

Silver.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN A. PICKLER,

OF SOUTH DAKOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, August 24, 1893.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT—AMERICAN PRODUCT.

Mr. PICKLER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask unanimous consent that on the consideration of the bill on Monday this amendment may be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send the amendment up.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, this time has been set apart for debate, and I do not think it is proper that any unanimous consent should be asked for at this time.

Mr. WILSON of West Virginia. I object to any change in the order.

Mr. PICKLER. I would like to have the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. It can be read as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. PICKLER. Who is it objects, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend H. R. 2, being "A bill for the free coinage of silver, and for other purposes," by inserting after the words "silver bullion," in the second line of section 1 the following words: "the product of mines of the United States," so that said section when amended shall read as follows:

"SECTION 1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this act all holders of silver bullion, the product of the mines of the United States, to the amount of \$100 or more of standard weight and fineness, shall be entitled to have the same coined at the mint of the United States into silver dollars of the weight and fineness provided for in the second section of this act."

Mr. PICKLER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to offer the following on Monday, to which it seems to me no one can object.

I ask it be read in my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Let it be read as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

That upon Monday, August 23, if the substitute to H. R. 1 and all amendments shall be voted down in the House, and if H. R. 1, known as the Wilson

bill shall pass, that immediately thereafter, without debate or intervening motions, the House shall vote upon H. R. 2, "A bill for the free coinage of silver, and for other purposes," amended as follows: Inserting after the words "silver bullion," in the second line of section 1, the following words: "the product of mines of the United States;" the bill as so amended being for the coinage of the silver bullion product of the mines of the United States at the present ratio.

If this bill fail to carry, the bill as so amended shall be voted on at the ratio of 18 to 1, and if this fail, it shall then, as so amended, be voted on at the ratio of 20 to 1.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, that simply provides that if all the substitutes proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] fail, and if, after that, the bill for the repeal of the Sherman act shall pass without amendment, the House shall then proceed to vote upon the substitute previously rejected, so amended as to confine it to the coinage of the product of the American mines, first at the present ratio of 16 to 1; if that fail, at the ratio of 18 to 1, and if that fail, at the ratio of 20 to 1: each of these propositions to apply only to the product of the American mines.

It seems to me, sir, that assuming, as my proposition does, that the bill for the repeal of the Sherman act will have passed the House without amendment, there should be no objection upon the part of any gentleman to vote upon the proposition to coin the product of the American mines.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has asked unanimous consent for the reception of that proposition; I must object to any change being made in the order that has been agreed upon.

Mr. PICKLER. This makes no change in the order. It simply proposes that after the gold men shall have carried the measure which they have advocated on this floor, carried it without amendment, we shall then have a chance to vote upon the question of coining the product of the American silver mines; that after these gentlemen shall have conquered the field, after they shall have got what they want, the repeal of the Sherman act, then we may have an opportunity to have this proposition voted upon.

Mr. TRACEY. I feel that it is my duty to object to that proposition at this time, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman can bring it up later if he desires to. I must object to any change in the order.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for fifteen minutes if I shall so desire.

Mr. TRACEY. If the gentleman will be content with ten minutes I shall have no objection.

Several MEMBERS. Let him have fifteen.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to address the House for fifteen minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLER. I think, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to five minutes on each of these amendments under the order. Perhaps we may as well have that question settled right here. The order is that for the last three days of this debate, to-day, to-morrow, and the next day (though the order has been since changed as to Saturday), the House shall consider the bill and amendments as in Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule. Now, as I understand the rule of the House in Com-

mittee of the Whole, a member is entitled to five minutes on any amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will look into that question. The gentleman is entitled to fifteen minutes by unanimous consent.

Mr. PICKLER. I thank the Chair and the House. I must say, gentlemen, as to the request I have just made, and which has been objected to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY], that I am somewhat surprised, and yet I am not surprised.

FAVORS BIMETALLISM.

I expect to vote for some of the ratios proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], although I should prefer to vote for the coinage of the American product, but as that is refused us, the only way to escape monometallism is to vote for the amendments. My constituents believe in the use of silver as well as gold, and after the arguments we have heard here from the gold men upon this floor, and after the protestations they have made of their eventual friendship for silver, that after the repeal of the McKinley act—not that that will never be repealed. [Laughter.]

I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is strange that my proposition should be objected to by the advocates of gold upon this floor after they repeal the Sherman law. I should think that after the repeal of the Sherman act they would be swift to propose an opportunity to vote upon a proposition for the coinage of silver, in order that we might have relief as far as silver is concerned.

But what is the spectacle presented here this morning? In the proposition I have submitted it is conceded that the Bland substitute shall first have been voted down; it is conceded that we who are bimetalists in the House will have been routed horse, foot, and dragoon; it is conceded that the President's bill for pure and simple repeal, as advised by him, will have been adopted; and yet when we ask that after all that we shall be allowed to vote upon the proposition to coin the American product of silver, giving the House the choice of ratios, 16 to 1, 18 to 1, or 20 to 1, these gentlemen who profess so much love for silver object, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY], true to his instincts, comes up and objects to any consideration of the silver question.

