SILVER.

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEWIS SPERRY,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 1893.

WASHINGTON.
1893.

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEWIS SPERRY,

OF CONNECTICUT,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, August 21, 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"—

Mr. SPERRY said:

Mr. SPEAKER: We have been called here in extraordinary session for the purpose of repealing a law the provisions of which have brought the country to-day into a panic the like of which we have not seen for twenty years.

For one, and speaking for the constituency which I represent I am in favor of the unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of that law; and in making this statement I will not qualify it by saying that I am a free-silver man or that I am a bimetallist. Yet I believe I could say I come nearer to being a bimetallist than that wing of the Democratic party who stand here proclaiming that they are bimetallists and demanding the free coinage of silver upon a ratio which will not permit anything but silver to circulate in this country.

If we are to choose, Mr. Speaker, between the two standards, gold or silver (which seems to be really about the issue presented to-day), I announce that as between those two metals I am a gold man. I believe that this country can not undertake to carry a standard differing from that of the other great commercial countries of the world; that it can not undertake to maintain the free coinage of silver upon a ratio different from the commercial ratio in this country and in the markets of the world.

We have heard much, Mr. Speaker, about the demonetization of silver, which it is said was brought about in 1873 by stealth. We are told that members of both branches of Congress did not know what they were voting for when they voted for that act. I have read the history of that legislation; and, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it was a premeditated act. The proposition had been brought before Congress by several Secretaries of the Treasury during several previous years, and had been considered by two or three or four different Congresses before the bill was finally passed.

On this subject I desire to read briefly from the remarks of Hon. Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania, then a member of this House, who stated the reasons why he favored a reminting law which should drop the silver dollar out of our coinage; and the reasons he then gave for that measure are precisely the reasons now urged by gentlemen here for restoring the silver dollar to wit, because existing conditions are supposed to operate favorably to Wall street, or the "money power." He urged as a reason for that legislation the fact that the bullion brokers of New York were making money out of the Government by the coinage of a silver dollar the intrinsic value of which was in excess of its coinage value. Mr. Kelley said:

It is a bill prepared at the suggestion and under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and now comes to us revised with much care by the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, exclusive of the chairman, his absence being accounted for by the reasons I have given.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, hastily point out some of the interests that are on this floor seeking to protect themselves by preventing the passage of this bill. One silver bullion dealer of New York, during the last Congress, admitted to the gentleman who is now acting as chairman of the committee in charge of the bill that under one defect in existing laws he was making at the cost of the Government from seventy-five thousand to one hundred thousand dollars a year. * * * His profits—and he is but one of those who are growing fat and greedy upon the defects in our mint laws—arise in this way: Our country, like every other civilized Government. should procure its own metal out of which to make subsidiary coinage.

Now, sir, every coin of ours that is not gold is subsidiary. Our silver dollar, half dollar, and every other coin that is not gold is subsidiary. As gentlemen seem to express surprise at this proposition I repeat that silver coin is subsidiary. The half dollar is not worth 50 cents, All other governments pay the expense of minting by the difference between the intrinsic value of subsidiary coins and the value at which they circulate and at which the government redeems them.

And such was the law of this country until, by a ruling of Mr. Guthrie, when he was Secretary of the Treasury, the Mint was ordered to receive silver from private individuals and coin it. Now, it so happens that a constituent of the gentleman from New York has been taking advantage of that ruling and deposited silver to be made into half dollars and other silver coins; and for every $2 worth of silver deposited by him he gets four half dollars and one 10-cent piece, or the equivalent thereof. He has, as he stated to my colleague [Mr. Hooper of Massachusetts] and myself, been doing a business of from eighteen hundred thousand to two million dollars per annum, giving him as profit an annual income equal to the salary of the President for the Presidential term. * * *

Again, sir, by a mistake in our law it has become impossible to retain an American silver dollar in this country except in collections of curiosities. They would, if coined in considerable numbers, be a source of enormous profit to the silver-bullion dealer of New York. Let me show you. The silver dollar required by our laws is worth 3½ cents more than our gold dollar, and is worth 7 cents more than two half dollars. Now, sir, let us get back, as the gentleman desires, to specie payment before we legislate upon the mint laws, and you will have an interest of from one million to many million dollars a year here, with its lobby in and around the House to prevent the Government from the possibility of losing a few dollars by substituting copper-nickel for copper and copper-bronze coinage.

Every dollar we will then coin in silver will put from 3½ to 7 cents in the pocket of the individual broker. Every half dollar for which he may deposit in silver and have it coined will yield him a profit of 2½ cents.

Now, sir, is the Government of the United States to be made the prey of the people of the world in order to give large profits to a few silver bullion brokers in New York? For there is the whole question.—*Congressional Globe*, second session Forty-second Congress, page 2311.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that speech was made on this floor April 9, 1872—a year before the bill demonetizing silver was passed. We had no silver in circulation at that time because of the well-established law that unless the coinage ratio corresponds to the market ratio of the bullion, and with great nicety, it is impossible to circulate the two metals together.

Without pursuing further the history of the act of 1873, which has been so much referred to by gentlemen in this debate as having been passed by stealth, I will, as my time is limited, attach to my remarks in the shape of an appendix a historical account of the demonetization of 1873, as placed before the House in a speech by Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, when that charge was first made. I borrow this appendix from the Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, as appears in a speech made by him in the United States Senate June 5, 1890.

Mr. PENCE. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SPERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PENCE. As the gentleman says he intends to incorporate as an appendix to his speech something which he is not going to present before the House, I ask him whether Judge Kelley of Pennsylvania, after the demonetization of silver, did not say, upon this floor, as reported in volume 7 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 605, these words:

> In connection with the charge that I advocated the bill which demonetized the standard silver dollar, I say that, though chairman of the Committee on Coinage, I was as ignorant of the fact that it would demonetize the silver dollar, or of its dropping the silver dollar from our system of coins, as were those distinguished Senators, Messrs. Blaine and VOORHEES. I do not think that there were three members of this House that knew it. * * * The Committee on Coinage, who reported the original bill, were able and faithful and scanned its provisions closely. As their organ I reported it; it contained provision for both the standard gold and silver dollar, and the trade dollar.
>
> Never having heard till long after its enactment of the substitution in this Senate of the section which dropped the standard dollar, I profess to know nothing of its history: but I am prepared to say that in all the legislation of this country there is no mystery equal to the demonetization of the standard dollar of the United States. I have never found a man who could tell how it came about, or why. * * * I wish gentlemen to know what the bill was; it was a bill to reorganize the mints, and it was passed without allusion in debate to the question of the retention or abandonment of the standard silver dollar. * * * I was the chairman of the committee that reported the original bill, and I aver upon my honor that I did not know that it proposed to drop the standard dollar, and I did not learn that it had done so for eighteen months after the passage of the substitute offered by Mr. Hooper.

I simply ask the gentleman if Judge Kelley did not make that statement; and I ask him if it was not made just as I read it after the demonetization act of 1873 was passed?

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Speaker, whether Judge Kelley made that statement or not, I am not advised. I understand that he afterwards was a prosilver man. I have read the words of Judge Kelley as they appear in the Congressional Globe. I hope the gentleman has read the words of Judge Kelley, to which he refers, correctly, if he has pretended to have read them at all.

But his question reminds me of a remark of Thomas H. Benton, when there was a resolution presented which was undertaken to be injected into one of the platforms about to be framed. It was refused in one shape and was afterwards sought to be put in in the shape of a resolution. Mr. Benton remarked that the resolution seemed to him to carry a stump speech in its belly. [Laughter.] It will, however, go into the RECORD as a part of my remarks; and I do not think it will do harm to the facts of the discussion, either as claimed by him or by me.

But, Mr. Speaker, however that may be, what I have quoted s the language of Judge Kelley is unquestionably true, that the silver dollar was worth a premium, and because of that fact it was not circulating in this country, and because it would not circulate it was dropped out of our coinage for the reason that the Government was a loser on every dollar that it issued. Now, if it be true, as Judge Kelley said, that a single broker made seventy-five to one hundred thousand dollars a year under a free-coinage system which showed him a margin of profit of 5 cents on the dollar, will the gentleman tell me how much the bullion brokers of New York and the bullion producers of Colorado will make when they are allowed to bring their products to the mints in silver bullion and take out dollars, worth only 55 cents on the dollar, as bullion? [Applause.]

But what I want to emphasize in that connection, and all I wish to emphasize, is this: That it is the history of every people and the history of all time that free coinage with unlimited tender must be accompanied in its ratio with an exact correspondence in value to the commercial ratio of the metal out of which the coinage is made. And I refer gentlemen to the debates which took place in Congress in 1834, when we rearranged the ratio between gold and silver and raised it from 15 to 16.

I suggest to our free-coinage friends in that connection the fact, as related by Thomas H. Benton in his Thirty Years' View—and, Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to my free-coinage friends the fact as he presented it in his work—that they, the parties, were divided here before the House as to whether the ratio should be 15⅝ or 16. With so great an exactness must you bring your statutory ratio to the market value of the bullion that the two parties divided in 1834 as to whether that ratio should be 15⅝ to 1 or 16 to 1.

And yet gentlemen on this floor bring forward their propositions of free coinage on ratios running all the way from 16 to 1 up to 20 to 1, and everyone is invited to take his choice, as though it would not make the slightest difference what he chose, provided only he chose something that was agreeable to his district. [Laughter and applause.] It reminds me, sir, of the country schoolmarm—and I think she belonged to Missouri [laughter]—who presented herself for examination before a committee as a candidate to teach a school, and the committee asked her if the world was round or flat? Her reply was that upon so great a question as that, of course, she should not be expected to have an opinion of her own. [Laughter.] She said, "In different districts in which I have taught I have found a great diversity of opinion among the people on that subject, and I have always made it my practice to teach it either way, just as the parents prefer." [Laughter and applause.]

So, Mr. Speaker, with our friend from Missouri who leads the free-coinage debate in this House: He brings to this body an assortment of ratios and he invites members on the floor to look over his assortment and pick out the one that in their judgment will be most acceptable in their district. But there is one wide difference to be made between the Missouri schoolmarm and the Missouri Congressman in that the schoolmarm was right half the time, and there is not a single one of these ratios brought forward by the Missouri Congressman that is right any time. Laughter and applause.] The highest ratio is 20 to 1, which makes the silver dollar worth about 80 cents.

I have from the Director of the Mint a statement as to the amount of bullion bought by the Government under the two acts of 1878 and 1890, and it appears from that statement that the Government has already lost, or that there is a depreciation in value of the metal, and the people have lost, or somebody has lost, by this depreciation between the price at which the Government bought and its bullion price, which I think two or three days ago was 75 cents an ounce, the sum of $119,274,583.

Is it any wonder, sir, that this great country running upon a financial system which shows such loss as that, with no gold reserve provided under either the statute of 1878 or 1890, compelled to go into the market and purchase silver, and powerless to stop the downward tendency of silver, is it any wonder that the country should be alarmed at the great exportation of gold going on since January 1, and begin to suspect not only their currency system, but even the solvency of the Government itself?

Now, it has been suggested, and that is one of the great arguments that has been offered, sir, that we need more money. I will submit a statement prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury, showing the amount of money in circulation from 1860 to 1892, inclusive:

Statement showing the amounts of money in the United States, in the Treasury and in circulation, on the dates specified.

Year.	Amount of money in United States.	Amount in circulation.	Population.	Money per capita.	Circulation per capita.
1860	$442,102,477	$435,407,252	31,443,321	$14.06	$13.85
1861	452,005,767	448,405,767	32,064,000	14.09	13.98
1862	358,452,079	334,697,744	32,704,000	10.96	10.23
1863	674,867,283	595,394,038	33,365,000	20.23	17.84
1864	705,588,067	669,641,478	34,046,000	20.72	19.67
1865	770,129,755	714,702,995	34,748,000	22.16	20.57
1866	754,327,254	673,488,244	35,469,000	21.27	18.99
1867	728,200,612	661,992,069	36,211,000	20.11	18.28
1868	716,553,578	680,103,661	36,973,000	19.38	18.39
1869	715,351,180	664,452,891	37,756,000	18.95	17.60
1870	722,868,461	675,212,794	38,588,371	18.73	17.50
1871	741,812,174	715,889,005	39,555,000	18.75	18.10
1872	762,721,565	738,309,549	40,596,000	18.79	18.19
1873	774,445,610	751,881,809	41,667,000	18.58	18.04
1874	806,024,781	776,083,031	42,796,000	18.83	18.13
1875	798,273,509	754,101,947	43,951,000	18.16	17.16
1876	790,683,284	727,609,388	45,137,000	17.52	16.12
1877	763,053,847	722,314,883	46,353,000	16.46	15.58
1878	791,253,576	729,132,634	47,598,000	16.62	15.32
1879	1,051,521,541	818,631,793	48,866,000	21.52	16.75
1880	1,205,929,197	973,382,228	50,155,783	24.04	19.41
1881	1,406,541,823	1,114,238,119	51,316,000	27.41	21.71
1882	1,480,531,719	1,174,290,419	52,495,000	28.20	22.37
1883	1,643,489,816	1,230,305,696	53,693,000	30.60	22.91
1884	1,705,454,189	1,243,925,969	54,911,000	31.06	22.65
1885	1,817,658,336	1,292,568,615	56,148,000	32.37	23.02
1886	1,808,559,694	1,252,700,525	57,404,000	31.50	21.82
1887	1,900,442,672	1,317,539,143	58,680,000	32.39	22.45
1888	2,062,955,949	1,372,170,870	59,974,000	34.39	22.88
1889	2,075,350,711	1,380,361,649	61,289,000	33.86	22.52
1890	2,144,226,159	1,429,251,270	62,622,250	34.24	22.82
1891	2,100,130,092	1,500,067,555	63,975,000	32.83	23.45
1892	2,219,719,198	1,603,073,338	65,520,000	33.88	24.47

NOTE.—The difference between the amount of money in the country and the amount in circulation represents the money in the Treasury.

As a matter of fact we never had so much money in circulation as we have now. In 1873 we had $751,881,809. In 1892 we had $1,603,073,338, or, stated per capita, in 1873 we had $18.04 per capita and in 1892 we had over $24.47 per capita. Now, if it be true, as has been argued by different men upon this floor, that abundance of money makes high prices, I beg that some of these gentlemen who hold to that view will tell us, if abundant money makes high prices, why it is that prices have been continually falling, while our money, per capita and in total, has been constantly rising since 1873.

As a matter of fact it is impossible to prove that because the gold dollar buys more of certain commodities to-day than it did formerly, that therefore the gold dollar has appreciated. There are other considerations to be taken into account. There is the fact that prices have declined in silver-using countries and in gold-using countries alike. If the argument were true that silver would make good prices, then it ought to be true that in silver-using countries prices have not fallen.

Upon the other hand, it is true that all over the world in the last twenty years, and perhaps longer, most of the commodities which a person needs have fallen. Wheat, cotton, and all the products of machinery, by reason of the improvements in machinery, by the reduction in the cost of transportation, by the reduction in interest charged, have fallen, not only in this country, but in every country. Prices have fallen in accordance with the law of supply and demand, and not because, as gentlemen have suggested, that we have not sufficient money.

Upon that point I will read briefly from the work of the Hon. David A. Wells upon Recent Economic Changes, page 115. Speaking of the fall of prices he says:

A further fact of the highest importance, and one that is not disputed, is that no peculiarity of currency, banking, or standard of value, or form of government, or incidence and degree of taxation, or military system, or condition of land tenure, or legislation respecting trade, tariffs, and bounties, or differences in the relations between capital and labor in different countries, have been sufficient to guard and save any nation from the economic disturbances or trade depression which has been incident to such changes in prices.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one item in the account which has not fallen in the last twenty years, and that is the wage of the daily workman. I will submit as a part of my remarks the report from the Finance Committee of the Senate to the last Congress as to prices and wages, which are stated, not in dollars and cents, but in percentages.

