soon bring financial disaster to the large commercial interests of my district and the country at large. It can well be stated, in the light of experience, that fiat money is certain to be followed quickly by the fieri facias of the sheriff. As domestic money the free coinage of silver means not only a change, but an abandonment of the standard recognized by this country and all the great commercial nations of the world. And it means more; it means the adoption of a fluctuating base by which all home commerce will be measured, and with it would follow such an unending train of financial disaster and ruin as we have never witnessed. Were the American Congress to accede to such a proposition and embody such doctrine in a statute, every creditor would at once demand payment of all debts due him.

The depositors in all our banks would quickly withdraw their balances, and the banks would be compelled to collect their loans rapidly to meet such demands. In turn, the great active business class of men, the intermediate class between the capitalist and laborer, a class of men who are often borrowers, and who are, in fact, the live, active, really valuable business men of this country, the merchant, the manufacturer, the coal operator, and such others, could not meet the immediate demands of the banks and would go down to financial ruin, thus throwing out of employment hundreds of thousands of laboring men. Who can measure the ruin, distress, and suffering that would be entailed? I feel sure that this House of Representatives, which has become and certainly is to-day the thoughtful and conservative body of the American Congress, will not follow the wild and visionary views of the United States Senate.

The great business interests of this country to-day have seen and learned that they must look to the House and not to the Senate for protection and for honest money, and they are to-day watching us with intense anxiety. Do any of us fear the disapproval of some of our constituents, and, thus fearing, will we adopt the tactics of the timeserver and demagogue by evading or remaining silent on the issue confronting us? I well know that there are in my district some so-called free-silver men. By my remarks I can not expect their favor, but they shall know that upon this important question I have the courage of my convictions. Like all of you, I care for my political future, but I care very much more that this nation be honest; honest with itself and honest with all its people of every class; that this country, the heritage of a mighty people, shall be prosperous; that my people and your people and all the people shall be contented and happy; that soon again we shall emerge from out the cold shadow of adversity into the warm sunlight of prosperity. [Applause.]

Let us address ourselves now and here to the great task before us, and demonstrate to our own people and to the world at large that by our act we will not agree with that radical body known as the United States Senate, and that by this House no financial dishonor shall blacken the pages of our glorious history.

That there is great business depression, that there are many who are unemployed, and that wages are too low will be readily admitted. High wages is always proof of general prosperity. If we were enjoying the prosperous condition of a few years ago, we would hear much less of the free and unlimited coinage of silver. Adversity is the fertile parent of wild theories, and with every period of business depression the speculative or incompetent or indolent citizen who fails is prompt to attack the financial system of the Government as the cause of his misfortune. Congress is powerful, but it has not the power to make 50 cents worth a dollar or legislate money into the people's pockets directly; neither can we produce crops and control markets by statute. There are business principles, practices, and laws higher than any statute we can enact; and you may pass laws enough to fill the Congressional Library, but no amount of talk, theory, or legislation can change the conditions of human life.

But, Mr. Speaker, the currency question, as I view it, is in no sense the cause of our financial troubles. A few years ago, when

we were enjoying great prosperity, we had about the same quantity and just the same kind and quality of currency that we have to-day. We must look deeper for the cause; and in doing so let us keep in mind this truism—that any individual or any nation whose expenditures exceed the income will, sooner or later, meet with financial disaster. Is not this true as proven by all business experience; and will we not apply the same business principles to our Governmental affairs as we do to the general business of everyday life? If we will, then will we be able to discover the cause of our financial troubles, and having discovered the cause we can remove it.

Let me give you a few statistics:

IMPORTS FROM EUROPE.	
During year 1895.....	\$383,686,842
During year 1894.....	295,077,865
Increase, 1895.....	88,608,977

Thus it appears that during the year 1895, since the Gorman-Wilson tariff went into effect, we bought from European countries foreign goods worth \$88,608,977 more than we bought in 1894. Now, having seen how we increased our purchases by this large sum in a single year, let us look at our exports or sales and learn what kind and manner of business we have been doing. Here are the figures.

EXPORTS TO EUROPE.	
During the year 1894.....	\$700,870,822
During the year 1895.....	627,975,133
Decrease, 1895.....	72,895,689

Thus it is clear that during the year 1895 we sold to European countries \$72,895,689 worth less of our American products and manufactures than we did during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1894. And in the year 1895 we spent \$88,608,977 more money in European countries, and they spent \$72,895,689 less money in this country. So our loss for the year's deal, under the Gorman-Wilson bill, exceeded \$160,000,000. Is it not, then, apparent to the most casual observer that the cause of our trouble is the so-called tariff measure passed by the Democracy in the Fifty-third Congress? That measure largely increased our purchases or imports and decreased our sales or exports, thus spending more than our income, which, as we have seen, always brings disaster. Not only this, but it has destroyed our industries, almost ruined the farmer, caused the loss of over \$100,000,000 in wool growing alone, and, worse than all else, it has turned out upon the highways hundreds of thousands of honest laborers who are begging for bread because the opportunity to earn it has been denied them.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, this is not a party question, it is a business question, and one of common humanity. The laboring men of this land care not for your fine-spun theories of finance, or your treatise on political economy by college professors, but they do care for the opportunity to earn fair wages by honest labor; and they not only care for it, but demand it, as citizens of this great Republic.

Are we, indeed, so blind to our interests that we can not "see ourselves as others see us"? Let me read you an article taken from the London Financial News, of October 8, 1895:

Once more the board of trade returns are of a gratifying character, and the improvement has, fortunately, occurred all around. The imports of the month were worth £30,618,854, an increase of £378,393, or one twenty-fifth of 1 per cent. There still remains a deficiency on the nine months, but the figure has been reduced to £662,301. Had it not been for the lower prices ruling for wheat and cotton throughout the greater portion of the year this decrease would not have to be recorded, for in bulk the import trade of the nine months has exceeded that of 1894. Luckily, our exports have been advancing by such leaps and bounds that the lower range of prices has not affected their monetary value to the same extent as it has the imports. For the month the gain is £1,862,620, or ten fifty-eighths of 1 per cent, and for the nine months the augmentation reaches £5,157,866, or three-nineteenths of 1 per cent.

One rather odd feature about these figures is the fact that one-half of the increase comes under the head of yarns and textile fabrics, although one department of our textile industries has been very hardly hit. The great prosperity of the wool trades has, fortunately, more than offset the retrogression in cotton, though that reflection brings small consolation to Lancashire. The total gain for the nine months under yarn and textiles is £3,297,675, and as the value of woollen tissues taken by the United States has been about £950,000 and of worsted tissues nearly £3,000,000 greater than in 1894, no further search for the origin of the improvement in the trade returns need be made. The lowering of the American tariff has been our salvation and it can not be said that we have shown much reciprocity, for, instead of taking the increased value of our shipments across the Atlantic in kind, we seem to have bought less American produce. It is needless to go beyond our own board of trade returns to find an explanation of a good deal of the monetary trouble in the United States.

Practically every penny that was subscribed here toward the recent American loan has been got back through the expansion in the exports of woollens and worsteds, but the United States has not confined her increased purchases to those articles. Last month she bought less raw wool than in September, 1894, but had to pay more for it. She took more cotton pieces, more iron, more alkali, and more of sundry articles which need not be specified. In some instances the rapid growth of the preceding months resulted in a slight check in September, but in all these cases the figures of the nine months show a big advance on 1894. On the other hand, we have paid a good deal less for American wheat, flour, bacon, hams, cheese, tallow, and cotton, to mention only those articles in which the contraction is almost apparent. The fact that the Argentine Republic heads the United States in respect of maize is not without significance.

Thus the trade balance between the States and this country is moving rap

Idly against the former, and it would require a large and regular transference of securities from New York to London to redress this tendency and restore the former position. And with India, Argentina, and Australia keeping up and even improving their positions as purveyors of wheat to this country, with Argentina sending more to the United States sending less tallow, it will not be easy for the Americans to regain their old footing in our market. Last month India and Argentina sent us more wheat than the United States, and Russia and Roumania together also topped the American figures. These are all factors that must be borne in mind in judging the outlook in the United States, and it is unfortunate that they are so consistently overlooked in that country itself. The increase in the purchase of British manufactures may not be maintained; but, on the other hand, the United States must count on the competition in wheat and maize becoming more and more intense as time goes on.

The movements in the imports last month were not of a nature to call for much comment, but we must note with interest the substantial increase in the arrivals of sugar and guano from Peru, the larger purchases of goats' wool, due to the briskness of business in mohair goods, and the fact that South Africa has sent us more, while Australia has sent less, sheep's wool. In the exports spirits have gone up considerably, and mining would seem to be thirsty work, for nearly all the increase has gone to South Africa and Australia. We have already referred briefly to cotton piece goods, which continue to decline both in quantity and in value. Central and South America, with the sole exception of Brazil, are buying more freely, and so is Japan, to which country we are sending more yarn, also, thanks, no doubt, to the disorganization of native industry by the recent war. India is, of course, reducing her purchases, though Bengal and Burmah constitute exceptions in the case of yarn. To Brazil we owe a satisfactory increase in jute, yarn and pieces, while Germany joins with the United States in absorbing more woolen and worsted yarn. It is rather odd to find that iron is going to America in larger quantities.

Let us now, Mr. Speaker, notice how, in another direction, our financial affairs have been managed by the present Democratic Administration, and also make some comparisons:

Between August 31, 1865, the date upon which the national debt reached its highest point, and March 1, 1893, the amount of the Government's outstanding obligations was reduced by \$1,881,367,873. To accomplish this remarkable feat of debt paying, bonds were purchased before their maturity and canceled to the amount of \$770,809,750. The reduction of the national debt by four-year periods, is given on March 1 of each fourth year, as follows, cents omitted:

March 1, 1869	\$280,430,492
March 1, 1873	403,948,454
March 1, 1877	65,204,017
March 1, 1881	73,646,751
March 1, 1885	430,161,982
March 1, 1889	341,448,449
March 1, 1893	236,527,696

Total reduction 1,881,367,873

On March 1, 1895, the national debt had been increased by \$105,328,774, and on December 1, 1895, by \$57,273,470, making the total increase under the present (Democratic) Administration \$162,602,245.—*New York World*.

To this frank avowal of Democratic deficiency and incompetency, we must now add another \$100,000,000 of debt, authorized by the Democratic Secretary of the Treasury on January 6, 1896, making the total Democratic debt \$262,602,245 within thirty-five months, as compared with the Republican decrease of debt of \$1,881,367,873 within three hundred and thirty months, the monthly averages being:

Republican monthly decrease of debt 1865-1893	\$5,701,114.77
Democratic monthly increase of debt, 1893-1896	7,502,921.23

Mr. Speaker, I confidently believe that the great masses of the American people at this time fully realize that because of the incompetency of the present Administration there must be a change, so that full power in all the departments of the Government may be given to the Republican party to enact such legislation, as they surely will, as will again give us prosperity in our business, comfort in all our homes, and contentment at every fire-side. God speed the day when again the honest laborer shall have full employment at honest wages paid in honest money. [Loud applause.]

I do not abuse, and will not attack, the present Administration, The facts and figures which I have given speak in louder and more emphatic tones than I can utter. If it were cruel to sneer at its impotence, then the feeble must be pitied. As to the Republican party, its financial views and specific financial doctrine, I am not authorized to speak, but as a Republican I have my own opinion, and I believe I am in accord with very many Republicans.

I favor as money gold, silver, and paper, interchangeable on equality, each dollar as good as every other dollar. I favor bi-metallicism and free coinage based on international agreement. If this can not be had, then I favor the coinage of silver limited only by the ability of our Government to make and keep each silver dollar as good as every and any other dollar and maintain the honor and integrity of the nation. [Applause.]

Let us not be deceived by the cry of our free-silver friends, that the great debtor class has interests which free silver will protect. We must not forget that for every dollar owing by any debtor there is a dollar due to a creditor. Simple justice demands that the creditor should receive from the debtor the same kind of money in value which he advanced, and common honesty demands that the debtor should return to the creditor just as good money as he received from him.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that, in my judgment, the financial question will speedily settle itself, when by a wise system of protective tariff we shall have sufficient revenues to pay our expenses; when by such system our great business and manufacturing interests are protected and thus employ our laborers and protect them against the low wages of foreign labor. Let us again see the smoke continually ascend from the iron furnace,

the coke oven, the tannery; let us again hear the happy melody of the loom and the factory, again listen to the clicking of the reaper in the fields of grain which will yield the farmer profit and not loss, and then we shall not need to issue more bonds and shall hear no more of deficits and depleted Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration by the House is a bill "to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet a temporary deficiency of revenue."

As it originally passed this House the bill in effect provided that the Secretary of the Treasury should be authorized from time to time, at his own discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to bear not to exceed 3 per cent per annum interest, payable semiannually, and redeemable by the United States in coin after five years, and payable in fifteen years from their date.

For the purposes of this discussion I do not care to enter into a consideration of section 2 of said House bill, inasmuch as the objections to the first section are conclusive.

The bill as passed by the House went to the Senate and was there considered by its Finance Committee, which reported back a substitute, the main point of which is that it provides for the coinage of silver by the United States as provided by the act of January 18, 1837, or, in other words, opens the mints of the United States to the unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

I did not have the honor, sir, of holding a seat in this House as a Representative of the State of Utah when the original House bill was here considered and passed. Therefore I think it fit that I should not only give my reasons in support of the passage of the Senate amendment, but should also give my reasons why we should accept it in preference to the bill which originally passed this House.

The people of the United States are opposed, and opposed on safe economic grounds, to the creation of bonded debt in time of peace. It has been said by those who own money and seek investment for it in such ways that it will be absolutely safe and beyond the reach of the tax collector, that great public debts are a source of safety, stability, and strength to the nation. The statement has no foundation in fact, and when the theory is carried into the practice of government it is fraught with direful consequences to the people who adopt it. Anything which adds to the burdens of the producing classes of a nation can be nothing but hindrance to them in the race of life. They are those who in the final analysis carry all the burdens of taxation and of private and public debt. How, then, can a nation be strengthened by increasing the burdens of those who create wealth? Useless debt incurred in times of peace is an economic crime, a crime for which not only that generation which incurs it must be punished, but a crime which affects even the children of the third and fourth generations.

And yet to one who studies the financial history of this nation there can be no escape from the conclusion that the men who own and practically control the money of this nation have been laboring for the past twenty-five years steadily, persistently, and cruelly to increase the indebtedness of the nation, that they might find a source from which they could draw additional revenues and additional gains.

The first attempt was to retire the greenback absolutely and completely from circulation. Under the distress which was thus caused came such an upheaval of public sentiment that those who had initiated this movement were forced to give way and a law was passed that the greenback, whenever taken into the Treasury of the United States, should be canceled and reissued.

By the demonetization of silver in 1873, done, as I believe, in the dark by stealth, without the desire of the people and against their present welfare and their future prosperity, a blow was struck at the integrity of the United States, under which it has reeled and staggered for the last twenty-three years. In spite of continued discussion in the Congress of the United States, in spite of Congresses elected pledged to the restoration of the white metal to its use as money, in spite of the growing distress of the agriculturists of the nation and the narrowing profit in all business, in spite of all true principles of monetary science this economic evil has been persisted in, and now, more than twenty years after the great wrong against the people of the United States was wrought, it is sought to take another step which inevitably must stifle industry and overwhelm our people with greater indebtedness.

Though the first attempt to retire the greenbacks had failed, those who had sought to compel their retirement had not yielded their point. The advocates of the coinage of silver have heretofore asserted that the next step in this conspiracy of the money owners against the producers of the United States and the world would be to force the destruction of the national paper currency. Citizens of the Republic have not realized this until within the last few months, but now the purpose is boldly declared and we are

confronted with the proposition that the greenback and silver certificate must be retired from our circulation. And when this shall be done there will be left to us nothing but our gold, our token silver, and such national-bank currency as the owners of bonds and money in their self-interest may allow to be issued to the people of the United States. Then it will be discovered that silver, the silver that we have coined or have held as bullion within our Treasury, is a further menace to the gold standard, and the third and last step in this series of contractions will be taken, and silver, if the scheme can be carried to its ultimate end, will be retired from use, except in so far as it may be utilized as small change by the people. It is well that this purpose of the gold monometallists at last stands revealed, since men more and more will realize the cost to the nation of this futile and foolish attempt to do its business on a money basis which is constantly decreasing as compared with the increase of population and the opportunities which will arise thereunder for the use of money.

If the House stand by the proposition which it made to the Senate and refuse to concur in the amendment made by that body, and the Senate should recede from its position as declared in the amendment presented to us, there would be given to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury the right to issue bonds in times of peace; and for what? To maintain a gold reserve. It is thereby confessed that gold monometallism is a failure; it is thereby confessed that we can not maintain it under the practice of the executive department, unless from time to time we increase our national indebtedness, put greater burdens of interest upon our people and the far greater and farther-reaching burden of a continued fall in prices, and the consequent diminution of the ability of the people to pay the burdens which are thus heaped upon them. When is this purchase of gold to cease?

No one will dispute that there is distress abroad in the land; no man in this House has the temerity, sir, to arise here and claim that the United States are prosperous. In 1893, sitting in the galleries of this Chamber and those of the Senate, I heard men declaim on the great prosperity that would come to America if the purchasing clause of the so-called Sherman Act were repealed. The President of the United States said, in effect, that the purchase of silver by the Government had produced the financial distress which was prevailing in our land, and he called upon the Congress of the United States to pass in a day a bill which would relieve the Government from the necessity of purchasing 4,500,000 ounces, or any amount at all, of the white metal. The bill was passed, the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act was repealed, and no relief came. Instead of that which had been fondly pictured, came the necessity of supplying from time to time gold to maintain the so-called reserve—gold purchased with bonds of the people, purchased sometimes under the terms of a secret contract for less than their market value.

The President and his Secretary of the Treasury have had at all times their means of relief at hand. If they thought it necessary to maintain in the Treasury a given amount of gold, it was at their option at any time to pay out silver upon the obligation of the Government. The people would have been benefited, the bondholders and the gold speculators would have been stopped in their raid upon the Government Treasury. But these high officials refused to exercise this option, and under a law which conveys no authority to them for this purpose purchased gold and used it to pay the running expenses of this Government.

Now, sir, it is proposed to give to these officials, and to those who may succeed them, the right, under cover of law, to issue bonds at any time with which to buy gold in order to maintain the gold reserve. Why does gold leave the Treasury? Simply because it is more valuable for export than it is for use within the United States, and because under the low prices which exist we are unable to export of all of our other products sufficient to pay the demand against us of foreign countries. This would be equally and increasingly true had we no greenbacks, no Treasury notes, no silver dollars.

Mr. Speaker, there is a sound economic reason why bonds should not be issued at such a time as this—a reason which lies at the foundation of monetary science. The people of the United States are suffering from a contraction of their real-money volume. They now have as their real money, money of ultimate redemption, according to the estimates of the Treasury Department, about \$550,000,000 of gold. No doubt this estimate is far beyond what the facts will warrant. In order to account for this sum of gold within the United States it is necessary to assume that outside of the \$175,000,000 which are in the vaults of the banks, and the \$50,000,000 which it is estimated are in daily circulation among the people of the mountain and Pacific Coast States, there are \$310,000,000 in circulation among the people of the East, or hidden away by them. What man of intelligence believes that the people of the East have hoarded any such sum of gold as this? It is not in active circulation. Gold, as we all well know, is not in daily circulation among the people of the North, South, and old West. If they have this enormous sum it must be hoarded by them, with-

drawn from active use as money by the people themselves. And every time that the Government steps into the market and buys \$100,000,000 of gold it contracts the money market in so far and produces an evil effect upon business and production. All men acknowledge that the effect of contraction is to depreciate the price of products; that the expansion of the money volume increases the price of products. By contraction business is hampered, credit must be withdrawn, and failures may ensue. Therefore, instead of easing monetary conditions, the sale of bonds and the purchase of gold with the proceeds must inevitably have the effect of contracting the volume of money in circulation and of forcing down the price of all the products which we produce and offer for sale.

[NOTE.—Since the above speech was made I have received a circular from Dimock & Co., of New York, bankers and brokers, which, in commenting upon the bond issue, confirms my statement above. Extracts from the circular are as follows:

The work necessary to the preservation of a gold standard, so auspiciously begun, is far from complete. During the last five years the Government banks of Europe have added nearly six hundred millions of gold to their reserves. In the same period the New York banks and the United States Treasury have together reduced their gold reserves nearly one hundred millions. Yet all natural conditions were incomparably favorable to the United States. The trouble is unpalatably stated in a recent issue of a well-known politico-economic publication: "The history of our national economic and financial policy since the civil war is an almost unbroken record of fatuous ignorance and empirical experimentation, and insolent disregard of the best established inductions of science." It is of small use to take up one form of Government note, if another ultimately redeemable by the Government is to be issued in its place. The original issue of national-bank notes was monumental folly, and without support from any sound principle of economic or financial science. Gold can only be drawn to this country and kept here by sufficient contraction of the circulation to create the vacuum necessary.

The sentimental advance in stocks which followed the favorable developments of the bond call was even more than we anticipated, but the reaction must soon set in. The pyrotechnics are over and we have now to face for months the most serious contraction of recent times.]

Mr. Speaker, it is claimed upon one side that the source of this difficulty is the lack of revenue, and upon the other side of the Chamber that there is no lack of revenue. The question of revenue does not enter into the consideration of the question before us. In my opinion, at no time and under no conditions should the executive department of our Government have the right to issue and sell the bonds of its people in time of peace. To give the right to the Executive is to grant a power which will be used for the benefit of the few and add burdens to the many. No power except the Representatives of the people sitting in Congress should be granted the opportunity of creating or increasing such indebtedness. Therefore I shall vote to concur in the Senate amendment, because it does not confer upon the Executive the right to sell the bonds of the people in time of peace, while the original bill does grant this power.

It is not my purpose, in what I shall say upon this occasion, to go into any extended discussion of the question presented to us by the Senate amendment. The reasons for and against the free and unlimited coinage of silver, irrespective of the action of other nations, and at the ratio which existed under the law of 1837, have, for the most part, been presented again and again. But the rapid march of events has brought more distinctly into view within the past two years the extent of the evil which is being brought upon the United States by its adherence to the views of the gold monometallists. As briefly as may be, I shall view the question from the standpoint alone of our debtor relations to the nations of Europe and the new trade relations which must inevitably spring up and have arisen between ourselves and the silver-using nations of the world if our present financial policy be maintained.

The United States can not protect her citizens against low prices and maintain a monometallic gold standard so long as she is a debtor to the nations of the world. The people of the United States must pay abroad annually upon the interest of their debts, public and private, in the expenses of their traveling citizens, and to the nations which carry their commerce upon the seas about \$250,000,000 over and above the excess of their exports over imports. This amount, which by some is made even greater, must be paid year by year, or else our foreign indebtedness must increase and must be paid either with the other products of toil or with our gold. We have not produced, and will not produce in the future, gold sufficient to pay this demand upon our resources. During the last year we produced about one-fifth of this sum. Therefore we must pay the balance either with the gold which has accumulated in the United States during the period when silver was continuously coined, or we must pay it with our products, or increase our foreign debts as we have done continuously since 1862.

We can not say to the nations of the world that we demand such or such a price for those products which we send abroad to pay this balance, but we must go into their markets and offer them for such a price that foreign nations will purchase, or we must pay the annual demand upon us by means of the gold which we produce or have accumulated. Therefore, to meet this drain which never ceases, if we would maintain the supply of gold which

we have we must force the price of the product which we export down to a point where we shall be able to meet or undersell the products of other nations.

Since the first blow was aimed at silver, year by year, almost month by month, there has been a steady and persistent decline in the price of our great products which enter into competition in the world's markets with those of other nations, and the effect has been to not only reduce the price of that which we sell abroad, but also to reduce the price of that which we sell at home. The decline in the price of our chief exports has not yet ceased and is shown for 1895 as follows:

About three-fourths of our exports in value consist of the following-named items: Cotton, wheat, wheat flour, bacon and hams, lard, corn, pork, beef, tobacco, and cheese. The value of our exports of the above-named articles in 1894 was \$510,012,686. In 1895 the value of our exports of the same product was only \$452,719,941, a decrease of \$57,292,745, a decrease amounting to 11½ per cent. As compared with the prices of these exports in 1894 there was so great an average fall in their value that had we obtained the prices for these exports which we received in 1894 there would have been placed to our credit by their sale \$552,486,345 instead of the \$452,719,941 which we actually received; so that in 1895, as compared with 1894, upon these ten articles our total loss was \$99,766,404.

Therefore the statement which the Secretary of the Treasury makes wherein, to account for the decrease in the value of our exports, he says that this decrease is due to "the improved crop conditions in other countries" which, he writes, "account largely for the diminished exports of domestic produce in 1895," is without foundation and utterly misleading. The inference to be drawn from the language of the Secretary is that we shipped less of these products abroad in 1895 than we did in 1894, and therefore received less money for them, while the statistics prepared in his own Department and under his own direction show that there was an increase in the amount of the above-named products exported to foreign countries from the United States in 1895 as compared with the year 1894, amounting to 8½ per cent.

Nor will this fall in the price of our chief exports cease with the year 1895. Prices must go lower and lower until the level made necessary by the single gold standard is reached, and when that shall have been done we will be upon the level, not of Mexico, but of China.

The gentleman from Maine in opening this debate with dramatic fervor asked if we wished to Mexicanize the United States. This gentleman, with the adroitness for which he is distinguished, did not pursue the subject further. Other gentlemen upon this floor have undertaken to show that the people of Mexico are indolent, uneducated, oftentimes slaves to their masters, and, generally speaking, utterly unfit to be compared with the citizens of this great Republic. For the sake of argument I will admit that what has been said by the adherents of gold monometallism upon this floor during this debate is true. What follows? If such a people at a time when every gold-using nation in the world, nations which boast themselves as being superior in intelligence and business ability, finds itself upon the verge of bankruptcy and looks with dismay into the future—I say if such a people at such a time are found prosperous and business of all kinds within the limits and under the laws of that people is flourishing, failures are rare, and dividends are large, surely they must have some great advantage which enables them to thrive and prosper when other nations are increasing their debts and the burdens of taxation. It can not be found, according to these gentlemen, in their blood, because they are Mexicans; it can not be found in their customs, because they are antiquated; it can not be found in their energy, because the people are lazy; it can not be their soil, since it is no more fertile than that of gold-using nations; it can not be their sunshine, because it contains no more life-giving power than the rays which fall upon our own people. There can be but one explanation of the continued and increasing prosperity of Mexico, and that is found in the fact that she uses silver as money and has the advantage of the difference in exchange over gold-using nations.

The following extract from the Mexican Herald will show the exact condition of affairs with relation to matters therein spoken of:

Mexico is now in position to invade the markets of the west coast of South America in competition with Germany, England, and all other countries on a gold basis. It is very significant that Mexican print works are now selling goods direct to ports on the Pacific coast of Mexico, and taking the market away from the gold-standard countries, which can only be done now because the west coast is quickly accessible.

One of the greatest merchants, forty years in business and a large importer from Europe, says it is no longer possible for the United States or Europe to compete with Mexican mills, which can turn out excellent cottons at \$1.25 less per piece. Mexico is growing more cotton yearly, and will soon be able to supply itself without bringing in American cotton; and as the growing and manufacturing are done on the basis of cheap labor and silver money, Mexico should aspire to enter the lists as an exporter of cotton goods.

There is an ample field here for the investment of capital in cotton mills, also in paper and other products. Mexican woolsens are now being turned out of superior quality, and thousands of people are refusing to buy expensive

English goods. Tailors are supplying their growing demands at prices less than one-half those charged for European goods. For example, trousers are being sold at \$5 per pair which if made of English goods would cost \$14. Mexican manufacturers are very prosperous, and there is undoubtedly a chance for a modern shoe factory. The policy of the Government is to render Mexico independent as far as possible of the foreign gold-standard countries. This tends to give employment to railways, and the policy of the Mexican Central Railway in favoring every Mexican industry on its various lines is cordially commended in Government circles. The road has become thoroughly Mexican in policy, with resultant higher earnings.

Hundreds of Americans are here, among them many capitalists, and there is a great interest shown in coffee lands and lands for general agricultural purposes. Sugar planters were never more prosperous than now, and this industry can not easily be overdone, as the domestic demand is not filled, and the profits will be large for many years. The National Bank of Mexico will in May declare a dividend of 17 per cent and add heavily to its reserve. The active capital of the bank is \$8,000,000, and the reserve \$5,000,000.

I will also submit the following letter, written me by a gentleman of standing in the City of Mexico, and which bears out the statements made by the silver men upon this floor and elsewhere that under the vivifying effect of silver coinage Mexico has entered upon an era of prosperity like unto that which we enjoyed from 1850 to 1873 under the impulse given our nation by the increasing flow of gold from California and Australia:

CITY OF MEXICO, January 18, 1896.

DEAR SIR: Answering your favor of the 12th instant, I send you under separate cover some printed matter and data referring to Mexico, prepared by this office. In this country the silver question is not discussed, as it is a question which interests us very little, being already on a silver basis. The prosperity of this country has undoubtedly been greatly aided by our silver coinage, as we have been entirely exempt from panics and financial crises of all and every nature. And although within the last five years there have been two droughts, which have resulted in partial losses of the corn crop—the most important crop of this country—still the receipts of the Government from taxes have gone steadily on increasing, and this in spite of the fact that there has been no increase in taxation. In fact, taxes have been reduced during this period.