It reminds me very much of the time when we stood here in the Fifty-first Congress, and were trying to get some show for silver, and when the Sherman act was proposed as a compromise. And let me say right here, parenthetically, that that bill was thought then to be a good measure, and in fact it has had a beneficent influence, and has added much good money to our circulation. I remember how it was regarded at that time by a good many gentlemen who have taken part in this debate, and when I contrast their utterances then with their speeches now, I must say that their hind-sight is very different from their fore-sight. [Laughter.]

There have been great changes, Mr. Speaker, and so far as the Democratic side of the House is concerned the conversion of the silver heathen Democracy to orthodox monometallism shows that President Cleveland outranks any missionary of this century. [Laughter.]

The fact has been stated here by gentlemen on the other side—

and I think with so much force that there must be truth in it—that the President is supported in his work by the London foreign missionary society.

SHERMAN LAW—AMERICAN PRODUCT.

I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that when the proposition was before the Fifty-first Congress for the passage of the Sherman bill, the friends of silver then proposed to the gold men in this House as a compromise that we have free coinage of the American product. The argument of those men was then the same as their argument is now. They always have the same argument. When the Bland-Allison act was under consideration the gold men were just as great "calamity howlers" as to what would befall the Government as they are now.

As "calamity howlers" they outstrip all other men, whenever the people want an expansion of the currency. When we had the Sherman bill under consideration they came forward and in the same tone as now preached calamity. They said that the nation would go to destruction if we adopted any of those propositions. Yet the Bland-Allison act became a law; the Sherman act became a law; and this Government prospered under both those measures. Yet we still have the same argument presented here to-day.

GOLD MEN OBJECT TO SILVER AS MONEY METAL.

We understood then—we understand now—the contention of the gold men, that if we have free coinage even of the American product there will be so much silver in circulation that it will become the cheaper money and will drive gold out of circulation. It was well known when we had the Sherman act under consideration that under that act we would just about coin the American product.

The proposition that we were to have a great oversupply of silver in the United States fell to the ground, because it was conceded when we were debating the Sherman bill that under it we would simply coin about the amount of silver that was the product of the mines of the United States, and hence free coinage of the American product would have put no more in circulation than the Sherman law. Yet, notwithstanding this proposition was squarely made, notwithstanding the gold men never sought to answer it, they steadily refused to consider the proposition to coin the American product, yet did agree to the Sherman law that used an equal amount of silver. And why? There was but one reason then and there is but one reason now for opposing the proposition.

The free coinage of the American product would recognize silver as a money metal; it would recognize it as one of the coin metals upon which our paper currency would be based. It would place silver to that extent alongside of gold as a money metal. And the gold men of the United States are eternally against the recognition of silver in any form as a money metal in this country. They want it treated as a commodity, as they have treated it under the Sherman act. They are determined to keep it in the position of a commodity to be measured by gold. And that, in my opinion, is the only reason they objected to the free coinage of the American product, and it is the only reason the gentleman from New York objects to my amendment to that effect to-day.

What is to become of the silver now? Have we not an indication this morning of the intention of the majority of the gold men not to give silver any chance? On what ground could there be any objection to the proposition I have submitted? The country is in trouble, and I simply proposed that after the passage of the Wilson bill, providing for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act, there should then immediately be taken, without debate, a vote on the amendment which was read. Why not take a vote on the coinage of the American product at these different ratios? Are we to be told by the gold men in this House that they will not consent to the coinage of the American product at the ratio of 20 to 1, which is one of the propositions embraced in the amendment?

SILVER STATES.

Where is the love of the gentleman from New York for the silver miners in the West? I want to know if you gentlemen propose to wipe out all the interests of the silver States, as well as ruin the agricultural States by lowering further the present low prices of products? The people in mining States and Territories are in great trouble; and certainly it seems to me there should be some consideration given to their product. This House can not too swiftly come to the question of aiding the Western people and keeping open if possible the American mines. It is ruin to those States to oppose it.

WESTERN REPUBLICAN.

As a Western Republican obeying the summons of the President, I came here with no expectation of engaging in any discussion concerning the financial situation.

I had supposed that the gravity of the situation had so impressed the President and his advisers that definite measures would have been devised and laid before Congress upon its assembling for the relief of the country. Measures, too, which the party elevating the President to power would accept, seize upon, and quickly enact into law.

But all these surmises proved incorrect, the sole negative proposition to repeal the Sherman law without any affirmative legislation being the sum total of the President's message.

DEMOCRATS DISAGREE IN NATION'S TROUBLE.

But even this recommendation is more than his party is able to agree upon.