Relative wages and prices in gold in all occupations, 1840–'91.

[Simple average of all the returns, taking the wages of 1860 as 100. From report of Senate Committee on Finance on wholesale prices, wages, and transportation, Report 1394, part 1, Fifty-second Congress, second session, pages 9 and 14.]

Year.	Prices.	Wages.	Year.	Prices.	Wages.
1840	116.8	87.7	1845	102.8	86.8
1841	115.8	88.0	1846	106.4	89.3
1842	107.8	87.1	1847	106.5	90.8
1843	101.5	86.6	1848	101.4	91.4
1844	101.9	86.5	1849	98.7	92.5

Relative wages and prices in gold in all occupations, 1840–'91.—Continued.

Year.	Prices.	Wages.	Year.	Prices.	Wages.
1850	102.3	92.7	1871	122.9	147.8
1851	105.9	90.4	1872	127.2	152.2
1852	102.7	90.8	1873	122.0	148.3
1853	109.1	91.8	1874	119.4	145.0
1854	112.9	95.6	1875	113.0	140.8
1855	113.1	98.0	1876	101.8	135.2
1856	113.2	99.2	1877	104.4	136.4
1857	112.5	99.9	1878	99.9	140.5
1858	101.8	98.5	1879	96.6	139.9
1859	100.2	99.1	1880	106.9	141.5
1860	100.0	100.0	1881	105.7	146.5
1861	100.6	100.8	1882	108.5	149.9
1862	114.9	100.4	1883	106.0	152.7
1863	102.4	76.2	1884	99.4	152.7
1864	122.5	80.8	1885	93.0	150.7
1865	100.3	66.2	1886	91.9	150.9
1866	136.3	108.8	1887	92.6	153.7
1867	127.9	117.1	1888	94.2	155.4
1868	115.9	114.9	1889	94.2	156.7
1869	113.2	119.5	1890	92.3	158.9
1870	117.3	133.7	1891	92.2	160.7

From that report, made up with the greatest care, it appears that the daily wage of the laborer has increased since 1840, and the monetary system of the country has not, except temporarily and in a small way, affected the continual rise in daily wages.

Now let me suggest to some of my friends on the other side of this question, if it be true that gold has appreciated in respect of certain commodities, it is also true that gold has depreciated in respect of the amount of labor which it will buy; because you can not to-day buy as much labor for a gold dollar as you could in 1873, when silver was demonetized. Therefore, I say that those who favor the gold standard can just as well and with as great propriety, or even greater, claim to this House and to the country that gold has depreciated, as that gold has appreciated. The change has been in favor of the man who labors.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SPERRY. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. COX. You are speaking there of the average day laborer and his compensation for a day's work. Will you be kind enough to state to the House what is the average that you have there, for a laboring man, for a day's work.

Mr. SPERRY. I have stated that the committee did not report it in dollars and cents. It is reported as a matter of percentage.

Mr. COX. Will you state to the House the average amount of compensation that the laborer gets in your State per day?

Mr. SPERRY. I have not seen any authentic statement that I can now call to mind, and I would not undertake to state it precisely. Skilled labor, perhaps, $2.50 per day, and unskilled, perhaps, $1.25—sometimes as low as a dollar.

Mr. COX. That is in your State?

Mr. SPERRY. The labor in my State is almost exclusively white labor.

Mr. COX. I do not suppose the gentleman would make a difference in labor on account of color.

Mr. SPERRY. There might be a difference in the price. I have understood that in the South labor was very much cheaper than that; and it was testified before the Ways and Means Committee of the Fifty-first Congress that they could hire abundant labor in the South at 65 cents per day. My impression is you can not hire labor in my State at that price.

Mr. BAILEY. According to skill, and not color.

Mr. COX. Certainly, according to skill, and not color.

Mr. SPERRY. In 1860, upon the percentage as presented in the report, labor stood at 100. In 1891, the wages stood at 160 and applying the line of reasoning which even my friend from Tennessee [Mr. Cox], will apply it to himself, it may be, upon that item at least, gold has depreciated since 1873; yes, even since 1860, because gold to-day will not buy as much labor at it did twenty years ago; it is better for the laboring man, and I will say hereafter, more emphatically than I do now, that the standard which the laboring man ought to have is the gold standard.

Thomas H. Benton, in debate on this subject in 1834, speaking of gold, says that "he fully concurred with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Calhoun] that gold, in the United States, ought to be the preferred metal; not that silver should be expelled, but both retained; the mistake, if any, to be in favor of gold instead of being against it."

Mr. Benton's best efforts were directed to giving to American yeomanry the best dollar that could be made, and he recognized the fact that a false mint ratio undervaluing gold had driven it from the country. He counseled, therefore, that the friends of gold should set to "work at the right place to effect the recovery of that precious metal which their fathers once possessed—which the subjects of European kings now possess—which the citizens of the young republics to the South all possess—which even the free negroes of San Domingo possess—but which the yeomanry of this America have been deprived of for more than twenty years, and will be deprived of forever, unless they discover the cause of the evil and apply the remedy to its root."

Mr. SIMPSON. I understand the gentleman to say that returning to the gold standard will not decrease the wages of labor, because the laborer will be able to purchase more with that dollar, and therefore get more for his labor?

Mr. SPERRY. I did not say so, but I think that is the fact.

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, is it not a fact that a man who is engaged in farming is a laborer; and if it is a fact, and I think it has been clearly proven, that a decrease in the amount of the circulating medium decreases the value of the products of the farm, does it not decrease the wages the farmer receives for his labor? I would like the gentleman to explain that.

Mr. SPERRY. I understand by laborer, not a man only who labors with his hands, for we all labor, even the gentleman from Kansas labors at times on the floor of this House, for I have seen him here when I thought he was laboring hard. [Laughter.] But the laborer under the common acceptation of that term is the man who sells his labor for hire as distinguished from the employer. The farmer is a man who is supposed to own his own farm and is the master of his own time. A laborer is not the master of his own time, and too often is not the master of his own wages. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMPSON. I want to ask the gentleman to explain the farmer's interest as a laborer and not according to his capital. I want to ask you if it is not a fact that a farmer who labors on his farm does have his wages greatly reduced if the price of the products of his farm is reduced by a decrease in the circulating medium, and as the wages of his labor is decreased does not that affect his interest?

Mr. SPERRY. If I understand the gentleman from Kansas correctly, it is this: He wants silver and cheap money in great abundance in order to benefit some particular class, to wit, the farming class.

Now, if the gentleman wants me to assume what may be the effect of a certain statute passed under these circumstances I can not tell him; but I can tell him this: That if it be true that silver will make wheat higher, it is equally true that silver will make bread higher; and there are more bread eaters in this country than wheat-raisers. [Applause.] And I will answer the gentleman further in that connection, too. If the gentleman expects that by cheap money and its great abundance he is to realize more for his wheat, I will say that not only every laborer who eats bread, many of whom I am sorry to say hunger for bread at this time, will not be able to buy more of the bread he eats because unable to get more for his daily wages at which he is paid in silver. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMPSON. Now, if the gentleman will allow me, I will say he entirely misconstrues my meaning. I do not want to establish cheap money. I want to keep the contract as it is, and not take half of the money out of circulation. I want to have sufficient of it to see that the contract is carried out as made, and that you shall not, by a return to the single gold standard, so decrease the currency and so decrease prices as to make farming more unprofitable, because the gentleman knows that profitable farming has already ceased.

Mr. SPERRY. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that his conclusions might be correct, if he only in his premise made a correct assumption. Let me tell the gentleman from Kansas that this is no single-standard affair and decrease of the currency; and let me tell the gentleman from Kansas that in 1873, when silver was demonetized, up to that time the entire silver coinage of the country was barely $8,000,000, and to-day, in round numbers, it is $500,000,000, worth 55 cents apiece. [Applause.]

The gentleman talks about discharging contracts in the way they were made. The contracts chiefly were made for the payment of gold. That is absolutely true of all the outstanding bonds. Now, when the gentleman comes here to say that the debtor class is to be benefited by enacting into law this cheap-money craze which is now passing over the country, let me suggest to him that in trying to better the debtors he must, if his theory holds good, injure the creditors.

Mr. SIMPSON. Just one thing more——

Mr. SPERRY. Just, just one thing more. If the gentleman will keep still I will give him something more. [Laughter.] The bonded railroad indebtedness of this country is over $5,000,000,-000, in addition to which there is a current indebtedness and a floating indebtedness. The railroads, which the gentleman from Kansas and all of his kind so much hate, and against which they have so thoroughly legislated, as far as they could—it is for their benefit that the gentleman from Kansas stands upon this floor to tell the country that he desires to relieve the debtor class by issuing cheap money. He proposes to relieve the railroads of a large proportion of their five or ten billions of indebtedness, because they are the largest debtors, and it is hard for them to carry their burden.

Who owns those bonds? They are owned by individuals who, if you consider the equity of the matter, can not as well afford to lose the money as the railroads can to pay it. In my own State we have on deposit in our savings banks $122,000,000. That is invested in part in railroad bonds and in other part in mortgages upon improved real estate paying rent throughout the State.

Now, if I understand correctly the argument of the gentleman from Kansas it is, that the men who borrow money from the savings banks are the debtor class and ought to be relieved; those who owe the railroad bonds, the men who own the real estate and collect the rents, they are the debtor class, and ought to be relieved

But who are you going to have contribute to this fund to relieve those debtors? I have stood at the counters of the savings banks in my State when the laboring man, his hand calloused inside with the tools of his trade, has come in to deposit a portion of his weekly stipend as a provision for "a rainy day," or to provide himself a home in the future. They are the creditor class whom you propose to have contribute to the relief of railroad corporations and men who own real estate.

And let me here say that the average of the deposits in our savings banks is less than $400; there are more than 300,000 depositors, and now the gentleman from Kansas proposes to come in here with his cheap money and repudiate half the debts in the country, to the end that the men who owe them, the men who own improved real estate and the railroads, who have issued bonds—to the end that they may be relieved; and he proposes to make the laboring men and women of Connecticut contribute $60,000,000 out of their hard-earned savings for such relief!

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants to relieve the debtor class, and if the debtors want relief, let us pass a bankrupt law, and then we can get at the individual equities; but let us not pass a general repudiation law that does not take into account either the ability or the disposition of any man to pay his debts.

Mr. SIMPSON. I understood the gentleman to say that the bonds were payable in gold.

Mr. SPERRY. What bonds does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. SIMPSON. The United States bonds.

Mr. SPERRY. I did not say so.

Mr. SIMPSON. Neither the United States bonds nor the railroad bonds are payable in gold.

Mr. SPERRY. Neither?

Mr. SIMPSON. There may be individual cases where railroad bonds are payable in gold, but a large majority of them are not. As to the United States bonds, they are payable in "coin," and if you take silver out of circulation you deprive the people of one-half of the resources which they now have to pay those bonds.

Now, in regard to the savings banks which the gentleman speaks of, does he not know that the average deposit throughout the country is $93 per capita? And does he not know, further, that the laboring classes are more interested as investors in real estate, as owners of their homes, than they are in the $93 that they have in the savings banks?

Mr. GEAR. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that a large proportion of the railroad bonds—over 80 per cent, I think—are payable, principal and interest, in gold.

Mr. SPERRY. When the effort was made on the part of the Government to refund its bonds the only standard coin in this country was gold. We had no silver. There was silver talk—perhaps some of it in Kansas. [Laughter.] There was talk at that time on the part of gentlemen who wanted fiat money. I believe the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SIMPSON], who has interrupted me so often, wants fiat money now.

Mr. SIMPSON. The gentleman is entirely correct. I want fiat money. I do not understand that there is any other kind of money than fiat money—money to which its value is given by the edict of the law.

Mr. SPERRY. A gentleman from Kansas in the last Congress came before a committee of this House advocating paper money which should not be even a promise to pay, which should not even profess to be redeemable, which anybody could obtain who wanted it—money put out by the Government which should never bear more than 2 per cent interest, and anybody who tried to get more than 2 per cent was to be imprisoned.

This money, instead of being a promise to pay, was to declare on its face "this is a dollar." Such money might be good money in Kansas; but outside of Kansas, I think not. It reminded me of the picture which a boy drew on his slate at school and then wrote under it, "this is a horse," because nobody would know it was a horse without this information. So no one could recognize the money which the gentleman from Kansas would have unless there were printed right on the face of it "this is a dollar."

The gentleman has said that the bonds of the Government were not payable in gold. Technically they were not; equitably and in good conscience they were, because when the Government tried to place the bonds we had nothing but gold as a standard of money. But the talk of cheap money, which was even then rife in the atmosphere, had so scared the people, who were hesitating whether they should accept the bonds that Mr. French, of New York, who, I understand, was one of a syndicate assisting the Government in refunding the bonds, wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury inquiring whether the bonds were payable in gold. I will read the letter of enquiry, and the Secretary's reply:

No. 94 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, *June 18, 1877.*

DEAR SIR: * * * If we are to have silver dollars with unlimited tender of free coinage, then, it is said, as silver coin is receivable for duties, from necessity both interest and principal of the public debt must be paid in silver. Gold will disappear; the new market will advance the value of silver for a time to the disappointment of the advocates of depreciation, but when under the vast supplies of the world silver again declines, we perpetuate a depreciated and fluctuating currency with all attendant evils.

And if, while restoring silver, we still pay gold on the bonded debt, the discrimination continues between bondholders and other creditors, odious and inviting constant assaults against a "favored class."

There should be one and the same dollar for the bondholder, for every other creditor, public or private, and for every workingman—and that the dollar of uniform, stable value throughout the world, now of the greatest purchasing power—gold.

And it is the people—the producing class, the workers—who have the greatest interest in restoring the gold standard, and not bondholders nor mineowners; not merchants, bankers, and middlemen, for all these protect themselves, whatever comes.

We seem to repeat the experience of ten years ago, when it was urged on technical grounds that 5-20s were payable in paper, whereby our credit was greatly impeded. It was not until May, 1869, after the passage of the credit act, that the great advance in United States bonds marked the sound policy of that honest measure.

So now, while your proposition limiting the issue will preserve the public faith, those who wish a depreciated dollar will be satisfied with nothing less.

Therefore, while the public mind is yet unformed, we need an emphatic declaration which will crystallize honest and intelligent sentiment, that by no quibble will the Government undertake to repay in silver the sums it now seeks to borrow in gold.

Then is the success of the 4 per cent loan assured, and with that resumption in 1879.

With great respect,

F. O. FRENCH.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, *Washington, D. C.*

To the above inquiry the Secretary of the Treasury made the following reply:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1877.

SIR: Your letter of the 18th instant, in which you inquire whether the 4 per cent bonds now being sold by the Government are payable principal and interest in gold coin, is received. The subject, from its great importance, has demanded and received careful consideration.

Under the laws now in force there is no coin issued or issuable in which the principal of the 4 per cent bonds is redeemable or the interest payable except the gold coins of the United States of the standard value fixed by laws in force on the 14th of July, 1870, when the bonds were authorized.

The Government exacts in exchange for these bonds payment at their face in such gold coin, and it is not to be anticipated that any future legislation of Congress or any action of any department of the Government, would sanction or tolerate the redemption of the principal of these bonds or the payment of the interest thereon in coin of less value than the coin authorized by law at the time of the issue of the bonds, being the coin exacted by the Government in exchange for the same.