The effect of the silver basis on this country appears to be about as follows: Native capital now remains in the country and is invested in home industries and enterprises, instead of being sent to Europe for investment as formerly. Also, as the income of our more important or wealthy families is entirely in silver, the premium on gold has resulted in keeping their money in this country and now a larger proportion of them remain at home and spend their money here instead of throwing it away in Europe.

Another thing: The premium on gold has increased in a most wonderful manner the exports of Mexico. We now export and make large profits on various articles which in former years it was not profitable to export. At the same time prices in this country have been but little affected by the premium on gold. I have been a resident of this Republic twenty-six years, and during that time intimately connected with financial and mercantile houses. I would say that a Mexican dollar buys to-day as much in this city as it did when I came here, and at that time a Mexican dollar was worth \$1.10 in gold in San Francisco. The price of corn, beans, flour, wearing apparel, etc., is almost exactly the same as in former years. Of course there are fluctuations due to good or bad crops, but the average cost of all the various articles which go to make up the expenses of a family are almost exactly the same as when gold was at par.

You will note by the printed matter sent you the wonderful increase in the income of the Government, and also of the Mexican Central Railway, which I think will compare favorably with that of governments or railroads on a gold basis. Also, the price of Mexican securities has steadily been advancing in spite of the increased premium on gold. The fact is that an abundant supply of good silver dollars, which everybody can get and everybody can spend, seems to make people more cheerful, harder workers, and induces the capitalist to go into new enterprises. Although there are bank notes in circulation in this country, they are represented by an actual store of silver dollars, so that at a moment's notice the same can be converted into coin. They are, in fact, like the gold certificates of the United States, except that ours are issued by incorporated banks. Mercantile failures are rare, and manufacturing establishments, especially those engaged in the manufacture of wool and cotton, are paying large dividends. Banks are also paying from 10 to 16 per cent a year on their capital stock. While the perfect peace and order which Mexico has enjoyed for the last twenty years has had a great effect on the development and prosperity of this country, I also believe that our silver basis has helped us prosper as much as any other cause. Also, another element which has helped this country greatly in all mercantile transactions is the stability of our currency. It obviates the necessity of an inverted pyramid of paper supported on a small gold basis, and there are none of those sudden fluctuations and variations in prices which result from a less sound financial system. The capitalist or the merchant knows that coin can always be procured, and that its value for purchasing purposes in this Republic has had but little, if any, change within the last century. The income of this company, which increased \$1,070,000 in 1895 over its income in 1894, shows in a striking degree the constant development of the country. In other words, a sound currency and fixed value has stimulated in the past, and is stimulating to-day, all mercantile enterprises, and the results can be seen in the dividends paid by the banks and mercantile enterprises of the country.

The premium on gold also tends to bring it to this country. European investors, taking advantage of the premium on gold, are more willing to come here and make investments in mining, manufacturing, etc., than if this disparity between gold and silver did not exist. While doubling their capital on bringing it into Mexico they can go into production of articles for export which are sold for gold, as, for instance, coffee, rubber, hides, vanilla, and kindred products, so that practically they double their capital and yet receive a gold interest on their investment.

A silver basis seems to tend to the increase of a larger number of small incomes rather than a small number of larger ones.

Any further information or statistics you would like I will take pleasure in forwarding if you will indicate to me what you desire.

Yours, truly,

A. V. TEMPLE,
Manager Bureau of Information.

MR. CLARENCE E. ALLEN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In Consular Reports No. 182, for November, 1895, the consul-general at Shanghai makes a statement which supports the position which I have here taken—that the effect of the demonetization of silver by European nations and by ourselves has been to force

down the price of those products which we export. The statement is as follows:

Stability in the value of silver is the one desideratum of the foreign merchant in the far East; and it is pointed out that fluctuations in it must really affect the well-being of the entire population of the United Kingdom. * * * Under the influence of cheap silver the volume of exports continues to expand, and the European consumer reaps the benefit of their cheapness in gold prices. The fall in silver and low freights have combined to enable the majority of the stable exports of China to be laid down in Europe at about one-half the cost at which they could be sold twenty years ago.

At the time when the United States entered upon the suicidal policy of destroying one-half of our money of ultimate redemption she found a remunerative market for her products in the marts of Europe.

In spite of the efforts which had been made by England in years past to establish the cotton industry in and the export of wheat from India, the United States had been able to demand and command a fair price for her wheat and cotton. Since that period not only India but Russia and the Argentine Republic and all the States upon a silver or paper basis have been enabled, through the difference in exchange between gold and silver, to enter the markets of the world and to force down the price of the great products which we export, and must export to pay our foreign debt and the interest thereon, to such prices that to-day there is no adequate recompense in any part of the United States for the planter, the farmer, or the ranchman. This could result because in the countries which have continued to use silver silver has the same purchasing power that it had before we recklessly, improvidently, and criminally demonetized silver.

A silver dollar in these countries buys the same amount of labor, pays debts, and purchases equally the products of the country even as it did before the gold-using nations finally effected the demonetization of silver within their limits. Thereby silver-using nations have erected a barrier against imports from gold-using nations which amounts to an ad valorem protective tariff of 100 per cent upon all goods imported, or, to state it another way, they have given their own people an export duty. Every bushel of wheat, pound of cotton, or peck of corn which they send abroad, since their governments retain the full use of silver, can be sold for one-half the former price thereof as measured in gold, because that gold price of such exports will purchase in silver as much labor or as much of the products of such silver-using nations as it would before we placed our financial affairs and the welfare of our people in the hands of the British. And if we would sell in the nations of the world, we must meet this advantage which silver-using nations enjoy by lowering the price of our products until we can command, or at least share, in this foreign trade.

This burden hitherto has been borne by the farmers and planters of this nation because their products have been those which for the most part have been sent abroad to pay the demands against us, but not only has the difference in exchange value between gold and silver reduced to extremity our farmers and planters, by reducing the price of their products below that which would allow a reasonable recompense, but it has compelled the silver-using nations to begin to manufacture for themselves. Under these laws which have been passed by the gold-using nations, where once it took a dollar in silver to buy a certain product from them, it now takes two silver dollars to buy the same product at the same price. Hence the silver-producing nations were compelled or induced by the very force of circumstances to establish within their own borders factories and plants which would produce for themselves that which they had theretofore been accustomed to buy abroad. Thus has the yarn trade of England in the Orient been destroyed; thus year by year are the East Indians finding themselves driven to the wall by the competition which Chinese and Japanese manufacturers are forcing upon them. And now the people of China and Japan stand ready to contend with us, not only for the market of the world, but for our own better and greater market.

The Republican party is the party of protection. Since the foundation of the Republic it and its predecessors in governmental policy have steadily held that the toiler in America must be protected against the cheap labor of foreign countries. To that doctrine Republicans heartily subscribe who believe that the true policy of our nation is to produce and coin all the gold and silver possible to be obtained. They yield to no one in their allegiance to the fundamental principle of the Republican party. By their votes for the last twenty years the great Republican West has made it possible for their party to maintain control of the United States Senate. By their votes they have sustained the fundamental principles of the Republican party. By their votes year by year the Republican party has been assisted to victory, and because we now and at all times announce ourselves to be unreservedly in favor of the coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, with or without the consent of any nation, we do not give the right to any man to deny our Republicanism. And we of the West, who were called silver barons until it was suddenly discovered that we could produce gold cheaper than we could produce silver, say and believe that there can be no adequate protection to American industry

until silver is restored to its rightful place as a money metal, with coinage privileges equal with those of gold.

Already, by madly holding to gold monometallism, the manufacturers of the East, whom many of you represent, have so reduced the purchasing power of the agriculturists of the nation that their best market, the only great market of the world, has been circumscribed and constricted instead of growing and expanding as it might have grown and expanded had silver retained its constitutional prerogative.

But now another danger confronts these manufacturers, who have put their trust in the golden calf and blindly followed the behest of the English owners of money. Not only is the home market weakened and depressed by the contraction in the world's supply of metallic money, but no longer are Americans to control that market, let alone to extend the sale of their wares to sister nations which use the white metal, as our Constitution declares we shall do.

In support of the position which I have here taken, and which rests upon the eternal principles of monetary science, I wish to submit the following observations of one of the keenest and brightest newspaper men of the United States, Mr. J. P. Young, and some of the quotations from leading newspapers which he published in the San Francisco Chronicle December 13, 1895:

On the 15th of June last the Japan Weekly Gazette published a memorial drawn up by the Yokohama Chamber of Commerce, in which the fact was pointed out "that Japan is becoming a great manufacturing country and rapidly advancing to a position of marked prominence in many branches of the Eastern trade." Figures furnished by the agricultural department show that the first cotton-spinning mill was erected in Japan in 1863, but twenty years later there were only 16 mills in operation, with 43,704 spindles. Since then the industry has advanced very rapidly. At the end of 1888 the number of spindles had increased to 88,140, and five years later there were 46 mills, running 600,000 spindles. The memorial above alluded to commenting on the department report, says that "there is a prospect of even more rapid development," and adds, "We think it unnecessary to refer in detail to the many other manufactures in which Japan is not only supplying home wants but is successfully competing with Europe in the markets of China, the Straits Settlements, and India."

Regarding Japanese trade with the United States and India, the memorial says:

We anticipate that if exchange with America remains at a very low level and the rupee continues to be held above its bullion value in India, China will eventually furnish to Japan all the cotton she needs, except such staples as can not be grown on Chinese soil. In evidence of this possibility the import of raw cotton from China into Japan increased from 61,328,021 pounds in 1891 to 95,115,180 pounds in 1893.

So, if the conclusion of these Eastern observers is correct, the fatuous monetary policy of Great Britain and the United States will make it impossible for either India or the United States to compete with China in the matter of supplying raw cotton to Japan. Thus we shall soon be deprived of the sorry satisfaction of furnishing the progressive inland Empire with the raw material for manufacturing the goods she promises to ultimately deluge us with.

The British Trade Journal of a recent date says:

Among the trades more recently introduced in Japan is the manufacture of watches. In 1893 Japan imported more than 103,000 watches from Switzerland, France, Germany, and the United States. The object of the new Japanese factory is to produce a watch of the cheaper kind. * * * But it seems not unlikely that the new concern will manufacture a better class of timekeeper if the demands should necessitate such a step.

There is no doubt about this latter point. Information from another source than that above quoted makes it clear that the American who is at the back of this new Japan enterprise is merely paving the way to the creation of a great industry in which he proposed to take advantage of the undoubted skill of the oriental workmen, in order to turn out both high and low grade watches which will successfully compete with the best watches made in the Western World.

An English journal early in the present year remarked:

Japan has certainly prospered on cheap silver. Through the instrumentality of the white metal she has made large strides toward industrial independence, and has begun to be recognized by the older manufacturing nations as a formidable competitor. Japanese cotton and linen goods and other manufactured products are invading markets where a few years ago they were unknown, and it is interesting to note that the increased importation of such articles into the United States is beginning to cause uneasiness to American manufacturers.

If the latter statement is true, the American manufacturers have effectually succeeded in concealing their uneasiness. The manufacturing industry in the United States is a powerful one, and if those concerned in it once awakened to the disadvantages under which they are laboring in their competition with the East, they will speedily make their influence felt. But it is reasonable to assume that the American manufacturers are still in the dark, and agree with the Boston Herald that the people of silver-using countries are on a lower plane of civilization, and their efforts to develop manufacturing industries are therefore to be despised. Meanwhile Japan, one of the silver countries on a lower plane of civilization, is increasing her productions at a rate which seems rapid when compared with our own advantages. We have made some progress in the production of pottery, but we venture to say that the Japanese, who in 1884 employed 19,000 in turning out

73,500,000 pieces, and four years later employed 27,000 men, who produced 126,000,000 pieces, a rate of increase that has been well maintained since, have no reason to shrink from a comparison. The extension of their cotton and silk industry has already been noted as being on a threatening scale, menacing a competition which Western people will not be able to stand up against.

The Textile Mercury, an English trade publication, expressed the belief a few days ago that the mischief had already been accomplished, and remarked:

It is high time for the English cotton spinner and manufacturer to look out for suitable fields to which he may emigrate.

The writer added:

It really looks as if the growth of England's cotton industry at home had reached its limit, and that English capital engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods would hereafter be forced to seek locations in India and China in order to find profitable employment. * * * English manufacturers can only hope to maintain their supremacy in Eastern markets by producing the goods on the spot.

The question for American manufacturers to consider is whether they could maintain themselves against a competition which has nearly proved fatal to Lancashire. Should there be an exodus of English capital to the Orient for the purpose of establishing manufacturing industries in China and Japan, how could we in this country hope to successfully exclude the flood of cheap goods that would be poured into the United States? The present tariff scarcely offers any obstacle to the European manufacturer operating under all the disadvantages of the gold standard. How, then, could we hope to successfully compete with the same manufacturer after he has transferred his machinery to a country where labor is phenomenally cheap and is compensated in a metal which, when measured in terms of gold, is likewise cheap? The manufacturer, under such circumstances, would ask in vain for an increase of the protective tariff, for the enlightened opinion of the agriculturist would be against the granting of such a request while the producer is subjected to the destructive influence of a constantly decreasing measurer of values. When the money of the world was composed of gold and silver the farmer could afford to stand shoulder to shoulder with the manufacturer in the United States and assist in building up a great manufacturing industry. The achievement of such a result meant for him increasing markets near his own door, and that, translated into plain English, meant increased profits through the diminution of cost of transportation and the elimination of the middleman. But the changed conditions preclude the idea of agriculture making common cause with manufactures. The farmers are now perfectly aware that the tremendous fall in the price of their products is due to the appreciation of the value of gold, and they will not be so foolish as to consent to rivet their shackles more firmly by assisting in artificially raising the prices of manufactured products while no steps are taken to prevent the depreciation of the prices of the products of the soil.

If this view is correct, unless something is done to restore silver and thus put all nations on a plane of equality the gold-using countries must prepare to have their markets invaded by the manufacturer of the silver-using countries, not only by those of the Orient, but those of Russia as well. The Textile Mercury, in the same article in which it bewails the decadence of the English cotton industry, also describes the prosperity of the Russian cotton manufacturer. It says:

While the English cotton manufacturer is in dire distress, in Russia the trade is in a highly prosperous condition. The mills of Moscow and other cotton spinning and weaving districts are paying dividends of from 25 to 33 per cent. Spinners have all their productions bought up into the middle of next year. A manufacturer who wants yarn now can only purchase it at enhanced values from the middleman or speculator; it is not to be had from any other source.

Russia, according to the theories of the Boston Herald, should be on a still lower plane of civilization than the silver-using countries of the Orient and of Central and South America, for its chief currency is an inconvertible credit note, although the legal unit of money is the silver ruble of 100 kopecks. But instead of Russia being in a condition to excite the commiseration of philanthropists in gold-using countries she actually is enjoying a degree of manufacturing prosperity which fills with envy the ruined cotton manufacturers of England and the United States.

This advantage has also operated to deprive English shipbuilders of a share of trade. At a meeting of the China Mutual Steamship Company, Mr. Maitland, the president, remarked that—

The working expenses had been considerably reduced, almost entirely by the great fall of the gold price of silver. * * * For the repairs of their steamers very large amounts of money were annually needed, and they had already commenced to make repairs in Singapore, China, and Japan. With the dollar at 2 shillings the skilled Asiatic will work for a month for less than a skilled British subject will work for a week.

This testimony regarding the danger to the shipbuilding industry is supplemented by that of the chairman of the Peninsular and Oriental, the greatest steamship line plying between the Orient and Europe, who has not hesitated to predict that if the Chinese and Japanese continue to retain the advantage which the excessive appreciation of the value of gold gives them, the new

vessels of the company will be built in those countries; and he adds that it is not at all improbable that the Chinese and the Japanese in the near future will build ships to be operated in Western waters.

On the 20th of September, 1894, the Hongkong Press published an article from the pen of H. Kopsch, F. R. G. S., in which he pointed out the reason why the English shipbuilding industry was suffering from the appreciation of gold. He enforced his views by practical illustrations.

Some years ago—

He said—

a mandarin sought to obtain estimates for a steamship launch in anticipation of his being permitted to introduce steam power on one of the lakes of the Empire. The tender submitted for the launch was £1,000, or 5,000 Mexican dollars. Subsequently the same officer renewed his inquiries and was amazed to find that the launch which he could have had built for 5,000 Mexican dollars when he first made his inquiries would cost him 10,000 Mexican dollars under the changed conditions. Permission has since been given to navigate certain inner waters of China, but owing to the high price of gold the Chinese are themselves making the boilers and engines instead of getting them from England.

This same writer also noted the fact that between 1884 and 1893 there were 399 steamers, aggregating 23,094 tons, built and engined in Hongkong, and he adds:

Twenty years ago had anyone prophesied that Chinese would ever compete with British shipwrights and engine makers, he would have been ridiculed; nevertheless the appreciation of gold has so reduced wages as to make it possible for China to compete with the West in the manufacture of articles for which the raw materials have to be imported.

If the Chinese are able to compete successfully, even when compelled to import the raw materials, as in the case of the manufacture of steam launches, what will they not be able to accomplish when, under the impetus which the planting of industries in a country naturally gives to production, they begin to pay attention to the development of their iron and coal mines and to the extension of the cotton-producing industry?

The extent and rapidity of this development should not be underrated or its significance misunderstood, as it seems to have been by some Englishmen and by our consul at Tientsin, who in a recent report to the United States Department of State, said that he had received information from a reliable source that the customs tsaotai at that port, representing officially and as an individual the big cotton mills then in course of erection at Shanghai and elsewhere in central Asia, had placed orders with a European firm in Tientsin for cotton-mill machinery amounting to nearly a million dollars (Mexican). Consul Reed, who gave this information, desired the attention of American manufacturers of such machinery to be called to the fact that many mills were springing up in various parts of China. This information was duly published in the consular reports issued by our Government and was reprinted in one or two trade journals. It excited no comment, however, and no doubt those under whose observations it came only looked upon the item as something concerning the manufacturing of machinery. They did not perceive its more important bearing and that the temporary advantage which might be derived from the sale of some cotton machinery would be followed by the loss of the American cotton-goods trade with China, which aggregated \$2,851,957 in 1894, \$2,772,065 of which consisted of uncolored cloths, which may be easily made by beginners enjoying the peculiar advantages which the appreciation of gold and the state of the labor market have given the Chinese.

What these advantages are may be inferred from a report of the board of directors of Boyd & Co., Limited, a ship repairing and machine manufacturing company doing business in Shanghai, made to stockholders on the 30th of April, 1894. The report, after remarking that "the general working for the past year shows a favorable result which has been largely contributed by the local industries which are springing up around us," goes on to predict still greater activity, provided certain restrictions which the Chinese have placed about manufacturers are removed. Discussing this phase of the subject, the North China Daily News says:

If this discouragement were only withdrawn and private capitalists and companies were allowed to undertake the business, Shanghai in two or three years would be a forest of chimney stacks, and the demand for machinery would startle the manufacturers in Lancashire. The cotton is to be had on the spot, labor is inexhaustible and very reliable; coal is cheap. There are no embarrassing factory acts, so that the machinery could be run twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week, and there is an unlimited market at a price for all that is produced. Once withdrawn the present restrictions and there will be a wonderful outburst here [Shanghai] of industrial activity.

The Item, Philadelphia, Pa., in its issue of December 14, 1895, says:

The Japanese consul-general at New York says that he thinks Japan is on the eve of building up a large trade of Japanese products in the United States. He says Japan has an ample supply of low-cost coal and is buying and making the best machinery for a large export trade.

He adds that hemp and cotton carpets, wall paper, copper and bronze ware, crystal ware, silk handkerchiefs, raw silk, pongee, umbrellas, rags, beer, tobacco, coal, and matches are among the leaders.

Besides these, Japanese agents are now offering bicycles at \$12.50; sashes, doors, and blinds, and wool carpets at astonishingly low prices; in fact, no line is now drawn limiting what that country proposes to do in selling to the United States, as well as to all gold-basis countries, so long as silver continues depreciated.

Take the above bicycle for an example of all the other goods. It is claimed equal to the best in this country, and at the price mentioned is delivered duty and freight free in San Francisco.

The \$12.50 received for each bicycle is in gold. This is sold for silver, equaling \$30 to the Japanese manufacturer. He pays \$15 of his silver dollars for making, freight, duties, etc., and clears a net profit of \$5 in silver.

This same method of profit is available to the Japanese for everything they are able to produce, as well as selling coal in the San Francisco market. The consul-general says that coal would be so sold now if the ships had a return cargo.

The following is from the Chicago Evening Post:

When Japan entered the sisterhood of civilized nations no power gave her a warmer welcome than the American Republic. We extolled her energy, her ingenuity, and her enterprise, and hailed her as the "United States of the East."

To-day we are face to face with the fact that this young-old Empire—old in years and young with the vigor of a new civilization—is already proving a formidable rival to us in the market of the world and at our own doors. The conditions of Japanese labor are a standing menace to American labor and trade. The gravity of this danger was illustrated yesterday in a report presented to the National Association of Manufacturers at Central Music Hall. It was pointed out by the chairman of the committee on Oriental Industries that articles of Japanese manufacture now appear in our Eastern cities rivaling and underselling American articles suitable for similar purposes. Japanese matting is now crowding out cheaper kinds of Philadelphia carpets.

Japanese rugs, made in imitation of American patterns, are sold in large quantities in preference to American rugs of a higher value. Brushes are sold at retail in Eastern cities for about the American value of the unmanufactured bristles. American watch-case makers are selling to Japan cases for excellent movements, made there for this market. There are 46 cotton mills in Japan, with about 600,000 spindles. New mills are being erected, and Japan threatens to become a bold and large competitor for the trade of the world in cotton fabrics. The Japanese use the latest improved American and European machinery in this and other industries established by them. They begin with mechanical appliances that are superior to those found in some American mills.

There is no use blinking at the facts. Some of our manufacturing industries are gravely menaced by this rivalry of a country where skilled labor may be had at the cost of 10 cents or 15 cents a day, or less than one-tenth of the cost of such labor in our own country. To-day tens of thousands of our laborers are idle. Our markets are invaded and the American workman, like the American manufacturer, is the victim of an Oriental competitor, in whom rare skill and fine taste are joined with a simplicity of domestic habits which enables them to support life in comfort upon a tenth of what it costs to do this in the United States. This competition will grow keener and keener. Japan will not confine herself to her present efforts. Her people are introducing a great variety of manufacturing industries, all using improved machinery, and they are imitating the patterns and inventions of the Western nations with impunity, because there is no protection for either the patents or trade-marks of foreigners in Japan. The importance of this condition of things can not be overestimated.

Already the manufacturers of this country begin to appreciate this fact; already they see that while they have been sitting in fancied security, calmly viewing the distress of the farmer, a distress brought about simply and alone by the demonization of silver, they have been preparing themselves for the same disaster through which their fellows were passing. The manufacturers of the United States can not compete with a silver-using nation, even when the conditions of labor are the same, because by the use of silver such a nation has a protective tariff against imports from the United States and has an export duty upon her own exports. To-day, into the port of San Francisco are coming goods manufactured in silver-using nations, with which our own people can not compete. Doors, sashes, all kinds of wood products, watches, bicycles, silks, and the finest quality of cotton goods in increasing quantities are being imported from China and Japan and sold at rates which make it impossible for American manufacturers to compete therewith.

We of the West feel the swell of the incoming tide. Soon with majestic sweep it will roll in with ever-increasing power and might, and wherever in its steady, onward, and growing volume it shall force its way American industry, based upon the quicksand of gold monometallism, will forever sink beneath its flood.

Onward through the grand canyons of our incomparable West; over the great highways of commerce designed and constructed by men who put not their trust in English greed nor in English finance for the American nation; across the plains which nurtured, educated, and made great a Grant and a Lincoln, that mighty tide of foreign industry, fostered, upheld, and become great by adherence to sound monetary laws, will force its way until the nation shall arouse itself and, employing every defense given it, stay and turn back the swelling wave of Asiatic industrial invasion by the coinage and use of silver money. [Applause.]

Mr. DANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall occupy but a very brief portion of time this evening. We sent over to the Senate from this House in the early part of the session a bill entitled "An act to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue." As a matter personal to myself, I will state that I voted against that bill. I did not believe that it was in keeping with the doctrines of the Republican party. I believed that it was the business of the Republican party to raise revenue and not borrow money.

I am gratified, Mr. Speaker, that that bill has had the lines of the Senate drawn through every word of it. But they have sent back to us, in place and in lieu of the bill I just referred to, one entitled "An act to restore the coinage of silver, and for other purposes," and to that measure I am more opposed than to the

bill that went from the House to the Senate. I take notice, Mr. Speaker, that the free-silver party, as they are termed in the country, demand nothing less than the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. In the convention that assembled in this city a few weeks ago to forward the silver interest, that was the one solitary feature of their party action—free and unlimited coinage of silver, 16 to 1. Nothing less than that will answer the purposes of those who are pressing this measure upon the country.

No proposition here to coin the American product; no proposition here to limit in any degree the free coinage of all the silver of the world. Mexico, Peru, wherever there may be an accumulation of 50, 60, or 70 cent silver—the attempt in this bill is to provide that it shall be coined by the Government of the United States, coined in our mints, and that we shall issue to the owner of the bullion a silver dollar, "In God we trust," backed by the credit of the American Government. Nothing short of that will answer the purpose of those who demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country.

There is a section of this bill which demands the immediate coinage of what is known as the seigniorage. What that may be or what it is I am unable myself to tell. It is some supposed interest that the United States has in the silver bullion purchased under what is known as the Sherman purchasing act.

This seigniorage is said to amount to some sixty or sixty-five million dollars if coined. And that, Mr. Speaker, would represent the actual profit of those who sold this silver bullion to the Government, would be their gain, their clear profit over and above the value of their commodity in the market. The Government bought from them, during the life of that act, silver bullion at the market value. And it is said that there is in the free and unlimited coinage of silver a profit of sixty or sixty-five million dollars over and above the actual value of the bullion.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is something behind this free and unlimited coinage of silver that looks to the very great enhancement of the value of the silver mines. The owners of silver bullion, by having the Government put its stamp upon their commodity and turn it over to them with the guarantee of the Government stamp upon it, would of course realize a great advantage. It strikes me that the American people are not ready to say that the owners of silver bullion, which brings to-day in the market not more than 53 cents, shall have it coined and get the benefit of the credit of the Government for the other 47 cents. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is any well-informed advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country who believes that at the present time we can maintain what is termed the parity between gold and silver with free and unlimited coinage of the silver metal.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that while men talk about bimetallicism, and about the use of both gold and silver as money metals, if we should pass this bill it would be practically silver monometallism, and it would be but a very short time before gold would disappear entirely from this country. There is gold in the country now. When the Treasury asks for the bids of the American people for the bonds of the Government, there proves to be more than five hundred millions of free gold that is offered for the bonds of the United States. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we should adopt this measure we should lose all this volume of gold, and we would at once take our place among the silver countries of the world.

There is nothing more sensitive than the money of ultimate redemption. I can remember very well that in the early fifties, after the discovery of gold in California, the bullion value of the silver in the "dollar of the fathers" became greater than its coin value. There was only a slight shade of difference—perhaps 2½ cents to the dollar; yet every dollar of six or seven millions that had been coined up to that time was bought up as a commodity and taken out of the country; and to take the place of the silver dollars thus taken out of the country we coined a little gold dollar about as big as your finger nail, which was to take the place of the silver dollar that, by reason of the 2½ cents excess in its bullion value as compared with its coin value, had passed out of the country, and passed out, let me say, forever.

I remember very well that when the resumption act was passed the subsidiary coin began to come out from its hiding places as early as 1878, and by the time the act took effect in 1879 the subsidiary silver coin was out in the pockets of the people, but never one of the standard dollars. Eight million of them, perhaps, had been coined up in 1873. They passed entirely away from the country and out of circulation. Somebody may have one as a keepsake or a pocket piece. I speak of this only to show that where the value of the metal is not maintained at a parity you can not maintain the coinage at parity.

Mr. Speaker, I voted in the Forty-fifth Congress for a bill similar to this. At that time we had no coin in circulation in the country. Gold and silver had been out of sight since 1862; and for fifteen years we had no coin in circulation. I believed at that

time that the country could stand the free coinage of silver, and I voted for that measure. I believed that it would be a great aid to resumption; and we were aiming at resumption then, straining every nerve to reach a point where we should see again the money of ultimate redemption on the counters and in the hands of the people.

Mr. Speaker, that measure was passed by both the House and the Senate and was vetoed by President Hayes. Afterwards there was a compromise upon what is known as the Bland-Allison Act. I am free to say I think that vote of mine for free coinage of silver in 1877 was a mistake. I do not believe we could have maintained the parity between these metals even for a few years if the coinage had been free and unlimited.

Mr. Speaker, it is said in this House and in the country, and we hear it wherever there is an argument made by an advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, that values have been shrinking ever since 1873; that farm lands have been going down; that the farmer is getting poor pay for his commodities. And all this is charged to the demonetization of silver in 1873. I shall not thrash over a bit of that old straw about the demonetization of silver in 1873. I only know that from 1873 down to 1892 this country enjoyed a season of great prosperity. I know that of the national debt of \$2,160,000,000 in 1873 there remained at the close of the Administration of President Harrison less than \$600,000,000. I know that during that period from 1873 down to 1892 we built a hundred thousand miles of railroad in this country. I know that we had prosperity almost unrivaled during all those years. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must look in other directions to account for the shrinkage of values of farm lands and farm commodities.