And although every member of this House was fully advised and as ready on the second day of this session to have voted upon any of the propositions as he will ever be, and although the country trembles upon the brink of ruin; although fortunes are being wasted every day, and the cries of unemployed men are going up all over this broad land, and the voices of all lines of business are loud in the cry for relief; although the fires of furnaces have ceased to burn; although spindles have ceased to turn; though looms are still, and the hum of manufacturing machinery is not heard; although all over this land is heard the lamentations of men and women and children asking employment whereby they may earn food; although riots and mob violence are endangering life and property in our large cities; although this great nation, which was prosperous and happy and proud in its greatness at the incoming of the present Administration six months ago, is now in the throes of a great financial panic, and experi-

encing the greatest overshadowing trouble known to this generation, yet, notwithstanding this condition, the Administration wing and the anti-Administration wing consume three long weeks of precious time, each faction seeking to prove that it is standing on the last Democratic platform and that the other fellows are off—all this, I repeat, before even a vote can be had upon any proposition of relief to the country.

It is about the usual gait at which the Democratic party has ever traveled when the country was in danger.

PATRIOTIC ADVICE.

And where has the Democratic majority, or in what way has it carried out the advice of the Democratic press of the land for this Congress to assemble as brethren, and especially enjoining Republicans to forget their party and work with the patriot Democrats; what, I inquire, has this majority done to carry out this programme?

One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, from the extreme unction of the advice administered to the Republican members, that immediately upon the organization of the House the gentleman from Illinois, late chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, would have moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that this motion having unanimously carried, the Speaker would have designated as chairman of the committee the Hon. THOMAS B. REED, of Maine, and that the remaining 354 members, after the former Czar had taken his place, would together repeat, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity," and that the deliberations of this House would more resemble the action of a Methodist class meeting than those of a legislative body. And in this frame of mind to act, and to act at once and without any desire to arouse partisan spirit, and with a sincere desire to join the majority in the speedy enactment of such legislation as might seem best to bring relief to the country, was, I believe, and is the feeling of every Republican upon this floor.

And such is still our desire. True, our confidence was somewhat shaken in the good faith of the brethren of the majority, when, under an ironclad rule, without regard for or consultation with the minority, a few propositions were offered upon which, and upon which alone, under the rules, the House can vote. And, while we were encouraged, and our hearts were touched by the urbane and cordial apologies of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] for even mentioning anything that savored of partisanship, our feelings were lacerated when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] charged the Republican party with the heinous offense of permitting the virtue of farmers' daughters to be commended on the stage, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MOSES] alleged that the Republican party had stolen everything, from the Presidency down, it sounded wonderfully like the old slogan, and we realized that we were to be regarded as patriots for voting, and Republicans for vituperation. And this the example that the majority set for patriotic action in this hour of the nation's peril. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, three weeks' debate to allow Administrationists and anti-Administrationists to prove that they stand on the Chicago Democratic platform.

So, Mr. Speaker, from the propositions presented by the ma-

majority the Republican members are compelled to choose *volens*.

BIMETALLISTS.

My State is chiefly engaged in agriculture, stock-raising, and mining, agriculture predominating.

My constituents are almost unanimously, without regard to party, bimetalists; and desiring to represent them, it is my desire to so vote as will best promote the use of both gold and silver.

My constituents are not, as I believe, wedded to free coinage of silver as a theory or proposition, except as it shall insure practical bimetalism—the use of both metals.

I have listened with interest to this entire discussion, and I have been highly pleased to hear well-nigh a unanimous declaration from all parties favoring bimetalism; and I have listened with unprejudiced interest to the arguments of those upon this floor who contend with so much earnestness that bimetalism will be more certainly attained by the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law. I should much prefer to provide for silver in the same bill.

TRAMPLING ON SILVER.

It is beyond my comprehension to understand how you elevate an object by depressing it. You say silver is now traveling upon a halting limb, but to enable it to run swiftly you amputate the leg, and so you vote against coinage at any ratio. You find silver upon the first floor, and in order to get it to the garret you hurl it into the cellar.

You find the silver craft leaking, damaged, and scarcely able to keep afloat, and you, in order to convert it into a sea-worthy vessel, sink it to the bottom.

Pretending to be the friend of silver, you thrust a dagger into its heart.

You pretend to desire to sustain silver and vote it up, and so you vote it down.

You find silver in a dying condition and pretend you wish to restore it and make it strong, and your first act is to bury it.

A convert seeking the way to Heaven, you send him to hades to start.

You pretend to be the friend to silver, you act like its bitter enemy.

Your acts are strongly inconsistent with your words.

Were you an avowed enemy of silver, your hostility could be no greater.

While you sing hallelujahs to it, you also breathe curses.

Your plan to restore silver as a money metal is in direct conflict with the plan and at variance with the opinion of every recognized leader in the contest for silver in the nation.

You consort with avowed enemies of the white metal, and yet pretend to be its friend.

This contest is too serious for temporizing.