The essential element of good faith in preserving the equality in value between the coinage in which the Government receives and that in which it pays these bonds will be sacredly observed by the Government and the people of the United States, whatever may be the system of coinage which the general policy of the nation may at any time adopt.

This principle is impressed upon the text of the law of July 14, 1870, under which the 4 per cent bonds are issued, and requires, in the opinion of the executive department of the government, the redemption of these bonds and the payment of their interest in coin of equal value with that which the Government receives from its issue.

Very respectfully,

JOHN SHERMAN, *Secretary.*

FRANCIS O. FRENCH, Esq.,
94 Broadway, New York.

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to say to the gentleman that the act to which he refers was passed in 1870, when silver was worth more than gold, and when silver was as much the money of the country as gold.

Mr. SPERRY. The gentleman is quite right. But most of the bonds were put out before 1878, the demonetization act having already been passed; specie payments had not been resumed. Some were put out after that and taken by the purchasers upon the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury, as above stated, that they would be paid in gold.

I will say further to the gentleman from Texas that in every case those bonds were paid for in gold—the Government received gold for them. We were then trying to get onto a specie-paying basis, a gold basis. We did get onto a gold basis and we ought to have stayed there.

If the gentleman from Kansas or the gentleman from Texas wants bonds paid kind for kind, that will suit me to a letter. When gentlemen allow the Government or other institutions or corporations to pay kind for kind, they will pay in gold.

Mr. BAILEY. They ought to pay according to the contract.

Mr. BOATNER. The gentleman from Connecticut should understand that those who advocate free coinage do not advocate "cheap money;" we advocate dollars of equal value. Now, does the gentleman advocate the passage of this bill on the ground that it will make better money than we now have?

Mr. SPERRY. That is precisely the ground upon which I advocate the passage of this bill, and the stoppage of the accumulation of any more 55 cent dollars, unless you place behind those dollars the gold standard which is behind the paper dollar. In the absence of such a standard behind these two currencies, the silver dollar is worth intrinsically 50 cents, and the paper dollar is not worth anything; that is the difference.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BAILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut be extended so as to allow him to conclude his remarks.

Mr. TRACEY. Of course I would be delighted to have the gentleman from Connecticut proceed without limitation; but it seems to me some restriction of time should be fixed, because there are gentlemen who desire to follow.

Mr. BAILEY. I will withdraw my request if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY] objects.

Mr. TRACEY. I simply suggest that the time be not extended indefinitely, so as to interfere with the right of gentlemen who are to follow.

A MEMBER. Say fifteen minutes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. RICHARDSON). Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut be extended indefinitely.

Mr. TRACEY. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

Mr. TRACEY. But I am perfectly willing——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman can not object conditionally.

Mr. TRACEY. Then I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COX. I would be perfectly willing to yield the gentleman five minutes of my time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there further objection to extending the time of the gentleman from Connecticut indefinitely? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPERRY. Now, will the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOATNER] proceed with his question?

Mr. BOATNER. I wish to know whether you desire that your constituents who have loaned their money to the constituents of the gentleman from Kansas shall be paid in a better money than they have loaned; and if so, how much better?

Mr. SPERRY. Not at all.

Mr. BOATNER. Then, if this money has been loaned upon a bimetallic basis, upon the issue of both gold and silver, on what ground of equity or justice does the gentleman ask that the lenders of that money shall be repaid in money based exclusively upon a gold standard?

Mr. SPERRY. My first anxiety in this connection is the public credit. We have been on an exclusively gold basis since 1834, as the gentleman well knows; and my heart's desire and prayer to God is that no free-coinage men, or not enough of them at least, may rise up in this House to attack the public credit of the United States, which for the last twenty years has been equal to the credit of the strongest power in the world. And when the gentleman comes here to advocate a dollar worth intrinsically only 55 cents, which the Government can not under the injunction of the Sherman act maintain at a parity with gold in any such a quantity as is now being accumulated, I say first of all let us be patriotic and maintain the public credit by stopping the further accumulation of dollars of that character. [Applause.]

Mr. BOATNER. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. SPERRY. Wait a moment. I have not answered your other question yet. If the gentleman asks a question he must take the answer.

My further suggestion is that the money that has been loaned in Connecticut has been loaned with the conviction and belief, as they had a right to believe, in the public credit. It was loaned either in gold or in money equal to gold in valuation, and now all we ask is that the legislation of this Congress shall be such that the two metals, so far as they have been accumulated in the Treasury of the United States, that the two dollars, the white and the yellow, shall continue each to the other to be of equal value.

Mr. BOATNER. Can the gentleman point to an instance anywhere in any part of the United States, and I might say anywhere in the commercial world as well, where the silver dollar did not, under the authority of the United States Government, stand equal with any other dollar; or has he an instance where a silver dollar has been sold or offered for sale for less than its value as one—its par value?

Mr. SPERRY. I concede to the gentleman from Louisiana that since the resumption act took effect in 1879, the credit and resources of this Government have been sufficient to keep its paper, and its accumulation of silver as well, at par. I hope it will continue so. I hope it will be able to continue the same condition of affairs under all circumstances. But the fact is, that so low has the gold run in the Treasury by exports abroad, and so timid have our investors become in this country, and in other countries as well, investors who would be glad to come here with their money and get an investment if they had any assurance of stability in values—but so timid have they all become, that under the present law the Government will not be able to maintain the parity farther. Therefore it is, that it is time, in the present emergency and in view of the depression which prevails throughout the country, that Congress should stop talking, and act in a manner to redeem the public credit.

Mr. BOATNER. Wherein is the Government credit in default? Has the gentleman any instance in mind? Does the gentleman suppose that the United States Government is not able to take care of the four and a half million or four million ounces per month on the basis of this issue of legal-tender paper? Wherein is the ground for this apprehension?

Mr. SPERRY. Upon the ground that silver has been constantly accumulating; upon the ground that there is no provision in either the act of 1878 or 1890 to accumulate or acquire a sufficient quantity of gold reserve with which to maintain the parity of the two metals except through the sale of bonds; and gold-standard man as I am I venture to assert that it will be a very long day off before I will be willing to vote under the circumstances that this Government shall sell bonds for gold and put the proceeds into the Treasury to buy silver, which would be the effect, I presume, of that policy.

Thus far the country has maintained the parity, as I have asserted before; but the country fears, and every thoughtful man fears who gives consideration to the subject, and looks six months ahead, that under the accumulation of silver going on so rapidly, in connection with the fact that all customs are being paid almost always in silver, that that condition of affairs can not be maintained very much longer.

And as the gold reserves of the Government, Mr. Speaker, have run down even below the one hundred million mark, I say it is time that we should put a stop to the further purchase of silver, as the French Government did fifteen years ago. It would be poor statesmanship, I am sure, if we were to wait to make provision for the public credit until the public credit had been lost.

Now, I would suggest to the gentleman from Louisiana also my belief that while the repeal of this act would be a great improvement, that it would restore credit, there is also supplemental legislation necessary to give sections of the South and West the relief they so much need, in my judgment. What troubles me is to know how in the world it is possible to continue pouring silver into the Treasury here and get any more money into the States of Louisiana and Kansas. You must give up something for it; you must give up cotton——

Mr. BOATNER. We give up more than any other people for what we get.

Mr. SPERRY (continuing). And the same course which the silver so far purchased has taken when it left the Treasury the silver that may be purchased hereafter will follow unless there shall be some change in the law which will divert it into another channel.

Mr. BOATNER. I suggest to the gentleman that we never get anything in the South unless we pay a big price for it.

Mr. SPERRY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have asserted that the value of gold has not appreciated. Upon the other side I may say, also, that it has not depreciated. Both of these are of course assertions, but I claim that the weight of evidence is in favor of the statement that gold has not appreciated. In that connection I have suggested the fact that a man's wages are higher to-day in gold than they were in 1873; and that is the best standard, if you are going to legislate for the public weal.

I do not say for the weal of the wheat-producer in Kansas, but for the public weal, and there is no part of the public that so much deserves and requires friendly legislation as that part of the public who labor by the day for their daily bread. And paid in that way, Mr. Speaker, and measured by that standard, it is the laborer who is benefited chiefly above all others under a gold standard, because his wages are appreciated and that which he can buy with a dollar of gold is more than he could buy with a dollar of silver, except, of course, as you keep the silver at a parity with the gold.

Now, another suggestion right there. Can you say that gold has appreciated? Is there any way in which you can measure gold in terms of itself, so as to show whether or not it has appreciated? It is an indisputable fact, which even the most radical silver men on the floor of this House will admit, that the interest paid in gold, upon gold, has fallen constantly for the last twenty years. Now, if I own railroad stock which pays $6 a year on a hundred, it is the $6 a year earning capacity which measures the value of the stock. If next year that stock pays $7, its $7 of earning capacity will fix the value of the stock.

Now, let me suggest to the silver men on this floor that twenty years ago $100 in gold would bring you $6 of interest. To-day, if it is invested in a way so as not in any manner to bring the subject of credit into the problem, $100 in gold will not bring you $3 in interest. I do not speak of the present panic, but I speak of the working of the money market in its normal condition. Taking the Government 4 per cent bonds for a series of years past, and estimating the premium upon which those bonds are sold, and it is an indisputable fact that those bonds, which everybody believes to be gold bonds, have paid in interest less than 3 per cent for something like ten years past.

Now, I ask some of my silver friends on the floor of this House, if gold has appreciated, and if the debt weighs heavily on the debtor, and if they want to pay it back in kind—I want to ask them how they account for the fall in the rate of interest, in view of the other claim they make that the value of gold has risen? It has not risen, and there is no line of argument you can invent that will indicate that it has.

I make one other suggestion, and then I will give way to my friend from Tennessee [Mr. COX], for I am afraid I am now consuming his time. That suggestion is this: Gentlemen have appeared here in behalf of free silver, to say that debts are so great that we ought to have relief in a cheaper money. Now, just bear in mind in that connection that one man's debt is another man's asset. The five billions of debt in railroad bonds is five billions of assets in the hands of savings banks, life-insurance companies, other banks, trust companies, and individuals, whoever they may be, who happen to hold the bonds.

It is exceedingly dangerous legislation, therefore, for anyone to undertake to come before a people like this, covering the territory that we do, and with the interests that we have, and pass a general act of partial repudiation, upon the argument so often put forward in this House that in that way you will relieve the debtor.

And right in that connection let me say also that gold is the lightest burden to anybody who has a debt to contract to-day, because the interest is least.

Mr. Speaker, I have already consumed something more than the time that was alloted to me, and thanking the House for its attention, I will take occasion possibly to extend my remarks in the RECORD, but further than that I am done. [Applause.]

EXTENDED REMARKS.

My purpose in extending these remarks in the RECORD is to present to the House some authorities which I had prepared to sustain the points which I made in oral argument, but which, by reason of the limited time allowed for discussion, I was unable to lay before the House.

The question of coinage and currency is strictly a commercial question, and it ought to be so considered. The claim so often made that America can establish an American system of finance which shall differ from the rest of the world is untenable and impossible of accomplishment even if it were desirable. It might as well be said that we can establish an American system of arithmetic which shall not accord with well-established arithmetical laws known to all the rest of the world.

It is to be regretted, also, that pending the discussion of this bill so many gentlemen have attempted to raise an issue between the rich and poor. The claim so often made by free silver advocates that they represent the people as against the "money power" and the "shylocks of Wall street" and "Lombard street" has no foundation in fact, is out of place in a discussion of this kind, and its effect upon that part of the community who are in sympathy with the coinage views of those who make such assertions is vicious and every way deplorable.

The ratio of the mint should be the commercial ratio of the market. Our standard of value should be the standard of value recognized by other nations of the earth. Our people should have a stable currency which is equal to the best currency which any nation possesses. Such were the views held by statesmen of the past generation when this question came before Congress in an effort to change the ratio, which finally culminated in an act passed in 1834. The line of argument pursued at that time was clear, business-like, and convincing.

The position taken by free-silver advocates at the present time upon all their main propositions is so utterly discordant and out of harmony with all previous history of the Democratic party, and advocates of sound money of all parties, that I feel justified in quoting at considerable length from that fearless defender of the people and advocate of sound money, Hon. Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri. The following is from his Thirty Years' View, volume 1, chapter 55:

In the next place, Mr. B. believed that the quantity of specie derivable from foreign commerce, added to the quantity of gold derivable from our own mines, were fully sufficient, if not expelled from the country by unwise laws, to furnish the people with an abundant circulation of gold and silver coin for their common currency without having recourse to a circulation of small bank notes.

The truth of these propositions Mr. B. held to be susceptible of complete and ready proof. He spoke first of the domestic supply of native gold, and said that no mines had ever developed more rapidly than these had done, or promised more abundantly than they now do. In the year 1824 they were a spot in the State of North Carolina; they are now a region spreading into six States. In the year 1824 the product was $5,000; in the last year the product, in coined gold, was $868,000; in uncoined, as much more; and the product of the present year computed at two millions, with every prospect of continued and permanent increase. The probability was that these mines alone, in the lapse of a few years, would furnish an abundant supply of gold to establish a plentiful circulation of that metal, if not expelled from the country by unwise laws.

But the great source of supply, both for gold and silver, Mr. B. said, was in our foreign commerce. It was this foreign commerce which filled the States with hard money immediately after the close of the Revolutionary war, when the domestic mines were unknown; and it is the same foreign commerce which, even now, when federal laws discourage the importation of foreign coins and compel their exportation, is bringing in an annual supply of seven or eight millions. With an amendment to the laws which now discourage the importation of foreign coins, and compel their exportation, there could be no delay in the rapid accumulation of a sufficient stock of the precious metals to supply the largest circulation which the common business of the country could require.

In the third place, Mr. B. undertook to affirm, as a proposition free from dispute or contestation, that the value now set upon gold, by the laws of the United States, was unjust and erroneous; that these laws had expelled gold from circulation; and that it was the bounden duty of Congress to restore that coin to circulation by restoring it to its just value.

That gold was undervalued by the laws of the United States and expelled from circulation was a fact, Mr. B. said, which everybody knew; but there was something else which everybody did not know, which few, in reality, had an opportunity of knowing, but which was necessary to be known to enable the friends of gold to go to work at the right place to effect the recovery of that precious metal which their fathers once possessed—which the subjects of European kings now possess—which the citizens of the young republics to the south all possess—which even the free negroes of San Domingo possess—but which the yeomanry of this America have been deprived of for more than twenty years, and will be deprived of forever unless they discover the cause of the evil and apply the remedy to its root.

It is to that plan—

Referring to the issue of paper money by the United States Bank—

that we trace the origin of the erroneous valuation of gold, which has banished that metal from the country. Mr. Secretary Hamilton, in his proposition for the establishment of a mint, recommended that the relative value of gold to silver should be fixed at 15 for 1; and that recommendation became the law of the land and has remained so ever since. At the same time the relative value of these metals in Spain and Portugal and throughout their vast dominions in the New World, whence our principal supplies of gold were derived, was at the rate 16 for 1, thus making our standard 6 per cent below standard of the countries which chiefly produce gold. It was also below the English standard, and the French standard, and below the standard which prevailed in these States before the adoption of the Constitution, and which was actually prevailing in the States at the time that this new proportion of 15 to 1 was established.

Mr. B. was ready to admit that there was some nicety requisite in adjusting the relative value of two different kinds of money—gold and silver for example—so as to preserve an exact equipoise between them, and to prevent either from expelling the other. There was some nicety, but no insuperable or even extraordinary difficulty, in making the adjustment. The nicety of the question was aggravated in the year 1792 by the difficulty of obtaining exact knowledge of the relative value of these metals, at that time, in France and England, and Mr. Gallatin has since shown that the information which was then relied upon was clearly erroneous. The consequence of any mistake in fixing our standard was also well known in the year 1792.