If you will stop a moment and look around the world it strikes me that you can see some reason why the value of farm lands in this country should decrease—why the products of the farm should shrink in value. A good deal has been said here to-day about wheat. Why, sir, the time was, a third of a century ago, when the United States commanded the markets of the world, so far as that commodity was concerned.

We supplied the deficiency of western Europe. How is it to-day? Cheap labor is producing cheap wheat in India; cheap labor is producing cheap wheat in Russia, and the same is the case in South America. And the cheap production of that commodity around the world that we must compete with whenever we leave our own market here and go into the markets of western Europe is no doubt one of the causes that has had the effect of reducing largely the price of wheat in the last two years. We must remember that England, France, and Germany are looking around the world for cheap bread, England especially. She has been engaged for the last third of a century in hunting for cheap bread for her people wherever she can find it.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. DANFORD. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. The gentleman was speaking of the cheap wheat of India. Is it not bought with the silver bullion that they buy here so cheaply? If silver bullion here, in other words, had free mintage, would they not have to pay more for it, and does not that cheap bullion which they purchase from us come in competition with the cheap wheat of America through this medium of purchase in India?

Mr. DANFORD. I care nothing for the price of wheat in India. I am speaking of it when it comes to western Europe.

It was said here to-day that the value of wheat in India, or rather the average price last year, was, I believe, 68 cents a bushel. I think that was very greatly overestimated. My recollection is that the wheat of India when it comes into the market of western Europe is sold for about 48 to 50 cents a bushel, and one-half of that goes to the British ship that carries it from India to Liverpool. Not only the cheap wheat of India, but Russia, as I said a short time ago, is engaged in raising wheat, and so also is South

America, and this cheap production comes in competition with American produce, and that has tended to bring down the price in the markets of the world. So also with wool, another commodity in which we in the West are very greatly interested. The price of wool has been going down gradually for years, not altogether since the repeal of the McKinley law, but even before the repeal of the McKinley law wool had been declining in price, and why? Because wool was being produced in Australia, in South America, and in South Africa—wool produced by cheap labor; and the competition of the American woolgrowers in the markets of the world from these cheap countries brought about this condition largely before the passage of the present tariff act putting wool on the free list. But that gave it a blow which was fatal to the interest.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we are to look to the free and unlimited coinage of silver in this country to restore the value of farm lands or the value of farm products among our people. I do not believe that the free and unlimited coinage of silver will reach the trouble that the country is in. But we must prepare in some way, sir, to meet these conditions in the world, in Australia and in South America, as to cheap production of wool.

Now, if I believed that free and unlimited coinage of silver would benefit those who have been most affected in the last quarter of a century by the cheapening of farm lands and of farm products, I would vote cheerfully for the Senate measure. But I do not believe that there is any relief in that direction; I do not believe that there is any relief in debauching our currency. It has been my observation through life that men who deal in stocks, who deal in money, and men who control great enterprises, are men who, as a rule, are able in the main to take care of themselves. It is the plain man in this country who needs an honest Government more than any other, and it is the plain man before others that needs honest money. The men who manipulate stocks, who manipulate great moneyed transactions, can and will always take care of themselves in the great struggle of life; but, as was remarked a few moments ago, the man who has but a single dollar needs a good round dollar, not a 10-cent short dollar, but a full honest dollar.

Now, as to the quantity of money. It would seem from the second section of this bill, the one providing for the immediate coinage of the seigniorage, that those who advocate this bill advocate it from the belief that there is not a sufficient quantity of money in the country to-day to transact the business of the country with. Now, if you will look back to the condition of things as to money at the close of the civil war, you will find that we had in 1865 a little over \$700,000,000 of money in circulation, a per capita of about \$20.50 for each man, woman, and child in the land. With that volume of money we had paid off the soldiers; we paid them in the field; we had raised great armies; we had built railroads, built cities; we had progressed at the North here in the way of building up the country as we never had at any other period of our existence as a nation and a people. We have at this time, in the year 1896—we have near \$23 per capita of actual money, near \$800,000,000 being in the Treasury and something like \$1,600,000,000 in circulation among the people. That sixteen hundred million dollars makes a per capita of nearly \$23.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DANFORD. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. I do not wish to take the gentleman's time, but has not the gentleman made a mistake in his calculation of the per capita by not remembering that practically one-third of the population of the United States from 1861 to 1865 were in rebellion and did not use any part, practically speaking, of the money which we had?

Mr. DANFORD. I am giving the per capita of 1865, and I will publish a table prepared by the Comptroller of the Currency upon this point. It is as follows.

Specie and bank-note circulation of the United States in the years specified from 1800 to 1859.

[Prepared by Loans and Currency Division, Treasury Department.]

Year.	Number of banks and branches.	Estimated bank notes outstanding.	Estimated specie in United States.	Total money in United States.	Specie in Treasury.	Money in circulation.	Population.	Per capita.
1800	\$10,500,000	\$17,500,000	\$28,000,000	*\$1,500,000	\$26,500,000	5,308,483	\$4.99
1810	28,000,000	30,000,000	58,000,000	*3,000,000	55,000,000	7,239,881	7.60
1820	44,800,000	24,300,000	69,100,000	*2,000,000	67,100,000	9,653,822	6.96
1830	61,000,000	33,100,000	93,100,000	5,755,705	87,344,295	12,866,020	6.89
1831	87,000,000	32,100,000	109,100,000	6,014,540	93,085,460	13,221,000	7.04
1832	91,500,000	30,400,000	121,900,000	4,502,914	117,397,086	13,590,000	8.64
1833	91,500,000	30,650,000	122,150,000	2,011,778	120,138,222	13,974,000	8.60
1834	506	94,839,570	41,000,000	135,839,570	11,702,905	124,136,665	14,373,000	8.64
1835	704	108,692,495	51,000,000	154,692,495	8,892,858	145,799,637	14,786,000	9.86
1836	713	140,901,088	65,000,000	205,901,088	*5,000,000	200,901,088	15,213,000	13.17
1837	788	149,185,890	73,000,000	222,185,890	*5,000,000	217,185,890	15,655,000	13.87
1838	829	116,138,910	87,500,000	203,638,910	5,000,000	198,638,910	16,112,000	12.33
1839	840	135,170,995	87,000,000	222,170,995	2,466,982	219,704,013	16,584,000	13.26

*Specie in Treasury estimated.

Specie and bank-note circulation of the United States in the years specified from 1800 to 1859—Continued.

[Prepared by Loans and Currency Division, Treasury Department.]

Year.	Number of banks and branches.	Estimated bank notes outstanding.	Estimated specie in United States.	Total money in United States.	Specie in Treasury.	Money in circulation.	Population.	Per capita.
1840	901	\$106,968,572	\$83,000,000	\$189,968,572	\$3,663,084	\$186,305,488	17,069,453	\$10.91
1841	784	107,290,214	80,000,000	187,290,214	987,945	186,302,869	17,591,000	10.59
1842	692	83,734,011	80,000,000	163,734,011	220,484	163,503,527	18,132,000	9.02
1843	691	58,563,008	90,000,000	148,563,008	1,449,472	147,114,136	18,694,000	7.87
1844	696	75,167,646	100,000,000	175,167,646	7,857,380	167,310,266	19,276,000	8.68
1845	707	89,008,711	96,000,000	185,008,711	7,658,306	177,350,405	19,878,000	8.95
1846	707	105,552,427	97,000,000	202,552,427	9,126,439	193,425,988	20,500,000	9.43
1847	715	105,519,796	120,000,000	225,519,796	1,701,251	223,818,515	21,143,000	10.59
1848	751	128,506,091	112,000,000	240,506,091	8,101,353	232,404,738	21,905,000	10.86
1849	782	114,743,415	120,000,000	234,743,415	2,184,964	232,558,451	22,489,000	10.34
1850	824	131,366,526	154,000,000	285,366,526	6,604,544	278,761,982	23,191,876	12.02
1851	879	155,165,251	186,000,000	341,165,251	10,911,945	330,253,005	23,985,000	13.76
1852		171,673,000	204,000,000	375,673,000	14,632,136	361,040,864	24,822,000	14.63
1853		183,181,000	236,000,000	419,181,000	21,942,893	402,238,107	26,433,000	15.89
1854	1,208	204,689,207	241,000,000	445,689,207	20,137,967	425,551,240	27,625,000	16.10
1855	1,307	196,952,223	250,000,000	436,952,223	18,931,976	418,020,247	27,536,000	15.34
1856	1,398	195,747,950	250,000,000	445,747,950	19,901,325	425,846,625	28,033,000	15.16
1857	1,416	214,778,822	260,000,000	474,778,822	17,710,114	457,068,708	28,918,000	15.81
1858	1,422	155,208,344	260,000,000	415,208,344	6,398,316	408,810,028	29,753,000	13.78
1859	1,476	193,306,818	250,000,000	443,306,818	4,339,276	438,967,542	30,596,000	14.35

Coin and paper circulation of the United States on June 30, from 1860 to 1895, inclusive.

[Prepared by Loans and Currency Division, Treasury Department.]

Year.	Coin in United States, including bullion in Treasury.	Paper money in United States.	Total money.	Coin, bullion, and paper money in Treasury.	Circulation.	Population.	Money in United States per capita.	Circulation per capita.
1860	\$235,000,000	\$207,102,477	\$442,102,477	\$6,695,225	\$435,407,252	31,443,321	\$14.06	\$13.85
1861	250,000,000	202,005,767	452,005,767	3,000,000	448,405,767	32,064,000	14.09	13.98
1862	25,000,000	333,452,079	358,452,079	23,754,335	334,697,744	32,704,000	10.96	10.23
1863	25,000,000	649,867,283	674,867,283	79,473,245	595,394,038	33,365,000	20.23	17.84
1864	25,000,000	680,588,067	705,588,067	35,946,589	669,641,478	34,046,000	20.72	19.67
1865	25,000,000	745,129,755	770,129,755	55,426,760	714,702,995	34,748,000	22.16	20.57
1866	25,000,000	729,327,254	754,327,254	80,839,010	673,488,244	35,469,000	21.27	18.99
1867	25,000,000	703,200,612	728,200,612	66,208,543	661,992,069	36,211,000	20.11	18.28
1868	25,000,000	691,553,578	716,553,578	36,449,917	680,103,661	36,973,000	19.38	18.39
1869	25,000,000	690,351,180	715,351,180	50,898,280	664,452,891	37,756,000	18.95	17.60
1870	25,000,000	697,868,461	722,868,461	47,655,667	675,212,794	38,558,371	18.73	17.50
1871	25,000,000	716,812,174	741,812,174	25,923,169	715,889,005	39,555,000	18.75	18.10
1872	25,000,000	737,721,565	762,721,565	24,412,016	738,309,540	40,596,000	18.70	18.19
1873	25,000,000	749,445,610	774,445,610	22,563,801	751,881,809	41,677,000	18.58	18.04
1874	25,000,000	781,024,781	806,024,781	29,941,750	776,083,031	42,796,000	18.83	18.13
1875	25,000,000	773,273,509	798,273,509	44,171,562	754,101,947	43,951,000	18.16	17.16
1876	52,418,734	738,264,550	790,683,284	63,075,896	727,607,388	45,137,000	17.52	16.12
1877	65,837,506	697,216,341	763,053,847	40,738,964	722,314,883	46,353,000	16.46	15.58
1878	102,047,907	689,205,669	791,253,576	62,120,942	729,132,634	47,598,000	16.62	15.32
1879	357,268,178	694,253,363	1,051,521,541	232,889,748	818,631,793	48,866,000	21.52	16.75
1880	494,363,884	711,565,313	1,205,929,197	232,546,969	973,382,228	50,155,783	24.04	19.41
1881	647,868,682	758,673,141	1,406,541,823	292,303,704	1,114,238,119	51,316,000	27.41	21.71
1882	703,974,839	776,556,880	1,480,531,719	306,241,300	1,174,290,419	52,495,000	28.20	22.37
1883	769,740,048	873,749,768	1,643,489,816	413,184,120	1,230,305,696	53,603,000	30.60	22.91
1884	801,068,939	904,385,250	1,705,454,189	461,528,220	1,243,925,969	54,911,000	31.06	22.65
1885	872,175,823	945,482,513	1,817,658,336	525,089,721	1,292,568,615	56,148,000	32.37	23.02
1886	903,027,364	905,532,390	1,808,559,694	555,859,169	1,252,700,525	57,404,000	31.50	21.82
1887	1,007,513,901	892,928,771	1,900,442,672	582,903,529	1,317,539,143	58,680,000	32.39	22.45
1888	1,092,391,690	970,594,259	2,062,985,949	690,785,079	1,372,170,870	59,974,000	34.39	22.88
1889	1,100,612,434	947,738,277	2,048,350,711	694,989,062	1,353,361,649	61,289,000	33.86	22.52
1890	1,152,471,638	991,754,521	2,144,226,159	714,974,889	1,429,251,270	62,692,250	34.24	22.82
1891	1,163,185,054	1,032,039,021	2,195,224,075	697,783,368	1,497,440,707	63,975,000	34.31	23.41
1892	1,232,854,331	1,139,745,170	2,372,599,501	771,252,314	1,601,347,187	65,570,000	36.21	24.54
1893	1,213,413,584	1,109,898,808	2,323,312,392	726,701,147	1,596,701,245	66,946,000	34.70	23.85
1894	1,251,543,158	1,168,891,623	2,420,434,781	759,626,073	1,660,808,708	68,397,000	35.39	24.28
1895	1,260,987,506	1,137,619,914	2,398,607,420	796,638,947	1,601,968,473	69,878,000	34.33	22.93

NOTE 1.—Specie payments were suspended from January 1, 1862, to January 1, 1879. During the greater part of that period gold and silver coins were not in circulation except on the Pacific Coast, where, it is estimated, the specie circulation was generally about \$25,000,000. This estimated amount is the only coin included in the above statement from 1862 to 1875, inclusive.

NOTE 2.—In 1876 subsidiary silver again came into use, and is included in this statement, beginning with that year.

NOTE 3.—The coinage of standard silver dollars began in 1878 under the act of February 28, 1878.

NOTE 4.—Specie payments were resumed January 1, 1879, and all gold and silver coins, as well as gold and silver bullion in the Treasury, are included in this statement from and after that date.

Mr. ALLEN of Utah. The question I asked was, were not two-thirds of our thirty millions of people using that \$700,000,000, which would bring up the per capita to over \$30?

Mr. DANFORD. The war closed in 1865, and there never was greater prosperity in this land than during the next few years. The whole people of the country were using the money that we then had, which amounted to a per capita of about \$20 or \$21.

I speak of this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of showing that it is not more money that we want, but more business. In those days a ten-dollar bill was busy from early morning until late at night. It did a great many errands in the course of a day. Now, in these last two years the money that we have, amounting to a per capita of nearly \$23, has been idle a great portion of the time. We have not been doing business. The remedy which I propose is that we should return to the policy of the Republican party as expressed in the McKinley schedules of the tariff bill, that we should return to the policy of protection, which built up this country from 1862 to 1892. The great progress that we made in those years I attrib-

ute to the fact that we were taking care of the American markets for the American people.

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are times in the life of every individual when he is perplexed by the necessity of accepting or rejecting a policy because the good which it contains is blended in varying proportions with evil.

There are other times in the life of each individual and of each nation when the choice is between absolute good and unmixed evil—when all the convictions of reason, all the teachings of history, all the suggestions of experience, unite with all the generous impulses of man's highest and best nature to influence and lead his action in one particular direction. In such cases duty is plain and choice is easy. And this, Mr. Speaker, is my attitude to-day in reference to this bill.

We are called upon, as the people's representatives, to decide whether we shall, by insisting on House bill 2904—the bond bill—authorize the executive branch of this Government to burden the people of this country with a debt which the present Admin-

istration admits to be unnecessary except for the purpose of retiring and eliminating from our circulation the "greenbacks" and Treasury notes issued under the law of 1890; or whether we shall, by returning to bimetalism, adopt a course which will remove the causes whose existence has been pointed to as an argument for the authorization by this Congress of the issue of bonds. In order intelligently to apply a remedy in any particular case it is always of the highest importance to clearly understand the exact nature of the ailment for which it is necessary to prescribe. In this case we have three distinct and different diagnoses and, naturally, three distinct and different prescriptions.

THE PRESIDENT'S DIAGNOSIS AND REMEDY.

1. The President and those who agree with him on financial questions claim that the true cause of all our woes is the circulation of greenbacks and United States Treasury notes in the channels of business and the danger to our gold reserve arising from the possibility of their being used to draw gold from the Treasury. To remedy this state of affairs (in which they conceive the whole danger to lie) we are asked to authorize the final retirement and cancellation of these noninterest-bearing obligations of the Government payable by law in coin and the substitution in lieu thereof of an equivalent amount of interest-bearing bonded indebtedness payable in gold.

However much I may differ with the President in my financial views, I heartily accord to him that same sincerity, honesty, and purity of purpose (no less and no more), that I claim for myself. Now, if we accept the President's view of our financial troubles, it is our manifest duty, in all sincerity, to lend to his financial policy all the legislative aid that he asks at our hands.

THE REPUBLICAN DIAGNOSIS AND REMEDY.

2. In the second place, our Republican friends claim that the greenbacks are not the cause of the trouble; and in support of their position they can point to the fact that during the fourteen years between the resumption of specie payments in 1879 and the retirement of the Republican party from power in 1893 no such trouble arose through the existence and circulation of the greenbacks as that which the President is now trying to lay at their door.

They claim that the true cause of the derangement of our financial system consists in an inadequacy of revenue to meet the necessities of the Government. In support of this contention they point out that if the Administration had not issued and sold \$162,500,000 of bonds, and put the proceeds thereof into the Treasury, there would not be a dollar in that Treasury to day had the same payments been made that have been made.

In pursuance of and in harmony with this claim that the real trouble arises from an insufficient revenue the Republican majority on this floor has, by the passage of House bill No. 2904, provided for the issue and sale, by the Secretary of the Treasury, of bonds to meet any temporary deficiency that now exists, or that may hereafter arise, in the Government's revenues.

It is necessary to a just statement of their position to add that they do not look to this as the normal method—the permanent method—of meeting such deficiencies. They offer this as a temporary or emergency scheme, which will be found necessary only until the amendments which they have proposed to the present tariff law shall have become operative, when, they assert, the tariff itself will produce a sufficient revenue to render a further resort to this bond law unnecessary. This assertion I deny, and in this denial I am supported by the history of this country; but such is the Republican view of the situation. If this view be the correct one, then it only remains for us to consider the wisdom of the remedy proposed by our Republican friends.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN CONSIDERED.

Before I proceed to a statement of the third view of the situation, and the remedy offered by those who take that view, I wish to say a word as to the President's plan of relief. As I can not accept his view of the causes of our present unfortunate situation, I can not, of course, assent to his mode of relief. I do not believe that there is too much money in the country to-day; I do not believe that the evils with which the country is afflicted are properly chargeable to an "inflation of the currency"—either at present or at any time hitherto. I do not believe that our troubles are caused by the presence in our circulation of our greenbacks and Treasury notes. I do believe, however, that our greenbacks are a redeemable currency which, sooner or later, it is our solemn duty to redeem and retire; but this should not be done until we return to a bimetallic basis. I believe that the system which prevailed in this country from 1792 to 1873—a system of gold and silver coin, standing upon an exactly equal legal footing, and the coexistence of a paper currency issued by the Government, redeemable in coin, and a full legal tender for all public and private demands—was and is the best system of finance that could be devised for this country; and could I be assured that that system could be restored, I would readily consent to the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes. But in the absence of any such assurance I am opposed

to the plan of retiring all United States (greenback) notes and the Treasury notes of 1890, and allowing the national banks, if they will, to issue nonlegal-tender bank notes in lieu of as many or as few of said retired notes as they wish. My objections are as follows:

OBJECTIONS TO THIS PLAN.

Its first sure effect would be a ruinous contraction of the currency of the country, for the bankers have made no secret of their claim that there is too much money in the country. Their orators, their newspaper organs, their apologists and defenders in both Houses of Congress, and all the literature they have so industriously disseminated throughout the country in their campaign of "education," have all preached the evils of an "excessive currency," an "inflated currency," and elaborated upon the glowing beauties of an "elastic" currency, a currency which can "come forth when needed, and when not needed in the course of business can withdraw itself from circulation." By this they evidently mean a currency that can be completely controlled by themselves, a currency which they can let out or take in as they may deem prices too high or too low.

2. In the second place, I oppose the President's plan because it would take from the Government (the people, for the people are and ought to be the Government) the power of regulating the currency, and it would place that imperial power, that highest and most distinctive mark of sovereignty, in the hands of a syndicate of national banks, responsible neither to God nor to man for the abuse of that power.

The friends of the Administration policy seem afraid to trust the American people, through their Government, to exercise this sovereign power, but prefer to take it from the people, in whose collective wisdom democracy is founded, and to centralize it in the hands of a few who appear to favor the subjection of this great country to the sway of European ideas of finance.

3. I object to the President's plan, in the third place, because, as a natural result of the policy of contraction, the burden of every debt, every mortgage, every fixed charge of every kind whatever would be still more increased and made still more difficult to be borne.

4. I am opposed to it, in the fourth place, because it would be an extension of the power, and consequently a further legislative recognition of national banks. If democracy means anything at all, it means the most uncompromising hostility to national banks in any form whatever. Whenever the question has been at issue before the American people, the Democratic party has declared its position on this question in no uncertain tones.

In January, 1836, the New York State Democracy gave the first platform utterance on this subject that was ever heard in American politics. That utterance was: "We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes and paper money as a circulating medium (notice why), because gold and silver is the only safe and constitutional currency." Notice that the language is "gold and silver is (not are) the only money" (not moneys). In the eyes of these early Democrats the two metals were indissolubly married—were treated as one—were spoken of as one. For the purposes of the Government, gold was silver and silver was gold. The Administrations of those days just went right ahead receiving both and paying out which ever they had on hand, without branding either of them as "dishonest" money, "unsound" money, "depreciated" money, etc., and, naturally, under this parity of opportunity, this parity of treatment, the two metals maintained a parity of value in commerce.

Again, the national Democratic platform of 1840, the first national platform that contained an utterance on the subject, delivered itself in clear and ringing terms: "Congress has no power to charter a United States bank." I wonder what the Democrats of those days would think if they could rise again long enough to learn that the Democratic (?) party was silently acquiescing in the existence of 3,715 of these institutions; that high alleged Democrats were denouncing as "wild-eyed fanatics" and "hare-brained enthusiasts" and silver "lunatics" the men who declare their loyalty to the doctrines of the fathers of Democracy, and to learn that Democrats were asking Congress to turn over the whole business of issuing paper money and regulating the volume (and consequently the value thereof) to these same national banks.

But let us read the remainder of the declaration of the national Democracy in 1840 on this subject:

We believe such an institution (a national bank) one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and to the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and the will of the people.

This resolution or plank was expressly readopted by the national Democratic party in its platform of 1844.

In the year 1848 new and overshadowing issues had arisen, national banks were not an issue, as they had been exterminated by the veto of a Democratic President, and so the party platform of that year said nothing on the subject.

In 1852 the question had again come to the front, and the party again declared its position in its national platform, as follows:

Congress has no power to charter a national bank; we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and to the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and that above the laws and will of the people.

In 1856 this identical language was readopted.

In 1860 the platform of 1856 was expressly readopted, and Democratic opposition to national banks was thus again officially placed on record.

In 1864 other issues crowded all reference to money out of all the national platforms.

In 1868 the platform declared that—

Where the obligations of the Government do not expressly state upon their face, or the law under which they were issued does not provide, that they shall be paid in coin, they ought, in right and justice, to be paid in the lawful money of the United States.

It makes a further declaration that now sounds strange, in view of the position now taken by Democrats and Republicans high in authority, that while silver and paper may be good enough for the uses of the ordinary American citizen, the bonds which we sell to bankers and speculators, foreign and domestic, ought to be made payable in gold only. It is this:

One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the office-holder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.

In 1872 the Democratic party abandoned all its principles temporarily by accepting the Liberal Republican platform of that year.

In 1876 it declared for a system—

well devised, and, above all, intrusted to competent hands for execution, creating at no time an artificial scarcity of currency, at no time alarming the public mind into the withdrawal of that vaster machinery of credit by which 95 per cent of all business transactions are performed—a system open, public, and inspiring general confidence.

Could this have referred to our present system, controlled and operated by men who make a specialty of producing panics to order for the purpose of furnishing "object lessons" to influence legislation?

In 1880 the party declared for "honest money—consisting of gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin on demand." Thus we see that the Democratic idea of "honest money" was "gold and silver, and paper convertible into coin"—into either.

In 1884, the year when the Democratic party first nominated Mr. Cleveland, and when it first elected its candidate for President since the war, it declared—

We believe in honest money—

And then it proceeds to tell what the Democratic idea of "honest money" is—

The gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulation convertible into such coin—

Not into gold only.

In 1888 this very platform was expressly adopted as Democratic faith.

What it declared in 1892, its last authoritative utterance on this subject, is still fresh in the minds of all:

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.

Such, Mr. Speaker, is the record of Democratic faith on this question. The score stands:

For national banks, 0.

Against national banks, 5 express declarations.

For gold and silver and coin paper, 4 plain declarations.

For gold only, 0.

Thus, standing in the light of the decalogue of Democracy, imbibing my faith from the aggregated wisdom of the fathers and forefathers of the school of political doctrine to which I belong, I oppose the President's plan because it gives additional power and opportunity to a set of institutions which my party has declared and their own history has proved to be—

Deadly hostile to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our Republican institutions, dangerous to the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and the will of the people.

THE REPUBLICAN VIEW.

Let us now turn to the remedy proposed by our Republican friends. They propose to issue \$50,000,000 of certificates of indebtedness to help the Government out when it has no money and to authorize the Government to issue and sell an indefinite amount of 3 per cent coin bonds to enable it to raise any amount of gold that may be needed to protect the gold reserve. This, with a permanent increase of revenue from an amended tariff—a high protective tariff—they propose as a solution of all our financial difficulties.

Within certain limits it can not be denied that there has been and is now an insufficiency of revenue to meet the expenditures of the Government. This deficiency, however, is not properly charge-

able to Democratic administration or to Democratic legislation. Four months before Mr. Cleveland's inauguration and nine months before the Democratic Fifty-third Congress met, the disastrous effects of the improvident and reckless legislation of the Republican Fifty-first Congress had begun to manifest themselves in a Treasury deficit. At the end of Mr. Cleveland's first term he turned over to his Republican successor, in addition to the one-hundred-million-dollar gold reserve, the sum of \$83,827,190 available cash assets, together with a fund of \$54,207,975, which up to that time had been held sacredly in trust for the security of the holders of national-bank notes.

This fund of more than \$137,000,000 for a time served as a break-water to withstand the reckless onslaughts upon it, but it had to yield at last, and when the Republican party retired from power on March 4, 1893, the gold reserve had dwindled down to a point nearer the danger line than it had ever reached before. Preparations had been made, in part, to issue bonds, the \$137,000,000 of cash assets had all disappeared except about \$24,000,000 of subsidiary coin and fractional currency, and for the last four months of that régime the receipts had fallen more than \$4,000,000 below the expenditures. Not even an absolute control of every branch of the Government had enabled the Republican party to stay the tide of national bankruptcy and panic which had set in through and because of improvident Republican policies, and which, gathering force from its onward movement like an avalanche descending the Alpine slopes, has continued its dire and disastrous course to this day, unchecked by the most strenuous exercise of economy by this Democratic Administration that was possible in view of the legacy of growing indebtedness, maturing obligations, and improvident appropriations inherited from the preceding Republican Administration.

It is true that there is now, and has been ever since the last days of the last Republican Administration, an inadequacy of receipts to meet the expenditures of the Government. This deficiency, however, has been largely caused by the decision of the United States Supreme Court that the income-tax feature of the present tariff law was unconstitutional, for this decision reduced the receipts of the Government more than \$30,000,000 a year.

But, however caused, the deficit is with us, and, under present conditions, it bids fair to become a permanent feature of our financial system, and the question now is how to dispose of it. Our Republican friends say that it must be met by selling "coin" bonds. Were this the only way, or the best way, to meet the evil, no consideration of the political origin of this bill would have the slightest influence in preventing me from accepting it and giving it my most cordial support. But, even in that case, I should wish to see these bonds issued as a popular loan in the true sense of that word.

Let it be a people's loan; let it be in the form of United States Treasury notes, like the seven-thirties issued during the civil war; let it be in denominations of \$5 and multiples of \$5; let these Treasury notes bear a low rate of interest (say 2 or 3 per cent;) let them be redeemable in lawful money of the United States, in the order of their issue, at the pleasure of the Government, at any time after the end of one year and before the end of thirty years; and above all, let them be a legal tender for all public and private debts and demands. With a loan of this character authorized I would be willing to retire all the greenbacks and Treasury notes of 1890 (provided, as I said above, that some form of loan was an absolute necessity, which I do not believe at all), for then the "endless chain," which has entangled our President and Secretary of the Treasury in its inexorable folds, like Laocoon of old, would be broken beyond the power to harm. Not only this, but we would have a legal-tender currency equal in amount to the United States Treasury notes and greenbacks displaced, and these securities would be held by the American people, and would not from time to time be thrown upon the London market to create a panic and influence financial legislation by Congress and to shape and control the financial policies of our Administrations. The "object lesson" thus taught would not be a great and disastrous panic, but would be the happy spectacle of a busy people, blessed with sufficient currency, supporting their Government in its financial straits, never "apprehensive," but always strong in their confidence in its ultimate financial solvency and triumph.