It means monometallism or bimetalism. The unconditional repeal of the Sherman law means a single gold standard. A vote against the amendments proposed for the coinage of silver is a vote for the single standard of gold.

It is a vote for monometallism. How can any bimetalist claim that he is truly in favor of silver and vote against its coinage as

provided by these amendments? I am opposed to monometalism, and hence shall vote for some of these ratios. As before stated, my State is largely agricultural, and adapted to stock-raising.

In the western portion, known as the Black Hills, we have rich mines of gold, silver, and tin. My State produced in the year 1892, as estimated by the Director of the Mint, gold, \$3,700,000; silver, \$77,576.

Our people believe that to strike down silver and go to the gold standard must inevitably lower the already ruinous prices of our wheat, and reduce still lower the already low price we shall receive for our horses, cattle, and wool.

We find that it is simply history, that as the price of silver goes up or down so the price of our products rise or fall.

And yet I am asked to vote against these amendments, to vote down the price of my constituents' wheat, flax, barley, horses, cattle, and wool, at the dictation of the gold men.

MONOMETALLISM.

No one as I have yet heard in this debate, and I have attentively listened to the whole of it, has denied that placing this country upon the single gold standard, which the voting down of these free-coinage amendments do, will reduce every article in price that the farmer has to sell, as well as ruin the silver-mining States.

It can not be denied; it is the eternal truth.

DEBTORS.

No gold man can deny, moreover, that it will largely increase our indebtedness in the West and South.

We are a debtor people; we are improving our lands, building houses and barns, and stocking our farms; building towns, schoolhouses, and churches, and developing new industries; and we need a great deal of money, and so we are borrowers. Now, you propose to double, and do double, our indebtedness by refusing longer to recognize silver as a money metal.

More than this, you not only largely increase our indebtedness, but you also reduce the value of our land, which is largely the security for this indebtedness; you impoverish us by increasing the debt, in the lowering the price of products with which we must pay the debt, and make us doubly poor by decreasing the value of our land, which secures the indebtedness.

DUMPING GROUND THEORY.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] also asserted that so many of his followers have reiterated, to wit, that if we had free coinage in this country the world would bring to us all its old junk pots, kettles, and spoons, as well as bullion, making this country the dumping ground for the silver of the world. This, I claim, is wholly untenable. It is well known that all articles manufactured from silver take on so great a value by reason of the labor value being added to the bullion value that the owner can not afford, nor does he sell for coinage at bullion values.

Neither, Mr. Speaker, can I understand how other nations will pour their bullion in upon us if we adopt free coinage. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is a proposition that can not be disproved, that if the United States by any legislation whatever can cause

the price of silver bullion to advance in New York, it will the same day advance in London, Paris, and Berlin.

Silver can not be one price in New York and another in London. Why should it be?

There can be no difference in the prices of silver bullion, sales of which can be by wire made in a few minutes, except perhaps the mere cost of exchange. Then if there could be no appreciable difference in price, certainly foreign bullion would not pour in upon us, and foreign silver would not drive our gold out of circulation; if worth no more here than in Europe it would not come here. But what nation has the silver to spare?

Where is the silver coming from? I think it is admitted by all parties to this debate that all the great nations are seeking a greater volume of money; they can spare nothing to exchange for our gold. And it being impossible that there be more than exchangeable difference in the price of silver bullion in the United States and its price in other countries, we are in no danger of being made a dumping ground for other nations. Neither could they get our gold unless they offered us something we wanted more than we wanted our gold.

WHY GOVERNMENT BUYS SILVER.

Several gentlemen in this debate, as did the gentleman from Florida [Mr. COOPER], with much emphasis argue that the Government should furnish them a market for their wheat and cotton if it furnish the silver-miner a market for his silver, and also indulge in the jocular demand for \$1 for 57 cents' worth of wheat.

The Government affords no market for silver except as far as its necessity goes.

The Constitution gives Congress the power "to coin money, and regulate the value thereof," and prohibits the States coining money, or from making anything but gold and silver a legal tender in payment of debts.

The duty is thus thrust by the Constitution upon the Government to provide a currency. Gold and silver are the money metals of the Constitution. The Government must supply a currency; it must have a gold and silver currency; it must therefore necessarily provide a market for silver in order to supply the people, as required by the Constitution, with money. For this reason, and this reason alone, the Government may purchase silver bullion as it does under the Sherman law. If it would adopt free coinage it would need to purchase none. There is no reason for the Government buying wheat or cotton; there is no constitutional obligation to so do, as there is to supply silver. Silver purchases are a constitutional necessity in the absence of free coinage, while there is no authority nor warrant of authority for purchasing farm or other products.

The Government purchased silver forty years ago; it is no new thing. Likewise, the frequent assumption that the people are being defrauded by the purchase of silver under the Sherman law is wholly untrue. The Government purchases at the lowest possible price in gold of the miner and pays in Treasury notes, and when it coins the silver the people get the benefit of the difference between the commercial and coinage value, and not the miners.