Mr. Secretary Hamilton, in his proposition for the establishment of a mint, expressly declared that the consequence of a mistake in the relative value of the two metals would be the expulsion of the one that was undervalued. Mr. Jefferson, then Secretary of State, in his cotemporaneous report upon foreign coins, declared the same thing. Mr. Robert Morris, financier to the Revolutionary Government, in his proposal to establish a mint, in 1782, was equally explicit to the same effect.

The delicacy of the question and the consequence of a mistake were then fully understood forty years ago, when the relative value of gold and silver was fixed at 15 to 1. But, at that time it unfortunately happened that the paper system, then omnipotent in England, was making its transit to our America, and everything that would go to establish that system, everything that would go to sustain the new-born Bank of the United States—that eldest daughter and *spem gregis* of the paper system in America—fell in with the prevailing current and became incorporated in the Federal legislation of the day.

Gold, was well known, it was the antagonist of paper; from its intrinsic value, the natural predilection of all mankind for it, its small bulk, and the facility of carrying it about, it would be preferred to paper, either for traveling or keeping in the house; and thus would limit and circumscribe the general circulation of bank notes, and prevent all plea of necessity for issuing smaller notes. Silver, on the contrary, from its inconvenience of transportation, would favor the circulation of bank notes. Hence the birth of the doctrine, that if a mistake was to be committed it should be on the side of silver.

Mr. Secretary Hamilton declares the existence of this feeling when, in his report upon the establishment of a mint, he says:

"It is sometimes observed that silver ought to be encouraged rather than gold, as being more conducive to the extension of bank circulation from the greater difficulty and inconvenience which its greater bulk, compared with its value, occasions in the transportation of it."

This passage in the Secretary's report proves the existence of the feeling in favor of silver against gold, and the cause of that feeling. Quotations might be made from the speeches of others to show that they acted upon that feeling; but it is due to Gen. Hamilton to say that he disclaimed such a motive for himself, and expressed a desire to retain both metals in circulation. and even to have a gold dollar.

The proportion of 15 to 1 was established. The eleventh section of the act of April, 1792, enacted that every 15 pounds weight of pure silver should be equal in value, in all payments, with 1 pound of pure gold; and so in proportion for less quantities of the respective metals. This act was the death warrant to the gold currency. The diminished circulation of that coin soon began to be observable; but it was not immediately extinguished. Several circumstances delayed, but could not prevent, that catastrophe.

1. The Bank of the United States then issued no note of less denomination than $10, and but few of them.

2. There were but three other banks in the United States, and they issued but few small notes; so that a small note currency did not come directly into conflict with gold.

3. The trade to the lower Mississippi continued to bring up from Natchez and New Orleans for many years, a large supply of doubloons, and long supplied a gold currency to the new States in the West.

Thus, the absence of a small note currency, and the constant arrivals of doubloons from the lower Mississippi, deferred the fate of the gold currency; and it was not until the lapse of near twenty years after the adoption of the erroneous standard of 1792 that the circulation of that metal, both foreign and domestic, became completely and totally extinguished in the United States. The extinction is now complete, and must remain so until the laws are altered.

In making this annunciation, and in thus standing forward to expose the error and to demand the reform of the gold currency, he (Mr. B.) was not setting up for the honors of a first discoverer or first inventor. Far from it. He was treading in the steps of other and abler men who had gone before him. Four Secretaries of the Treasury—Gallatin, Dallas, Crawford, Ingham—had, each in their day, pointed out the error in the gold standard and recommended its correction. Repeated reports of committees in both Houses of Congress had done the same thing.

Of these reports he would name those of the late Mr. Lowndes, of South Carolina; of Mr. Sanford, late a Senator from New York; of Mr. Campbell P. White, now a Representative from the city of New York. Mr. B. took pleasure in recalling and presenting to public notice the names of the eminent men who had gone before him in the exploration of this path. It was due to them, now that the good cause seemed to be in the road to success, to yield to them all the honors of first explorers; it was due to the cause also, in this hour of final trial, to give it the high sanction of their names and labors.

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

1. It had an intrinsic value which gave it currency all over the world to the full amount of that value, without regard to law or circumstances.

2. It had a uniformity of value, which made it the safest standard of the value of property which the wisdom of man had ever yet discovered.

3. Its portability, which made it easy for the traveler to carry it about with him.

4. Its indestructibility, which made it the safest money that people could keep in their houses.

5. Its inherent purity, which made it the hardest money to be counterfeited and the easiest to be detected, and therefore the safest money for the people to handle.

6. Its superiority over all other money, which gave to its possessor the choice and command of all other money.

7. Its power over exchanges, gold being the currency which contributes most to the equalization of exchange and keeping down the rate of exchange to the lowest and most uniform point.

8. Its power over the paper money, gold being the natural enemy of that system and, with fair play, able to hold it in check.

9. It is a constitutional currency and the people have a right to demand it for their currency as long as the present Constitution is permitted to exist.

Mr. B. said that the false valuation put upon gold had rendered the Mint of the United States, so far as the gold coinage is concerned, a most ridiculous and absurd institution. It has coined, and that at a large expense to the United States, 2,262,717 pieces of gold worth $11,852,890; and where are these pieces now? Not one of them to be seen. All sold and exported, and so regular is this operation that the Director of the Mint, in his latest report to Congress, says that the new-coined gold frequently remains in the Mint uncalled for, though ready for delivery, until the day arrives for a packet to sail to Europe. He calculates that two millions of native gold will be coined annually hereafter, the whole of which, without a reform of the gold standard, will be conducted like exiles from the national Mint to the seashore and transported to foreign regions, to be sold for the benefit of the Bank of the United States.

Mr. B. said this was not the time to discuss the relative value of gold and silver, nor to urge the particular proportion which ought to be established between them. That would be the proper work of a committee. At present it might be sufficient, and not irrelevant, to say that this question was one of commerce—that it was purely and simply a mercantile problem—as much so as an acquisition of any ordinary merchandise from foreign countries could be. Gold goes where it finds its value, and that value is what the laws of great nations give it. In Mexico and South America—the countries which produce gold, and from which the United States must derive their chief supply—the value of gold is 16 to 1 over silver; in the island of Cuba it is 17 to 1; in Spain and Portugal it is 16 to 1; in the West Indies, generally, it is the same.

It is not to be supposed that gold will come from these countries to the United States if the importer is to lose one dollar in every sixteen that he brings, or that our own gold will remain with us when an exporter can gain a dollar upon every fifteen that he carries out. Such results would be contrary to the laws of trade, and therefore we must place the same value upon gold that other nations do if we wish to gain any part of theirs or to regain any part of our own. Mr. B. said that the case of England and France was no exception to this rule. They rated gold at something less than 16 to 1 and still retained gold in circulation, but it was retained by force of peculiar laws and advantages which do not prevail in the United States.

In England the circulation of gold was aided and protected by four subsidiary laws, neither of which exist here; one which prevented silver from being a tender for more than 40 shillings; another which required the Bank of England to pay all its notes in gold; a third which suppressed the small note circulation; a fourth which alloyed their silver 9 per cent below the relative value of gold.

In France the relative proportion of the two metals was also below what it was in Spain, Portugal, Mexico, and South America, and still a plentiful supply of gold remained in circulation; but this result was aided by two peculiar causes: first, the total absence of a paper currency; secondly, the proximity of Spain and the inferiority of Spanish manufactures, which gave to France a ready and a near market for the sale of her fine fabrics, which were paid for in the gold of the New World. In the United States gold would have none of these subsidiary helps: on the contrary it would have to contend with a paper currency, and would have to be obtained, the product of our own mines excepted, from Mexico and South America, where it is rated as 16 to 1 for silver. All these circumstances, and many others, would have to be taken into consideration in fixing a standard for the United States.

Mr. B. repeated that there was nicety, but no difficulty, in adjusting the relative value of gold and silver so as to retain both in circulation. Several nations of antiquity have done it; some modern nations also. The English have both in circulation at this time. The French have both, and have had for thirty years. The States of this Union also had both in the time of the confederation, and retained them until this Federal Government was established, and the paper system adopted. Congress should not admit that it can not do for the citizens of the United States what so many monarchies have done for their subjects. Gentlemen, especially, who decry military chieftains, should not confess that they themselves can not do for America what a military chieftain did for France.

Mr. B. made his acknowledgments to the great apostle of American liberty [Mr. Jefferson] for the wise, practical idea that the value of gold was a commercial question, to be settled by its value in other countries. He had seen that remark in the works of that great man, and treasured it up as teaching the plain and ready way to accomplish an apparently difficult object; and he fully concurred with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Calhoun] that gold, in the United States, ought to be the preferred metal; not that silver should be expelled, but both retained; the mistake, if any, to be in favor of gold, instead of being against it.

THE MARKET RATIO CONTROLS THE MINT RATIO.

It will be seen by the above position of Mr. Benton that he maintained that the mint ratio should correspond with the commercial ratio; that in adjusting the ratio this country should be in accord with other great countries; he suggested the impossibility of fixing any mint ratio which would allow the two metals to circulate for any considerable length of the time under the provisions of free coinage, and in view of the mistake so liable to be made, and in order to be on the safe side, he maintained that as gold was the better currency the mistake, if any was to be made, should be made in favor of gold, so that the American people might have gold money.

An ounce of gold will buy in the market to-day nearly 28 ounces of silver. The coinage ratio is 1 to 16. The free-silver advocate insists that it should be lawful for the silver bullion broker and the silver-bullion producer to bring his silver bullion to the Government Mint, where the Government should impress its stamp upon it, and deliver it back in a form—dollars—to carry a statutory and debt-paying value nearly double the intrinsic value of the bullion when brought to the Mint. The ultimate loss accruing from that palpable fraud must sooner or later fall upon the people among whom such a coin circulates, and yet the advocates of that theory claim to be the friends of the people! The mere statement of such a proposition would seem to be fatal to its advocacy by anybody.

Upon the other hand, however, very distinguished men claim, not only that such a policy enacted into law would be wise, but that the mere Government edict under which such coins circulate would enable both gold and silver to circulate freely and concurrently under the Mint stamp without regard to the intrinsic value of the bullion contained in the two different classes of coin.

If the experience of men proves anything, and if any historical record can be relied upon, it is that free coinage of gold and silver with unlimited tender of each can not exist for any length of time unless the Mint ratio corresponds with the commercial ratio. In other words, the bullion value of the two coins must correspond exactly with the value set upon them by the Mint. The International Monetary Conference, Paris, 1878, Forty-fifth Congress, third session, Senate Executive Document No. 58, collated a long list of authorities upon that point and published the same in the appendix to their report, from which the following quotations are selected:

The debate and legislation of 1717, and the advice of Newton.

[Extract from reports made by Sir Isaac Newton, master of the mint, concerning the state of the gold and silver coins.]

* * * * * * *

Pages 318, 319:

In Sweden gold is lowest in proportion to silver, and this hath made that kingdom, which formerly was content with copper money, abound of late with silver, sent thither (I suspect) for naval stores.

In the end of King William's reign, and the first year of the late Queen, when foreign coins abounded in England, I caused a great many of them to be assayed in the mint and found by the assays that fine gold was to fine silver in Spain, Portugal, France, Holland, Italy, Germany, and the northern kingdoms, in the proportions above mentioned, errors of the mint excepted.

In China and Japan 1 pound weight of fine gold is worth but 9 or 10 pounds weight of fine silver; and in East India it may be worth 12; and the low price of gold in proportion to silver carries away the silver from all Europe.

So, then, by the course of trade and exchange between nation and nation in all Europe fine gold is to fine silver as 14½ or 15 to 1, and a guinea, at the same rate, is worth between 20*s.* 5*d*, and 20*s.* 8½*d*, except in extraordinary cases, as when a Plate fleet is just arrived in Spain, or ships are lading here for the East Indies, which cases I do not here consider. And it appears by experience, as well as by reason, that silver flows from those places where its value is lowest in proportion to gold, as from Spain to all Europe, and from all Europe to the East Indies, China, and Japan, and that gold is most plentiful in those places in which its value is highest in proportion to silver, as in Spain and England.

It is the demand for exportation which hath raised the price of exportable silver about 2*d.* or 3*d.* in the ounce above that of silver in coin, and hath thereby created a temptation to export or melt down the silver coin rather than give 2*d.* or 3*d.* more for foreign silver; and the demand for exportation arises from the higher price of silver in other places than in England in proportion to gold; that is, from the higher price of gold in England than in the other places in proportion to silver, and, therefore, may be diminished by lowering the value of gold in proportion to silver. If gold in England or silver in East India could he brought down so low as to bear the same proportion to one another in both places, there would be here no greater demand for silver than for gold to be exported to India (see pages 266 and 778); and if gold were lowered only so as to have the same proportion to the silver money in England which it hath to silver in the rest of Europe there would be no temptation to export silver rather than gold to any other part of Europe.

And to compass this last, there seems nothing more requisite than to take off about 10*d.* or 12*d.* from the guinea, so that gold may bear the same proportion to the silver money in England, which it ought to do by the course of trade and exchange in Europe; but if only 6*d.* were taken off at present, it would diminish the temptation to export or melt down the silver coin, and, by the effects, would show hereafter, better than can appear at present, what further reduction would be most convenient for the public.

[Extract from the writings of Sir James Steuart, illustrating the monetary situation of England, 1759-1773.]

An inquiry into the principles of political economy, by Sir James Steuart, of Coltness, Bart. (*Volume 2, chapter 7, page 313.*)

Page 323:

* * * * * * *

The defects in the British coin are these:

First. The proportion between the gold and the silver in it is found to be as 1 to 15.2, whereas the market price (1759) may be supposed to be nearly as 1 to 14½.

Secondly. Great part of the current money is worn and light.

Thirdly. From the second defect proceeds the third, to wit, that there are several currencies in circulation which pass for the same value without being of the same weight.

Fourthly. From all these defects results the last and greatest inconvenience, to wit, that some innovation must be made in order to set matters on a right footing.

The aim of England's monetary legislation, 1773-1799.

[Extract from a treatise of the coins of the realm, in a letter to the King. Oxford, 1805. By Charles, Earl of Liverpool. 4to, 266 pages.]

Page 341:

* * * * * * *

A difficulty then existed, and continues to exist, which must necessarily be removed before any plan can be adopted for the improvement of the silver coin. I have already observed that gold and silver, in reference to each other, are estimated at your Majesty's mint at a different value or price than these metals are generally sold for at the market. As long as this difference subsists both these metals will not be brought in a sufficient quantity to the mint to be coined; that metal only will be brought which is estimated at the lowest value with reference to the other; and coins of both metals can not be sent into circulation at the same time without exposing the public to a traffic of one sort of coin against the other, by which the traders in money would make a considerable profit, to the great detriment of your Majesty's subjects.

And this mischievous practice, and the frauds committed in carrying it on, are the more to be apprehended in this country, where the mint is free—that is, where every one has a right to bring gold and silver to the mint to be converted into coin, not at the charge of the person who so brings it, but of the public—for since the 18th Charles II, chapter 3, the charge of coining gold and silver has been borne by the public, and, contrary to the practice of most other countries, no seigniorage has been taken. To prevent this evil it is necessary to determine whether there must not be a standard or superior coin, made of one metal only; and whether the coins made of other metals must not be made and take their value with reference to this standard coin, and become subservient to it—and, in such case, of what metal this standard coin, to which the preëminence and preference are to be given, should be made.