But while this is one way in which the present financial difficulties of the Government can be met, and while I regard it as having many advantages over the coin bonds provided for in the House bill 2904, yet it occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is

A FAR BETTER WAY.

Before entering into the consideration of that "better way," let us be sure that we have a thorough and comprehensive idea of the situation that confronts us as the representatives of the American people, charged with the high responsibility of securing for them the freest and the widest opportunity for successful effort in whatever sphere of activity they may severally be engaged. Mr. Speaker, this is no ordinary occasion. A proper consideration of the whole subject-matter fairly involved in the scope of this bill and the Sen-

ate amendments thereto will bring into review our whole financial system, with all its patchwork of incongruities, its temporary makeshifts, its time-serving expedients, and the disgraceful marks of its manipulation by the most selfish, the most unscrupulous, the most conscienceless, and the most audacious body of shylocks that ever insisted on the pound of flesh that lay nearest the nation's heart and life. It is not my purpose, however, Mr. Speaker, to attempt such a review. It would proceed more properly from those of deeper knowledge, wider experience, and a greater degree of familiarity with the sinuous processes of this unseen hand which for thirty years has, by hook and crook, imposed upon this nation as law its own code of gain and greed.

I do propose, however, to state with the utmost frankness and with a bluntness which I feel is demanded by a sense of fidelity to my constituents and to the whole people of the country what I honestly conceive to be the exact trouble with the Treasury today, and what remedy is demanded.

The trouble with the views of the present situation which have been expressed both by the President and by the Republican leaders on this floor is that they are too narrow—that they look at only a part of the case. Both are intently watching the outbreak of a poisonous blood disease and regarding the pimple on the surface as the sole and entire extent of the malady, while the deadly virus is eating its way through the vitals and sapping the very foundations of the patient's life. The Republican party, with its eyes focused on the bare bottom of the Treasury vaults and its hand on the pulse of the avaricious manufacturer, reads in that aching void the conclusion that the Treasury does not take in enough money and feels their "sinews of war" demanding more protection, more favoritism, and larger bank accounts. The President, with his eyes focused on the far East, sees that the great bankers and speculators are "apprehensive"—that they are "solicitous about our future fiscal policy," that they have a feeling of "distrust," etc. But, Mr. Speaker, the eye of true statesmanship looks beyond the empty Treasury vaults, and beyond the "distrustful" speculators of Wall street. To the eye of the honest student of present conditions there is a wider and more suggestive field.

THE TRUE SITUATION.

He sees that times are hard. Money is scarce and difficult to obtain. Business is depressed. Bankruptcy stalks abroad in the land. Prices are constantly falling, and those who buy stocks today must sell them for less to-morrow. Enterprises are languishing. The laborer, already inadequately paid, finds his wages reduced with a periodical and painful regularity. Coal miners in the East hungering for bread which they can not find money to buy, and shivering farmers in the West burning precious corn because they can not find money to buy coal; Eastern mill operatives unable to obtain money to buy Western food products, and Western people unable to obtain money to buy Eastern mill goods—and yet we hear preached the gospel of currency contraction and all our woes attributed to an excess of money.

These money contractionists and gold redemptionists ignore these features of the situation, but evince deep concern for the speculators who have "lost confidence" in the gullibility of the American people and their willingness to be fleeced. They seem deeply moved because of "those who are apprehensive" that the American people can not and will not pay coin obligations in gold.

Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned for this class. It is the corner stone of their gospel that "business knows no sentiment," and hence their "apprehensions" can arouse no sympathy in my bosom. They bought our securities as a speculation and for profit. Whether they gain or lose is no concern of the American people. If this Government pays its own governmental obligations in "coin"—in the money of the contract—the American people are not "apprehensive" whether European bankers and their unnaturalized American representatives make more or less than they had figured out as a desirable profit.

There is not a man within the sound of my voice who will deny the proposition that every dollar of the bonded indebtedness of this Government is payable, not in gold, not in silver, but in coin, which means either gold or silver, as the Government prefers. In fact, the American Congress, only last year, when asked by the President to authorize the issue of bonds payable in gold only, flatly but wisely, I think, refused to do so, although they knew that by doing so the burden of interest on the bond issue then contemplated, and which was made soon after, would thereby have been reduced \$16,000,000. A Democratic Congress very sensibly refused to slap silver in the face and discredit it in the eyes of the financial world in full view of the fact that bimetallism has ever been one of the foundation pillars of the structure of Democratic faith in this country. An American Congress refused to spit upon silver while there remained on the statute books of the country (the act of 1879) a declaration that gold and silver must be maintained at a parity. The Fifty-third Congress sensibly concluded that that was not just exactly the way to maintain the parity of the two metals. So they disregarded the importunities of bond syndicates; they

turned a deaf ear to a gold-standard Administration's appeal in behalf of gold bonds; they ignored those who were "apprehensive" that we would not pay coin obligations in gold, and said by their votes, "No; we may pay these bonds in gold if it should be convenient, but not for \$16,000,000 will we sell the American people's right to pay its lawful debts in the lawful coin of the realm."

I am solicitous, Mr. Speaker, for those American citizens who are suffering and struggling. My heart goes out not to Wall street, but to the great West and to the great South and to the great East and to the great North—to every part of this great country where men toil and trouble and where women and children work and want. And it is our duty to consider not what will refill the empty Treasury, not what will quiet the "apprehensions" of the immeasurably wealthy syndicates that want to become more wealthy at the expense of the toilers of this country, but what will unclug the wheels of trade and commerce, pour the rich lifeblood of a safe, sound, and abundant currency into the veins and arteries of business, and usher in an era of commercial and industrial peace. What will do this? Will increased taxation do it? Will issuing more bonds for the people to pay do it? Will retiring half the active money of the country do it? Will increasing the value of all money by increasing the difficulty of getting it—will this send a ray of sunlight into the homes of the suffering toilers and those who want to be but can not get the opportunity to be toilers in this land? By that test should we weigh and measure the fitness of every measure that comes before us.

THE TRUE DIAGNOSIS.

My view of the situation, then, is, Mr. Speaker, that the country in all its industries and in every class of its population is suffering from an insufficiency of primary or redemption money.

The constant fall of prices ever since the campaign against silver was begun in 1873 has greatly reduced, where it has not completely destroyed, the ability of our people to consume manufactured products. This has led to depression in manufacturing industries, to reductions of wages, to the shutting down of factories, to strikes, lockouts, etc.

This is the situation in all its breadth and length and depth. This is the state of affairs we should consider. True statesmanship will look over the shoulders of the "apprehensive" gold syndicates and the demands of the selfish manufacturers to the fears and tears, the wants and woes, of the great masses of willing but worn, weary, and disheartened workers who look piteously here for relief.

THE TRUE REMEDY.

This, then, being the situation, what is the remedy?

I conceive the proper remedy is set forth in the provisions of the substitute offered by the Senate for the House coin bond bill. The Senate proposes:

1. To reestablish the free and unlimited coinage of silver as it existed in this country prior to 1873.
2. To coin the seigniorage and use it in payment of current expenses.
3. To retire national bank notes of less than \$10 in favor of the wider use of silver and its certificates.
4. To have the Government resume its option to redeem greenbacks and Treasury notes of 1890 in either gold or silver, according to the condition or convenience of the Treasury.

Such is the Senate's plan of remodeling our financial system, and to each and every one of the foregoing propositions I give my unhesitating and unqualified assent, believing that nothing short of this will give that general and permanent relief which the condition of the country demands, and which it is our duty to extend.

It might seem presumption in me to undertake to make any arguments in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, since they have been presented by the friends of bimetallism on this floor and elsewhere in such great profusion and variety and have been supported by so many known facts and by such plain and convincing logic that it would be impossible, save by some new mode of arrangement or statement, to increase the strength of the contention in favor of equal and indiscriminating bimetallism. Nevertheless, I shall vote to accept the Senate amendments; and my action in the matter will be the result of a deep-seated conviction that not until these amendments, or some other propositions embodying the same principles, are enacted into law and honestly enforced by an administration in full sympathy with them can we hope for any permanent return of prosperity to this country or of sound financial health to our Treasury. I believe in free silver coinage on terms of exact legal equality with gold, because—

FREE COINAGE WOULD PREVENT PANICS.

1. Free coinage of silver will increase the volume of primary money in the country, and thus prevent the panics we have so often experienced under the gold standard by reason of the "apprehensions" of speculators that, on account of the limited supply of gold in the country, we could not, or would not, redeem our securities in gold. The restoration of free coinage will be an unmistakable notice to those shylocks and to all the world that all coin obligations of this Government will be redeemed in "coin," as provided in the contract, and not in gold alone. This announcement may produce a temporary panic among the few hundred English and

semi-American speculators, in fact they may produce an artificial panic themselves as an "object lesson" to this Congress in order to influence it to repeal the law authorizing free coinage of silver. But the law will cause no apprehension on the part of the great masses of our people; but, on the contrary, it will be welcomed by them as a means of escape from the disastrous evils of the panics which are naturally expected and regularly experienced under any financial system where the stock of money of ultimate redemption is insufficient to perform the work of redemption. Should there be, under the restored system of bimetallism, a scarcity of one metal, there will at once be an increased demand for the other, for their money functions being identical, the more abundant or more easily obtainable metal, or its paper representatives, will answer any purpose or demand as well as the other. And this shifting of the demand from the one to the other, according to the relative supply of the two, will remove all incentive to hoard either; and it will obviate the possibility of either going to a premium, and will thus insure absolute commercial parity at the mint ratio.

WOULD INSURE SUFFICIENT CIRCULATION.

2. Free and unlimited coinage of silver will, by increasing the stock of primary money or redemption money, increase in the same proportion the stock of credit money based upon the primary money, and will thus insure at all times a sufficient circulation to transact the business of the country.

GOLD SUPPLY DECREASING.

The annual production of gold in this country is slowly but surely decreasing, and, sooner or later, it will become impossible for the Government or the people to find the gold to redeem outstanding obligations if payment in gold only be insisted upon. In 1853 the gold production of this country, with all the crudity and inefficiency of the apparatus and methods then employed, was \$65,000,000. In 1893, forty years later, with the full benefit of all the wonderful discoveries and inventions of nearly half a century of the most rapid progress the world has ever made, with a wider experience in mining, with a more abundant capital, with an infinitely extended and improved transportation service, with better and cheaper machinery and supplies, and, above all, with a demand for gold greater than had ever been known in all the centuries before by reason of the demonetization of silver and the increased need of gold thereby created—with all these causes working together to increase the output, the production of gold in this country had dropped from \$65,000,000 to less than \$36,000,000, a decline of 45 per cent. And when we take into consideration the increased population of the country, the decline in production becomes still more marked.

In the ten years between 1850 and 1860 the production was \$1.29 per head of population. In the ten years between 1884 and 1893 the production was \$0.53 per head. Our population has increased from 25,000,000 to 70,000,000—a growth of 180 per cent. Our home and foreign commerce has increased twentyfold; new enterprises have been inaugurated; new lines of business have been opened; new inventions have appeared; new discoveries have been made; the new force of electricity, with its countless applications, has revolutionized the industrial world; new forces and new substances and materials have been brought to light, with new uses and applications for old substances and materials, all calling for a vast increase in the volume of money; and yet our gold production has fallen off nearly one-half. And still we are told by the apostle of the gold standard that it is the most perfect standard; that it is absolutely without variableness or shadow of turning.

The merest exercise of common sense and common honesty in discussion is sufficient to show that the charge of "an inflated currency," and "a currency far beyond the needs of commerce," so often advanced to explain our present troubles, is false. It requires some honesty toward oneself, but no astuteness whatever, to understand that the use of silver as primary money having been discontinued, by the interpretation put on a statute of Congress, silver dollars at once passed from the domain of primary or redemption money. This very fact, this very saddling upon gold all the redemption functions formerly exercised by both metals, naturally led to "apprehensions" that there was an insufficient supply of gold in the country to do this work, and, as silver is not allowed free coinage in Europe, holders of our securities naturally feared they would be paid in that metal which, even in this country, under present administrative policies, is regarded as a mere commodity.

In this way we can see that the partial demonetization of silver has been the cause of that want of confidence which is now pointed to as a convincing argument in favor of the completion of the demonetization of silver. But restore the free and unlimited coinage of silver and the result they fear will be quite different. They may be paid in silver, but it will not be silver the commodity, outlawed as a money metal, and therefore worth but 50 cents on the dollar, but they will be paid in a metal which throughout all the length and breadth of this vast country and among all its busy and increasing millions, will answer every monetary purpose that gold will answer. Then the commodity silver can be converted

into current money, coequal in all its functions with gold, and therefore of equal value. The "50-cent dollar" of the gold-bug orators will have disappeared forever. Then, silver and gold both being primary money, or money of ultimate redemption, the ability of the nation to redeem its coin obligations will have been doubled, the medium of redemption will either be gold or the monetary equal of gold, confidence will return, apprehension will cease from troubling, and even the distrustful speculator will be at rest.

WOULD PREVENT APPRECIATION IN VALUE OF GOLD.

3. Free coinage of silver would prevent the injustice of requiring the debtor to pay his debts in a constantly appreciating currency. Prices have been falling with remarkable uniformity since 1873 in most of the products of labor. But debts, interest, taxes, and many other things calling for the laborer's money have either remained stationary or, as in the case of interest, have actually advanced. In this way the burdens of the debtor, instead of becoming lighter with each succeeding year of toil and self-denial and gradual payment, have been actually increased.

I submit here a table, taken from the Bimetallist, a British publication, showing the great appreciation in the value of gold in Great Britain since the demonetization of silver in this country in 1873. Any given amount of gold will purchase more than it would in 1873 by the following amounts:

More wheat by 108 per cent.
More flour by 76 per cent.
More sugar by 60 per cent.
More iron by 64 per cent.
More cotton by 95 per cent.
More lead by 110 per cent.
More wool by 93 per cent.
More leather by 24 per cent.
A average increase on these articles, 73½ per cent.

A still more startling statement of this great appreciation of the value of gold is made by President Andrews, of Brown University, in a recent article on this subject, "An honest dollar." He says that on September 1, 1865, our public debt, then amounting to \$2,750,000,000, could have been paid by 18,000,000 bales of cotton, but that now, after that debt had been reduced 55 per cent by the payment of \$1,500,000,000, it will take 30,000,000 bales of cotton. In other words, it will take 12,000,000 more bales of cotton to pay the debt after it has been reduced \$1,500,000,000 than it would have required at first—66½ per cent more cotton to pay 45 per cent of the debt now, under the gold standard, than it would have required to pay the whole debt under bimetallism. And yet, when the producer of cotton, or corn, or wheat, or wool, or leather, or iron, or sugar complains that by this appreciation the meaning of the word "dollar" (and consequently the meaning of the contract itself) has been changed to his prejudice in all his notes and mortgages, and asks that the original meaning of the word "dollar," and the meaning of the contract, be retained, and that no new meaning shall be added to the word which will double the burden of his obligation, he is denounced as a repudiationist, a wild-eyed socialist, a silver lunatic. He is told that he wants something for nothing; that the dollar which would mean the same now that it would have meant and did mean a few years ago when the contract was written would be a "dishonest" dollar, an "unsound" dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I resent the imputation or insinuation, from those high in authority or any other misguided idolaters of the gold standard, that my people are dishonest or want anything that is not rightfully their own. To them a dollar means something. To them it means much long, hard toil in the blazing heat of a southern sun. To them it means many of the comforts of life that are indispensable necessities to us, but which are unattainable luxuries to them.

The restoration of silver to its former legal status of perfect legal equality with gold would at once prevent any further appreciation in the value of gold, for the demand for gold would be at once transferred to silver, and the pressure on gold thus removed. The gold corner would be broken, the combine would be "busted," and the great masses of the common people throughout America and all the world would breathe easier.

WOULD STIMULATE BUSINESS.

4. In the fourth place, free coinage will give us a more abundant supply of money, and thus give a much-needed stimulus to every branch of business that makes use of money, excepting, perhaps, that of the pawnbroker and other usurers. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that there is an inadequate supply of money in this country to properly serve the demands of its great and growing trade and commerce. The fact that the country's business is transacted with the limited supply of money at its command is no argument whatever that the supply is sufficient. A large family can get along somehow by eating off one plate by taking turns; but from that fact no one would infer that one plate constitutes an abundant supply of tableware for a family. So the fact that, in some sort of way, amid suffering, depression, and bankruptcy, we are getting along with our present supply of primary money does not prove that that supply is adequate for

the demands of the country. With a sufficient money stock there would be no appreciation in the value of any part of our currency; the money of payment would be, as it ought to be, the money of the contract—that is, money of the same exchangeable value as that in circulation at the time of the making of the contract. This sufficient supply of money can never come through gold. It can not and ought not to come through fiatism. It should come, as it did for the first eighty years of our national life, through and from the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold.

But the restoration of bimetalism will immediately and permanently stimulate all the industries of this country, except those of the shylock and the sheriff. It will lead to the inauguration of many new enterprises. It will fill the mountains of the West with a busy and joyous host of miners, now wholly or partially idle, but then provided with steady and remunerative employment, digging the gold, silver, and lead from those venerable mountains, and furnishing a new and profitable market for the agricultural and horticultural products of the great West, and for the machinery, tools, and other mining appliances manufactured in the East and the North.

The great West would again spring to its feet full of financial and industrial strength. Towns and cities would spring up among its valleys. New railroads would thread its canyons and surmount its lofty passes; a silver and gold stream would trickle down those lofty mountain sides and find its welcome way into the financial circulation and the business and industrial life of the nation; and a great people would arise from the hideous nightmare of gold monometallism and, with their faces turned to the dawn of a newer and brighter day, address themselves to the great task of restoring that prosperity to which this country has so long been a stranger. Here and there—yes, in too many cases, as experience has shown—the development of mines would prove unprofitable, and the investor would lose vast sums, for silver is not to be had without money and without price or toil or effort, as the gold bug claims to believe; but the investor's loss would be the people's gain, for it would involve the distribution among the armies of labor of vast sums of money that had hitherto been hoarded.

But in other cases a fair profit would reward the progressive capitalist and the net profits of his enterprise would be added to the active capital of the country. New fields would be sought for investment. New enterprises North and South and East and West would be the natural sequence of profitable mining ventures, and those enterprises would each and all call for more men, more material, and more supplies and would thus give employment to the idle, business to the manufacturer, profitable custom to all that purvey to the toiler, and by increasing the number of profitably employed laboring men and by increasing the laborer's capacity to purchase the manufactured products of other labor it would stimulate every line of manufacturing and revivify every department of production and distribution.

Gradually the demand for labor would furnish opportunities for employment to all that would work. The armies of the unemployed could then be mustered out of service, for the war of the Government and its syndicate allies against the business and the industries and trade and commerce of the country—against the comfort and prosperity of the American people—would be over, and peace and plenty would again prevail in the homes of the poor toilers throughout the land. Thus, and thus only, can we fully meet and adequately provide for the situation that confronts us to-day.

WOULD HELP INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM.

5. But the beneficial effects of free coinage would not be confined to this country. The example of the greatest nation on earth deserting gold monometallism, on mature deliberation, and taking a bold stand for absolute bimetalism—the immediate transfer of one-fourth of the enlightened people of the world, and that the most progressive and enterprising part, from the single gold standard to the double standard—would wonderfully encourage the advocates and friends of bimetalism throughout the world, and would go far toward inducing France and Germany, and ultimately all Europe except England, to return to bimetalism. Nearly all the single gold standard men in this country, except a few new converts (always the most zealous champions of any cause), claim to favor the free and unlimited coinage of silver provided it be done by international agreement; that means that they admit that bimetalism would be beneficial if we could have it, but they say we can not bring it about ourselves. If they are sincere in this profession I know of no better way to secure an international agreement than for this imperial nation—the strongest, the most enterprising, the most influential, and the most populous of all the enlightened nations of the earth—to take the lead and invite the others to follow. But her influence would do more than to invite, it would compel the adoption of free coinage by all other nations except England herself, and possibly by England too, after she had once fairly experienced the disadvantages and the losses imposed by her financial isolation.

WOULD GIVE US THE TRADE OF SILVER NATIONS.

6. Evidently the effect of this country's putting itself on a bimetallic basis would be the establishment, to England's prejudice, of closer commercial relations between the United States and the 900,000,000 of people composing the silver nations of the world. The needs of trade would ultimately lead, no doubt, to the establishment of a common or international unit of value, for the purposes of international commerce between these silver countries; and this commercial bond, in connection with the fact that we stood ready to receive their silver currency, as we did prior to 1857, in payment of trade balances due us, would give us a decided advantage over gold-standard nations in dealing with nations that recognize silver as money.

WOULD RAISE THE PRICE OF FARM PRODUCTS.

7. Again, the opening of our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver would at once advance its price all over the world to the price in this country, less the cost of transportation to this country. One beneficent effect of this result would be an immediate advance in the price of wheat and cotton and all other American products that now come into competition at Liverpool with the products of coolly labor in India. Under present conditions England buys our discredited silver at 63 or 64 cents per ounce, takes it to India, and with it there buys cotton and wheat and other Indian products at about the same price she has paid for them heretofore, for the demonetization of silver in this country did not affect prices in silver countries. The silver price paid for those articles in India, plus the cost of transportation thence to Liverpool, becomes the silver price of the same articles in Liverpool, and as silver in Liverpool is worth only about 50 cents on the dollar in gold, the gold price of these products in Liverpool is thus fixed at about one-half their silver price in India.

As Liverpool fixes the price for our surplus of agricultural products, and thus indirectly fixes or determines the price in America of our home-sold products, it becomes apparent that the present depreciated price of silver is the chief cause of the ruinously low prices our wheat, cotton, and such of our other products as come into competition with Indian products command. Let free coinage be adopted by this country, and England, no longer able to buy silver for her India trade at 48 cents on the dollar, but being required to pay its full mint value, will no longer be able to dictate a price to our farmers which they can not afford to accept, but which they are nevertheless helpless to reject. The benefits accruing to our farmers each year under such a system would amount to hundreds of millions of dollars.

During the the year 1894 we exported the following farm products, worth in Liverpool the following sums:

Product.	Amount exported.	Price.	Value.
Corn.....bushels..	66,480,529	45.7	\$30,385,714
Wheat.....do.....	164,283,129	49.1	80,063,016
Cotton.....pounds..	3,769,381,478	6.94	261,595,074
Total value of these three exports ..			372,043,804

Since the production for 1894 may fairly be taken as an average, it will be seen that the advance in the value of silver caused by the demand free coinage would create would cause our exports of those three farm products alone to advance in value in the Liverpool market not less than \$372,000,000, to say nothing of the vast increase in the value of those portions of the same products which would be sold for consumption in this country. If we consider the home-sold products as equal to the part sold abroad, the benefits accruing to the producers from free coinage would amount to nearly or quite \$700,000,000 per year on those three products alone.

And when we add to these three crops the general advance in the value of all other farm products, we can begin to have some conception of the benefits of free coinage.

It is true the price of farmers' supplies and all other articles bought by the farmer will be increased; but the farmer will then be in a condition to pay higher prices, and these higher prices that he pays will redound to the benefit of the operatives and manufacturers engaged in producing these articles. But the debts, interest, and other fixed charges which our people must meet will not be increased, and can thus be more easily met.

WOULD ENABLE US TO MEET JAPANESE COMPETITION.

8. One other great advantage will result to the people (more particularly to the manufacturers and operatives) of this country from the adoption of free coinage. The cheapness of silver in its present demonetized condition not only enables the Indian agriculturist, without loss to himself, to force down our competing farm products to almost half the price they would command under free coinage, but it also enables the Japanese manufacturer to sell his products in this country at such prices as absolutely defy American competition.

The Japanese laborer, by inherited aptitude, by an inexorable life-long apprenticeship to one calling, and that the calling of his fathers for centuries before him, and by the possession of an instinct trained and developed through a thousand years of unrelenting battle for existence, has solved the problem of finding the minimum of human necessity. He has been inured to self-denial till he has deadened natural human desires; he has, by immemorial abstinence and self-abnegation, thrown himself outside the pale of temptation; he has familiarized himself with the contented use of those means of existence which would mean starvation to other men; and he has thus developed himself into the cheapest, the most ingenious, the most patient, the most willing, and the most profitable laborer in all the industrial world. To him a thin cotton garment is raiment, a few morsels of rice are food, and a shed, an awning, or a goods box is shelter. To him strikes and boycotts are unknown. His manufacturing employer can command such labor in unlimited supply for a few cents a day, and pay those few cents in silver depreciated one-half by our demone-tization of it in this country. The products of such labor can be and are to-day sold in our markets for less money than they can be actually produced for in this country.

They have already entered the field of competition in many lines of industry, and, exulting in their easily obtained success in those fields, they will undoubtedly enter others. What is to be the outcome of this new invasion of the western world—an invasion which, if unchecked, threatens to result in a greater measure of human suffering and calamity than was ever produced by any invasion of Europe by Goth or Hun or Vandal or Turk? When, as soon will be the case, all the heretofore pent-up energies of that wonderful nation are directed to our industrial overthrow, we shall be compelled to abdicate our proud position of the world's purveyor and descend to the level of a civilization in which the conditions of life are so hard that to the vast majority of our people bare existence will be the summation of all human hope—the ne plus ultra of human aspiration.

And let us not flatter ourselves that the Japanese will be without allies in this momentous struggle. Almost in sight of the shores of Japan lies a sleeping giant with dormant powers whose magnitude has never been tested, but who holds in his hands the key to the future progress and happiness of the human race on this globe. The Chinese Empire has just been waked by its war with Japan to a consciousness that its methods belong to the past, and that it must align itself with the progress of the present if it would rise to the true level of its opportunity. It is now rapidly shaking off the sleep of centuries, opening its eyes to the grand opportunities of the present, and girding on its armor to meet us in the industrial wars of the future.

With a population equal to that of the United States and all Europe combined—a population whose faculties have been sharpened into inherited instincts by forty centuries of untiring exercise under the relentless laws of necessity—a population with which toil is the normal condition of existence, unrestricted by legal limitations and unrelieved by the restful oasis of the Christian Sabbath—with such a population thrown into the scale against us, paid in the silver our own greed and folly have depreciated, our industrial fate is inexorably fixed unless we resort to the only avenue of escape left us. Either we must give up to them the markets of this great country (the most remunerative markets in the world) and all our markets for manufactured products in other countries or we must struggle to retain them. The "most favored nation" clause in our treaties with those countries would prevent our discriminating against them in our tariff schedules, and thus protecting our manufacturers and operatives. But even if we resort to the exclusion policy of a high tariff, it would not only impose unjust burdens on our own people in the effort to protect our own people, but it would be powerless to save for us our foreign markets.

There remains, then, the one hope—restore the free coinage of silver in this country. Raise thereby the price of silver throughout the world at one stroke, as such a step would do, to commercial parity in this country and in every country where American commerce finds its way, and by that same act you double the value of the silver constituting the wages paid to the Hindoo farmer and to the Chinese and the Japanese operative, and thus practically place a protective duty of 100 per cent on their products. This would not only protect the American operative and the American manufacturer, but it would also increase the lowest possible price of Chinese and Japanese products in all the markets of the world, and would thus be the wisest step this country could take toward retaining the share we now have of foreign trade in articles of American manufacture, and in saving our people from being degraded from the highest to the lowest civilization in the world of to-day.

In conclusion, then, it is clear that, as the theory of the Republican party is wrong as to the malady that afflicts our people to-day, it must be wrong as to the remedy—higher duties and more bonds. It is clear that, as the President's theory of the disease is

at fault, we can not accept his suggested remedy of retiring the greenbacks and abdicating to the national banks the high function of regulating the volume and the value of our entire circulation of paper money. It is as clear to my mind as any proposition involving the exercise of human reason can be made to appear that our financial troubles and the present deplorable condition of the masses of our people have their origin in the lack of sufficient primary money properly to discharge the business of the country and in the low price of silver throughout the world.

Reasoning from this undoubted premise, I can not resist the conclusion that the sure remedy for our financial and economic troubles lies in such legislation as will give us a larger volume of money and raise the price of silver throughout the world by creating an unlimited demand for its limited supply, and that these twin results can be accomplished by the incorporation into our national statutes of the principles embodied in the Senate amendments to this bill. Believing thus, I shall gladly cast my vote in favor of the minority report of the Ways and Means Committee, which recommends concurrence in the Senate amendments.

Believing that the free and unlimited coinage of silver as provided in the Senate amendments will prevent the panics which we have so regularly experienced under the single gold standard, believing that free coinage will furnish sufficient circulation to prevent the evils which an inadequate money supply has imposed upon us, believing it would prevent appreciation in the value or purchasing power of gold, that it would secure greater stability of prices, stimulate business, promote the cause of international bi-metallism, improve our trade with silver nations, raise the price of farm products, ease the burden of every debt in the land, enable us to meet Asiatic competition, and assure to our people prosperity at home and a more commanding financial and commercial position among the nations of the earth, I should be untrue to the interests of the people and to my convictions of duty were I not to cast my vote in favor of the cause of free-silver coinage.