RATIOS.

I am constrained to vote for some of the ratios or the reënact-

ment of the Bland-Allison act, because it seems to me to be the only vote that favors bimetalism which the Republican party has ever advocated in national and State platforms. The Republican party has ever been in favor of bimetalism and the full monetization of silver, and it is to-day. I am a Republican, and believe that to vote for a ratio of coinage or for the Bland-Allison act, if ratios fail, are the most consistent Republican votes, the National Republican platform declaring for silver, and the Republican party has ever been a bi-metallic party.

I submit the platforms of the National Republican party during the last three Presidential campaigns:

PLATFORMS.

1884.

We have always recommended the best money known to the civilized world; and we urge that efforts should be made to unite all commercial nations in the establishment of an international standard, which shall fix for all the relative value of gold and silver coinage.

1888.

The Republican party is in favor of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver, as standard money, with such restrictions and under 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 or gold or paper, shall be at all times equal.

The interests of the producers of the country—its farmers and its workmen—demand that every dollar, paper or coin, issued by the Government shall be as good as any other.

We commend the wise and patriotic steps already taken by our Government to secure an international conference to adopt such measures as will insure a parity of value between gold and silver for use as money throughout the world.

The Republican party of my State has declared in favor of the remonetization of silver, as follows:

PLATFORM OF 1890.

We favor such expansion of our currency as will meet the growing demand of our increasing population and wants, and offset the contraction resulting from the withdrawal of national-bank circulation. To this end we favor such legislation as will utilize the entire product of our silver mines as money.

1891. We heartily endorse the action of the late Republican Congress in passing the silver bill, by which \$50,000,000 of currency is yearly added to the amount in circulation, and we favor such further increase in the coinage of silver as is consistent with a sound financial policy, and we favor the complete remonetization of silver.

1892. We favor the use of both gold and silver as standard money, under such legislative regulations as will secure the parity of values of the two metals, and we commend the steps already taken by our Government to insure this important object by an international monetary conference.

Believing in the platforms of my party, I can not vote for monometallism.

PROTECTION.

And how do Republicans, who are in favor of protection of home industries and the protection of American labor refuse any protection to the great silver-mining industry in this country and refuse protection to the labor in the mines also? And not only refuse protection, but actually join in legislation that ruins the industry?

FAIR WEATHER PLATFORMS.

Gentlemen of both parties seem to think that their platforms as to bimetalism are fair weather platforms, and not to be carried out in a storm panic; especially is this true of the Demo-

cratic party at this time. They seem to regard the platform as a dress-parade declaration and not for active service. The people of this country believe in the use of both gold and silver, and although gentlemen may under the shadow of this great panic for a time obscure their vision, they will very soon emerge into the broad sunlight of their settled convictions for a permanent bimetallism.

Gentlemen representing the gold side of this question theorize in regard to what will occur, but the only way to know the result is to test it. There was not a member, I think, of either branch of the Fifty-first Congress who did not predict and believe that the passage of the Sherman law would permanently advance the price of silver bullion. In this all were mistaken.

No finer illustration of the failure of theorists and doctrinaires in finance can be adduced than the history of the Sherman law.

WHEAT—INDIA.

It has been conclusively, as it seems to me, shown in these debates that the low price of silver bullion which has obtained in this country has enabled India to compete with us in wheat-raising, and lost to this country a vast amount of money, and has been a terrible drawback to the wheat-raisers of this country. We desire the advance of silver bullion in the markets of the world, believing it will advance the price of our wheat and all products we have to sell. Low silver bullion has enabled England to buy Indian wheat low to compete with our wheat producers.

PARITY.

There has been no answer to the argument upon this floor that France for seventy years maintained the parity of the two metals, and no answer to the conclusion that this nation could not now do the same.

And if, upon trial, it should prove that the parity could not be restored, this Congress in its regular December session could repeal or change the law.

Why should we not give silver the opportunity it ever had in this country during its whole history until the year 1873, during all of which time it was equal to and much of the time at a premium over gold?

57-CENT DOLLAR.

It has seemed to me very unfair in this debate that the monometallists persistently talk of a 57-cent dollar when they know that the theory of the bimetallist, the theory of the free-coinage advocate, is that with free coinage, with an equal chance for silver bullion at the mints that gold bullion now has, there will be no longer a 57-cent dollar; that the silver bullion in a dollar will then advance in price and be worth 100 cents, and that the commercial value and coinage value of silver bullion will come together, and that the bullion in a silver dollar will then actually be worth the bullion in a gold dollar.

This must be or bimetallism or free coinage is a failure. No one advocates any such measure as is here persistently talked by gold men, that the nation will continue to issue a dollar of 100 cents legal-tender value and 57 cents commercial value as bullion.

No one favors short or cheap or depreciated dollars, of which the gold men unfairly and for the purpose of prejudicing the

cause of silver and its use continually talk. Every dollar of whatever kind must be equal to every other dollar, and their value must be an interchangeable value.