[Extract from Mr. Jefferson's notes on the establishment of a money unit, and of a coinage for the United States.]

* * * * * * *

Page 441:

The proportion between the values of gold and silver is a mercantile problem altogether. It would be inaccurate to fix it by the popular exchanges of a half Joe for \$8, a Louis for 4 French crowns, or 5 Louis for \$23. The first of these would be to adopt the Spanish proportion between gold and silver; the second the French, the third a mere popular barter, wherein convenience is consulted more than accuracy. The legal proportion in Spain is 16 for 1, in England 15½ for 1, in France (uncertain in the United States in the printed copy) 15 for 1. The Spaniards and English are found in experience to retain an overproportion of gold coins and to lose their silver. The French have a greater proportion of silver. The difference at market has been on the decrease. The financier states it at present at 14½ for 1.

Just principles will lead us to disregard legal proportions altogether: to inquire into the market price of gold in the several countries with which we shall principally be connected in commerce, and to take an average from them. Perhaps we might with safety lean to a proportion somewhat above par for gold, considering our neighborhood and commerce with the sources of the coins and the tendency which the high price of gold in Spain has to draw thither all that of their mines, leaving silver principally for our and other markets. It is not impossible that 15 for 1 may be found an eligible proportion. I state it, however, as conjectural only.

[Extract from report of Alexander Hamilton on the establishment of a mint.]

Pages 458, 463, 464, 465:

* * * * * * *

The difference established by custom in the United States between coined gold and coined silver has been stated upon another occasion to be nearly as 1 to 15.6. This, if truly the case, would imply that gold was extremely overvalued in the United States; for the highest actual proportion in any part of Europe very little, if at all, exceeds 1 to 15, and the average proportion throughout Europe is probably not more than about 1 to 14.8; but that statement has proceeded upon the idea of the ancient dollar.

One pennyweight of gold of 22 carats fine, at 6*s.* 8*d.*, and the old Seville piece of 386 grains and 15 mites of pure silver, at 7*s.* 6*d.*, furnish the exact ratio of 1 to 15.6262. But this does not coincide with the real difference between the metals in our market, or, which is with us the same thing, in our currency. To determine this, the quantity of fine silver in the general mass of the dollars now in circulation must afford the rule. Taking the rate of the late dollar of 374 grains, the proportion would be as 1 to 15.11. Taking the rate of the newest dollar, the proportion would then be as 1 to 14.87. The mean of the two would give the proportion of 1 to 15, very nearly—less than the legal proportion in the coins of Great Britain, which is as 1 to 15.2, but somewhat more than the actual or market proportion, which is not quite 1 to 15.

* * * * * * *

One consequence of overvaluing either metal, in respect to the other, is the banishment of that which is undervalued. If two countries are supposed, in one of which the proportion of gold to silver is as 1 to 16, in the other as 1 to 15, gold being worth more, silver less, in one than in the other, it is manifest that, in their reciprocal payments, each will select that species which it values least to pay to the other where it is valued most. Besides this, the dealers in money will, from the same cause, often find a profitable traffic in an exchange of the metals between the two countries. And hence it would come to pass, if other things were equal, that the greatest part of the gold would be collected in one and the greatest part of silver in the other.

The course of trade might in some degree counteract the tendency of the difference in the legal proportions by the market value; but this is so far and so often influenced by the legal rates that it does not prevent their producing the effect which is inferred. Facts, too, verify the inference. In Spain and England, where gold is rated higher than in other parts of Europe, there is a scarity of silver, while it is found to abound in France and Holland, where it is rated higher in proportion to gold than in the neighboring nations. And it is continually flowing from Europe to China and the East Indies, owing to the comparative cheapness of it in the former and dearness of it in the latter.

* * * * * * *

But it is to be suspected that there is another consequence more serious than the one which has been mentioned. This is the diminution of the total quantity of specie which a country would naturally possess.

It is evident that as often as a country which overrates either of the metals receives a payment in that metal it gets a less actual quantity than it ought to do or than it would do if the rate were a just one.

* * * * * * *

In establishing a proportion between the metals there seems to be an option of one of two things—

To approach, as nearly as it can be ascertained, the mean or average proportion in what may be called the commercial world; or

To retain that which now exists in the United States.

As far as these happen to coincide they will render the course to be pursued more plain and more certain.

To ascertain the first, with precision, would require better materials than are possessed, or than could be obtained, without an inconvenient delay.

Sir Isaac Newton, in a representation to the treasury of Great Britain, in the year 1717, after stating the particular proportions in the different countries of Europe, concludes thus: "By the course of trade and exchange between nation and nation, in all Europe, fine gold is to fine silver as $14\frac{4}{5}$, or 15 to 1."

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

There can hardly be a better rule in any country for the legal than the market proportion, if this can be supposed to have been produced by the free and steady course of commercial principles. The presumption in such a case is that each metal finds its true level, according to its intrinsic utility in the general system of money operations.

[Extract from report on Currency, made to the House of Representatives of the United States, February 24, 1820, by William H. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury.]

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

Pages 518, 519:

In an inquiry into the state of the currency, the consideration of the coinage is necessarily involved. The principles upon which the coinage of the United States has been established are substantially correct. The standard fineness of the gold coinage corresponds with the coinage of England and Portugal. The standard of the silver coinage differs but little from that of Spain. The American dollar is intrinsically worth about 1 per cent less than the Spanish milled dollar. This difference, if the Spanish dollar had not been made a legal tender, might have secured to the nation a more permanent use of its silver coinage. American dollars would not be exported as long as Spanish dollars could be obtained for that purpose at a reasonable premium. If this latter coin was not a legal tender, the banks might afford to import it, and might sell, at a fair premium, the amount which might be required of them for the China and East India trade.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

It is believed that gold, when compared with silver, has been for many years appreciating in value, and now everywhere commands in the money markets a higher value than that which has been assigned to it in States where its relative value is greatest. If this be correct, no injustice will result from a change in the relative legal value of gold and silver, so as to make it correspond with their relative marketable value. If gold, in relation to silver, should be raised 5 per cent, 1 ounce of it would be equal to 15.75 or $15\frac{3}{4}$ ounces of pure silver. This augmentation in its value would cause it to be imported in quantities sufficient to perform all the functions of currency.

[Extract from report of the Committee on the Currency on the expediency of increasing the relative value of the gold hereafter to be coined at the mint of the United States.]

FEBRUARY 2, 1821.—Read, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

Page 556:

In the United States, before the establishment of the present Government, it has heretofore been ascertained by a committee of Congress that, by custom, the value of gold has been considered as equivalent to about fifteen and six-tenths of its weight in silver. (See page 441.) This, without doubt, arose from finding this to be the average of the different values affixed to the gold in different foreign countries.

Why it was thought proper, on establishing the mint of the United States, to reduce this value to 15 for 1 is not now material to inquire. It is sufficient to know from unhappy experience that its tendency is to rid us of a gold currency and leave us nothing but silver.

The merchants, if they have occasion to import specie and can not obtain silver, are compelled to import gold at a loss of from 2 to 10 per cent. If they have a remittance to make they will, if possible, exchange silver for gold, as thereby they will gain from 2 to 10 per cent, according to the value of gold in the country to which the remittance is to be made.

[Twenty-first Congress, first session, 135.]

[Extract from report from the Secretary of the Treasury (in compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 20th December, 1828) respecting the relative values of gold and silver, etc.]

MAY 4, 1830.—Read and ordered to be printed, and that 1,000 additional copies be sent to the Senate.

* * * * * * *

Pages 569, 570, 571, 575, 578, 580, 591:

The history of coinage proves that little reliance can be placed on artificial regulations of relative values of the standard measure of property as a means of maintaining a regular currency of uniform value. Some remarkable instances, as noticed by Lord Liverpool, occurred in England in the reign of James I, and subsequently.

Gold being estimated too low at the mint, compared with silver, was freely exported, which caused incessant complaints. To remedy this evil King James raised the value of gold in his coins by successive proclamations; but he at last raised it too high; and during the remainder of his reign, and that of Charles I, the silver coins were exported until the complaints were as great for want of silver as they had been before for want of gold. About the middle of the seventeenth century, during a short period, according to the same author, the relative values at which the precious metals were estimated in the coins appear to have been in equilibrium with the market prices.

* * * * * * *

It seems very clear from these facts, to which many others of later date might be added, that, however exactly the proper equilibrium of values of gold and silver may be adjusted at the mint, the balance is liable to be disturbed by causes which can neither be anticipated nor controlled by political power. If the regulation be founded on the most exact calculation of relative values for the time being, the vibrations of the values of gold and silver must alternately cause the expulsion of each; and where one metal is more essential to public convenience than the other, the adjustment which exposes that under any circumstances to general exportation or melting may become a greater evil than a regulation which constantly excludes from circulation the less desirable coin. These difficulties had long been a matter of great concern in England, although it was not well settled in public opinion which metal was the best suited for the currency of that country.

* * * * * * *

It remains to be considered whether gold or silver is the most convenient currency for the United States. It has already been observed that prior to the year 1821 gold and silver generally bore the same relation in the market of the United States which they did in the Mint regulation. Silver sometimes commanded a premium for the India trade. But, at no time since the general introduction of bank paper, has gold been found in general circulation. It may not be necessary here to inquire minutely into the causes which prevented the ratio of gold and silver in Europe from affecting the price of gold in the United States prior to 1820. The fact that gold did not circulate in the United States at a time when it commanded no premium, is sufficient to prove that other causes than an erroneous mint regulation have excluded, and may still continue to exclude it from circulation. These are to be found partly in the operations of our banks.

* * * * * * *

The proposition that there can be but one standard in fact is self-evident. The option of governments charged with this duty is therefore between having property measured sometimes by gold and sometimes by silver, and selecting that metal which is best adapted to the purpose for the only standard. Why the latter course has not been universally adopted it is not easy to explain, unless it may be attributed to that prevalent delusion which seeks to secure the possession of gold and silver by restraining their exportation, and avoiding the payment of debts rather than improving the public economy by giving every facility to it. It would seem strange, however, that while every individual who had a deposit of money in bank, or in his chest (unless he is sufficiently deranged to think of hoarding it), would be wholly indifferent whether it were gold or silver. Governments should persevere in maintaining a different theory.

But such has been the fact. The history of coinage abounds with mint regulations to keep gold and silver together, and statutes prohibiting, under severe penalties, the exportation of either; all of which have disappointed every expectation of their projectors. The adoption of one metal as a standard measure of property is recommended by its simplicity. No change in the mint regulations can ever be required, and it removes every pretext for dishonest or unwise governments to debase their coins. All other metals may be imported as freely as before, and, like other articles of merchandise, applied to the payment of debts.

* * * * * * *

In conclusion, should it be determined to maintain both gold and silver as standard measures of property, without changing the ratio, it will be advisable to discontinue the gold coinage whenever the premium for gold shall exceed 2 per cent. The mint may be employed in coining silver; and an assay of gold bullion will, at a small expense, answer every purpose now derived from coining it. But if it be deemed expedient to change the ratio, the extent of the alteration is a matter of considerable importance.

* * * * * * *

Although it can not be expected that an alteration in the erroneous relative legal value of the gold and silver coins of the United States will, whilst paper chiefly of a local circulation continues to be their general currency, be productive of any great advantage, still the change will do some good, and can be attended with no injury. The present rate was the result of information, clearly incorrect, respecting the then relative value of gold and silver in Europe, which was represented as being at the rate of less than 15 to 1, when it was in fact from 15.5 to 15.6 to 1. It would be better, at all events, to discontinue altogether the coinage of gold than to continue the present system.

[Extracts from the reports of Mr. C. P. White, from the Select Committee of the House on Coins, etc.]

[Extract from the report of June 30, 1832, page 7.]

* * * * * * *

Page 674:

The committee think that the desideratum in the monetary system is the standard of uniform value; they can not ascertain that both metals have ever circulated simultaneously, concurrently, and indiscriminately, in any country where there are banks or money dealers; and they entertain the conviction that the nearest approach to an invariable standard is its establishment in one metal, which metal shall compose exclusively the currency for large payments.

IS BIMETALLISM POSSIBLE?

With such authorities before us it would seem to be idle to talk about ratios in the present unsettled condition of the silver bullion market. In 1834, when the ratio was fixed at 16 to 1, silver was overvalued about 3 cents on the dollar, and the result was that silver disappeared from circulation, and from that date until 1878 the coinage of the United States was almost exclusively gold, excepting the fractional silver.

At the ratio of 16 to 1 a silver dollar is worth at this time about 55 cents, and at the ratio of 20 to 1, which is the highest ratio suggested under the pending resolution, a silver dollar at the present market price of bullion would be worth about 81 cents. Free coinage of silver, therefore, means silver monometallism. The advocates of the free coinage of silver may claim to be bimetallists; but they know, and everybody else knows, that bimetallism is absolutely impossible under any ratio at the present time. The $500,000,000 of gold now circulating in the country would disappear as in a night, with no hope of return, so long as such silver policy continued.

Congress has already gone too far in the attempt to force a cheap silver dollar into circulation.

It is the bullion in the coin which gives it value, not the mint stamp. The United States recognizes this fact in respect of our gold coin; why should we not in respect of our silver coin also? It is provided by the United States Revised Statutes, edition of 1878, section 3505, that—

Any gold coins of the United States, if reduced in weight by natural abrasion not more than one-half of 1 per cent below the standard weight prescribed by law, after a circulation of twenty years, as shown by the date of coinage, and at a ratable proportion for any period less than twenty years, shall be received at their nominal value by the United States Treasury and its offices, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe for the protection of the Government against fraudulent abrasion or other practices.

That is to say, gold coin becomes demonetized, ceases to be legal tender, and passes at bullion value only if it shall become light weight to the extent of one-half of 1 per cent in twenty years' wear; and yet it is seriously contended here that we ought to pass a free-coinage silver statute under which every silver dollar would be 45 per cent light weight the moment it left the mint.

The fact is, we can have but one standard. A double standard is impossible. International bimetallism is an international impossibility. Bimetallism with free coinage and unlimited tender never yet existed for any considerable length of time in any country. From 1792 to 1834 our metal currency was exclusively silver. From 1834 to 1878 our metal currency was almost exclusively gold, and our experience is the experience of all other nations who have tried bimetallism with free coinage.

It has been several times claimed on the floor of this House that France had succeeded from 1803 to 1873 in maintaining bimetallism, meaning by that the free and unlimited coinage of both metals with unlimited tender and the concurrent circulation of both metals among the people. Such assertions are easily made, but they have no foundation to rest upon.

In referring to that statement so frequently repeated on the floor of the House, the New York Evening Post, under date of August 12, 1893, said:

We find it necessary, therefore, to reprint what Chevalier, the French economist, says on this point in his celebrated treatise on money. Chevalier, it should be added, was the great champion of silver in his day. He says:

"In the year XI (1803), when the law of seventh Germinal was enacted, which established for a temporary standard the ratio of 1 to 15½ between the two metals, this ratio actually existed in the commercial world; but little by little it changed, and soon gold came to be worth ordinarily a little more than 15½ times as much as silver—it has sometimes been worth a little above 16 times as much. This discrepancy, which has usually been about 1½ per cent (that is, one-half of that which manifested itself from 1726 to 1785), would have had no effect if the provision of Gaudin had been correct. On the contrary, it had a very considerable effect; it sufficed to retire gold from circulation.