Mr. TURNER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no intention, of course, of undertaking to discuss in detail the Senate substitute now under consideration by this committee in the brief limit of the five minutes which have been allowed me; but not knowing whether I shall have an opportunity to vote upon the sections of this substitute separately, or whether I shall have to vote to concur or to nonconcur in the substitute as a whole, I desire to say that this substitute has four sections, which are wholly distinct and independent. Neither of them depends upon the other. Each contains an independent proposition so distinct that members of this committee may very well be in favor of some and opposed to others. I find myself in just that predicament. I think the sections ought to be voted on separately. Being thus situated, I desire to express my position upon the substitute, as my vote would not express it if I should be compelled to vote upon the substitute as a whole.

I am in favor of the second section of this substitute, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of 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," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

I voted for this same proposition in the last Congress, and I see no reason why these millions lying idle in the Treasury, bought and paid for by the Government, now its property, but as worthless as bricks in its present position, should continue to lie there idle, when so much needed for the uses of the Government.

In the next place, I am in favor of the third section of this substitute, which reads:

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than \$10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of \$10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

I should prefer to substitute five dollars for the ten mentioned in that section, simply for the reason that I am afraid that if the entire circulating medium of the country below ten dollars in denomination is changed into silver it will be cumbersome and not easily handled; but as I shall not have the opportunity of voting for that modification, I am prepared, if given the opportunity, to vote for this section as a whole.

I am in favor of that part of the fourth section which provides as follows:

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department.

The time of Mr. TURNER of Virginia having expired, by unani-

mous consent, on motion of Mr. COOPER of Texas, it was extended five minutes.

Mr. TURNER of Virginia. I am in favor of this provision which I have just read, sir, because I believe the language of this section was the purpose and intent of the original act, and I see no possible wrong in paying in silver notes that were given for silver.

Now, sir, I will say as to the balance of this section, I will be in favor of the same provision with reference to the greenbacks provided that I can satisfy myself that it can be done without any bad faith on the part of the Government, as to which I am not entirely satisfied. I think it ought to be done, if it can be done with honor.

I can not support the first section of the substitute, which provides that all the silver bullion of the world, wherever and by whoever owned, when presented at the mints of the United States, shall be coined for the owner free of cost to him, the owner to receive a standard silver dollar for every 412½ grains of standard silver bullion nine-tenths fine so presented at the mint, and when these coins are received in the Treasury silver certificates to be issued therefor. Thus in effect a silver-dollar certificate going into circulation and becoming an obligation of the Government for an amount of silver which, without the passage of this section, the Government can buy in open market for a sum about one-half that which the owner will get for it from the Government under the operation of this section if enacted into law.

There are other grave reasons, but this is sufficient and controlling to me, so much so that if I am not permitted to vote upon these distinct and independent sections separately, and am compelled to vote upon them as a whole, my understanding of my duty will compel me to vote to nonconcur in the substitute, though I sincerely hope we may be given the opportunity to vote separately on these distinct sections, standing independent of and having no connection with each other—each upon its own merits.

And it does seem to me that if the extreme advocates for free coinage persist in holding they will have all or none, and refuse an opportunity to pass that which I believe we may get, viz, the great benefits and immensely enlarged circulation of silver to result from the second, third, and fourth sections with the first left out, with the incident relief to the gold reserve, the loss to the people will be owing to them, and they will have "lost the substance by grabbing at the shadow."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the only excuse I have for burdening the House with any remarks upon this question is that I expect to be called away and shall not have an opportunity to vote upon the several propositions under discussion, and for that reason it is but just to myself as well as to my constituents that I should define my position upon these various questions. Now, as I understand it, when the discussion ceases a motion will be made to concur in the Senate substitute. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, on that proposition, that if present I shall not vote to concur. I am not in favor of the unlimited coinage of silver in this country; I am not in favor of throwing our ports open to the commerce of the world without any restrictions; nor am I in favor of throwing our mints open to the free coinage of silver of the world without restriction. Therefore if present I shall cast my vote, as I have suggested, against concurring in the Senate substitute.

I am further informed that the next question that will be submitted to the House will be on a motion to nonconcur in the Senate substitute, and insist upon the House bill. If present I will cast my vote against this proposition also, for I did not believe, and do not now believe, that the bill passed by the House should become a law. I can not see the necessity of enacting that law at this time. While perhaps some amendment of the law of 1875 should be made, I can not see the necessity for the House bond bill leaving the law of 1875 upon the statute books. I believe the power of the Secretary of the Treasury should be restricted with reference to the issuance of bonds. So, upon that proposition I would also vote no.

There is another proposition or two, separate and independent, that will doubtless come before this House in the way of an amendment to the Senate substitute, and that is with reference to retiring notes of less denominations than \$10. Now, I believe in bimetalism, and I believe that we should do just as much as we can, with safety, toward bringing the two metals together. In other words, if we continue to discriminate against silver always we may never hope to see the two metals come nearer together, and the breach will continually widen from day to day and from month to month. It seems to me we have an excellent opportunity of placing in circulation all the silver that is produced by our own mines by adopting this method of retiring all the notes less than \$10 in denomination and substituting therefor silver dollars or silver certificates. Now, I am not advised as to the number of these notes, but they must run into the millions, and if we retire these notes and substitute silver therefor we thereby then find an opportunity of placing in circulation a large amount of silver money, equal in

my judgment, to the output of our American mines, and by doing this we will show a disposition to aid silver and prove to the country that we are in fact friends of silver; therefore I should favor that proposition, if I were permitted to vote upon it alone.

I am also inclined to believe that we could safely coin the seigniorage in the Treasury and put that in circulation, and I should vote for that proposition.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we continue to discriminate against silver always, if we fail to put in circulation that part of our silver product which we can safely put in circulation, we need never hope to see the commercial price of silver advance. Therefore I believe it is the duty of the American people with reference to the product of their silver mines to take the same care that they take of our other commodities. In other words, I am a protectionist. I believe in protecting our own industries; I believe in discriminating in our own favor and against the outside world, and I believe in applying that doctrine to silver. We can take care of our own product and let the rest of the world take care of its own. By so doing we succeed in finding an opportunity to circulate every silver dollar coming from our own mines, and certainly we are under no obligation to Mexico or to any other country on the face of the earth to take care of its product. [Applause.]

Mr. DE WITT. Mr. Speaker, it has been asserted on the floor of this House that to remonetize silver would at once restore the commercial parity of 1 to 16. This proposition, in the light of such information as I have upon the monetary question, I can not accept as being correct. The commercial ratio existing to-day between silver and gold stands 1 to 32, so that bringing it to 1 to 16 would double the price of silver bullion or cut in two the price of gold bullion. There is nothing in the history of the two metals to warrant this assertion of the advocates of the free coinage of silver. Silver when compared with gold has always fluctuated in value. Julius Caesar on one occasion exchanged gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 9. Livy mentions that in the year 189 before the Christian era the two metals were exchanged at the ratio of 1 to 10. Under the early Roman Emperors the ratio was 1 to 12. From Constantine, A. D. 306, to Justinian, A. D. 565, the ratio was 1 to 14 and 1 to 15. This shows, Mr. Speaker, that such mints as they had in the Roman Empire were open during this long period to the free coinage of the two metals, yet notwithstanding that fact the metals drifted apart in relative values and no ratio was steadily maintained. The history of our own country shows very conclusively that these two metals vary in value, each to the other, when cast upon the bosom of commerce.

The laws of commerce are far more powerful in regulating the value of bullions than the acts of Parliament or the acts of the American Congress. In 1717 Great Britain called upon the keeper of the mints for a statement as to the commercial ratio existing between silver and gold. Newton, the master of the mint, made a report to Parliament of 1 to 15½. Parliament desired that more silver should be coined, establishing a legal ratio of 1 to 15½, thus discriminating by law as against commerce in favor of silver three-tenths of 1 per cent. What was the result? A ratio was established in Holland and in France of 1 to 14, and the silver went from England into the commercial exchanges of France and Holland, where it found a better market than the mint market of England. The ratio which was established by the British Parliament in 1717 of 1 to 15½ was never changed, but remained upon the statutes for ninety-nine years. It remained statutory until 1816, when Parliament abandoned the idea of establishing any legal ratio of the two metals which would be supported by a commercial parity, repealed the act of 1717, and thereby demonetized silver forever in Great Britain. What is true of England and Italy in the variation of values of these metals comes with equal force from the history of Greece; exchanges were noted as early as Herodotus in the fifth century before Christ.

The Senate substitute under consideration, Mr. Speaker, which provides for the free coinage of silver on a ratio with gold of 16 to 1, contains no provision which in any way attempts to maintain a commercial parity of these two metallic moneys so that gold would not be driven out of circulation and out of the country. I am opposed to the substitute.

Silver fluctuates in value in the markets of the world from day to day and year to year. How to maintain the commercial parity of these two metals on a given ratio when both are coined and used as money is a question which has puzzled many ages. It can be done in one way. A gentleman asserted on this floor yesterday that it could be done by an international agreement. Such an international agreement can never be had. Why? From the simple fact that in order to make it effective Great Britain would have to become a party to it, and she never will become a party to any such international agreement. Great Britain, according to a statement current in the public newspapers a few months ago, had at that time within her dominions \$1,300,000,000 of gold coin and gold bullion, and according to the statement of Gladstone the people of Great Britain hold in credits, which are payable, principal and interest, in gold, upon people of foreign countries and foreign na-

tions, \$10,000,000,000. Under these circumstances, Great Britain, being a gold country, will never unite with the other nations of the earth in an agreement to coin and use silver in any given ratio. No, never; it is an utter impossibility. She is caring for Great Britain, and appears to be doing quite well on a gold monometallic basis.

The people of America who desire the further coinage of silver must abandon the idea of an international agreement; such an agreement can never be had. The European nations—France, Greece, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland—which formed what was known as the Latin Union, agreed to coin and use silver upon the ratio of 15½ to 1. Great Britain did not join with those nations in that agreement, and she broke down the Latin Union; so that each of those nations was compelled in turn to recede from the agreements made in that combination. I ask how, then, can we coin more silver and maintain the parity of silver and gold on any established ratio? I will tell you, first reading a passage from Professor Perry's work on the Elements of Political Economy, published in 1866, when money was discussed for the benefit of the American students in American colleges upon sound principles. This book was written prior to this great flood of silver bullion upon the American market. What does this author say upon this question of a double metallic currency?

When, however, it is designed that both metals shall circulate in the same currency, then it becomes necessary that government shall determine, as well as it can, not the absolute value of either, but the relative value of each in each; and the value of each, estimated in the other, regulates itself independently of edicts or enactments. If the legislators can ascertain in what proportions they are exchanging for each other in a free market, they may mark that as the legal relative value of the two, but they must not suppose that their work will not require revision from time to time.

Taking the old established principles laid down by this eminent author, which permeate the pages of all authors upon the science of money, but which have never been formulated into an enactment to perpetually maintain the parity of silver and gold where both are coined, I here submit a formulation in accordance with those indisputable principles of a frequent revision by which, if enacted into law, stating an unchangeable ratio, the revision being not in the coins, but in the reserves at the foundation of and back of the coins, to correspond with the ever-shifting commercial value of silver bullion, the commercial parity of the two metals can be perpetually maintained at the legal ratio. It is as follows:

First. That the United States of America shall admit silver bullion to coinage in its mints upon the surrender by the owners to the Government of the difference between the market price of the bullion and its face value when coined.

Second. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall set apart, to be governed by the provisions of this act, any silver bullion the property of the Government of 2,000,000 ounces, which fund shall be replenished from said sources so that the same shall not fall below 2,000,000 ounces of silver bullion, and shall be known and designated as the secondary silver reserve fund.

Third. That the aforesaid difference in bullion surrendered to the Government under section 1 of this act shall be held by the Government in trust, subject to the provisions of this act, and known and designated as the primary silver reserve fund.

Fourth. That on the first Monday in each calendar month the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the primary to the secondary silver reserve fund, or from the secondary silver reserve fund to the primary silver reserve fund, as the case may require, silver bullion in such amount as shall be necessary to make the primary silver reserve fund, and all of the coins under this act, equal in bullion value to the face value of all of the coins under this act.

Fifth. That 37½ grains fineness of pure silver shall constitute \$1 face value under this act.

Sixth. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required, when demanded by the holder of any coins under this act, to receive and retain said coins and issue to the holder in return thereof the silver certificates of the Government in denominations of \$1, \$2, \$5, \$10, \$20, \$50, and \$100.

Seventh. That the coins and certificates under this act shall be legal tender (unless otherwise provided by contract) in any sum for any debt or obligation, both private and public.

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required when demanded by the holder of any coins under this act who desires to have the same redeemed to receive said coins when presented in the sum of \$100 or any multiple thereof, and place the same in the primary silver reserve fund as bullion, and surrender as pay therefor, and in lieu thereof, to such holder from the primary silver reserve fund silver bullion of the bullion value of that day in the face sum of said coins so surrendered and redeemed.

It will readily be seen that under this proposition silver would be remonetized. The party, for illustration, who should present \$1,000 worth of silver bullion at the mint would receive 1,000 legal-tender silver dollars. The balance of the bullion, commonly called seigniorage, would pass to the primary silver reserve fund.

That which fails to be in the silver dollar to make it intrinsically worth \$1 in gold is in the primary reserve fund held in trust for that dollar. This primary reserve fund is increased or diminished, as the case may require, every thirty days, so that there shall be just that amount, no more, no less.

I submit this proposition for consideration to go in the RECORD because the gentleman from Maine discussed the international agreement plan, which is impracticable and has been exploded, as the remedy for the silver question and the proper method for the further coinage of silver. Should silver be remonetized under this plan, it would not disturb gold, but would aid in taking the strain from gold and would furnish a mint market for silver bullion. This would give it two competitive markets, the mint market and art market, which would, at least to some extent, en-

hance the bullion value of silver. Should silver bullion advance under this proposition, the Government would gain through the reserve; should it decline, the Government would lose. It is fair to make this deduction in political economy. A metal used as money and demonetized depreciates in its bullion value; remonetized it appreciates in value.

The Republican national platform of 1892 favors the coinage of silver "under such restrictions and such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal." The Democratic national platform of 1892 is exactly the same, only differing in the phraseology of the sentence in the resolution. I believe in the further coinage of silver on a safe, conservative, and enduring plan. The two great parties are together by their last national declarations.

Why not this Congress devise the way to coin silver under safeguards and redeem our pledges to the people of the whole country? Silver is an American product. It is a source of great national wealth. Why not utilize it and let the mines yield their wealth to the American people? [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that nothing that can be said upon this floor can affect the result of the vote which will be taken upon the report of the committee, and that no amount of discussion will change the settled purpose of the large majority of gold monometallists or Pickwickian bimetallicists to prevent the enactment of any legislation looking to the recognition of silver. But this discussion extends beyond these walls and reaches the great body of the people of this country who are vitally interested in the results and critically weighing the sentiments that control this body.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ON TRIAL.

The last campaign was a remarkable one in the political history of the Union. It was an off year. No Presidential election was pending. Nevertheless, the Democratic party was arraigned throughout the length and breadth of this land as hopelessly incompetent to manage the finances of the country; that although in full control of the executive and legislative departments, it had entirely failed to give any relief to the suffering millions of our citizens and our languishing industries. And the people believed the charge. The party in power was held responsible for the unfortunate and distressed condition of the nation; how unjustly, it is now beginning to realize. History declares the indisputable fact, of which this side of the House is justly proud, that during all the half century of the government of this country by the Democratic party there was never an act passed contracting the currency of the people or imposing upon them laws calculated or designed to enrich the few at the expense of the masses, making the rich richer and the poor poorer.

It has the enviable distinction of having been always true to the Constitution and its bed-rock principles; that the only justification for taxation is the necessity of it, and that its only virtue is in the equality of its burden upon all classes of citizens and all kinds of property. It has ever opposed robbery in all of its forms, whether directly by extravagant expenditures, or indirectly by tariff assessments upon the consumer for the benefit of the manufacturer, or insidiously by the contraction of the currency, and thereby depriving them of the opportunity to work, the means to pay their debts, and of fair values for their products. That is still the position of our party, judged, as it should be, by its platform and the votes of its representatives in Congress. It is essentially and by inheritance the party of the people. Its past record bespeaks its future, and it will yet, and at no distant day, resume business at the old stand as young and lusty as when ten years ago it emerged from its eclipse of a quarter of a century.

As I was stating, in the campaign of 1894 the Republican party proclaimed that it alone was capable of conducting the finances of the Government and of infusing life into the arteries of commerce, giving employment to labor, and restoring a general era of prosperity. The people took them at their word. That party is now in full possession of the Senate and House. Congress has been in session two months. The eyes of the people have already begun to open to the true situation. The recollection is now dawning upon them that this very party is the cause of all the financial ailments of the Government and of the ills of the country. That party has erected monuments to itself which will be as enduring as history. It has enacted every tariff law that has been passed for the benefit of the manufacturers rather than for revenue for the Government.

The act which destroyed silver as a mint money was enacted by you in 1873. From that date to this we have been trying to rehabilitate it, to restore it to the house of its fathers, while you have with equal persistency striven to prevent a resurrection. In November, 1877, Mr. Bland (Democrat) carried through the House a bill for the free and unlimited coinage of silver which should be legal tender at face value. In January, 1878, the Senate amended

it by limiting the coinage to a minimum of \$2,000,000 per month on Government account and providing for the exchange of silver coins for certificates of not less than \$10 each. The bill passed as amended. President Hayes vetoed it "as an act of bad faith" to bondholders. It was passed over the veto. It was repealed July 14, 1890. In June, 1890, a bill authorizing the issue of Treasury notes upon deposit of silver bullion passed the House. The Senate substituted for it a bill for the free coinage of silver. The House rejected the substitute. The committee of conference agreed to what is known as the Sherman law. It became an act July 14, 1890. It provided for the monthly purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion, at not more than \$1 for 371½ grains of pure silver, and for the issuance of Treasury notes in payment, redeemable on demand in gold or silver, at the discretion of the Secretary. It made them legal tender except when otherwise stipulated in the contract, required the monthly coinage of the bullion into standard silver dollars till the following July, after which he could coin only so much as should be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes.

It may be well to state also in passing that it also declared it to be "the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio as may be provided by law." Now the mask can only be taken from this miserable appearance of silver recognition when it is compared with the essentials or qualities constituting the stability as money of a metal. Those essentials are that the owner of it shall have free access to the mints for coinage and in unlimited quantity; that there shall be no charge for mintage beyond the actual cost to the Government; that the amount, by weight, of pure metal in the coin shall be exchangeable for its weight in the bullion, and that the coin shall at all times be a full legal tender. The hollowness of the pretense appears at once. It was indeed a "miserable makeshift." Its author has since justified, or rather excused it, by claiming that that was the only way to defeat the free coinage of silver. And, at last, the coup de grâce was given to aspiring silver by the act of November, 1893, which repealed that portion of the Sherman Act which allowed the purchase of silver. That is the story. All the glory for the demonetization of silver—whatever that glory may be—is yours. All of the wrongs done your countrymen by that act rest upon your head.

THE RESULT OF REPUBLICAN LEGISLATION.

With Sir Christopher Wren you may point to your own work as your monument. You may claim as your own particular production the long and continually lengthening list of tariff barons, manufacturing princes, trust-monopoly magnates. All the rivulets of a nation's toil and all the streams of her industry have, under the system of protection, paternalism, extravagance, and class favoritism, inaugurated and maintained by the Republican party during the past thirty-five years, been poured into the cavernous vaults of the favored few of her citizens and of the alien. That party has been the means of concentrating wealth to an extent never before known to any nation or people. Europe with her centuries of feudal despotism, class distinctions, and hereditary accumulations stands awestricken in the presence of the colossal fortunes which have risen in this Republic of freedom and equality within the past quarter of a century.

I need not dwell upon details. They are known of all men. Extreme wealth and extreme poverty have become the features of our civilization. One-half of 1 per cent of our population owns one-half of the total wealth of the country. The remaining 99½ per cent of the people must divide among them in all manner of proportions this unappropriated other half of the wealth of the nation. It is they who are vitally interested in this measure and who are keenly alive to the disposition to be made of it. They realize that within the past thirty-three years twenty thousand millions of wealth of this country, created and produced by its honest toilers, have passed into the hands and under the control of capital, and that that process is continuing at the rate of about one billion each year. The census of 1890 tells them further that from 1861 to 1890 the people of these United States were compelled to run into debt, public and private, twenty-eight thousand million dollars. Labor has been most vigorous and faithful, the soil has been most generous, the spirit of enterprise has been active, energy and boldness have characterized these closing years of this marvelous century in all departments of commerce, manufacturing, and development of all our resources. Yet, notwithstanding all this, the great mass of the people have steadily been growing poorer and poorer, and the wealth created by them has flowed into coffers already filled to overflowing.

The last census demonstrates the fearfully blighting effect of our financial system upon our agricultural and producing States and the corresponding benefits to the States where organized capital has taken its abode. One illustration will be sufficient. The 16 agricultural States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska,

Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana have a combined area of about 800,000 square miles. The State of New York has about 50,000 square miles. The population of the 16 States was about 21,000,000 in 1880, and that of New York about 5,000,000. The assessed valuation of the property of the 16 States was a little over \$4,000,000,000 in 1880, while that of New York was \$2,650,000,000. Now, in the ten years the 16 producing States, with an area sixteen times as great as that of New York, increased in wealth eleven hundred and fifty millions, while that State alone gained eleven hundred and twenty-three millions. These silent figures tell more eloquently than I can the story of the great body of the people being made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the favored few. If any further evidence is desired, it can easily be found in the comparison of the values of our two great export crops, cotton and wheat, in the years 1881 and 1893, which has been compiled as follows:

In 1881 the wheat crop of the United States was 383,000,000 bushels. It realized \$456,000,000.

The cotton crop of the United States for the same period, estimated at 6,000,000 bales, at 470 pounds per bale, at 10 cents per pound, would amount to \$282,000,000; the same weight of cotton in 1893, at the selling price of 6 cents per pound, realized only \$169,200,000, or a difference in the price of the crop, estimating the quantity the same, of \$112,800,000.

The difference in the price of wheat for the same period, 1881 and 1893, was \$243,000,000 less than 1881, so that we have a shrinkage of values in the two staple crops of the country of \$355,800,000, which, together with the other staple crops, will make at least a shrinkage in farm products alone of more than \$1,000,000,000 per year.

We have for the past twelve years lost in the material wealth, the product of the soil from which the wealth of the country is derived, \$12,000,000,000. With this vast sum of money in the country we should never have been in the pitiable condition we are to-day—a sum so large that it would purchase all the railroad stocks and bonds, watered or unwatered, besides leaving a surplus.

THE ACT OF 1873 CHIEFLY RESPONSIBLE.

That this robbery of the producing and laboring classes has been chiefly accomplished through the instrumentality of the demonetizing act of 1873 has never been successfully denied and has been conceded by the greatest of Republican statesmen and politicians. It would indeed be a bootless task to enter upon the discussion of that subject at this late date. Those that are not now convinced of the fact would scarce believe though one came from the dead.

In 1880 Secretary of State James G. Blaine said:

On the much-vexed and long-mooted question as to bimetallic or monometallic standard my own views are sufficiently indicated in the remarks I have made. I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in and throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property. If, as the most reliable statistics affirm, there are nearly \$7,000,000,000 of coin or bullion in the world, very equally divided between gold and silver, it is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands.

I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution; indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which the great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare either metal should not be money. Congress has, therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize either. If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of remonetizing it. If its coinage has been prohibited, I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed; I am in favor of having it enlarged.

Prof. Francis A. Walker said in an article in the North American Review:

The abandonment of silver will result in the enhancement of the burden of all debts and fixed charges, acting as a drag upon production; and suffocation, strangulation, are words hardly too strong to express the agony of the industrial body when embraced in the fatal coils of a contracting money.

Dr. Giffen, of England, chief of the statistical department of trade and an authority with monometallists, has admitted:

If the test of prophecy be the event, there was never surely a better forecast. The fall of prices in such a general way as to amount to what is known as a rise in the purchasing power of gold is generally, I might almost say universally, admitted. Measured by any commodity or group of commodities usually taken as the measure for such a purpose, gold is undoubtedly possessed of more purchasing power than was the case fifteen or twenty years ago, and this high purchasing power has been continued over a long enough period to allow for all minor oscillations.

President Andrews, of Brown University, a member of the International Monetary Commission, concedes all that I have asserted: That the underlying cause for the financial and industrial depression is the fact of ever-falling values produced by the contraction of the currency and the displacement of silver from its position in the world's money circulation; that it was "the hardest, saddest blow to human welfare ever delivered by the action of the States; that so long as gold is the sole standard of money these wrongs and sufferings must continue—to abate them, silver must be monetized."

Hear what Senator JOHN SHERMAN, at present the high priest of gold monometallism, says in a letter written by him in 1878:

During the monetary conference in Paris, when silver in our country was excluded from circulation by being undervalued, I was strongly in favor of the single standard of gold, and wrote a letter, which you will find in the proceedings of that conference, stating briefly my view. At that time the wisest of us did not anticipate the sudden fall of silver or the rise of gold that has occurred. The uncertainty of the relation between the two metals is one of the chief arguments in favor of a monometallic system, but other arguments, showing the dangerous effect upon industry by dropping one of the precious metals from the standard of value, outweigh in my mind all theoretical objections to the bimetallic system.

There should be yoked to this opinion of one so high in Republican councils and of such undoubted authority in finance the maiden and unbiased judgment of his twin brother in economics, the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle, who a few months previously sounded this clarion note to his countrymen, who even that early appreciated his remarkable abilities:

I shall not enter into an examination of the causes which have combined to depreciate the relative value of silver and to appreciate the value of gold since 1873, but I am one of those who believe that they are transient and temporary in their nature, and that when they have passed away or have been removed by the separate or united actions of the nations most deeply interested in the subject, the old ratio of actual and relative value will be reestablished on a firmer foundation than ever. I know that 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 of 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 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 movable property of the world, including horses, ships, railroads, and all other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the 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 of the world.

One more object lesson from statistics, and I shall leave this subject. In 1873 wheat was \$1.30 per bushel, cotton 19 cents a pound, and silver \$1.30 an ounce. The farmer could then pay a debt of \$100 with 77 bushels of wheat or with a bale of cotton weighing 526 pounds. To-day, with silver at 57 cents, for him to pay a debt of \$100 it would require 220 bushels of wheat, or 3 bales of cotton weighing 450 pounds each. And it is the unavoidable result of the demonetization act of 1873. It can not be explained upon the theory of overproduction. The statistics already produced in this debate demonstrate that there has been no fixed ratio upon the basis of production. The ordinary law of supply and demand has been overridden by the higher law, that an insufficient currency reduces all commodities to beggars upon the market, be the production great or small.

It is equally futile to attempt to ascribe this disastrous condition to improvements in machinery appliances. The tabulated statements appearing in the London Economist show that the decline in values is greatest in the raw materials and in which there is the lowest minimum of the application or employment of such improvements. There is no escape from it. The conclusion is irresistible.

The one great cause of the depression which is resting like a nightmare upon the people of this broad land—the producers, the laborer, the merchant, the manufacturer; upon all save the money lender and the security owner, benumbing their energies and paralyzing their industries, as they measure a future which can only promise further decline in values—is the statute law of this Government, which, with ruthless purpose, has deprived the veins and arteries of the business of the country of the sufficiency of the money which is its lifeblood. Let not gentlemen delude themselves. The issue confronts you. The people are intensely in earnest. The limit of the tether has been reached. You made the law. You must unmake it. The country expects Congress to act. Almost every agricultural journal and every labor organization in the country is demanding the repeal of that iniquitous law. Manufacturing industries, seeing the impending ruinous consequences of an Asiatic competition which is fostering, are joining in the demand. Commerce has long felt its chilling hand and is eager to rid itself of its grasp. The one cheerful voice, bidding you stay your hand from interference with that lovely act, is that of your old friends, the bondholder and the capitalist. They will never get enough, even though it comes from the hearts of the poor, struggling masses, who have made you and made this country.

BONDS CAN GIVE NO RELIEF.

You have met this demand of the people by introducing and passing through this House a bill which is a masquerading farce, a meaningless nothingness, a vapid, airy, unsubstantial appearance of relief.

It simply proposes these changes in existing laws: It provides for the issue of bonds, the reduction of the interest to 3 per cent and of the length of them to fifteen years, and for the issue of three-year debenture certificates in the sum of \$50,000,000, should it become necessary, in order to defray the expenses of the Government. That is all. Should it be passed, no possible relief could proceed from it other than now provided by the existing law authorizing the issue of bonds. A 3 per cent short-term bond will realize less than a 4 per cent long-term bond, and a larger issue would be required to raise the same amount of money. Nothing would be saved to the Government. By this bill not one dollar of gold will be kept in this country, not a dollar would be added to the circulation, not one single enterprise encouraged, not a day's employment given to labor.

The height of its aspiration is to improve upon and render more facile the present indefensible system of issuing bonds—more bonds! It simply echoes the policy of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, adding by way of adornment a bay window and a few turrets. The "grand old party" has pinned itself to the policy of the President, and is content to solve the financial problem by the easy and primitive process of borrowing money. It has committed itself to the system, odious to American sentiment, and injurious to the interests of the people and of generations yet unborn, of levying tribute upon them in time of peace by the issue of bonds with which to borrow money to keep up a gold reserve whose only good purpose is to subserve the interests of bond investors by continually exhausting itself, only to be replenished by the sale of more bonds. Within two years we have issued one hundred and sixty-two millions, and yet the last condition of the Treasury is worse than the first. Another issue of one hundred millions will follow within a few days, and the end is not yet. The policy inaugurated by Secretary Sherman, continued by Secretary Carlisle, and now approved and indorsed by this bill has proved utterly unavailing, a delusion and a snare.