Our gold friends say we can not have a parity of gold and silver without an international agreement for bimetallism. Gladstone opposes it because, he says, the world owes England \$10,000,000,000, and they want gold in payment. When will we have international agreement under these conditions?

BANKS AND THE PANIC.

' Have you gentlemen read the RECORD this morning of what occurred yesterday in the United States Senate? Have you seen that a Senator of the United States introduced a resolution to ascertain whether the national banks of the cities of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia were violating the banking laws of the United States; and have you also seen that the East—the gold men in the Senate regardless of politics (because I want to say to you gentlemen of the West and South that when you get east of the Allegheny Mountains there are no politics so far as the money question is concerned; there was none yesterday in the Senate on the measure of which I am now speaking)—have you seen that on a simple resolution of inquiry addressed to the Treasurer of the United States, the Senate debated an hour and a half as to whether that inquiry should be answered or whether the resolution should be referred to the Finance Committee.'

It was conceded by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, it was conceded by the senior Senator from Maryland that there had been violations of the law. It was conceded, as you will see by reading the debate, that the banks of New York City are charging their depositors as high as 3 per cent for their own money, and yet the Senate refused a resolution for a report of any violation of law by these banks. And yet these gentlemen from the East—the gentlemen from New York City—come here and cry out against the dishonesty of the farmers from the West and against the bad character of the loans which have been placed there.

WEST HONEST.

I want to say to you gentlemen that you never had as good securities as the landed securities of the West. You have never lost money by loaning to the West. We have paid you your interest. And now, simply because we do not want you to make a dollar worth \$1.50—because we want you to accept payment in the dollar in which your contract was made, to wit, silver equal to gold and at a ratio of 16 to 1—you talk about dishonesty and "cheap money" and all that sort of thing. That has been your cry for a generation. That was the cry when you brought up the question of the payment of the bonds, the bonds you purchased at low rates during the war.

RESUMPTION.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a Republican. After our flag was triumphant in the late war—after the Union had been saved, after the nation had had a little breathing spell, after the matters of reconstruction had had some consideration—the Republican party took the position that every promise to pay a dollar, although that promise had been depreciated during the terrible war, should be worth 100 cents on the dollar.

And, Mr. Speaker, we were a patriotic people. We as Re-

publicans insisted all the time for a system which would give not only a proper currency in the land, but put all of the obligations of the Government upon an equality. It was a patriotic purpose, a purpose which was right and which I indorse then and indorse now. Under that law the bondholders got the money and the bonds were payable in lawful money of the United States; afterwards they were made payable in coin. I am not complaining. I repeat, the efforts of the Republican party to keep these bonds and their payment as a sacred obligation upon the people was a wise, honest, and honorable policy.

But in 1873 there was by legislative enactment stricken down one of the coins of the country—silver—and the bonds theretofore payable in coin were made payable in gold. And while it was right and patriotic, as far as that is concerned, to bring up the bonds of the Government and make them all alike payable in the best money of the Government, and while I do not indorse the demonetization act of 1873, but condemn it as absolutely bad, the action that was taken before for the purpose of bringing the credit of the United States up to where every dollar was equal to every other dollar was a right and praiseworthy duty of a patriotic people. But while we were doing that there was standing alongside of the patriotic mass of the people of the country the bondholders, crying aloud and sparing not for this legislation.

I repeat, sir, while it was right and patriotic to bring up the credit of the United States we incidentally voted multiplied millions of dollars into the pockets of the bondholders by increasing the value of their bonds. And yet, notwithstanding all this, they are not satisfied. They come here now and resist every intelligent action on the part of the Western people. Because we simply desire to pay off our mortgages, which they hold, in the money which was contracted for at the time the obligation was created, and resist them doubling our debts and reducing the price of our products one-half by adopting a single gold standard, they cry out against us and talk about "cheap money."

SOUND MONEY.

Mr. Speaker, that is the veriest claptrap. There has not been a man of any standing on this floor or elsewhere who has advocated any kind of dollar which is not equal to every other dollar issued by the Government.

I am a Republican, and this is a proposition on which the Republican party has stood firm and unchanged, as immutable as the eternal rocks, at all times in its history. It has stood always for good and honest money in this country. We have pledged ourselves to it in all of our platforms, State and national (although it seems that some of our friends forget that our platforms have declared for bimetallism), and we are still declaring for it.

But I desire to read what was said in the debate in the Senate, not longer ago than yesterday, upon this subject of the action of the banks of New York, the remarks of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and I commend them to the gentlemen from New York and West Virginia, who lay all the trouble now prevailing to the existence of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law. I ask these gentlemen and others to consider this language of Senator ALLISON. He said:

Those of us who were here some years ago remember very well that the

national banks of the city of New York refused to take upon deposit silver certificates issued by the Government, and in 1882, now eleven years ago, we were compelled by law to say that no national bank should be a member of any clearing-house association which did not receive on deposit silver certificates; and it is a matter of fact well known—at least, very well known in this body and elsewhere—that those national banks from that hour to this have, wherever they could, discriminated against silver certificates.