"A few years after the passage of the law of the year XI gold became so scarce that people had to buy it of the money-changers when they wanted to carry that kind of cash on their journeys. In fact, the circulation of the two metals side by side, which Gaudin flattered himself that he should establish by means of the coinage of pieces denominated 20 francs and 40 francs, had ceased to exist shortly after the year XI, and twenty-five years after that date the circulation consisted of silver only." (La Monnaie, page 216.)

Oceans of testimony in support of the foregoing statement of Chevalier can be obtained.

Afterwards, on August 14, 1893, the same paper, referring to the same subject, published the following editorial:

THE EXPERIENCE OF FRANCE.

In his speech in the House on Friday Mr. BLAND quoted the British gold and silver commission of 1888 to prove that the bimetallic law of France at the ratio of 15½ to 1 kept the market ratio steady at that ratio for the period of seventy years, from 1803 to 1873. This is one of the fictions of the silverites from which no amount of refutation will suffice to loosen them. But we will try to shake them once more. We might ask, as a preliminary question, why the spell was broken in 1873. The argument, based upon the supposed fact that silver and gold ratio was steady for the seventy years in question, is that there was a peculiar force in the French law causing that steadiness. Why did this magic cease to work in 1873? France did not close her mint to silver until after the market ratio had changed. It was nothing but the change of market ratio, which had begun to drain her of gold, that drove France to stop the coinage of silver. The bimetallists themselves admit this when they throw upon Germany the blame of forcing the hand of France by selling silver in 1873 and later.

So it appears, even according to their own showing, that the French bimetallic law of 1873 was good only for fair weather. When a strain came, like the selling of silver by a neighboring country, the bimetallic law gave way. So the real question at issue is, how much strain such a law could possibly endure. If we admit all that they claim for the experience of France, the sum total of their gain is that a bimetallic law has a tendency to hold the market ratio at a particular level, but that this tendency may be overcome by the conditions of supply and demand.

Even this is more than we can concede. And first let us glance at the report of the British commission of 1888. This commission consisted of men of a high order of intelligence, but, as it happened, it did not embrace a single person who could be called an expert. Not one of the members had any special familiarity with the subject in hand, while all of them had general familiarity with it. Accordingly they were in the mood to accept as true any scrap of misinformation that had passed for a long time unchallenged. Such a scrap of error was the statement that France had had the two metals in concurrent circulation for seventy years, from 1803 to 1873, at the ratio of 15½ to 1. They took this for granted and proceeded to advance certain *a priori* arguments to account for the remarkable steadiness of the market ratio. Among other things they said:

"The fact that the owner of the silver could in the last resort take it to those mints and have it converted into coin which would purchase commodities at the ratio of 15½ of silver to 1 of gold would, in our opinion, be likely to affect the price of silver in the market generally, whoever the purchaser and for whatever the country it was destined. It would enable the seller to stand out for a price approximating to the legal ratio and would tend to keep the market steady at about that point."

When their final report was published Mr. Robert Giffen, the statistician of the British Board of Trade, who is a real expert in monetary science, took up this paragraph, so fraught with mischief, and showed that it was founded upon an entire misapprehension, for the reason that France did not have the two metals in concurrent circulation during the period under consideration, but had had them alternately, first one and then the other. He produced and published the market reports of Paris for each month from 1820 to 1847, during all of which time there had been a premium on gold ranging from ½ per cent to 2 per cent. Nobody would pay a debt in gold when ½ per cent could be saved by paying it in silver. On every debt of 1,000 francs from 5 to 20 francs could be saved, according to the premium of the day, by paying in silver. The literature of the period is fuln proofs that gold was not in circulation at this time, although it was coined more or less at the French mint for money-changers and hoarders.

After 1847 a change took place, due to the gold discoveries in California and Australia. Silver went to a premium in France, and was exported and melted to such an extent that the country was left with an insufficient supply of small change, and was obliged to adopt a token coinage by debasing the fineness of all coins smaller than 5 francs to .835 instead of .900. After 1867 there was another change. Gold went to a small but increasing premium, which became so excessive in 1873 that the coinage of franc pieces was limited by law, and stopped altogether in 1876, in order to prevent the exportation of gold. In short, the facts show that France did not have the double standard in practice during the period in question any more than we in America had it. Mr. Giffen showed conclusively, too, that the French law of 1803 had no tendency to hold the two metals together. It should be remarked that as no reason has been assigned by the bimetallists for the spell coming to an end in 1873, there is as little reason for putting its beginning in 1803. The ratio of 15½ to 1 was adopted by France in 1785, and was continuous from that time, and was merely reënacted in 1803.

The work referred to in the above article is The Case Against Bimetallism, by Robert Giffen, 1892. In an appendix to that work the author gives a table showing the premium on gold in Paris each month from September, 1820, to December, 1847, and the premium varied regularly, up or down, nearly every month.

I add one other authority:

It comes out very clearly that one feature of the French system has been that, since 1803, France has sometimes had a currency approaching to monometalism, if not actually monometallic; and it has happened that whenever the compensatory action of the law of the fixed ratio has been called into play, its result was to confine the currency almost entirely to that metal which was the cheapest for the time being. Thus, from 1816 to 1820 gold was practically the standard, and from 1821 to 1850, silver, and from 1829 to 1847 there ruled a premium on gold varying from a little below 1 to 2 per cent.—*The Industrial Competition of Asia*, by Clarmont J. Daniel, F. S. S., late of Her Majesty's Indian civil service, page 135.

By reference to the table of commercial ratios given in the appendix it will be seen that during the seventy years when it is claimed that France maintained bimetallism the commercial ratio varied but a trifle over a unit from maximum to minimum. The ratio was 15.41 in 1803 and 15.57 in 1870, and during that time the lowest was 15.04 in 1814 and the highest was 16.25 in 1813. The ratio has risen from 15.57 in 1870 to 23.72 in 1892, and to 28.52 for the first seven months in 1893.

It is quite a different matter, therefore, to undertake to maintain bimetallism for seventy years with a commercial ratio which does not vary a unit and a half in the extreme during all that time, and attempting bimetallism now when the commercial ratio varies more than two units a year.

Even if the increased production is kept in view, it is not easy to understand why, with the increased purchasing by the United States to the amount of six millions sterling per annum, and the simultaneous large increase of the Indian imports of silver, which averaged from August, 1890, when the Sherman act came into force, to March, 1893, upwards of 46,500,000 ounces, the price should be 6*d.* per ounce lower than it was in the beginning of 1890. It has, indeed, been argued that the recent fall in the price of silver was due to the blow which the passing of that act gave to the hopes of those who desired the free coinage of silver. But against this it is to be observed that the price of silver in London rose during the time that the Sherman act was passing through Congress, and continued to rise for some weeks after it became law.

Whatever be the cause, the fact that, although the United States Government has under that act made purchases varying from 34 to 42 per cent of the estimated production of the world, and India has increased and not diminished her imports of the metal, the price of silver has fallen to its present low level, is beyond question and of grave moment.

Supposing even that no change were made in the currency arrangements of the United States, the experience of the past would forbid the conclusion that the price of silver would be stationary at its present level. It would be imprudent to act on the assumption that no further fall is possible or even probable.—*Report of the committee appointed to inquire into the Indian currency*, Herschell Report, London, 1893, page 9.

In 1827, when the new rupee was introduced into Bombay, Mr. Bruce, of the civil service, and a member of the mint committee, thus wrote to that body:

"I take the liberty of drawing your attention to the inconvenience which the public have for some years experienced from the disappearance of all gold from the circulation, and of submitting to your consideration the expediency of revising the principles by which the coinage of that metal is at present regulated; that is to say, of raising the existing mint proportion between its value and that of the silver coin, without which, as it appears to me, gold can never again be expected to form any part of the currency of this presidency. The present mint regulations must of necessity be tantamount to a perpetual banishment of gold from the currency.

"Mr. Bruce then goes on to argue that the exchange rate for the gold and silver money of the East India Company's currency should be assimilated to the commercial rate, but he stops short of saying how this should be done."—*The Industrial Competition of Asia*, by Clarmont J. Daniell, pages 273, 274.

Between 1769 and 1833 the currency of gold mohurs and rupees was remodeled four times. Almost as soon a legal rate was settled it was upset by the evolution of a different commercial rate. From 1793 to 1833 the gold coin of India was undervalued in the silver coin, if judged by the contemporary European price of one metal in the other, which perhaps accounts for the almost complete disappearance of gold money from circulation.

"At the beginning of this century, and previously, the East India Company used to export gold to England, while the undervaluation at the mint prevented the gold coinage from being replenished; at the same time the importations of silver went on increasing, and in 1835 the company, giving up the attempt to keep two kinds of full-value coin in circulation together at a fixed rate of exchange, abandoned gold and made silver, which had become the predominant currency, the standard of value and money of account for India."

Note on page 302.—"Remarks on a Gold Currency for India," by Col. Ballard, R. E., mint master, Bombay, 1868.—*The Industrial Competition of Asia*, by Clarmont J. Daniell, page 302.

"At the time when gold and silver money were both in use in the East India Company's territories, attempts were made from time to time, by recoining the gold and silver coins in conformity with what appeared to be their market value in one another, to make them exchange at a fixed rate, but it was never successful for a long time together."—*Ibid.*, page 299.

Not only is bimetallism impossible, but experiments in bimetallism are expensive. An estimate by the Director of the Mint shows that the United States have lost in depreciation of silver bullion nearly $8,000,000 a year since they inaugurated the bimetal policy in 1878; and the Secretary of the Treasury shows in a recent letter that it would cost $112,866,321 to recoin our outstanding silver and bring it up to an approximate parity with gold.

All highly civilized countries have abandoned the attempt to maintain a double standard. Not only is bimetallism a thing of the past, but the preference is universally for the gold standard, and this has been especially noticeable in the past twenty years. The coinage of full legal-tender silver was suspended in England in 1816*; in Portugal in 1854; in Germany in 1871 (proclaimed in 1873); in Belgium in 1873; in the Scandinavian Union—Norway, Sweden, and Denmark—in 1873; in the Netherlands in 1877; in Finland in 1877; in the states composing the Latin Union—France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and Greece—in 1878; in Austria-Hungary in 1892; and on private account in India in June, 1893.

Not that the use of silver has ceased in these countries, nor is

---

*The date usually given for the adoption of the gold standard by England is 1816. Dr. Soetbeer, however, in Geld und Münzwesen, as tending to show an earlier date, quotes the Stat. 14, George III, c. 42 (1774), which provided: "That no legal tender in payment of money made in the silver coin of this realm, of any sum exceeding the sum of £25, at any time, shall be reputed in law or allowed to be legal tender, within Great Britain and Ireland, for more than according to its value by weight, after the rate of 5*s.* 2*d.* for each ounce of silver."

This act was reënacted by act 38, George III, c. 59 (1798). By act 56, George III, c. 68 (1816), legal tender in silver coin was limited to two pounds sterling, and the shilling was debased from 60 to 66 shillings to the pound troy.

it desirable that it should, but bimetallism has ceased. In closing these remarks under this heading I can not do better than borrow the language of a distinguished writer on finance, whose name is familiar to everyone conversant with the subject.

Mr. Horace White, in an address on "The Gold Standard," before the Congress of Bankers and Financiers, at Chicago, June 20, 1893, sums up the whole bimetallic situation in his opening paragraph, as follows:

The most impressive fact in the world of finance is the dominance of the gold standard. A year or two ago Roumania passed under its sway, to-day it is Austria, next year or soon it will be Russia, by and by it will be India, and meanwhile it has lost no ground that it has ever held. Three international conferences have been assembled to stay this conquering march, while none has been called to promote or assist it. Yet the movement has been as little impeded as that of an ocean steamer would be by the action of a debating society in its own cabin. Is all this due to human perversity, or has it a rational cause founded in the needs of mankind?

AS TO THE FALL OF PRICES AND RISE OF GOLD.

Another claim that prices for commodities have declined, and that therefore gold has appreciated in recent years, and that the adoption of the gold standard would still further depress prices and still further appreciate gold and work to the detriment of debtors and the laboring classes and in favor of the rich is utterly unfounded in fact. To say that prices of certain commodities have declined in terms of gold does not prove by any manner of means that such decline is due to an appreciation in the value of gold, or that gold has, in fact, appreciated.

There are a great many considerations to be taken into the question of declining prices. Prices of commodities, agricultural products and manufactures alike, have declined in recent years, but they have declined in gold-using countries and in silver-using countries alike, and gold itself, measured in terms of its own interest or earning capacity, has suffered as heavy a decline as the average decline in other commodities.

Prof. Marshall repeats in various forms his argument (Qustions 9755, 9759, 9775) that the relative values of gold and silver do not lower the value of wheat relatively to other commodities. He contends that the importation of Indian wheat into England is due exclusively to the development of the railway system and the lowering of freights and to a series of very favorable harvests; that if the cause of this exportation had been the rate of exchange we should have found Indian wheat coming a long time ago. In 1876 the price of silver was low, but India exported then only one million sterling in value of wheat as against eight millions now. "The difficulty," to use Prof. Marshall's words, *i. e.*, the competition of Indian with English wheat, "exists without any reference to silver, and would be the same if India had a gold currency."

This way of putting the case of course neglects for the moment any consideration of the tendency which a gold currency if used in India might have, for more reasons than one, to raise the price of Indian productions. Using the argument merely to prove that it is not the metal out of which the coin of India is fabricated which bonuses her exports, it is unanswerable.

Mr. W. Fowler, expresses a similar opinion (Questions 8388, 9077), that "price depends much more upon the supply and demand of the article than upon any condition of money," and that "prices, which are the governing factor in exports and imports, have much less to do with the question of the money than we suppose in our ordinary ideas about these things."—*The Industrial Competition of Asia*, by Clarmont J. Daniell, F. S. S., late of Her Majesty's Indian civil service, page 340.

The question which next naturally suggests itself is, What have been the price movements of such commodities as have not in recent years experienced in any marked degree a change in their conditions of supply and demand? Do they exhibit any evidence of having been subjected to any influence attributable to the scarcity of gold?

The answer is that not only can no results capable of any such generalization be affirmed, but no one commodity can even be named in respect to which there is conclusive evidence that its price has been affected in recent years by influences directly or mainly attributable to any scarcity of gold for the purpose of effecting exchanges.

In the first place all that large class of products or services which are exclusively or largely the result of handicrafts; which are not capable of rapid multiplication, or of increased economy in production, and which can not be made the subject of international competition—have exhibited no tendency to decline in price, but rather the reverse. A given amount of gold does not now buy more, but less, of domestic service and of manual and professional labor generally than formerly.—*Recent Economic Changes*, David A. Wells, pages 191, 192.

Note to the above: "There is no feature in the situation which the commissioners have been called to examine, so satisfactory as the immense improvement which has taken place in the condition of the working classes during the last twenty years."—*Report of the Royal (British) Commission on the Depression of Trade*, 1888.

Instead of an alleged lowering of the price of labor, we have to report, taking a wide extent, rather a rise in wages.—*Report of Factory Inspectors*, Germany, 1886.

Now, while such results [fall in prices] are not in accordance with what might have been anticipated from and can not be satisfactorily explained by any theory of the predominating and depressing influence of a scarcity of gold on prices, they are exactly the results which might have been expected from and can be satisfactorily explained by the conditions of supply and demand—conditions so varying with time, place, and circumstance as to require in the case of every commodity a special examination to determine its price experience, and which experience, once recognized, will rarely or never be found to exactly correspond with the experience of any other commodity; the leading factor occasioning the recent decline in the prices of sugars having been an extraordinary artificial stimulus; in quinine the changes in the sources of supply from natural to artificially cultivated trees; in wheat, the accessibility of new and fertile territory, and a reduction of freights; in freights, on land, the reduction in the cost of iron and steel, and on the ocean new methods of propulsion, economy in fuel and undue multiplication of vessels; in iron and steel, new processes and new furnaces, affording a larger and better product with less labor in a given time; in certain varieties of wool, changes in fashion, and in others an increase of production in a greater ratio than population and their consuming capacity; in ores and coal, the introduction of the steam drill and more powerful explosive agents; in cheese, a disproportionate market price for butter; in cotton cloth, because the spindles which revolved 4,000 times in a minute in 1874 made 10,000 revolutions in the same time in 1885; in "gum arabic" and "senna," a war in the Soudan; in wines, a destruction of the vines by disease; in American hog products, a plentiful supply of hogs, consequent upon an abundant corn (maize) crop, etc.