The original act of 1875 may have subserved the purpose of placing the greenback notes upon a par with our metal currency. The effort to maintain the reserve so authorized is productive of evils exceeding in their magnitude all the depreciation that those notes could have suffered had they not received the support afforded by that act. The remedy has proven worse than the disease, under the application of the ruinous construction given to the word "coin" in their redemption. One note redeemed in silver coin would have stopped the drain of gold from the Treasury and the reserve would to-day be intact. But the face of the Administration is set straight toward gold, and there is no hope for an early departure from that policy. It is very seriously questioned whether the reserve is any longer of service in sustaining the par value of the notes. When it has fallen as it is to-day to forty-six millions, there is no accompanying decline in their market value. Had it descended 50 per cent lower, the greenbacks would have scarcely depreciated one cent. The one hundred millions is at best but 10 per cent of the Government's indebtedness. It is asking too much of the public to believe that this small deposit in our national vaults is essential to the maintenance of the three hundred and forty-six millions of our greenbacks at par with our other currency. The majority in this House thinks differently and will commit your party to the position that it has done all that is necessary to relieve the country when it has provided for the issue of more bonds to create or sustain a reserve which at most is not admittedly essential or for the public good.

THE SENATE SUBSTITUTE THE REMEDY.

The Senate in its substitute to this bill proposes relief which is practical, substantial, clear-cut, and certain. It restores the status that existed prior to the demonetization of 1873 by opening the mints to the free coinage of silver at the old ratio of 16 to 1; provides for the coinage of the seigniorage accumulated under the act of 1890; requires bank notes under \$10 to be redeemed and larger denominations substituted; and directs that the greenbacks and Treasury notes shall when presented for redemption be paid at the option of the Government and not of the holder in gold or silver, the greenbacks when so redeemed to be reissued as provided by the act of 1878.

That substitute, if adopted, will give relief. It presents squarely the issue that the only source of permanent relief to the country is in the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

WE CAN NOT HOLD GOLD UNDER PRESENT LAWS.

It is useless for the United States to attempt to hold gold. History proves it; the conditions now surrounding us demonstrate it beyond a question. Our mines now furnished about one-half of all the gold of the world. Seventeen hundred millions have passed through our mints. Of that vast sum we have to-day only about six hundred millions. The rest has gone over the waters. Other causes must be found than that the greenbacks and the Treasury notes have drained it from our vaults, for, as an

evidence, from 1849 to 1879 there were no Treasury notes, and no gold was paid for greenbacks. Yet during those thirty years, the era of our great metal production, of the fourteen hundred millions of gold and silver produced, one thousand million were exported. Forced residence of gold in our Treasury can only be temporary and fleeting. The three last purchases of it with our bonds remove the fact from the domain of controversy. So long as we are burdened with our present heavy foreign indebtedness and continue our foreign expenditures, by which the balance of the trade is against us, just so long will it be impossible for us to retain the gold which is necessary or required to liquidate that balance.

Our indebtedness to Europe and foreign holders of our securities is variously estimated at from five to six billion. Upon this we must pay an annual interest of at least \$200,000,000. As not over 8 per cent of our exports and imports are carried upon our own ships, we must pay an estimated expense for carriage of \$100,000,000. In addition to this, it is estimated that the annual expenditures abroad of our tourists is about \$100,000,000. These three items make a total annual outgo from the United States, roundly estimated, of \$400,000,000. Against this we have upon our side of the account not more than one hundred and fifty millions, consisting of excess of exports over imports of products, manufactures, gold, and silver, leaving an annual balance against us of about two hundred and fifty millions. Under present conditions there is no reason to expect a reduction of this balance. Our gold must continue to settle, upon demand, these balances against us, so long as they continue to exist. We can not pay them by borrowing money. We can pay them by increasing the value of our products, which can only be done by increasing the value of our currency, and also by increasing the volume of our foreign trade, which can best be done by monetizing silver.

OUR ONLY HOPE IS IN MONETIZING SILVER.

It is a law of economics recognized by all that the prices of commodities rise or fall with the enlargement or the contraction of the currency. It is needless to hope for any appreciable increase in circulation from gold alone. All the gold in the world to-day would not pay one year's interest upon the bonded indebtedness of the world. Dr. Giffen, the monometallist whom I mentioned, gives it as his opinion that practically the whole annual production of gold is consumed in the arts and sciences, none of it adding to the supply of money. Our population is increasing at the rate of 3 per cent a year. The per capita supply of our metal coin must each succeeding year become less and less. Prices must continue to fall and debts become harder to pay. The result is as certain as the laws of Newton and Kepler, as sure and relentless as fate.

The value of all money is dependent upon the elements of value vested in it by the law, which are its legal-tender qualities and its debt-paying power, and the debt-paying power is measured by the quantity of the legal tenders. Under the act of 1873 the quantity of silver dollars was then and there fixed, and under the act of 1893 it is prevented from being further enlarged. Silver has been reduced from a money to a commodity. This country is now upon a single gold basis; as much so as England and Germany.

So, then, the fact confronts us in all of its fearful reality that under the laws upon our statute books the money of the people will year by year become scarcer and scarcer; commodities will grow less and less in value; all industry will be handicapped with the almost certain loss of a falling market. In a word, this fair country, with its boundless possibilities, which should be the home of millions of happy, contented, and prosperous people, will fall a helpless victim to blighting, merciless legislation. Our silver mines are ready and anxious to open their stores of wealth; but no! And why not? Because gold permits no rival, is jealous of its monopoly, and wishes not for its daily growing greatness to be curtailed. The less money there is the better for those who have it is a fact too strong to be resisted by those who are in position to profit by it.

WE CAN VENTURE ALONE UPON FREE COINAGE.

Now the question arises: Can the United States, without the cooperation of Europe, safely venture upon the free coinage of silver—as the Senate substitute proposes?

The great need of this Government is the infusion of some of the Monroe-doctrine courage into its financial policy. We boldly announce our fiat that no foreign hand shall lay hold of American soil or extend dominion already acquired, and we stand prepared to maintain it. The great heart of the nation beats responsive to the declaration. But when the proposition is suggested that we exercise our independence by establishing our own currency, we are seized with timidity and halted with dire forebodings and given visions of all the horrors of a debased and dishonored currency. We are told that we dare not run counter to the financial systems of the great powers of Europe. Prophecy is the last refuge of a defeated cause. The future is invoked, armed with all manner of dangers and calamities, and employed to induce us to take

counsel of our fears. It is very effective. It is to-day restraining thousands of our citizens from declaring for the remonetization of silver. Their timidity is not justified by the conditions. If ever a people were in a position to work out their own financial salvation it is this people. We have 70,000,000 population, only a little less than the combined population of Great Britain and France. We have 3,000,000 square miles of territory. Our per capita indebtedness is less than that of any of the great powers, as this table shows:

Country.	Population.	Debt.	Per capita.
Austria-Hungary	41,827,700	\$2,866,339,539	\$70.84
France	38,218,903	4,445,793,398	116.35
Germany	49,421,064	1,956,217,017	39.58
Great Britain and Ireland	37,880,764	3,350,719,563	87.79
Italy	29,699,785	2,324,826,329	76.06
Russia	113,354,649	3,491,018,074	30.79
Spain	17,550,296	1,251,453,696	73.85
United States	69,000,000	915,962,112	14.63

In each of those countries, its per capita indebtedness largely exceeds its per capita of coin, whereas our per capita of coin exceeds our per capita of indebtedness by nearly \$4. We furnish Europe nearly one-half of its breadstuffs and three-fourths of its cotton. Our supply of silver is only one-third of hers. It seems bold indeed to assert that this great country, so marvelously favored, so Titanic in its enterprise, the foremost nation of all the world, should not be able to keep at par its silver metal bearing the stamp of its mint. For more than a century it has done so, and at 16 to 1. The people of the United States are not afraid of it in their domestic affairs. The great bugaboo held up to us is the effect of free coinage upon foreign exchange. At best, foreign exchange amounts to scarcely more than 5 per cent of the business transactions of the world; and almost the only thing that would be accomplished by the impossible ignis fatuus of international bimetallic agreement is international exchange. In all other respects each country is free and independent to act for itself, as the almost infinitely varied coins and currency of Europe, Asia, and Africa to-day attest.

If there is any power on earth that can restore the old ratio between gold and silver as money it is the United States. The conditions to which I have already referred, and the urgent necessity for the relief of our people, certainly justify the effort. So soon as our mints are opened to the free and unlimited coinage of silver the demand for it will necessarily increase. The strength of our Government and national resources would nullify the effort of gold to depreciate the coin and to place itself at a premium. Gold would no longer be the master of the situation, but the Government. The demand for it would decrease as the demand for silver increased, and they would soon move along side by side, in friendly parity, at the old step of 16 to 1, as they should do, for that is the ratio of the stocks of the two metals in the world.

But let us suppose that, as claimed by the opponents of this substitute, gold would go to a premium and remain there. Then the result would simply be the difference in exchange between us and the single gold countries to the extent of the premium. There is nothing in that to frighten us. The ultimate results would be vastly in our favor. That very rate of exchange is to-day a mighty barrier in the way of the trade between Asia and South America on the one hand and Europe and ourselves on the other. The rate is continually changing. The Japanese merchant can only guess at what his goods will be worth in English or American gold at the time of arrival at their destination. The profits of the transactions are largely dependent upon the exchange fluctuations. Our trading relations with them can not prosper when thus hampered. The advantage in the difference in exchange is all with them.

China, Japan, and Mexico have the money they have always known and none other. Silver is to-day what it was. They are satisfied to receive it at its old valuation. If we are to compete with their manufacturers we must be content with silver on the same basis, and not at 100 per cent exchange. At the present bullion value of our silver and its exclusion from the mints it is on a gold basis, worth only one-half of its face value, and the only thing left us is the payment of the difference of that exchange before being placed in equal competition with our new Eastern rivals. Even the most ardent friend of protection can not hope for his old friend to cope with 100 per cent exchange. The extraordinary progress and development now being made in those countries, upon a silver basis, effectively chase away the dogmas, theories, and hobgoblins of the gold monometallists. The consular reports, which have already been so freely quoted in this debate, tell the story of the vast impetus given to the commiserated silver countries by this little matter of exchange. China and Japan's 1,000,000 spindles are alone sufficient to make anyone but a gold zealot stop and think a moment.

If there is no possibility of restoring the two metals to a parity,

if the line now drawn between gold-standard and silver-standard countries is to be permanent, then it is the policy of this country to cast its lot with the silver-using people.

Hear what President Andrews again admits:

Should the United States begin free coinage alone, it would take its place as the one great manufacturing nation of the silver world, and derive from that position the immense gain which England has hitherto reaped, but largely lost, by the demonetization of silver. We should manufacture for Mexico, South America, China, and Japan, and England, owing to the lack of par exchange with them, would lose most or all of her custom. No doubt here is a splendid chance. We may effectually dish England as a manufacturing and commercial nation by the means suggested. I do not wonder that this prospect carries away so many, for it is indeed a glorious one.

The London Financial News, a very high authority in matters of finance, says:

There can be no doubt about it that if the United States were to adopt a silver basis to-morrow British trade would be ruined before the year was out. Every American industry would be protected, not only at home, but in every other market. Of course the States would suffer to a certain extent, through having to pay their obligations abroad in gold, but the loss on exchange under this head would be a mere drop in the bucket compared with the profits to be reaped from the markets of South America and Asia, to say nothing of Europe. The marvel is that the United States has not long ago seized the opportunity, and but for the belief that the way of England is necessarily the way to commercial success and prosperity undoubtedly it would have been done long ago.

The balance of trade in those silver-using countries is now strongly against us, that of China and Japan alone being for the last year \$34,000,000 in their favor. It will continue to grow as it is doing to-day, at most rapid rates, to the increasing injury of our products and manufacturing industries and the labor which they employ.

It will be a glad day for the vast majority of the people of this industrious land when the shackles of money contraction are removed from the energies of our people, and they are given the opportunity to carve out the destiny of their Republic and the happiness of its citizens with the money of their constitution, and that day is not far distant. This substitute will be rejected by this House. Nevertheless its voices, as I believe, the sentiments of a large majority of the voters of this nation.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in the time at my disposal I shall not attempt to present in detail all the historical and statistical facts bearing upon the free coinage of silver. These phases of the subject have been presented exhaustively, time and again, upon this floor and in the prints of the country. Every nook and corner of history on financial and cognate lines have been closely scanned under the calcium light of the concentrated attention of the monetary world, and the results spread out as a common fund of information.

Hence, for the sake of brevity, I shall assume sufficient familiarity, both on the part of the House and on the part of the country, with the leading facts to warrant me in merely referring to them, though under different conditions I should prefer, for the sake of symmetry and completeness, to quote the authorities in full.

In the endeavor to adjust myself to the limitation of time I shall (1) bestow only a passing notice upon considerations of mere policy—considerations which, to my mind, have been accorded undue attention in the discussions of this subject here and elsewhere. Believing that public questions are never settled until they are settled right, I shall dispose of such considerations as have been accorded most attention, and having disposed of them, will (2) endeavor to present plainly and briefly the questions of principle and right lying beneath this turbulent surface discussion.

AS TO MERE QUESTIONS OF POLICY.

First, then, in discussing the questions of policy, I will follow the order of the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], deservedly the leader of the opposition on this floor, in his argument before the House yesterday. I select his order because, as chairman of the leading House committee and leader of the opposition, it is to be presumed that he has presented the subject in the strongest possible aspect from the gold monometallist point of view. What, then, are the considerations of policy urged against the free coinage of silver by the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means?

1. First and foremost (and this is the stock argument of the other side, urged with more or less of vehemence), that the enactment of this or any bill providing for the free coinage of silver would create widespread alarm in business circles, an all-pervading distrust of the honesty of the Government, a disastrous shrinkage of values, and universal distress. This has been urged time and again in the same connection. It was urged with great vehemence at the other end of the Capitol last week, when this bill was on its passage in the Senate. It was urged then that even the agitation of the bill was a menace to the pending bond sale, and Senators who favored the bill were charged with conspiring to defeat the bond negotiation and destroy the confidence of the financial world in the integrity of our purposes. All this and more was iterated in the press of the country. And yet, Mr. Speaker, even while the distinguished gentleman was on this floor insisting with vehement

iteration that such results would follow with the absolute certainty of doom, there was being enacted in the Treasury Department the most crushing, because the most practical, refutation of his argument.

The bids for the one-hundred-million-dollar popular loan then and there being opened demonstrated that 4,600 applications, aggregating \$558,269,850, had been filed at prices ranging all the way from par to 119. Not only so, Mr. Speaker, but the big bankers were fairly treading on each other's toes and resorting to the disreputable practices of Wall street in their eagerness to get hold of these coin bonds; and offering to pay for these coin bonds in gold. Does this look like lack of confidence? Where was the distrust and alarm about which members and others have so vociferously declaimed? Surely, Mr. Speaker, after this practical object lesson, concurrent and contemporaneous with the passage of this free-coinage measure, I need not consume more time in refutation of this argument of the opposition—their strongest argument, if we are to judge by the frequency of its repetition. It is no answer to this crushing demonstration at the Treasury for the opposition to say that the President, as has been intimated, has given assurances of a veto in case this bill or any other free-coinage bill be passed. Without discussing the propriety of his conduct, or the necessity of some modification of the veto power given him by the Constitution, it is sufficient to say in regard to the case in hand, that Mr. Cleveland's power to interpose a veto upon the will of the people in the matter of silver legislation will expire next year, while these coin bonds run thirty years; and, to borrow a favorite expression of the other side, "you know capital is proverbially timid," even of remote contingencies.

2. The second argument, from the standpoint of pure policy, to which the gentleman from Maine devoted much attention, was in substance this: If this bill should pass, the Treasury notes would immediately become redeemable in silver dollars, while the silver dollars in the Treasury would not be free for the purpose of such redemption, being really the property of holders of silver certificates outstanding. Hence, he argued, no holder of a greenback could get a silver dollar out of the Treasury without getting somebody else's dollar, namely, the dollar of the holder of the corresponding silver certificate outstanding. Admitting the literal accuracy of this statement, in what respect does this condition differ from the existing condition as to the greenback in its relation to the gold redemption fund, which the gentleman seeks so ardently to perpetuate? What are the facts? There are in the neighborhood of \$346,000,000 of greenbacks outstanding, which the gentleman, following the unwarranted construction of the Administration, desires to redeem exclusively in gold. There has not been at any time for several years exceeding \$100,000,000 of gold in the Treasury for the redemption of these greenbacks. According to the Treasurer's statement for this date, there is only a little over \$46,000,000 of such gold on hand. At times it has reached even a lower figure. How can \$346,000,000 of greenbacks be redeemed with \$46,000,000 or even \$100,000,000 of gold? How can any holder of a greenback, under the condition which our opponents seek to perpetuate, get a gold dollar out of the Treasury without getting somebody else's dollar? If there is any force in the point raised against redeeming greenbacks in silver dollars, surely there is threefold more force in the point as applied to redemption of greenbacks in gold exclusively as proposed by our opponents and actually attempted by the Administration without warrant or the color of authority of law. If there be any force in the point that no holder of a greenback can get a silver dollar out of the Treasury without getting somebody else's dollar, then surely no holder of a greenback can get a gold dollar out of the Treasury to-day without getting a dollar to which at least three other people have an equal claim.

The condition so much feared by gentlemen on the other side is already with us, in more aggravated form, under their favorite method of an exclusive gold redemption. The difference between our proposition and theirs is, that theirs involves more bonds, more taxes, more monopoly; our proposition means a strict compliance with the contract, less taxes, no bonds, and death to gold monopoly.

3. The third consideration of policy urged against the free coinage of silver is, that its effect would inevitably be to drive this country to a silver basis, and the stock references to India and Mexico are cited here on this floor in style ranging from tame assertion to incoherent declamation—in no case supported by proofs of any sort, or the semblance of proofs. It might be sufficient to point again to that scene now progressing in the Treasury, and remind our "friends the enemy" that with so swift and palpable a refutation of their assertions on another point, in the shape of a fresh object lesson under our very eyes, we prefer to go a little slow in accepting their assertions on this point at their face value.

The cold facts in point are that the Government has been offered upward of six hundred millions of gold for an issue of one hundred millions of coin bonds at a rate of premium that would yield interest at 3½ per cent. Not gold bonds, mind you, but coin bonds, at a time when a free-silver bill has passed the Senate and

is pending in the House! And there is nothing unusual about this. It is thoroughly in keeping with the financial history of our Government during the entire eighty years that silver coinage prevailed on equal terms with gold.

In other words, at the very storm center of the agitation for free coinage, a call for one hundred millions of gold is met by prompt responses to more than five times the amount called for. There is a scramble for the bonds, and the premium offered voluntarily is such as to yield on the investment only 3½ per cent. This, too, in spite of the Executive dictum (when the private deal for these same bonds was pending at 104 or thereabouts) that there was doubt about floating a coin bond at all; but that a bond payable exclusively in gold might be floated at 3 per cent interest. There is absolutely no proof that we should go to a silver basis, and our experience so far teaches exactly the contrary.

4. Neither need I occupy the time of the House with the causes for the alleged decline of silver. It might be sufficient to deny any real decline in the value of that metal. The value of silver to-day as compared with the values of all staple commodities and forms of property is practically the same that it has always been, the slight difference being readily accounted for in the improved methods of production and manufacture of those commodities which are cheaper than formerly as compared with silver bullion.

It is only as compared with gold that silver has declined, and in that decline all other commodities have more or less shared. Is it not plain that to say silver and all other commodities have declined as compared with gold, is tantamount to saying that gold has risen in value as compared with all other values? Is it not more rational to say gold has risen in value as compared with everything else, than it is to say everything else has fallen in value as compared with gold? Is not the rise in gold an inevitable and necessary corollary of the fall of everything else?

But granting, for the sake of argument, that silver has fallen in value, is not a sufficient reason to be found for that decline in the legislation against silver? The act of 1873 dropped the silver dollar out as the measure of value, the unit of account, and substituted the gold dollar in its place. If there was no advantage in the position of unit of account, why did the gold combine seek to displace silver? Why did they seek to put gold in its stead? At the time the act was passed the silver in a silver dollar was worth a dollar and three cents in gold. As a result of that change, gold has appreciated until their holdings have doubled in value within twenty-three years, without their turning a spindle or plowing a furrow. They have amassed untold millions by a mere stroke of the Executive pen, unconsciously given, and the masses have been robbed by just so much. That legislation may affect the value of everything no sane man will doubt. If anyone doubts, let him procure the passage of a law against the use of pacing horses, and see where the price of pacing horses will go to.

So much for the considerations of mere policy which are relied upon to sustain the opposition. What are the real issues? What are the principles, upon which the question should be settled rather than upon questions of policy?

THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED.

1. The free coinage of silver involves the integrity of all contracts, public and private, entered into for eighty years. For eighty years, from 1793 to 1873, every contract involving the measure of value and the payment of money was predicated upon the silver dollar of 371½ grains of fine silver. During the period of the civil war alone the public contracts amounted to more than two thousand million dollars. The total, public and private, before and subsequent to that war, up to 1873, would defy conception, not to say computation. By the statute of 1792 every one of these contracts in plain terms provided for liquidation in coin upon the basis of 371½ grains of fine silver as the measure of value. The act of 1873 changed all this. So long as that measure of value remained the same, every contract could be settled with equity and exact justice to both the creditor and the debtor. Increase that measure of value, and the debtor is robbed by just so much as the increase multiplied by the number of units; decrease the measure of value, and the creditor is robbed in the same ratio. Increase it and not only are the debtors robbed, but every farmer and wage worker and producer is robbed in the markets where he sells his products or his labor.

Nothing can be more elementary or plainer than this. The farmer is robbed just as surely by increasing the value of the dollar as if the half bushel in which his grain is measured at the market had been correspondingly increased in size; he is robbed just as surely as if the scales upon which his cotton or his pork are weighed at the market had been previously loaded or "set back."

The fathers evidently appreciated this fundamental truth, and hence when they in 1834 found the commercial value of silver and gold varying slightly from the coinage ratio, they properly adjusted it by changing the coinage ratio. But how? By changing the unit of account, the silver dollar? Nay, verily. Through all the changes in our coinage laws—in 1834, in 1837, in 1849, in 1853—

no change in the amount of pure silver in the silver dollar was ever made. And the reason is plain. It was the measure of value, the standard of value, the unit of account, and the most primitive honesty demanded that it be inviolate. Whatever change was made in adjusting the difference between the silver and the gold dollar was adjusted by reducing the gold in the gold dollar. Only once in all the eighty years from 1792 to 1873, under the operation of open mints to both gold and silver on equal terms, did it become necessary to adjust the commercial difference between the gold and the silver dollar by a change of ratio in the coinage. That was in 1834, when the gold in the gold dollar was reduced from 27 grains to 25.8 grains.

It was left for the gold combine that battered upon the misfortunes of their country during the civil war, while the brave sons of the North and the South were drenching the soil in defense of their convictions—it was left for these sordid sons of greed to shift the measure of value by surreptitious means in the coinage act of 1873, and thus unsettle the equities and destroy the integrity of the contracts of almost a century. By the act of 1873, which passed both Houses without many of the most prominent members knowing what its secret purpose and concealed effect would be, which was signed by the President without any suspicion of its intended effect—so carefully was it framed, so carefully managed to conceal its purpose while assuming the air of utmost frankness—by that act of 1873, procured in this way, the equities of a century were destroyed and the way opened for limitless oppression of the masses of the people, for limitless pillage of the farmer and of all productive industry. In the name of the masses, who have been wronged by the rich for the benefit of the rich, we stand here to-day and demand that the wrong shall be righted; that the debtor, public and private, be allowed to discharge his debt according to the plain terms of the contract—i. e., in the coin of the Constitution (gold and silver), but measured in the silver dollar of 371½ grains of fine silver.

And we deny that the payment of those debts in silver dollars, according to the terms of the contract, is paying them in dishonest dollars. Our debts are payable in coin, and under the definition in the Constitution coin is both gold and silver; while by the act of 1792 the silver dollar is the sole measure of value. If the term "dishonest" properly attaches anywhere in this connection, it attaches to that dollar which requires double as much of the farmer's cotton and wheat and corn to pay a debt as was required when the debt was made.

Here is a table showing that we have paid the civil-war debt nearly twice over in dollars, and yet it would require nearly twice as much of the products of the farm to liquidate the balance due, \$889,313,380, as would have sufficed to pay the whole debt at first:

Year.	Debt, interest-bearing and non-interest-bearing, less cash in Treasury.	Debt could have been paid in bales of cotton of 500 pounds each.	Average price of cotton.	Debt could have been paid in bushels of wheat.	Average price of wheat.
1866.....	\$2,636,026,164	12,940,020	\$0.43	1,116,922,103	\$2.36
1873.....	2,105,462,062	22,035,118	.20	1,349,719,538	1.56
1879.....	1,996,414,905	39,928,298	.10	1,649,929,673	1.21
1884.....	889,313,380	25,916,812	.0694	1,474,284,229	.61
Paid in principal and interest since 1866.....	3,914,424,855	65,240,414	.12	3,131,539,884	1.25

Add to this the enormous private debt during the same period and we get some faint idea of the mammoth stake for which the gold combine played during and since the civil-war, and which they are now striving to still further enlarge at the expense of the debtors both public and private.

In the first burst of righteous indignation that swept over the country after the true meaning of the act of 1873 became apparent, men were sent here fresh from the ranks of the people to undo this wrong. Among them was the present Secretary of the Treasury, whose magnificent arraignment of that crime has rarely been matched, never surpassed. Here is what Mr. Carlisle said in 1878:

I shall not now enter into an examination of the causes which have combined to depreciate the relative value of silver and to appreciate the value of gold since 1873, but I am one of those who believe that they are transient and temporary in their nature, and that when they have passed away or been removed by the separate or united action of the nations most deeply interested in the subject the old ratio of actual and relative value will be reestablished on a firmer foundation than ever. I know that the world's stock of the 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 of 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 oc-

curréd 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 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 of the world. With an ample currency, an industrious and frugal people will speedily rebuild their works of internal improvement and repair their losses of property, but no amount of industry or economy on the part of the people can create money. When the Government creates it, or authorizes it, the citizen may acquire it, but he can do nothing more.

I am in favor of every practicable and constitutional measure that will have a tendency to defeat or retard the perpetration of this great crime, and I am also in favor of every practicable and constitutional measure that will aid us in devising a just and permanent ratio of value between the two metals, so that they may circulate side by side and not alternately drive each other into exile from one country to another.—*Congressional Record*, volume 7, part 5, page 41, Appendix.

Closing the same speech, Mr. Carlisle uses the following extraordinary language:

Our power of legislation over this subject will not be exhausted by the passage of this measure, and we ought not to halt for a single moment in our efforts to complete the work of relief inaugurated by it. The struggle now going on can not cease, and ought not to cease, until all industrial interests of the country are fully and finally emancipated from the heartless domination of syndicates, stock exchanges, and other great combinations of money grabbers in this country and in Europe. Let us, if we can do no better, pass bill after bill, embodying in each some one substantial provision for relief, and send them to the Executive for his approval. If he withholds his signature, and we are unable to secure the necessary vote here or elsewhere to enact them into laws, notwithstanding his veto, let us, as a last resort, suspend the rules and put them into the general appropriation bills, with the distinct understanding that if the people can get no relief the Government can get no money.

And here is what Mr. SHERMAN, the arch evangel of gold monometallism to-day, said in 1869, when the proposition was made to go to a specie basis:

It means the payment of \$135 where he has agreed to pay \$100; or, which is the same thing, the payment of \$100 where he has agreed to pay \$74. When he has purchased property and paid one-fourth of it, it means the loss of the property. It means the addition of one-fourth to all currency debts in the United States. A measure to require a debtor now to pay his debt in gold, or currency equivalent to gold, requires him to pay 135 bushels of wheat when he agreed to pay 100; and if this appreciation is extended through a period of three years, it requires him to pay an interest of 12 per cent in addition to the rate he has agreed to pay. The appreciation of currency is a far more distressing operation than Senators may suppose. Our own and other nations have gone through this process before, and always with the sorest distress. It means the ruin of all debtors whose debts are twice their capital, though one-third less than all their property. It means the fall of all agricultural productions without any great reduction of taxes. To attempt this task suddenly by a surprise upon our people, by at once paralyzing their industry, by arresting them in the midst of lawful business and applying a new standard of value to their property, without any reduction of their debt or giving them an opportunity to compound with their creditors or distribute their loss, would be an act of folly without example in modern times.

And yet these men have out-Heroded Herod in recent years to bring about precisely the conditions of misery and distress they so vividly portrayed. Shall we trust them again? Shall we follow them further? When they were fresh from the people, they eloquently pleaded for the rights of the people; now they construe every point of law and of contract against the people, and violate law to do it. We who are fresh from the people to-day are standing for precisely what they stood for when they were fresh from the people twenty-five years ago.

2. It is argued that if free coinage of silver under this bill be reestablished a hardship would result in the settlement of contracts entered into since 1873. My reply is that we should not hesitate to right a wrong because, forsooth, some of those instrumental in bringing about that wrong and who, by reason of that wrong, have amassed fabulous fortunes, will be compelled to disgorge some of their ill-gotten gains. Still, there would doubtless be a large number of innocent and honest contractors who do not merit any punishment of this sort, and for their protection I would suggest as an amendment to the bill (which is sent to the desk) that all such contracts be adjusted upon the basis of the purchasing power of the dollar at the time the contract was made, as certified to by the Bureau of Statistics.