They have pushed them out and out into the remote regions of our country and held, where they could, the greenbacks and the gold certificates.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the two gentlemen especially to this language:

Much of the currency famine that has recently existed in the city of New York arises from the fact that the banks have not held in their vaults as a part of their reserve the silver certificates issued under the authority of the United States, nor have they held there any silver dollars. The silver certificates and silver dollars have been pushed out into the remoter regions of our country.

This is what the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] says in regard to what has brought on the panic and where the responsibility rests for our present condition.

More than this, Mr. Speaker, in an article in that great Democratic organ, the New York Sun, of April 29, it is boldly charged that the New York banks and the Administration were working together and understandingly to compel an extra session of Congress to repeal the Sherman law, even at the expense of a panic. An extract is as follows:

The conference yesterday between Secretary Carlisle and a number of the bankers of this city was of great value in that it resulted in a definite understanding of the financial policy of the Administration, as indicated in this column last Tuesday. That policy is to interpose no obstacle to the natural operations and logical results of the Sherman law. In a word, the Administration proposes to allow the people to reap the rewards of their own folly.

The statement of Mr. Carlisle to the New York bankers makes it clear that, while Mr. Cleveland works in Congress, the bankers will be expected to work, not in New York only, but throughout the country, doing their utmost to pinch business everywhere in the expectation of causing a money crisis that will affect Congress powerfully from every quarter. There is an explicitness in these declarations and a boldness in making them that would be astounding were not the country too familiar with Mr. Cleveland and his methods to be astonished by anything from him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. Mr. Speaker, I asked to be recognized on the next amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from South Dakota that it has looked at the order, and while, perhaps, it is a little ambiguous, still the Chair is inclined to think, and will put that construction upon it unless the House otherwise directs, that it was designed to limit the members to five or ten minutes as under the ordinary five-minute rule in the House, and as to all of the amendments, and not on each amendment.

The Chair believes that the order was so understood by the House to permit, under the five-minutes' rule, the discussion of all of the amendments at once, as has been done under the general debate up to this time, and to construe the order otherwise would, as the gentleman himself must see, make the debate to-day or to-morrow for each member who gets the floor just as long as it was under the rule for general debate.

Mr. PICKLER. I do not wish to discuss the construction of the rule with the Chair, and will yield to the decision without

comment, simply asking the privilege of continuing for five minutes longer.

The **SPEAKER**. If there be no objection, the gentleman from South Dakota will be recognized for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. **PICKLER**. It is most remarkable that in either branch of the United States Congress, when a simple proposition of inquiry to one of the great Departments as to the operations of our national banks—the agents in one respect of the Government of the United States—as to whether they are violating the law, and when it is even conceded on the floor of the Senate that they have been violating the law, should find opposition and fail of adoption—I say I do not understand why objection can be made to the information being laid before Congress. It will not do to argue that any acts of Government officers or agents shall be concealed from the people's representatives in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, what must it lead to? If you can cover up the transactions of the banks by an action of this character, what may you not be able to cover up? It is a dangerous position, and will do more to create a fear in the minds of the people that the money power has undue influence in national legislation and Government than can be readily imagined.

VOLUME OF CURRENCY.

It has been argued here, Mr. Speaker, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. **HARTER**], justifying the demonetization of silver, that the narrowing of the volume of currency does not interfere with business. That is the most dangerous proposition to the people of the West that has been suggested on this floor. We are a new country. We have lands that we desire to sell. We desire new railroad enterprises. We desire money to build factories in cities and towns, and schoolhouses and court-houses, and to develop our new country in a hundred ways.

We have a great need for money, and we know that if money is scarce, if there is but little money, the East will consume all of it before we even hear of it in the West. Certainly there never have been better times in this country than under a large volume of currency, during the war and immediately following. It appears to me, gentlemen, that it is a proposition that can not be denied, that so long as every dollar is as good as every other dollar there can not be too much good money in circulation. Who has ever known a country to have too much good money in circulation? Who has ever known times to be good when you have too little money in circulation? I believe the volume of the money has much to do with the prosperity of the country.

CHECKS AND DRAFTS.

Much has been said here about business being done with checks and drafts. Now, I confess that while I know a large per cent of business is done on credit with small cash basis, it is my impression that in order to have a check or draft to amount to anything in business a man must have money back of it. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. **CATCHINGS**] supposed a case the other day in this wise: He said, "Suppose a man brings in a \$100 of cotton and sells it for \$100, and that the merchant instead of paying him \$100 in cash gives him a check on the bank for \$100, and with that check he goes and buys goods of the dry goods merchant, and the merchant sends it to some other man whom he owes,

and so it goes around;" the gentleman argues, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] argues that the use of the check does away with the use of or requires less money.