And yet all these so diverse factors of influence evolve and harmonize under, and at the same time demonstrate, the existence of a law more immutable than any other in economic science, namely, that when production increases in excess of current market demand, even to the extent of an inconsiderable fraction, or is cheapened through any agency, prices will decline; and that when, on the other hand, production is checked or arrested by natural events—storms, pestilence, extremes of temperature; or by artificial interference, as war, excessive taxation, or political misrule or disturbances—prices will advance; and between these extremes of influence prices will fluctuate in accordance with the progressive changes in circumstances and the hopes and fears of producers, exchangers, and consumers.—*Recent Economic Changes*, David A. Wells, pages 202, 203.

The monetary experience of the United States since 1879 has been so especially remarkable, and has such bearing on the economic problem of the relation of money supply to prices, as to entitle it to extended notice. The following table shows the changes in the circulating media of the United States—bullion, coin, and paper—since January 1, 1879 (when the country resumed specie payments), and January 1, 1889— a period of ten years:

Circulation.	Jan. 1, 1879.	Jan. 1, 1889.	Total.
Gold coin and bullion	$278,310,126	$704,608,169	*$426,298,043
Silver dollars	22,495,550	315,186,190	*292,690,640
Silver bullion	9,121,417	10,865,237	*1,743,820
Fractional silver	71,021,162	76,889,983	*5,863,821
National-bank notes	323,791,674	233,660,027	†90,131,647
Legal-tender notes	346,681,016	346,681,016	
Total currency issues	1,051,420,945	1,687,890,622	*636,469,677

*Increase. †Decrease.

Of this large increase of $636,469,677, $578,637,368, in coin and paper, were in the hands of the people; and $57,832,309, in bullion, coin, and paper, in the National Treasury.

It thus appears that, while there has been an increase in the population of the United States during the period of ten years under consideration of about 30 per cent, the increase in the precious metals and paper available for circulation during the same time was 60.05 per cent; while of coin and paper in active use among the people and banks the increase was 69.9 per cent, or much more than double the rate of increase in population. Now, as during this same period there was a great and universal decline in the prices of commodities in the United States (as elsewhere), the interesting question arises, How do these experiences harmonize with the theory that the volume of circulating medium controls prices, and that the movement of the precious metals puts down prices in the event of a reduction of the supply and puts them up in the event of an increase of supply?

Note, further, that the increase of gold and silver coin and bullion in the United States during the ten years from 1879 to 1889 was $720,500,000, while the paper circulation diminished. Nor can it be maintained that the fall in the value of silver bullion has affected this circulation, since, for all purposes of internal circulation, silver and its paper representatives have had the same efficiency and exchangeable value as existed before the depreciation of silver bullion. The availability of silver coin for the settlement on the part of the United States of international balances has been alone affected; and this, so long as there has been an adequate supply of gold, is an immaterial factor. It would, therefore, seem that the above exhibit furnishes the most complete refutation of the theory that changes in the supplies of the precious metals account for the fall in the prices of commodities.—*Recent Economic Changes*, David A. Wells, pages 221, 222, 223.

THE GOLD SUPPLY.

Another claim often made in debate upon this floor in the past week is that there is not sufficient gold in the world to supply the money needed to effect the exchanges if all nations should adopt the gold standard. The first weakness of that argument is, so far as the United States is concerned, that whatever supplies of gold other nations have, we are certainly in condition to supply ourselves with all that we need. First, our immense and varied natural resources; the great variety and extent of our home manufactures; our cotton and food supplies, so much needed abroad, put us in position to demand from other nations in trade balances whatever gold we may need in the future.

And another point not to be lost sight of, and perhaps the strongest in our favor, is that of the one hundred and thirty millions of gold output annually in the world the United States produces upwards of one-quarter, and has produced it in those proportions for many years past. All we need is such laws as will permit gold to circulate among us. The laws of trade will then supply us. If anyone has any fear that the adoption of a gold standard by this country, and the few remaining countries which have not as yet adopted it, would result in a contraction of currency because of a scarcity of gold, an examination of the authorities, historical and statistical, can not but convince any investigator that such a fear is unwarranted.

The recent closing of the Indian mint to the further coinage of silver seems to have emphasized this fear among those who look upon India as a great silver-using country, embracing 255,-000,000 of people, and the idea of their being supplied with a gold currency in the present "scramble for gold" among European nations seems to be one which is peculiarly exciting to the free-silver advocate. But there is authority for saying that India has already sufficient gold for her own monetary purposes if the gold standard should be finally adopted, as it undoubtedly will be. India was on a gold basis up to 1835, when gold was demonetized in British India by the East India Company (by act of Parliament, September 6, 1873), but from that time forward India has lost none of her gold. It is still in existence as bullion or ornament or plate, not to mention a very considerable amount of gold coin still passing current in different provinces. Upon that point I quote from the following authorities:

Net imports of gold and silver into India from 1859 to 1893, as furnished by the Director of the Mint.

	Pounds sterling.	Dollars.
Gold	125,906,000	612,721,549
Silver	230,418,000	1,121,329,197
Total, thirty-three years	356,324,000	1,734,050,746

It has been objected that the natives of India are accustomed to silver; that the transactions are small in amount, so that silver is better suited to their use than gold, and that they will not willingly give up the rupee. The answer to this is, that it is not proposed to substitute the gold sovereign for the rupee as currency in ordinary use, and that the case would in this respect resemble that of many of the countries above referred to, where the standard is gold, but the ordinary currency is silver or paper.

Moreover, gold has never been entirely out of use in India. It is true that in India silver has for the last thirty or forty years been more exclusively used than in many of the countries referred to. But, though gold coins have not been in use as legal tender, and no fixed ratio has been established between gold and silver coins, there is no part of India in which gold coins are not well known and procurable, and recognized as a form of money, the value of the chief gold coins being regularly entered in the "Prices current." Until 1835 or thereabouts gold coins constituted a recognized part of the Indian currency, and they were received by the government in payment of its demands till December, 1852; and as late as 1854-'55 gold coin to the value of £412,000, was sent by the government from India to London. The value of the gold imported into India in the eight years from 1862-'63 to 1869-'70, was no less than £50,000,000.

Sir Charles Trevelyan, writing in 1864 in support of a proposal to make sovereigns legal tender in India, referred to the large importation of gold since 1860 as indicating "the determination of the people to have gold," and added that it "shows that the Government would be cordially seconded by them in any attempt to introduce a gold currency on a sound footing." The Secretary of State, Sir Charles Wood, when replying in the same year, wrote:

"It is obvious, from the information collected by Sir Charles Trevelyan, that there is a very general desire for the introduction of gold coins in

India," and "that the people, even in the upper and remote parts of India, are well acquainted with the sovereign."

There is little question but that these observations are as applicable at the present time as when originally made.

It may be added that the value of the net imports of gold into India since 1880 has amounted to more than Rx. 41,000,000 ($208,428,000 coinage value), and it might be expected that much of the uncoined gold now in India, which must be very considerable, would be brought to the mints if a gold coinage were introduced on a proper basis.—*Report of the committee appointed to inquire into the Indian currency.* The Herschel Report, London, 1893, page 28.

Dual currencies of gold and silver, exchanging with one another at their market valuation, have been commonly in use in India for many centuries, and are so to this day. It is only in British territory, and since the year 1835, that gold has been demonetized.—*The Industrial Competition of Asia*, by Clarmont I. Daniell, page 295.

That this gold treasure, of the value of £270,000,000, is much more than the country will require for its gold currency need scarcely be stated. In former years the gold currency of India was not less than one-seventeenth part of the value of the whole circulation, and that the proportion was larger there can be little doubt. During the first thirty-two years of this century the East India Company coined gold and silver money in about the proportion of 1 to 17, but there was at the same time in the company's territories a large circulation of gold coins provided by the mints of native powers—so large that up to that time about half the revenue used to be taken in gold.

The currency of India at this day is estimated to amount to two thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine millions of rupees, and if one-tenth of this value is taken as the amount of gold coin which the people would use, or, say, thirty millions of sovereigns, this sum would be found sufficient for all purposes to which a gold currency in India is at present likely to be applied. Thus it is clear that India can not only provide all the gold required for her own currency without drawing a single ounce of metal from the West, but also retain gold to the value of more than two hundred and forty millions for the indulgence of that propensity on the part of the people to hoard the precious metals, which those who are opposed to the use of gold money in India predict will be fatal to its circulation.—*Ibid.*, page 282.

Apprehensions have been expressed in many quarters that the introduction of a gold standard in India would involve a serious disturbance of existing contracts and financial obligations, and a dangerous derangement of the cost of trade. We desire, however, to have it clearly understood that, if it were decided to adopt a gold standard in India, we should propose a rate for the transfer from silver to gold which did not greatly differ from the market ratio of the day. We are of opinion that in such case the adoption of a gold standard would not have any serious effect in lowering prices, or reducing the rate of growth of the land revenue, and that it would not materially affect either the opium revenue or the burden of our gold or silver debt.—*Correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretary of State.* London, 1893, page 12.

The following is from Trade, Population, and Food, by Stephen Bourne, page 208. The author, after discussing the statistical aspect and trade requirements of gold at considerable length, concludes as follows:

Do not these several observations justify the conclusion that, though at particular times and places there may be a temporary deficiency of supply, so far from there being any scarcity of gold, there never was a period in the world's commerical history when the existing quantity was so large as it is at present, in proportion to the necessity for its use or the purposes it has to serve?

Also from the same author:

Shortly to recapitulate the several phases of this question which have thus passed under observation, we may observe:

1. That basing our calculations upon the best estimates which can be obtained of the annual production of gold and silver, and comparing the assumed stock of gold with the movements of bullion and merchandise throughout the world, there appears no reason to suppose that the existing supply is not amply sufficient for all the purposes of trade as at present carried on.

2. That the general fall of prices in recent years has neither been so regular nor so closely connected with the supply of gold and silver as to prove that alterations in the purchasing power of the sovereign have been due wholly or chiefly to an appreciation of gold.

3. That the variations in the value of gold itself as shown by the fluctuation in the price of the funds, and the rates of interest charged for the use of money, prove that it has no constant or unalterable value.

4. That in addition to the well-known effects on the value of silver arising from the growing yield of the American mines and the decrease in its use from its demonetization by Germany, there are others resulting from the increased quantity of gold, the facilities for economizing its use, and its natural superioity to silver, sufficient to account in some measure for the depreciation of the inferior metal.

5. That the coincidence of the fall in the price of silver with the contraction and depression of trade renders it probable that in this is to be found the most potent cause of depreciation, and that the revival of trade will in all probability be accompanied by a restoration of its value.

6. That it is not likely that any agreement to establish a fixed ratio in the value of silver to gold could ever be permanently maintained or not be liable to disruption at any moment from causes incapable of regulation or control.

7. That it is a fallacy to suppose that the extent of trade, and consequently the value of the medium through which its transactions are settled, depends so much upon the quantity of money in existence as upon the assiduous and judicious employment of productive power, the thrift by which its products are accumulated, and the wisdom which governs their consumption or expenditure.—*Trade, Population, and Food*, Stephen Bourne, pages 232, 233.

No one doubts that the amount of gold in the civilized countries of the world has largely increased in recent years. According to Dr. Soetbeer, the monetary stock of gold and gold reserve in the treasuries and principal banks of civilized countries has shown an increase for every decade since 1850, and at the end of 1885 was nearly four times what it was in 1850; so that, instead of there being a reduced supply of gold, as compared with thirty-five years ago, there is a greatly increased supply.

Prof. Laughlin estimates this increase to have been "from $447,000,000 in 1870-'80 to $836,000,000 in 1885." In 1871-'74 there was, according to the same authority, "$1 in gold for every $3.60 of the paper circulation of the banks of the civilized world; in 1885 there was $1 of gold for every $2.40, the total note circulation increasing during the same time to the extent of $464,000,000, or 29 per cent." In 1870-'74 the gold reserves amounted to 28 per cent of the total note circulation and 64 per cent of all the specie reserves; in 1885 "the gold bore a larger ratio to a larger issue of paper, or 41 per cent of the total note circulation and 71 per cent of the specie reserves. This," as Prof. Laughlin remarks, "is a very significant showing. What it means, beyond a shadow of doubt, is that the supply of gold is so abundant that the character and safety of the note circulation have been improved in a signal manner."

The investigations of Mr. Atkinson have also led him to the conclusion that, while the population of the world since 1849 has increased about 40 per cent, the concurrent increase in the volume of the money metals has been fully 100 per cent, and that the value of the gold added to the circulation during that period was more than double that of the silver added.

Since 1873-'74 Germany has radically modified her metallic circulation, giving preference to and using additional gold, and the United States and Italy have resumed specie payments. But the supply of gold has been sufficient to give these nations all the gold that they required, without apparently affecting the requirements of other countries. Again, it is not disputed that the rate of interest and discount has declined in all these countries, like Germany, the United States, Scandinavia, Holland, and Italy, which, in recent years, have increased their demand and use of gold for coinage; whereas a scarcity of money resulting from a scarcity of gold ought to have produced just the contrary effect.

The present annual production of gold is enormous compared with any period antecedent to 1850. Between 1820-1830 its average annual production was $10,000,000; between 1831-1840 it was $14,151,000, and between 1840-1850, $38,194,000. It was at its highest figure—$170,000,000 to $180,000,000—in 1852; averaged $101,000,000 from 1881 to 1885, and (according to the estimates of the Director of the United States Mint) was $103,000,000 in 1885 and $99,000,000 in 1886.

The production of silver has largely increased in recent years ($39,000,000 in 1850, $64,000,000 in 1873, and $135,000,000 in 1887), and no evidence can be produced to show that there has been any actual diminution in its aggregate use by reason of its so-called "demonetization" in any country.—*Economic Changes*, David A. Wells, pages 208, 209, 210, 211.

For the settlement of international balances—a large function of gold—it is certain that every ounce of this metal, through the great reduction in the time of ocean transits, is at the present time capable of performing far more service than at any former period; the time for the transmission of coin and bullion having been reduced in recent years between Australia and England from ninety to forty days, and from New York to Liverpool from twelve or fifteen to eight or nine days. Such an increase of rapidity in doing work is certainly equivalent to increase in quantity.—*Ibid.*, page 213.

The evidence, therefore, seems to fully warrant the following conclusions: That the tendency of the age is to use continually less and less of coin in the transaction of business; and that "so far from there being any scarcity of gold, there never was a period in the world's commercial history when the existing quantity was so large as at present in proportion to the necessity for its use or the purposes it has to serve."

The present and rapidly increasing indifference of the business public, alike in Europe and the United States, whose interest in this subject is mainly practical, is also significant, as indicating that the importance formerly conceded to the gold-scarcity theory has not been confirmed by experience.—*Ibid.*, page 218.