I need not pursue the question through its various phases since 1873. The compromises of 1878 and of 1890, and the final crowning infamy of 1893 have been burned into the memory of the masses. How the Executive grasped the reins and dictated legislation is fresh in mind. What was lacking in the act of 1893 to give full swing to the conspirators has been since supplemented by Department-made law to fit the schemes and the desires of the gold combine. Never before, perhaps, in the history of constitutional government, have trusted agents of the people dared go so far in constraining contracts to which the people are a party to the manifest disadvantage of the people. Never before have trusted agents dared violate the laws so flagrantly to force the people's representatives along the lines laid out by the conspirators. And when the Congress hesitates to carry out their behests, forsooth, the representatives of the sovereign people are insolently met with the scarcely concealed threat that if we do not go forward and validate by law what the head of a Department has done without the warrant of law, there will be another object lesson of panic and ruin and disaster.

By such efforts at compulsion every energy should be aroused.

I say to such, We accept your challenge; we will pass this bill. Do your worst. The contract right of the Government to pay its debts, according to the plain terms of the contract, shall not be tamely surrendered. The rights of the plain people shall not be bartered away. The worst you can do can be no worse than the prolonged and ever-increasing distress of the millions under the existing conditions. Even if your new object lesson result in wreck and ruin equal to the last one, the loss and destruction of value can be no greater than the ultimate aggregate loss and shrinkage from the continued operation of the existing system. But after the paroxysm of this new object lesson is past the toiler in shop and field and factory will be free to pursue the road of prosperity and progress without having his heels forever clogged with an ever-increasing load, without meeting a gold monopoly tollgate at every milestone.

[Mr. HYDE addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is scarcely to be expected that anything which might be said at this time in the brief period allowed for debate by the Republican majority on this floor upon this, the mightiest issue which now confronts the American people, can add very largely to the general stock of information on the subject. With a full appreciation of my lack of preparation to discuss the pending Senate bill, and of my inability to do the vast and far-reaching subject justice even under the most favorable conditions, still less at this late hour of night, I have yet deemed it a duty of highest moment to seek opportunity to present my views briefly, even though my method and arrangement be crude.

At the outset I beg to say that I gratefully salute the American Senate and render my meed of praise, feeble though it be, to that body for its prompt and ready recognition and performance of duty to the great body and mass of the citizens of this Republic in the passage of the bill now pending in this House.

That Senate which in the past has often been the subject of ribald diatribes from the penny-a-liners of the metropolitan press of the country and the sometime theme of the cheap-john and pinchbeck criticism of pseudo statesmen infesting this House has once again risen to the heights of a grand statesmanship and taken the initial step toward enacting into law a measure more beneficent, more just, more equitable, more largely enuring to the best interests of the masses of the plain people of these United States—the toiling millions, if the phrase pleases you, or if it displeases you—than any legislation enacted in this Capitol within half a century of the past. Think you the action by so decided a majority of that Senate, composed of Senators representing by entireties the sovereignties of all the States of this Union, is a matter to be lightly considered, pooh-poohed, and laughed out of court by the cry of “thrashing over old straw,” “calamity howls of Populists,” “wailing of anarchists,” and other kindred stentorian utterances of the attorneys and advocates of the single gold standard of money?

To those who entertain such views, let me sound a warning that they are mistaken, and perchance grievously mistaken. It is well that all should know and be advised at the threshold that there are representatives of the people on this floor who, believing that the time has not yet come, and with an abiding faith in the providence of the God of nations that it will never come, for the patriotic and honest masses of the people of this country to be permanently enslaved, in a thralldom thricefold worse than the worst example of African slavery, will stand unflinchingly by the action of the Senate and demand of you, the representatives of an outraged people, to do likewise. Looking to the environments and difficulties and obstructions besetting the pathway of the great mass of producers, toilers, and wage earners of this country, preventing absolutely that degree of material prosperity which it is their God-given right to enjoy, is it not, fellow-Representatives, a time for calm, deliberate, and unprejudiced consideration on our part?

I have during all the period of my manhood life been a partisan. In my early manhood there came a call which sounded and seemed to my ears the call of my country, a call to arms in defense of my native Southland, whose flag I followed through evil as well as through good repute until it went down in a sea of gloom and disaster never more to rise. I was then a partisan. Returning to the paternal roof-tree which, more fortunate than many others, had escaped fire and sword, I again, by the tolerance—if it please you—of the conquering section, was permitted to resume the duties and privileges of citizenship in a restored Union. The very logic of events, the instincts of self-preservation and a self-respecting manhood, made me a Democrat. I was a partisan. Later on I read and studied somewhat according to my limited opportunities the history of our Government and of the political economy affecting it, and became convinced that the tenets, theories, and practices of government advocated by the Democratic party were those best adapted to the welfare—material, moral, and mental—of the masses of the people. I was still a partisan, and I am yet a Democrat, rock-ribbed and thoroughly grounded in the faith, if

I know myself, but nevertheless somewhat rattled and shaken up, as it were, in my partisanship. [Applause.]

As a Democrat I would talk to-day, and of the theories and practices of finance as applied to our Constitution and Government, which are Democratic as I read the history and experience of the past, and yet I know full well that all I may say in this behalf will fall unheeded, and even scorned, upon the ears of some gentlemen whose Democracy in the past has been unquestioned and is yet unchallenged by me. This again somewhat impairs my partisanship, in fact, impels me toward discarding narrow partisanship, and to try to make my argument on the broader and higher plane of an appeal in behalf of all of my fellow-citizens of this broad and grand Union of States. In fact, I will take the liberty—I trust it is not an undue or an improper one—to remind my fellow-Representatives upon the other side of the Chamber that there is a duty resting upon them of as high import as that resting upon my humble self; that they should also rise above the low plane of partisanship, eschew all desires and practices looking simply to party advantage, and cooperate with gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber in striving to do our whole duty to the entire people of these United States.

A majority of you gentlemen, acting under the party whip, nominally in response to the sensational message of the President so dramatically sent to the Senate on the evening of December 20, 1895, passed a bill soon afterwards for the issuance of United States bonds, which bill reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2904) to maintain and protect the coin redemption fund, and to authorize the issue of certificates of indebtedness to meet temporary deficiencies of revenue.

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury by the act approved January 14, 1875, entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," he is authorized from time to time, at his discretion, to issue, sell, and dispose of, at not less than par in coin, coupon or registered bonds of the United States, to an amount sufficient for the object stated in this section, bearing not to exceed 3 per cent interest per annum, payable semiannually, and redeemable at the pleasure of the United States, in coin, after five years from their date, and payable in fifteen years after their date, with like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said act for the bonds therein authorized. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds thereof for the redemption of United States legal-tender notes, and for no other purpose: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or modify an act approved May 31, 1878, entitled "An act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes." Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall offer any of the bonds authorized for sale by this act or by the resumption act of 1875, he shall advertise the same and authorize subscriptions therefor to be made at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States.

SEC. 2. That to provide for any temporary deficiency now existing, or which may hereafter occur, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to issue certificates of indebtedness of the United States, to an amount not exceeding \$50,000,000, payable in three years after their date to the bearer in lawful money of the United States, of the denomination of \$20, or multiples thereof, with annual coupons for interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and to sell and dispose of the same for not less than an equal amount of lawful money of the United States at the Treasury Department and at the subtreasuries and designated depositories of the United States and at such post-offices as he may select. And such certificates shall have the like qualities, privileges, and exemptions provided in said resumption act for the bonds therein authorized. And the proceeds thereof shall be used for the purpose prescribed in this section and for no other.

The Senate Finance Committee reported this bill with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the following:

That from and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be open to the coinage of silver, and there shall be coined dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy, of standard silver, nine-tenths fine, as provided by the act of January 18, 1857, and upon the same terms and subject to the limitations and provisions of law regulating the coinage and legal-tender quality of gold; and whenever the said coins herein provided for shall be received into the Treasury, certificates may be issued therefor in the manner now provided by law.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall coin into standard silver dollars, as soon as practicable, according to the provisions of section 1 of this act, from the silver bullion purchased under authority of 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," that portion of said silver bullion which represents the seigniorage or profit to the Government, to wit, the difference between the cost of the silver purchased under said act and its coinage value, and said silver dollars so coined shall be used in the payment of the current expenses of the Government; and for the purpose of making the said seigniorage immediately available for use as money, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against it, as if it was already coined and in the Treasury.

SEC. 3. That no national-bank note shall be hereafter issued of a denomination less than \$10, and all notes of such banks now outstanding of denominations less than that sum shall be, as rapidly as practicable, taken up, redeemed, and canceled, and notes of \$10 and larger denominations shall be issued in their stead under the direction of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the United States notes, commonly called "greenbacks," and also the Treasury notes issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, when presented for redemption, in standard silver dollars or in gold coin, using for redemption of said notes either gold or silver coins, or both, not at the option of the holder, but exclusively at the option of the Treasury Department, and said notes, commonly called "greenbacks," when so redeemed, shall be reissued, as provided by the act of May 31, 1878.

In this form the bill passed the Senate a few days ago by a majority of 7, the vote being—yeas 42; nays 35. There was no demand by the country for the bill which you passed and sent to the Senate. That bill is said to be also unsatisfactory to the Executive, in response to whose request you had professed to act.

In my humble opinion there is a demand existing to-day by a majority of the people of these United States for the passage of the amended Senate bill, providing for the free coinage of silver, and for the retirement of all national-bank notes of a denomination less than \$10.

There can scarcely be a question of more importance to a free people than the question of finance. Upon this subject Senator JONES of Nevada, in his great speech in the Senate in October, 1893, used the following language, which I deem eminently worthy of repetition here:

Upon a proper solution of the problem of money in a country depends the decision of the question whether there shall be in that country more poverty or less, more crime or less, more insanity or less; whether among its people there shall be more employment or idleness, more happiness or more misery—indeed, more liberty or more slavery; for it must be borne in mind that men may be as thoroughly enslaved by unfavorable industrial conditions as by legal enactment.

No matter under what form of government a people may live, whether the irresponsible despotism of a military autocrat or a constitution carefully framed to permit the widest play of political action, the table from which hunger rises unsatisfied will have no seat reserved for freedom.

Surely a subject that affects so vast a range of topics deserves serious consideration at the hands of a self-governing people.

These are the utterances of a man who has given the subject great consideration and study, which his intellect, education, and habits of life preeminently fitted him for.

Gold and silver coins are the money of the Constitution. On this subject Daniel Webster, whose great ability as a statesman was never questioned, whose most enduring fame, perhaps, was won as an expounder of the Constitution, and whose patriotism was never challenged, so far as I know, except in the closing years of his life in his own native New England, said:

Most unquestionably there is no legal tender, and there can be no legal tender, in this country under the authority of this Government, or any other, but gold and silver, either the coinage of our mints or foreign coins at rates regulated by Congress. This is a constitutional policy perfectly plain and of the very highest importance.

The States are prohibited from making anything but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts, and although no such express prohibition is applied to Congress, yet as the Constitution has no power granted to it in this respect but to coin money and to regulate the value of foreign coin, it clearly has no power to substitute paper or anything else as a tender in payment of debts and in discharge of contracts.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Gwin vs. Breedlove*, 2 Howard Report, said:

By the Constitution of the United States gold and silver coin, made current by law, can only be tendered in payment of debts.

Similar language was used by Chief Justice Chase and perhaps by some of the other judges of the Supreme Court in the decisions on the legal-tender cases. Of course I do not overlook the fact that this same court, by a bare majority, and by a construction which I think most lawyers consider a forced one, afterwards decided that the Government Treasury notes were a legal tender for the payment of debts.

Silver and gold had circulated side by side at par in the United States from the date of the first coinage act in 1792, until the demonetization act of 1873, with the slight change of ratio from 15 to 1 provided in the act of 1792 to the ratio of 16 to 1 provided in the coinage act of 1834.

During this period there had been coined in the United States mints about \$145,000,000 in silver coins, and under the operations of the acts of Congress of February, 1793, April, 1806, April, 1816, and June, 1834, respectively, the silver dollars of Spain, Mexico, Peru, Chile, Central America, and the crowns and 5-franc pieces of France had been made legal-tender money in the United States and were in circulation here to an amount estimated at \$100,000,000.

It is the fashion nowadays of the advocates of the single gold standard to speak of the free coinage of silver as a new and strange doctrine, a device of Populists and a scheme of anarchists, in order to debase the people's money, to ruin commerce, unsettle business, and derange prices. [Applause.] And these same flamboyant orators immediately and in the same breath proclaim themselves the friends of the laboring people and manifest an interest in the welfare of the working classes, which might be somewhat touching were it not so manifestly and transparently fraudulent in its purpose and design. In truth, the very first coinage law enacted under the present Constitution provided for the free and unlimited coinage of silver. It did more; it made the silver dollar, or unit of the value of a Spanish milled dollar as the same was then current, the unit of value.

I refer, of course, to the coinage act of April 2, 1792.

Section 14 of said act provided as follows:

And be it further enacted, That it shall be lawful for any person or persons to bring to the said mint gold and silver bullion in order to their being coined; and that the bullion so brought shall be there assayed and coined, as speedily as may be after the receipt thereof, and that free of expense to the person or persons by whom the same shall have been brought. And as soon as the said bullion shall have been coined the person or persons by whom the same shall have been delivered shall upon demand receive in lieu thereof coins of the same species of bullion which shall have been so delivered, weight for weight, for the pure gold or pure silver therein contained.

This was free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver, and that without any charge for mintage.

And thus the law stood until the act of February 21, 1853, which

provided for the lessening of the weight of half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes, respectively. The sixth section of which act also prescribed a mintage charge of one-half per cent for coining either pure metal or that of standard fineness. So that, as a matter of fact, under the coinage laws of Congress there was free and unlimited coinage, pure and simple, from 1792 till February 12, 1873.

During all this long period from 1792 to 1873, I have never heard that any of this stock of silver money was ever discredited, or failed to fulfill all the functions of good money and sound money, at home or abroad, except at our own National Treasury, where it is refused and dishonored by the gold sharks, Treasury despoilers, and shylocks, who are permitted to demand and receive gold only in redemption of the Government's paper promises to pay, to wit, legal tenders and silver-purchase Treasury notes.

It is true that Secretary Carlisle asserted in his Covington (Ky.) speech that the undervaluation of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, established by the coinage act of 1834, when the ratio existing at the mints of France was 15½ to 1, caused our silver to leave us and be taken abroad and sold as bullion.

The same statement has frequently been made by others, and has perhaps become a stock argument of the gold monometallists.

These men make these statements as evidence to prove their assertions that gold and silver coins will not remain in circulation together when the commercial ratio differs from the legal ratio established by law. That is to say, that when the relative commercial value of the bullion of the two metals varies from the relative value of the same metals after being coined the coins will not both remain in circulation, but that the coins made of the metal having the highest commercial ratio or value will be driven out of circulation and sold for bullion.

The weakness of these statements consists in the fact that they are palpably untrue as applied to the history of some parts of the United States, while they may be true as to the larger portion of the country. I assert it as a fact easily within my recollection, and more fully within the recollection of intelligent gentlemen older than myself with whom I have conversed frequently on the subject in the last year or two, that the standard silver dollars of the United States and the Mexican silver dollars and the 5-franc pieces of France constituted a large part of the money in Arkansas from 1846 to the beginning of the war in 1861. I know from the statements of intelligent gentlemen, some of them older than myself, that the same state of facts existed in the States of Tennessee and of Missouri adjoining my own State.

It is within my knowledge that the receiver of the United States land office which was located at Batesville, Ark., from about 1828 to 1861, received large amounts of the silver coins above mentioned in payment to the Government for its public lands, and was receiving them up to the day the State attempted to secede from the Union in May, 1861.

I know it would be very easy for some fellow in the North or East to say that down in Arkansas and the Southwest we did not have very much money at that time. While it is true we had no great money centers like at present exist, the people there had money, most of it brought in by the immigration coming from the States east of the Mississippi River, and while I do not controvert the proposition that in the more commercial States of the Union, those having most intercourse with the countries of the Old World, it was a fact that between 1834 and 1873, when the legal ratio between gold and silver was in this country 16 to 1, while in France the ratio was 15½ to 1, thereby giving a greater value to silver in France than in this country, there was a tendency in our silver coins of standard value to find their way to France.

But it is not true that this was the case as to all our silver coin, and I have mentioned my own personal knowledge of affairs in some parts of the country to prove that the coins of the two metals did remain in circulation together in some sections, and that those sections of country enjoyed the benefits of bimetallic currency up to the disappearance of both gold and silver coins during the late war.

But the question as to whether the coins of gold and silver will both remain in active and general circulation under any fixed or given ratio is not the great vital and underlying principle in favor of free coinage, which is the right of free access to the mints by both metals without discrimination against either.

Something very like this was embodied in the seventh section of the platform adopted by the Democratic party at Chicago in June, 1892, which reads thus:

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.

Recurring for a moment to the condition of monetary affairs in this country from 1834 to 1873, during which period, as a matter of fact, silver bullion was undervalued slightly at our mints by the coinage laws, and when we were, according to the dictum of the gold-standard people, on a gold standard, I submit there was no inconvenience or injustice suffered by silver. The industrious miner could dig out of the earth the precious metal, and there was

a demand for it, and I may say truthfully an unlimited demand. If he did not choose to take it to the mints of his own country, and there have it coined entirely free of all mintage charge prior to 1853 and with the mintage charge thereafter, there was a good demand for it in France at a rate slightly above its coinage value in the United States.

During the period referred to, that is to say, from 1834 to 1873, when, as our gold-standard friends assert, the United States was practically on a gold standard, and when we know that England was absolutely so, it appears by statistics published by the Treasury Department of the United States that the silver product of the world was year by year increasing. I now quote from the report of the Director of the Mint for 1895, on pages 248 and 249, that the annual product of silver during the period from 1831 to 1840 was \$24,793,000 coining value. Annual product from 1841 to 1850, \$32,440,000. Annual product from 1851 to 1855, \$36,824,000. Annual product from 1856 to 1860, \$37,618,000. Annual product from 1861 to 1865, \$45,772,000. Annual product from 1866 to 1870, \$55,663,000.

The advocates of the single gold standard continually harp upon the fact that prior to the demonetization act of February 12, 1873, there had been only some 8,000,000 of standard silver dollars coined altogether, and that since the reopening of the mint to silver under the Bland-Allison Act of February 28, 1878, there have been some four hundred and twenty-odd million of standard legal-tender silver dollars coined, and that therefore this country is already flooded with silver. The gentlemen who indulge in this sort of statement—I will not call it argument—forget to take notice of the population of this country in 1870 and the vast increase between that date and the present. By the census reports the population of the United States in 1870 was in round numbers 38,000,000, and in 1890 it was 62,000,000.

It seems to me that it would be apparent to any fair-minded man who is really seeking for the truth that the people of this country would be capable of using profitably a good deal larger amount of money in 1890 and up to the present date than was required in 1870 and anterior thereto.

The same gentry also utterly ignore and in my judgment try to conceal the real truth in the case, to wit, that whereas, while prior to 1873 the coinage of silver in the United States had not amounted to an enormous sum, still the metal having free access to the mints, and having abroad a larger value as bullion than it had at home when coined, the people of this country got the benefit of all the silver mined in the United States whether it was coined or not coined. If it was shipped to Europe there was a return in money or some kind of commodity for its value.

Another stock argument of the gold bugs is that the silver we already have will not circulate, as, for instance, that of the 423,000,000 standard silver dollars coined by the United States mints there were on the 1st day of January, 1896, 364,000,000 in the Treasury and only 59,000,000 in circulation. And they raise a great hurrah over this, and say the people do not want silver and will not have it. They neglect to tell the whole truth, which is, that for every silver dollar in the Treasury there is outstanding and in the hands of some person a paper dollar in the form of a silver certificate. They also neglect to state the fact, plain to all men of some experience in the affairs of life, that at this time there is little or no gold in actual circulation. For instance, the statement from the Treasury Department of date February 1, 1896, issued from the division of loans and currency, places the amount of gold coin in the Treasury at \$34,000,000, and the amount of gold in circulation at the same date \$499,000,000. Now, of this amount stated as being in circulation the Treasury does have means of knowing the amount held by the national banks, which are required to make returns to the Treasury Department.

This is stated in the report of the Comptroller of the Currency made to the Secretary of the Treasury December 22, 1895, on page 15 of said report, as being upon July 11, 1895, \$127,621,099.

Where is the remainder of the four hundred and ninety-nine million asserted by the Treasury Department to have been in circulation on the 1st day of this month? I state upon my knowledge and information upon such matters, which is, however, not very extensive, that there are not \$150,000,000 of gold coin in the United States in general circulation, and I challenge any gentleman on this floor to show where even that amount is, even by prima facie evidence. I venture to say there is not a gentleman within the sound of my voice, unless he be a bank official or has been about a bank, that has within six months past seen \$500 of gold coin of any description whatever. It is an undeniable fact that this coin does not pass from hand to hand. Even the people who have it will not part with it except upon extraordinary occasions. It has been laid away in vaults, and the people who have it will not allow it to be handled lest it suffer abrasion, thereby lessening its value.

Another stock argument which has been used against any increase in our stock of silver coins is that because of its demonetization by the countries of Europe it has not in any of those countries a value as coin over and above its bullion value. And the Secretary of the Treasury, who in the spring and early summer of

1895 abandoned the duties of his great office and meandered over the country in advocacy of a system of finance which he had in 1878, when a Representative in this House, denounced with a logic and eloquence alike superb, drifted down to Memphis, Tenn.—he was doubtless there by invitation—to instruct the Tennesseans in the matter of finance.

He is quoted by the St. Louis Republic, a reputable newspaper, which published what purported to be a full report of his speech, as saying, among other things, that—

Up to the present time there is no legal tender in international trade. Whether payments are made in gold and silver coins or in gold and silver bullion, the actual intrinsic value determines the amount or quantity to be delivered, no matter what may be the legal-tender laws of the different countries, and no matter though they may have the same or different ratios of value between the metals within their respective limits. * * * The law of France, for instance, places a higher value upon silver relatively to gold than is placed upon it by the laws of the United States, the French ratio being 15½ to 1 and ours being 16 to 1; but if 16 pounds of our silver, coined or uncoined, were sent to that country to be used in the payment of a debt or in the purchase of commodities, it would not be accepted at the ratio of 15½ to 1 or at the ratio of 16 to 1 as compared to gold, but only at the ratio of about 32 to 1, which shows that neither our ratio nor the French ratio has any effect whatever upon the value or the purchasing power of the metal itself.

I place in contrast to this statement and against it the testimony of Mr. William P. St. John, the president of the Mercantile National Bank of New York City, taken before the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House on the 15th day of December, 1894. Under a rigid cross-examination by Representative SPERRY, Mr. St. John said:

The silver dollar of the United States if it were in London to-day would sell at a discount of about five-eighths of 1 per cent, that is par, less freight, insurance, and interest to New York. It would not sell at the value of the bullion composing it, as you are sometimes told here.

This statement went unchallenged by all the great array of single gold standard advocates and witnesses in attendance at that hearing, and I assume, without fear of successful contradiction, that it was absolutely true.

It would take a volume of vast proportions to contain all the objections which the gold monometallists in this country, not to speak of their allies in Europe, can bring up against the free coinage of silver at any ratio. They utterly ignore the experience of the country under the free-coinage laws obtaining here up to 1873. With them experience is nothing. They have a theory which they intend to stick to; whether logical or illogical they care not. Every mother's son of them is like old Sol Gills was in the estimation of grand old Captain Cuttle, in Dickens's novel of *Dombey and Son*, "chock full of science."

They tell us that with the restoration of silver coinage, gold would at once go to a premium, that it would leave the country and go to the gold-standard countries of Europe. Then they tell us, which is true, that our largest foreign commerce is with these gold-standard countries.

It occurs to me, as I think it has occurred to all rational men who have considered the subject without prejudice and with a desire to arrive at the truth, that if gold left this country and went to the countries of Europe with whom we have the most trade, we would scarcely be injured by that. If we sent over our produce it would be paid for in gold, and the larger the stock of gold there most certainly the higher prices would be. But in truth all this twaddle that gold would go to a premium in the event of the restoration of silver coinage is begging the question. As a matter of fact, gold is at a premium to-day, and has been for months. I hold in my hand the weekly financial review of Henry Clews & Co., of Wall street, New York, who, I believe, are considered an authority in such matters. This circular bears the date of January 25, 1896, and states that the current rate of premium on gold and on legal tenders at that date was three-fourths of 1 per cent. The weekly letter of same date of Dimmock & Co., bankers and brokers, of Broadway, New York, states that there is one premium on gold and another on greenbacks, but without giving the rate.

In the line of my argument some minutes ago that the amount of gold in circulation in the United States is far below the amounts estimated in the Treasury statements, I desire to submit the opinion of Cox, Bixford & Co., bankers and brokers, of 46 Congress street, Boston, set forth in their circular of the 1st instant, who say:

In order to bring up the amount of gold to his estimate the Director of the Mint is obliged to charge to circulation among the public the astounding figures of \$367,600,000.

These parties further say:

As this sum does not circulate, that is, pass from hand to hand, it must be either locked up in stockings or strong boxes, and it is a sufficiently ridiculous proposition to anyone knowing our people as to warrant some explanation on his part and an effort to produce some statistics in justification of his claim.

Continuing, they say:

No less an authority than Professor Taussig, of Harvard, challenges this absurd assumption as follows: "This last figure of \$367,600,000 I am inclined to question very much. I am inclined to think \$150,000,000 is all the gold there is in circulation."

The gold monometallists of the United States assert that the only financial safety for our people is to keep our monetary system in harmony with that of Europe. A few weeks ago there was

witnessed on this floor a wonderful ebullition of enthusiasm over the reading of the message of the President of the United States upon the Venezuelan controversy with Great Britain. I can say truthfully that I at the time marveled at the temper of men who manifested such a belligerent disposition toward Great Britain in a matter which, however much it enlists our sympathies, can scarcely be said to strictly, immediately, and vitally concern the people of the United States, and yet the same men are so absolutely cringing and subservient to England's opinion, England's views, and England's methods of finance.

It is a well-authenticated fact, denied by no well-informed person, that at and for some time prior to February 12, 1873, when the further coinage of standard silver dollars was prohibited by law, that the coins were at a premium of about 3 per cent over gold; in truth, this fact is relied upon by gold-standard advocates as an argument against bimetalism. It is also a fact that at the very date of this demonetization act of February 12, 1873, the United States had successfully resumed the free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars, which had almost ceased during the war and for some years thereafter.

The report of the Director of the Mint for 1895, on page 273, shows that in 1871 there were coined standard silver dollars \$1,115,700, and in 1872, \$1,106,450, and in the month and twelve days of 1873 ending February 12, \$293,600. These facts to a plain man of common understanding would seem to be evidence that the free coinage of silver ought not to have been disturbed when it was in successful operation, especially as the law by which it was done is strongly suspected, if not proven, to have been tainted with fraud of the basest character. [Applause.]

It is contended by those who are opposed to the free coinage of silver that the general decline of prices has not been caused by the demonetization of silver and the correlative appreciation of gold.

In the discussion of this identical measure in the Senate this position was taken. A Senator, in his remarks, asked the question:

What evidence has been adduced by a single advocate of the free-coinage measure to show that prices have declined because of the so-called demonetization of silver, and that gold has appreciated, which is the correlative of the decline of prices in gold? None that I have been able to discover, except that the price of silver itself has declined nearly pari passu with that of the staple commodities with which it is compared.

Secretary Carlisle, in his Memphis speech, which I have heretofore alluded to, also assumed this position, although he did not go to the full length of asserting that the discontinuance of the use of silver had caused no appreciation in the price of gold and no effect upon prices.

While there are perhaps few phases of this subject of finance that are capable of clear mathematical demonstration, yet there are some things connected with it about which we may be reasonably certain by means of observation, experience, and the concurring opinions of those in the best position to get at the truth. Now, to my mind, as a plain man and a practical one, and in a small way a man of affairs and business, there is a vast multitude of circumstances tending to prove that the general fall of prices which has occurred since about 1873 has been caused to a great extent by the demonetization of silver in this country and in Germany and the consequent measurement of all values by the amount of gold in existence. I am supported in my view of this by many eminent authorities. Mr. Robert Giffen, the statistician of the London Board of Trade, is perhaps the ablest as he certainly is one of the bitterest enemies of bimetalism. From his book entitled *The Case Against Bimetalism*, printed in London, 1895, I desire to submit the following extracts:

Holding, myself, the view that there is "a" relation between the quantity of the precious metals and prices, I have been frequently claimed by bimetalists as going a long way with them. I avail myself, therefore, of the present opportunity to give an answer as to how the question of the ratio of exchange between the precious metals and other commodities is fixed. I hold most fully to the view that it is fixed in no other way than is any other ratio, viz, by the supply and demand, and by the cost of production of the last margin of supply necessary to meet the last margin of demand. * * *

The demand for non-monetary purposes on the annual production is also preponderant in the case of gold, and very large in the case of silver. About two-thirds of the gold annually produced is taken for the arts; and if the consumption of India is included, as being either for simple hoarding or for the arts, and in no case for the purpose of circulating money, then the demand for gold for non-monetary purposes appears almost equal to the entire annual production. * * *

Equally with the stock of precious metals for purely non-monetary uses, the stocks of the precious metals hoarded are very large. The military and quasi-military chests of military Governments like France, Germany, and Russia, the accumulations of the precious metals in these countries, far beyond any strict requirement of monetary circulation, are enormous. The United States again has accumulated both gold and silver in its Government vaults far beyond any ordinary monetary necessity. There are large private hoards besides all over the world, but especially in India, where both gold and silver are largely hoarded. Whatever the motives may be which determine these hoards the hoards themselves are not money in circulation in any form, and the supply of these demands is not a supply of "money," which can help to make any such relation between the quantity of money and prices as the quantitative theory of money, and with it the bimetallic theory, assume. (Pages 82, 85, 87, and 88.)