Now, how can it be? The man who gave a check on the bank had a hundred dollars in that bank, or he could not have drawn his check. So all the office that the check performed was that in place of the man going and getting the money out of the bank and carrying it to the next man, and he to the next, they simply passed the check around from one to the other, and it did not take a dollar less to do business with the check than if the actual money had been used.

Mr. BYNUM. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, if my time can be extended. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYNUM. Will you tell me why it is, then, that the deposits in the banks exceed the entire circulation in the country about three times?

Mr. PICKLER. What has that to do with my proposition?

Mr. BYNUM. It simply has got this to do, that the deposits are three times as great as the entire circulation, and therefore the checks represent three times as much money as there is in circulation.

Mr. PICKLER. If the gentleman means three one hundred dollar checks are drawn against the same one hundred dollars, that is not legitimate banking, and is a dangerous inflation of credit. It is not that the bank has three times as much cash deposits as its circulation; it may have three times as much credits. This does not interfere with my statement as to checks and drafts. Can a man draw a check unless he has money to draw against?

Mr. BYNUM. No, but the money is deposited by different persons. The deposits are three times the amount of circulation.

Mr. DINGLEY. If my friend will pardon me, his check may be drawn against a credit given him by the bank.

Mr. PICKLER. Yes, but when the check is presented it takes actual cash to meet it; credit will not. I want my time extended if I am to be interrupted. The gentleman says that a man may draw his check against a credit that is given him. If he draws it against a credit, he had deposited money to obtain that credit. No bank honors a check unless it is drawn against cash or a cash credit, and the bank must have the money to pay the check, so that it is only the representative of money actually existing in the bank. Of course credit, as suggested by the gentleman from Indiana, may largely exceed the actual cash. A man may deposit \$100, against which he may check; the bank may loan it to B, and he may deposit it in same bank, and he may check against it, but when either A or B checks the bank must have the actual cash—somebody's cash to pass over to the holder of the check; just as to obtain a draft you must have actual cash to the amount of the draft, so that the use of a check or draft is only a convenience, and does not lessen the amount of actual money required to do the business.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PICKLER. One moment and I will be through.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. PICKLER] have a minute longer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman will have one minute more.

LONG TIME CHECK.

Mr. PICKLER. It seems to me that the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] that the use of a draft or a check lessens the necessity of actual money must be based on about the financial theory of a certain young Israelite of whom I have heard. An old Israelitish banker of whom I heard a few days ago had become rich in the business. His nephew Isaac had been associated with him in the business, and he was desirous to have his wealth go to Isaac at his death; so he brought Isaac to his bedside, and he said, "The physicians tell me I am only to live a short time. You have been a good and faithful friend and relative to me. You have been loyal to my interests and I desire to turn over to you my entire wealth except \$500 in cash that I began business with. That I wish buried with me. "Now, I want you to deposit \$500 in cash in the coffin with me, because I want to take it along with me." Isaac, tenderly regretting the sad event, said, "All right, I will do so." But the old Israelite was a little fearful that Isaac might be tempted by the glittering \$500, so he made known to the rabbi what his request was, and asked the rabbi to see that Isaac carried out this promise. So the venerable Jew in time died and the rabbi went to the funeral.

[Here the hammer fell].

Mr. PICKLER. Will my colleague yield me a half minute?

Mr. LUCAS. I will.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. LUCAS. Half a minute.

Mr. PICKLER. So the rabbi examined the body and could not find the money. He called Isaac and said to him, "Did not you promise to bury with our old friend the \$500, the amount he commenced business with?" Isaac said, "Yes, I did." The rabbi said, "You did not do it." "Oh, yes I did," said Isaac, "you will find my sheck in his vest pocket." [Laughter.]

I believe there is no danger whatever of silver monometallism. Silver dollars have been at a premium the last few days in New York City, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States declares that he has not had sufficient silver to redeem Treasury notes presented. There is not a man in all this country who does not believe silver a sound currency. The ratio of 16 to 1 is the money in which our debts have been contracted and in which it is fair, right, honest, and just to pay them. Other ratios are compromises. If all the amendments for silver shall be voted down I shall vote against the repeal of the Sherman law; shall vote

AGAINST REPEAL OF THE SHERMAN LAW

Because it is all that is left in any way favoring silver coinage. Because its unconditional repeal places this country on a single gold standard.

Because it now adds to our circulation from three to four million dollars per month, and if repealed it contracts our currency in that amount, and will compel the sale of Government bonds to buy gold to take the place of silver, thus imposing a tax on the people.

Because its repeal absolutely stops the coinage of silver in this country, and further reduces the price of silver bullion, and likewise the prices of our products.

Because I do not believe it responsible for the present panic to any appreciable extent, but that it has been seized upon by the present Administration to drive the country to a single gold standard, at the dictation of the money interests of the country.

Because the people of the country want more good money in circulation, while this repeal lessens it by fifty millions per year.

233