We see, then, how largely mistaken these monometallists have been who, in their dislike of bimetalism, have denied that the recent great demands for gold in proportion to its supply were likely to have caused a rise in its exchange value for other things. Looked at in this way, the fall of prices is in itself a proof that gold, in relation to all demands for it, has been relatively scarcer than it was.

Everybody who has wanted it has had to give more for it. If everybody who wanted coal or pig iron was giving more for it than before, we should not hesitate to say that coal and pig iron were relatively more in demand than they had been; and what we should say of coal and pig iron we must also say of gold or silver in a like case.

Some monometallists, as we have already hinted, have given a great advantage to their opponents by denying altogether the necessary connection between a fall in general prices and a relative scarcity or short supply of gold, which they have foolishly done on the score of gold in the form of currency being abundant enough. (Pages 219 and 221.)

This is one of a multitude of authorities to the same purport which might be produced if time permitted. That we are living in an era of falling prices and general depression of a majority of the interests of the whole people of the United States will, I think, be admitted by every observant and well-informed person who is honest enough to tell the truth. The great producing classes of agricultural products, including the landowners as well as the tenants and laborers who perform the manual labor, are not prosperous. There is no thrift, no enterprise. The people who have considerable sums of money are unwilling to let it out, except upon the most overwhelming and ironclad security. They are afraid to invest it in any kind of property on account of the general continuous shrinkage of values.

The result is stagnation, labor unable to procure employment, landowners unable to make any profit by the most economical and industrious management. This should not be so. The United States has a territory the richest on the earth; a population for industry, enterprise, intellect, courage, and morals unsurpassed by any upon the globe, if indeed it could be equaled by selections from all other nations.

A benign providence has blessed the toil of the husbandman with abundant harvests, and while there is no lack of food and raiment, there are hundreds of thousands of honest people unable to procure the bare necessities of life in a sufficient amount, and that without any fault of their own. This evidences that there is something wrong in our condition. My belief, and in my opinion the belief of more than half of the people of the United States, is that the present source of our trouble is that we are on the gold standard; one-half of our metallic money, although in use and circulating as token money, is denied at the Treasury of the Government which coined it the full measure of its legal-tender qualities. And I will add that this is done not only without warrant of law, but in absolute defiance of law, under the paltry, miserable pretense of keeping up a parity between gold and silver.

Mr. Speaker, I charge, and I make the charge with all earnestness and with a full sense of my responsibility, that all this cry for sound money and for a single standard and all this opposition to the coinage of silver dollars upon any ratio is directly in the interest of the holders of the \$749,000,000 of outstanding United States bonds and of the holders of the hundred million to be now issued immediately under the recent bidding. These bonds, according to law and according to the contract written or printed in the face of each bond, are payable in coin of the United States of the standard value of July, 1870, which included standard silver dollars as fully as gold coins. No man will deny this, because it is a matter of record and a matter of law. Five hundred and fifty-nine millions of the bonds mature in 1907, one hundred millions in 1904, and one hundred and sixty-two millions in 1925.

The holders of these bonds are now getting the interest in gold without any warrant of law. They desire to get this country firmly anchored to a gold standard in order that the principal of all the bonds may be payable in gold. These bonds constitute a mortgage upon the property, the energy, the industry, and the toil of the entire people of this country for the next thirty years, and it will be utterly impossible for us and our posterity to pay them in that time.

As touching upon the subject of these bonds, and as touching the subject of a gold standard and the theory that all the Government obligations must be paid in gold alone, I desire to have read from the Clerk's desk a concurrent resolution introduced in the Senate of the United States by the Hon. Stanley Matthews, a Senator from Ohio, on the 6th day of December, 1877.

This resolution was considered by the Senate, and thereafter, on the 25th day of January, 1878, adopted by a yea-and-nay vote of the Senate—42 yeas and 20 nays, not voting 14.

This same concurrent resolution was adopted in the House of Representatives January 28, 1878, by a yea-and-nay vote—180 yeas and 79 nays.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MATTHEWS. I submit the concurrent resolution with a view of having it read for the information of the Senate and laid upon the table to be printed.

The resolution was read, as follows:

"Whereas by the act entitled 'An act to strengthen the public credit,' approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold or silver; and

"Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled 'An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt,' approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act were declared to be redeemable

in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

"Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled 'An act to provide for the resumption of specie payment,' approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States described in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled 'An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt'; and

"Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, as declared by the act approved January 18, 1857, entitled 'An act supplementary to the act entitled "An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States," to be a legal tender of payment according to their nominal value for any sums whatever: Therefore

"Be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor."

Mr. NEILL. I ask the Clerk to read the yea-and-nay vote upon the adoption of this concurrent resolution in the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

YEAS—42.

Allison,	Davis, Ill.	Jones, Fla.	Plumb,
Armstrong,	Davis, W. Va.	Jones, Nev.	Ransom,
Bailey,	Dennis,	Kirkwood,	Sansbury,
Beck,	Dorsey,	McCreery,	Saunders,
Booth,	Eustis,	McDonald,	Spencer,
Bruce,	Ferry,	McMillan,	Teller,
Cameron, Pa.	Gordon,	Matthews,	Thurman,
Cameron, Wis.	Grover,	Maxey,	Voorhees,
Chaffee,	Hereford,	Merrimon,	Wallace.
Coke,	Howe,	Morgan,	
Conover,	Johnston,	Oglesby,	

NAYS—20.

Anthony,	Christiancy,	Hamlin,	Paddock,
Barnum,	Conkling,	Kernan,	Rollins,
Bayard,	Dawes,	Lamar,	Sargent,
Blaine,	Eaton,	Mitchell,	Wadleigh,
Burnside,	Edmunds,	Morrill,	Windom.

ABSENT—14.

Butler,	Hill,	McPherson,	Whyte,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Patterson,	Withers.
Garland,	Ingalls,	Sharon,	
Harris,	Kellogg,	Randolph,	

Mr. NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I will not ask for the reading of the vote in the House of Representatives upon this concurrent resolution, but will state that on the 28th day of January, 1878, the resolution was agreed to in the House by a vote of 189 yeas to 79 nays; not voting, 24. Among the yeas there is the name of Carlisle, who, I think, is the same distinguished gentleman who now holds the portfolio of the Treasury, and who is so solicitous that the Government of these United States shall not pay any of its obligations in a money which he now considers inferior, to wit, silver. I also observe the name of Herbert, if I mistake not the same Herbert who now holds the portfolio of the Navy, and who has found it convenient during the past twelve months to absent himself from his post of duty and make stump speeches urging upon the people of this country their solemn duty, from his present standpoint, to pay all their governmental obligations in gold. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, as illustrative of the feeling of the people of this country upon the momentous question of the use of silver money in 1878, only eighteen years ago, I desire to read the following from the proceedings of the Senate on the 10th day of December, 1877. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. Mr. Matthews, a Senator from the State of Ohio, said:

Mr. President, the general assembly of the State of Ohio at its session last winter adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved by the general assembly of the State of Ohio, That common honesty to the taxpayers, the letter and the spirit of the contract under which the great bodies of its indebtedness was assumed by the United States, and true financial wisdom each and all demand the restoration of the silver dollar to its former rank as lawful money."

Continuing, Senator Matthews said:

This resolution was passed with great unanimity.

There were but three negative votes in the house of representatives and one in the senate, and I have no doubt it expresses the deliberate and considered public opinion of the people of that State with the same proportion among them as to unanimity as was evidenced by the vote of their representatives in the general assembly.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate in the Senate upon this concurrent resolution Senator Matthews further said:

" * * * But my statement is, that gold has risen in value with all commodities and therefore with silver, and with silver only because it has risen in value with all commodities.

I have the testimony of my observation; I have the testimony in the list of bankruptcies which I read; I have the testimony in the list of sheriffs' sales I have noticed; I have the testimony of the prices to which real estate has sunk; and I could recount instances in that city which I believe to-day the soundest and most prosperous one on the continent, where business has been transacted the least on credit—I mean the city in which I live (Cincinnati)—where the depreciation in real estate and in every article of property other than gold itself has been actually unexampled. What else means all this cry of discontent? What else means all this half-suppressed murmur of dissatisfaction?

Do gentlemen suppose that people are crying out when they suffer no pain? Do they suppose that the voice of lamentation comes up from the homes and houses of the people merely that they may hear themselves shriek and cry? Or is it the truth and is it the fact that the distress of the country is beyond

all historical comparison in our country and that to-day it will require but a few more turns of the wheel to submerge the majority of the body of the people into hopeless bankruptcy? So then, Mr. President, on any ground and in any view that I am able to take, if we restore the silver dollar to its former and accustomed place in our legislation, in our coinage, and in our currency, we are still paying the public debt and all private debts according to a large and a full and overflowing measure of value.

Mr. Speaker, who was Stanley Matthews? Was he a lunatic, an anarchist? No; he was a Senator from the great State of Ohio and died an honored member of the Supreme bench of the United States. With him, and his great colleague in the Senate at that time, was Allen G. Thurman, who heartily and warmly supported, spoke for, and voted for the resolution which I have had read. I will not take up the time of the House in commenting and calling particular attention to other great names whose support was lent to that resolution, many of them now historic. These men were talking and were acting at a time when the demonization act of 1873 was fresh in the minds of the people, who were stirred to profoundest depths of indignation.

During that very session of Congress, on the 28th day of February, 1878, there was enacted into law over the veto of a Republican President the act commonly called the Bland-Allison Act, which restored to silver dollars their full legal-tender qualities and provided for a limited coinage of silver, which gave to the country in thirteen years something over \$400,000,000 addition to its coinage, and gave very considerable relief to the monetary needs of the people, and in a measure alleviated the distress of which Senator Matthews spoke so graphically. But the Bland-Allison Act never was satisfactory to the gold bugs of the country, and when I use the term "gold bugs" now I mean those people who are directly interested from mercenary motives in the establishment and maintenance of a gold standard, and in 1890, during the life of a Republican Congress, these people were strong enough to secure the repeal of the Bland-Allison Act and the substitution therefor of the so-called Sherman silver-purchase act.

This act has been confessed upon the floor of the Senate to have been intended as a device to prevent the enactment of a law for the free coinage of silver. I refer in this directly to a statement made by the senior Senator from Ohio in the extraordinary session of 1893. There is no sort of doubt but that the Sherman law of 1890 was designed and intended, and that it did prevent the passage of a bill for the free coinage of silver. This view of the case was evidently in the minds of the majority of the national Democratic convention assembled at Chicago in June, 1892, when that convention in section 7 of the platform adopted used this language:

We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman Act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future, and which should make all of its supporters as well as its author anxious for its speedy repeal. 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 or charge for mintage.

Was that declaration, solemnly made, and upon the faith of which the present Administration came into power, and without which it could not, in my opinion, have been elected, a delusion and a snare?

We shall see, and history will record the facts.

It is certain that the majority of Democrats in Arkansas have been terribly disappointed in the nonfulfillment of their understanding of that declaration, dispirited and discouraged. They had followed the flag of their party with a fidelity as unselfish and a devotion as pure as that which inspired the patriot fathers in their struggle for liberation from the British yoke in the war of the Revolution.

Having but few Federal offices located within their territory, their expectations of Federal patronage were necessarily small. They were not contending for pelf and power, but from love of principle and pride of party.

They had been educated by the men in whom they trusted into the belief that the system of coinage authorized by the Constitution and adopted by Hamilton and Jefferson in the days of Washington, and pursued and amplified under the Administration of the immortal Andrew Jackson, was a tenet of Democracy. To have one of their cherished doctrinal beliefs and traditions, inherited from a past century, and endeared by the history of a glorious past, rudely thrust aside, nay, even trampled upon, by an Administration which they had found in obscurity and by their generous suffrages helped to elevate to power, has been to them indeed a draught of the bitter waters of Marah.

In my opinion they will still adhere to principle and to the doctrines and usages of Democracy as taught by the fathers of the party, but it is almost certain that they will not longer consent to be dominated by a faction whose sole aim seems to be to fasten this country to a system of finance imported from monarchical Europe, and which will surely result in the ruin and financial enslavement of the masses and their children and children's children through untold generations.

It is, in my opinion as an humble member of the party in whose ranks I have toiled so long, a time for plain speaking. It may be that my candor will cost me my political life; if so, so be it. I am

no better than the rank and file of my party. In the first remarks I ever had the honor of submitting on this floor, in February, 1894, I said to my fellow-Democrats that, in my judgment, our grand old party was perilously near to shoals and breakers. I was not a prophet or the son of a prophet, yet it seemed to me the danger was apparent—the elections in November, 1894, proved it to be so.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to concur in the Senate amendment for two other reasons, namely, if the amended bill is enacted into law it will compel the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem legal tenders and Treasury notes in standard silver dollars without giving any option to the note holder. In the next place it will to some extent, even though slight, curtail the power of the national banks, which I regard as the enemies of the human race. I have not time to amplify upon this part of this subject. Let us, fellow-Representatives, do our duty in the premises without regard to any probable or prospective Executive action. The issue is upon us now; it may be shirked, but it will not go down. Seventy millions of people are interested in the result; the right will in the end prevail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By the order of the House a recess was to be taken at 10.30 p. m. until half past 10 o'clock tomorrow. Unless objection is made, the Chair will assume that consent is given that the recess be taken now.

There was no objection; and the House accordingly (at 10 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until 10.30 a. m. on Friday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examinations and survey for location of dams Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Ohio River series—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Commissioner of Labor, replying to the House resolution of the 4th instant, relating to the efficiency of employees in certain Executive Departments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for engraving on copper a map of the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, replying to the House resolution of the 4th instant, relating to the efficiency of employees in certain Executive Departments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6) constituting Syracuse, N. Y., a port of delivery, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 264); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULICK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3279) to authorize the reassessment of water-main taxes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 265); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4779) relating to the anchorage and movements of vessels in St. Marys River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 266); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PENDLETON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred House bill No. 3342, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 5641) to grant to railroad companies in the Indian Territory additional powers to secure depot grounds, accompanied by a report (No. 267); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MINOR of Wisconsin, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2662) to provide for the adjudication of the claim of the Fond du Lac band of Chippewa Indians arising upon the failure of certain treaty stipulations, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 268); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EVANS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4580) to amend

section 3449 of the Revised Statutes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 281); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

By Mr. HANLY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 4763) for the relief of W. H. Ferguson, administrator of Thomas H. Millsaps. (Report No. 269.)

By Mr. BLACK of Georgia, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5083) granting an increase of pension to A. H. McLaws. (Report No. 270.)

By Mr. HARDY, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2605) granting pension to Henry V. Andrews, of Fulton County, Ill., a survivor of the Black Hawk war. (Report No. 271.)

By Mr. COFFIN, from the Committee on Pensions: The bill (H. R. 3749) to increase the pension of Mrs. Eunice Ida Rhoades. (Report No. 272.)

By Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Helen A. Jackman, dependent daughter of Lieut. William Jackman, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment of Maine Volunteers. (Report No. 273.)

By Mr. MILES, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 5140) for the relief of Michael H. J. Crouch, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry. (Report No. 274.)

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4606) to grant an increase of pension to Mary B. Houk. (Report No. 275.)

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 4265) granting a pension to Eliza Wilson. (Report No. 276.)

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1181) for the relief of Maria E. Wilson. (Report No. 277.)

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2621) to increase the pension of Jane Webster, widow of Joel Webster. (Report No. 278.)

By Mr. WOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 1634) to grant pension to William F. Good, Company L, Tenth Indiana Cavalry Volunteers. (Report No. 279.)

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Joseph A. Cooper. (Report No. 280.)

By Mr. PICKLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 507) to pension Mollie Crandall. (Report No. 282.)

By Mr. POOLE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions: The bill (S. 344) granting a pension to Mary A. Hall. (Report No. 283.)

By Mr. HANLY, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 1256) for the relief of Henry A. Webb. (Report No. 284.)

PUBLIC BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5633) to incorporate the Most Worshipful Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 5634) providing for the withdrawal of distilled spirits from bonded warehouses by the distiller or owner, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROSIUS: A bill (H. R. 5635) to amend section 1754 of Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to preferences in the civil service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 5636) for the erection of a public building at Atlanta, Ga.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 5637) for the relief of settlers on certain lands in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 5638) to grant 2 condemned cannon and 50 cannon balls to A. G. Reed Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, of Butler, Pa.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: A bill (H. R. 5639) to amend section 711 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 5640) disposing of 4 condemned cannon and 24 cannon balls—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri (by request): A bill (H. R. 5641) to provide for the retirement of the Treasury notes issued in payment of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of 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," to provide for the coinage of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of said act, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McEWAN: A bill (H. R. 5642) to insure creditors of corporations in the collection of their claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 5674) authorizing Rear-Admiral W. A. Kirkland, United States Navy, to accept the gold box presented to him by the Emperor of Germany—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRELOAR: A bill (H. R. 5675) authorizing the construction of a wagon and motor bridge over the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 5676) to extend the provisions of an act to provide for the muster and pay of certain officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT: A joint resolution (H. Res. 109) to provide for an investigation to determine a location for the Naval Academy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

The bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of George T. Vance and Guy P. Vance, executors of William L. Vance, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (H. R. 1143) for the relief of Miriam Goodloe, widow, and Laura Blinn, Richard V. Goodloe, and Joseph A. Goodloe, children, and James H. Goodloe and Mrs. Fannie Hough, grandchildren of James Goodloe, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. APSLEY: A bill (H. R. 5643) granting a pension to Charles A. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5644) granting a pension to Augustus Witte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5645) for the relief of James W. Wilmot—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5646) granting a pension to Frances M. Roberts—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 5647) for the relief of Mrs. Magdalena Eitel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 5648) granting a pension to John A. Link—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5649) granting a pension to Henry H. Taylor, of Burlingame, Kans.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5650) for the relief of Solomon F. Brown, of Topeka, Kans.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAYTON: A bill (H. R. 5651) for the relief of James V. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 5652) granting relief to the heirs of the late J. M. Doddridge, of Wheeling, W. Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 5653) for the relief of Mrs. Jane A. Sanders, widow of Edward W. Sanders, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 5654) for the relief of Catharine Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 5655) to increase the pension of William H. McClelland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICK: A bill (H. R. 5656) for the relief of Hugh M. Henson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5657) for the relief of Hugh M. Henson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCALL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5658) for relief of Henry Runnebaum—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5659) for relief of John Wade—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5660) for relief of Thomas M. Wadley—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLURE: A bill (H. R. 5661) to increase the pension of Anna E. Botsford, widow of Eli W. Botsford, late major of Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 5662) for the relief of W. T. Fitzpatrick, Bedford City, Va.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 5663) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe, late sergeant Company A, Seven-

teenth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5664) granting a pension to Elizabeth Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED: A bill (H. R. 5665) granting a pension to Henry F. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPERRY: A bill (H. R. 5666) granting a pension to John A. Hopkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 5667) granting a pension to Mrs. Maria B. Brinton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURNER of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5668) for the relief of Miss E. A. Lewis—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 5669) to increase the pension of Salem Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5670) to increase the pension of Richard S. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5671) to remove the charge of desertion against Elisha K. White and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 5673) removing the charge of desertion from the military record of Albert H. Hamlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of H. A. Carr and 47 other citizens of Flatwoods, Fayette County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Memorial of the National Board of Trade, praying for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations, especially with Canada, Mexico, and the States of Central and South America—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, urging the passage of the Patterson bill, to prevent unjust discrimination in freight rates, without amendments—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, favoring aid in the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the National Board of Trade, praying for the continuation of the improvement of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers and their navigable tributaries—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CURTIS of Kansas: Petitions of citizens of Delphos, Concordia, and Glasco, Kans., to prohibit the issuance of liquor licenses except to those who hold a permit issued by virtue of the laws of Kansas, so far as that State is concerned—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of the Structural Iron Workers' Protective Union, of Pittsburg, Pa., and the Blacksmith Workers' Union, of McKeesport, Pa., in favor of a bill to regulate the manning of vessels on the Great Lakes—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANFORD: Petition of David Lentz and others, of Antioch, Ohio, and vicinity, praying for the passage of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of J. V. McMaster and others, of Demos, Ohio, asking for the passage of the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIS: Memorial of the Commercial Club, of Vancouver, Wash., asking an appropriation for the improvement of the Columbia River between Vancouver and the mouth of the Willamette River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of John Blanchard and 68 others, of Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the Stone immigration bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Petition of 5,000 settlers in Oklahoma, praying for the passage of the free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 4091—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5596—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Hornellsville, North Hector, Southport, Canisteo, Buena Vista, Havana, Reading Center, Odessa, and Wellsburg, all of the State of New York, in favor of the suppression of the sale of beer and spirituous liquors at Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of T. S. Card and 79 citizens of Corning, N. Y., in favor of a bill to restrict immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of H. P. Burdick and others, of Hornellsville and Hartsville, N. Y., against the Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKS: Petition of George W. Page, A. M. Snyder, P. F. Custer, and 45 others, of Mineral Point and Vinco, Pa., praying for the passage of the William A. Stone bill, restricting immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of Charles J. Kinnie and 51 others, of Rockford, Ill., urging an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting any law, State or national, respecting an establishment of religion or the use of public moneys in support thereof—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allentown, Fredonia, and Frewsburg, N. Y., against the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, and Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island, and at Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Blair County Union ex-Prisoners of War Association, of Altoona, Pa., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 306, providing pensions for soldiers and sailors who were prisoners during the late rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULICK: Petition of David Mering and 14 other ex-soldiers of Springboro, Ohio, and vicinity, for the enactment of the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: Petition of S. J. Loughran and 76 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, asking that no money be appropriated for private or sectarian purposes—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HURLEY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Brooklyn, N. Y., to forbid the sale of beer to immigrants at Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. LACEY: Petitions of F. M. Davis and 28 others, H. Barrett and 24 others, J. C. Mathis and 23 others, all citizens of Oklahoma, for free homes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAWSON: Petition of certain colored citizens of Georgia, for aid from the United States to facilitate their emigration to Liberia—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAHANY: Memorial of the East Buffalo Live Stock Association, to remove unnecessary restrictions from the foreign live-stock trade—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of J. O. Larson and other voters of Round Lake, Minn., against Sunday-observance bill (H. R. 167)—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: Petition of the Los Angeles County Association, Union ex-Prisoners of War, favoring the passage of House bill No. 306, relating to the granting of pensions to soldiers and sailors who were confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of American seamen on the Pacific Coast, protesting against the repeal of the act of Congress approved February 18, 1895—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of C. P. Nance & Son, E. F. Rogers, and others, of San Lucas, Cal., for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Elizabeth Martin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. McCabe, late sergeant, Company A, Seventeenth Pennsylvania Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill to grant 2 condemned cannons and 50 cannon balls to H. G. Reed Post, No. 105, Grand Army of the Republic, of Butler, Pa.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAY: Resolution of Watrous Post, No. 30, Grand Army of the Republic, of Binghamton, N. Y., favoring the independence of Cuba—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of officers of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Campville and Tioga County, N. Y., for a measure to prohibit the sale of beer at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Connecticut: Petitions from chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Bridgeport, Stamford, and Berlin, Conn., and from citizens of Middletown, Montville, New London, and Groton, Conn., and from the president and officers of Yale University, and the president and officers of Wesleyan University, containing 439 names, all forwarded through Anna Warner Bailey Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Groton and Stonington, Conn., in favor of the acquirement of additional plats of ground contiguous to the Fort Griswold property, in order to preserve and protect that Revolutionary site—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TRACEWELL: Resolutions adopted by the Indianapolis Board of Trade, requesting the passage of House bill No. 3212,

to secure a better foreign market for grain and other agricultural products of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Club of Madison, Ind., asking for an appropriation of \$25,000 for dredging and otherwise improving the Ohio River at that point—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TRELOAR: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of David Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Albion, Nunda, Elba, Corfu, and Bergen, N. Y., in the regard to the sale of beer to immigrants at Bedloes Island and Fort Wadsworth, and at Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. WILBER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Schenectady, Richmondville, Rockton, and Amsterdam, N. Y., in regard to the sale of beer to immigrants at Bedloes Island, Fort Wadsworth, and Ellis Island, N. Y.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1896.

Prayer by Rev. HUGH JOHNSTON, D. D., of the city of Washington.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

The Secretary (Hon. W. R. COX) called the Senate to order and read the following communication:

VICE-PRESIDENT'S CHAMBER, Washington, February 7, 1896.

SIR: It will be impossible for me to be present at the opening of the Senate this morning. You will, therefore, please call the Senate to order, as required by law.

Very respectfully,

A. E. STEVENSON.

Hon. W. R. COX,
Secretary United States Senate.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Secretary, I offer the following resolve, upon which I ask immediate action:

Resolved, That the Senate now proceed to elect a President pro tempore of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Secretary, I also offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from the State of Maine, be, and he hereby is, elected President pro tempore of the Senate, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, and in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March, 1890, on the subject.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. Secretary, I have been instructed by the unanimous vote of the Democratic Senators on this side of the Chamber to present the name of the honorable Senator from Tennessee, Hon. ISHAM G. HARRIS, whom the Democrats when they had control of the body honored by electing as President pro tempore of the Senate, and upon whom the Senate further conferred the honor of not permitting any other name to be presented in opposition to him. That was done in accordance with the precedent which has grown up in the last few years, so as to avoid even the appearance of a scramble for that high position, but to accord it to the majority of the body, as was also done in the case of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Manderson, and the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Mr. Ingalls. The Senator from Tennessee, appreciating as a matter of course the compliment that his colleagues on this side of the Senate had paid him, has requested me, in view of the precedents, not to present his name, and it is only because of his desire and request that I fail to carry out the direction of the Democrats of the Chamber.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Secretary, I avail myself of this occasion to tender my profound thanks to the Democratic Senators for the honor they did me in nominating me for reelection, my term of office as President pro tempore of the Senate having expired with my then Senatorial term on the 4th of March last.

As already stated by my friend from Maryland, in March, 1891, the then senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, Mr. Manderson, was elected President pro tempore of the Senate without division and without a single dissenting vote. In March, 1893, the Senate honored me by electing me in the same manner. It is true, Mr. Secretary, that in 1891 there was a Republican majority in this body. It is equally true that in 1893 there was a Democratic majority here. It is also equally true that the Republicans lack one of having a majority of the whole body as the Senate is now constituted. But notwithstanding that fact, in order that there shall be not even the appearance of friction and in order that those kindly relations which should exist and be maintained between every Senator and the Presiding Officer of the body, my personal wish is that the distinguished Senator from Maine may

be elected to that high position in the same manner that Senator Manderson was elected in 1891 and I in 1893.

This much I have deemed it proper to say.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Secretary, the Populist party, numbering six in this Chamber, concluded some time ago to present the name of the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. KYLE] to the Senate for the office of President pro tempore. But in view of the fact that there has been or is to be such a harmonious union between the Democratic and Republican parties in this Chamber, I do not know that it would be worth our while to present his name. We can certainly have no choice between the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. Either, we have confidence, would make a competent presiding officer, fair in his rulings. Therefore the Populist party, while holding to its determination to stand as a distinct party in this Chamber upon all vital matters, will not offer any resistance to the election of the honorable Senator from Maine.

The SECRETARY. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The resolution was agreed to nem. con.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will conduct the President pro tempore-elect to the chair.

Mr. FRYE was escorted to the chair by Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HALE, and, the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him by the Secretary of the Senate, upon taking the chair as President pro tempore, he said:

Senators, I am profoundly grateful for this exceedingly generous expression of your confidence. I can only try to justify it by bringing to the discharge of the duties of the office to which you have elected me fidelity and strict impartiality. The Secretary will read the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HANSBROUGH, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

On motion of Mr. HALE, it was

Ordered, That the Secretary wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Senate has elected WILLIAM P. FRYE, a Senator from the State of Maine, President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold and exercise the office in the absence of the Vice-President, from time to time, during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the terms of its resolution passed March 12, 1890, and that he make a similar communication to the House of Representatives.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 5th instant approved and signed the act (S. 1450) to reconvene the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference of 1889.

The message also announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 285) for the relief of the Independence National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; and

An act (S. 650) to incorporate the Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that after the usual morning business on Monday morning I shall desire to address the Senate for a few moments upon the resolution now on the table in regard to the Monroe doctrine.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of George K. Shaw and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Greene, Clark, and Clinton counties, all in the State of Ohio, and a petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for an adequate duty on wool; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 120 citizens of Bucyrus, Ohio, praying for the passage of the so-called Stone immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of sundry lake shippers of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against placing obstructions to navigation in the Detroit River in the nature of bridge piers; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Wooster, Ohio, and a petition of the Ministerial Association of Mansfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation in the interest of morality, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present a memorial of the Northeast Citizens' Suburban Association of the District of Columbia, relative to school facilities and the lighting and the grading of streets. I move that the memorial be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN presented the petition of Walter B. Cole and