The magnitude of the gold production since 1850 is the marked characteristic of this period. The annual yield of gold in past centuries has been insignificant in comparison with the annual production in the years following the discoveries in Australia and California. Some years before the Russian mines had been increasing the supply; but from a production of about $15,000,000 a year in 1840, the supply rose to more than $150,000,000 a year soon after 1850. This phenomenon, moreover, was accompanied by an increase in the production of silver of from 25 to 50 per cent a year.

The comparative extent of the new gold production may be seen by Chart IX, previously mentioned, which gives the yield from the mines in the years since the discovery of America. The sudden and remarkable ascent of gold product on the chart after 1850 is all the more noticeable because of the comparison with previous years. In fact, the gold production is the striking feature in this portion of our monetary history.—*History of Bimetallism in the United States*, by Laughlin, page 112.

Setting before us as an object to discover the reasons for the fall in the value of silver in 1876—which has been the beginning of modern bimetallic discussions—we shall confine ourselves to the effect which the great production of gold has had upon the value of silver. And to this end we must bear in mind what has been said in the last section in regard to the prejudice for gold. Then there must be taken with this preference for gold the possibility of satisfying the demand. The amount of gold produced, therefore, is an important part of our problem. We should then proceed to get some idea of this amount.

We find ourselves, in the period following 1850, confronted with an enormously increased production of gold. How enormous it was I do not think has been generally recognized in our monetary discussions, particularly of late in those dealing with the appreciation of gold. It seems almost incredible to say that in the twenty-five years following 1850 as much gold was given forth by the mines as had been produced to that time since the discovery of America by Columbus; and yet it is literally true.

Years.	Gold.	Silver.
1493-1850	$3,314,553,000	$7,358,450,000
1851-1875	3,317,625,000	1,395,125,000

The facts may be more conveniently seen in their proper relations in chapter 10, which represents, first, by square areas the total quantities of gold and silver produced since the discovery of America down to 1850. During this time of three hundred and fifty-seven years it will be seen that more than twice as much silver as gold, in respect to value, was produced. And we have already seen that in this period there occurred two great falls in the value of silver, or at least an almost continuous fall of silver (see chapter 4). But what is remarkable is that while gold to an amount so much more than enough for the ordinary uses of commerce was produced from 1493 to 1850 that it fell in its purchasing power, in the twenty-five years succeeding 1850 an amount equal to the product of the previous three hundred and fifty-seven years was suddenly added to the existing stock of the world.

This was an amount far more than was necessary for the growth of trade and population in those twenty-five years, and, as Prof Jevons has shown, it resulted in a loss of its purchasing power of from 9 to 15 per cent. The wonder is that its value did not fall more, and it would have fallen more if it had not been for the influences which, as we shall later see, widened the field for its use. * * *

Now, what was the effect upon the relative values of the two metals of suddenly doubling the quantity of gold, without anything like a proportional increase of silver? First of all, gold fell in value, both in regard to silver and to all commodities. The ratio between gold and silver, which had risen from 1 to 15 to 1 to 16, now showed the effect of the cheapening in gold by dropping to 1 to 15.3 for a time. This was the first effect. But a second effect soon became visible. The cheapened gold began to drive out silver from the currencies of the United States and Europe, because at former ratios, fixed before the gold discoveries, gold was overvalued at the mints, and so by Gresham's law came into circulation as the sole medium of exchange.

But the matter worthy of most attention is that this exchange of gold for silver was seen and watched, not only without opposition, but even with satisfaction. Had there been a similar flow of silver into the place of gold, there would have been no such complacency. Here again is the preference for gold which we find so constantly present. The effect of this movement was, of course, to prevent gold from falling in value as much as it would otherwise have done, and to withdraw the previously existing demand from silver for use as a medium of exchange in Western commercial nations. The very cheapness and abundance of gold increased the demand for it for use as a medium of exchange, and *ipso facto* diminished the demand for silver.

The world could choose between the two. There was silver enough; but as soon as gold became plentiful there was no doubt for a moment which metal was preferred. It was in the same spirit in which the modern world made choice between the railway and the stage coach as a means of transportation. Wherever choice was possible, the best and most convenient means of locomotion was taken.—*Ibid.* pages 115, 116, 117.

The following clipping is from an article which appeared in the New York Evening Post of August 21, 1893, by the above author:

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE PRESENT CRISIS—THE SUPPLY OF GOLD.

Calm reflection upon facts constantly overlooked may lead us to believe that the consensus of opinion among the large commercial states of Europe in favor of the gold standard is not based on flimsy ground. From 1493 to 1850 the world's production of silver was $7,358,450,000, and of gold $3,314,-553,000—or more than twice as much silver as gold. From 1851 to 1891 the world's production of silver was $2,967,444,000, and of gold $5,072,410,000—or nearly twice as much gold as silver. In the United States alone the gold production has been about twice as large as silver; from 1792 to 1891 that of silver was $1,073,172,000, and that of gold $1,904,881,769. The $5,072,410,000 of gold produced in the forty years since 1850 has filled the channels of circulation in Europe and America, and permitted the disuse of silver.

The resumption of gold payments by the United States in 1879, and the adoption of the gold standard by Germany, Denmark, Scandinavia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary, have not required, at the outside, more than $1,000,-000,000 or $1,500,000,000, leaving more than $3,000,000,009 for general uses, exclusive of the stock existing in 1850, which is about as much more. Never before have the paper currencies of the world been better secured by gold reserves. There is in sight to-day more than $500,000,000 in gold in the reserves of the banks of Europe alone. In view of these facts, it does not seem wise to feel any doubt of the ability of the United States, with its untold resources and exportable products, to keep intact its small reserve of $100,-000,000, or double that sum, which it should be.

Nor, in view of these facts, should too much weight be assigned to the argument that general prices have fallen because of the demonetization of silver in 1873; the less so when it is remembered that Germany took to herself only about $400,000,000 of gold and discarded the same amount of silver. In short, apart from the action of Germany, silver is as much used now in all the other States of Europe as in 1873. If the giving up of silver by Germany lowered the level of prices for the world, then the action of this country in buying as much silver as Germany discarded ought to have restored the former level. That it did not shows how untenable is the position that prices have fallen because silver was demonetized or that prices can be regulated by legislative action in increasing or diminishing either gold or silver. In short, prices can never be fixed by the mere quantity of metallic money in the country. They depend much more on conditions of credit and banking. If this is properly understood it will be possible to see how debts can be paid without the infusion of more silver into our currency as easily as ever before. The only means of paying debts, in fact, are salable goods, for they can always be changed into a means of payment.

The increased output of gold in the United States for the first six months of 1893 amounts to $1,100,000, and it is estimated by competent authority that the increased output for the world for the year 1893 over that of 1892 will amount to at least $8,000,000.

The following is taken from the editorial columns of the Washington Post, August 18, 1893:

OUR GOLD PRODUCT.

The chief risk of dependence on gold as a standard is that the supply may not be sufficient, but the gold fields of South Africa, now being developed, promise to bring relief in that direction.—*Philadelphia Ledger.*

But what about our own gold fields? Wherever gold has been produced before in years gone by prospecting has been renewed with most encouraging results. New discoveries have been made in Oregon and other Western States that are reputed to be very valuable. Even in Colorado, the very heart of the silver industry, the outlook for gold is brightening daily. Says the Denver Republican of August 14:

"Already there has been a notable increase in the gold output. The gold deposits at the Denver mint in July exceeded by $60,000 the deposits in any previous month in the history of the mint. It shows that Colorado miners are not completely at the mercy of the men who are endeavoring to strike down silver as a money metal. There are promising gold districts in both Gunnison and Pitkin Counties. Telluride is one of the best gold camps in the Rocky Mountains, and during this summer a large amount of work has been done there in the development of gold claims, which, during the time of active silver mining, were more or less neglected. Gilpin County keeps up its reputation as a gold producer, and the camp on Yankee Hill near the edge of Clear Creek County is a very promising place."

The San Francisco Examiner of the 11th instant reports that gold is coming down from the mountains at the rate of $1,500,000 a month; that "the corner of the hard times" has been turned; that money enough is to be had for saving the bulk of the fruit crop, and that wheat is rushing to market, every cargo shipped yielding $50,000 to $100,000 in "English gold" as soon as it is cleared.

There is no cause of alarm because of a probable scarcity of gold for a currency reserve. What the country does not produce the Government can easily buy.

IN CONCLUSION.

As to the direful calamity which the advocates of free silver promise us will surely befall the country if we adopt the gold standard by passing the pending bill—the scarcity of money, the fall of prices, commercial depression and increase of poverty—I quote once more from that old stalwart, hard-money, gold-standard Democrat from Missouri—of a past generation, Hon. Thomas H. Benton:

A measure of relief was now at hand, before which the machinery of distress was to balk and cease its long and cruel labors: it was the passage of the bill for equalizing the value of gold and silver and legalizing the tender of foreign coins of both metals. The bills were brought forward into the House by Mr. Campbell P. White, of New York, and passed after an animated contest, in which the chief question was as to the true relative value of the two metals, varied by some into a preference for national bank paper. Fifteen and five-eighths to 1 was the ratio of nearly all who seemed best calculated, from their pursuits, to understand the subject.

The thick array of speakers was on that side, and the eighteen banks of the city of New York, with Mr. Gallatin at their head, favored that proportion. The difficulty of adjusting this value, so that neither metal should expel the other, had been the stumbling block for a great many years, and now this difficulty seemed to be as formidable as ever. We find calculations were gone into; scientific light was sought; history was rummaged back to the times of the Roman Empire; and there seemed to be no way of getting to a concord of opinion either from the lights of science, the voice of history, or the result of calculation.

The author of this View had (in his speeches on the subject) taken up the question in a practical point of view, regardless of history and calculations and the opinions of bank officers; and looking to the actual and the equal circulation of the two metals in different countries, he saw that this equality and actuality of circulation had existed for about three hundred years in the Spanish dominions of Mexico and South America, where the proportion was 16 to 1. Taking his stand upon this single fact as the practical test that solved the question, all the real friends of gold currency soon rallied to it.

Mr. White gave up the bill which he had first introduced, and adopted the Spanish ratio. Mr. Clowney of South Carolina, Mr. Gillet, and Mr. Cambreeng of New York, Mr. Ewing of Indiana, Mr. McKim of Maryland, and the other speakers, gave it a warm support. Mr. John Quincy Adams would vote for it though he thought that gold was overvalued; but if found to be so, the difference could be corrected hereafter. The principal speakers against it and in favor of a lower rate were Messrs. Gorham, of Massachusetts, Selden of New York, Binney of Pennsylvania, and Wilde of Georgia. And eventually the bill was passed by a large majority—145 to 36. In the Senate it had an easy passage. Mr. Calhoun and Webster supported it; Mr. Clay opposed it; and on the final vote there were but 7 negatives: Messrs. Chambers of Maryland, Clay, Knight of Rhode Island, Alexander Porter of Louisiana, Silsbee of Massachusetts, Southard of New Jersey, Sprague of Maine.

The good effects of the bill were immediately seen. Gold began to flow into the country through all the channels of commerce; old chests gave up their hoards; the mint was busy, and in a few months, and as if by magic, a currency banished from the country for thirty years, overspread the land, and gave joy and confidence to all the pursuits of industry. But this joy was not universal. A large interest connected with the Bank of the United States, and its subsidiary and subaltern institutions, and the whole paper system, vehemently opposed it, and spared neither pains nor expense to check its circulation and to bring odium upon its supporters.

People were alarmed with counterfeits. Gilt counters were exhibited in the markets, to alarm the ignorant. The coin itself was burlesqued, in mock imitation of brass or copper, with grotesque figures, and ludicrous inscriptions—the "whole hog" and the "better currency," being the favorite devices. Many newspapers expended their daily wit in its stale depreciation. The most exalted of the paper money party would recoil a step when it was offered to them, and begged for paper. The name of "Gold humbug" was fastened upon the person supposed to have been chiefly instrumental in bringing the derided coin into existence; and he, not to be abashed, made its eulogy a standing theme—vaunting its excellence, boasting its coming abundance, to spread over the land, flow up the Mississippi, shine through the interstices of the long silken purse, and to be locked up safely in the farmer's trusty oaken chest.

For a year there was a real war of the paper against gold. But there was something that was an overmatch for the arts or power of the paper system in this particular, and which needed no persuasions to guide it when it had its choice: it was the instinctive feeling of the masses which told them that money which would jingle in the pocket was the right money for them—that hard money was the right money for hard hands—that gold was the true currency for every man that had anything true to give for it, either in labor or property; and upon these instinctive feelings gold became the avidious demand of the vast operating and producing classes.—*Benton's Thirty Years' View*, volume 1, chapter 58.

The extent of suffering which follows in the wake of a cheap and unstable currency can not be overestimated. It stops all development and curtails all existing enterprises; it reduces the income of capital and the wages of labor; it increases the cost of living; it displaces confidence with suspicion, turns all merchandising into speculation, and destroys public and private credit. There can be no public credit, nor private credit, nor individual prosperity unless the money of the realm, which measures all services, all wages, all property, shall be free from suspicion and of sound and stable value.

APPENDIX.

The pending bill and order of the House for its consideration.

A 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."

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of the act approved July 14, 1890, entitled "An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes," as directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase from time to time silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered in each month at the market price thereof, not exceeding $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, and to issue in payment for such purposes Treasury notes of the United States, be, and the same is hereby, repealed; but this repeal shall not impair, or in any manner affect, the legal-tender quality of the standard silver dollars heretofore coined; and the faith and credit of the United States are hereby pledged to maintain the parity of the standard gold and silver coins of the United States at the present legal ratio or such other ratio as may be established by law.

The Order.

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

Order of amendments: The vote shall be taken first on an amendment providing for the free coinage of silver at the present ratio. If that fail, then a separate vote to be had on a similar amendment proposing a ratio of 17 to 1; if that fails, on one proposing a ratio of 18 to 1; if that fails, on one proposing a ratio of 19 to 1; if that fails, on one proposing a ratio of 20 to 1. If the above amendments fail, it shall be in order to offer an amendment reviving the act of the 28th of February, 1878, restoring the standard silver dollar, commonly known as the Bland-Allison act; the vote then to be taken on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended, or on the bill itself if all amendments shall have been voted down, and on the final passage of the bill without other intervening motions.

The law of July 14, 1890, commonly called the Sherman law.

[Public—No. 214.]

An act directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion to the aggregate amount of 4,500,000 ounces, or so much thereof as may be offered in each month, at the market price thereof, not exceeding $1 for 371.25 grains of pure silver, and to issue in payment for such purchases of silver bullion Treasury notes of the United States to be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury, in such form and of such denominations, not less than $1 nor more than $1,000, as he may prescribe, and a sum sufficient to carry into effect the provisions of this act is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 2. That the Treasury notes issued in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be redeemable on demand, in coin, at the Treasury of the United States, or at the office of any assistant treasurer of the United States, and when so redeemed may be reissued; but no greater or less amount of such notes shall be outstanding at any time than the cost of the silver bullion and the standard silver dollars coined therefrom, then held in the Treasury, purchased by such notes; and such Treasury notes shall be a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract, and shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued; and such notes, when held by any national banking association, may be counted as a part of its lawful reserve. That upon demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes herein provided for the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin, at his discretion, it being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall each month coin 2,000,000 ounces of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act into standard silver dollars until the 1st day of July, 1891, and after that time he shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for, and any gain or seigniorage arising from such coinage shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury.

SEC. 4. That the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act shall be subject to the requirements of existing law and the regulations of the mint service governing the methods of determining the amount of pure silver contained, and the amount of charges or deductions, if any, to be made.

SEC. 5. That so much of the act of February 28, 1878, entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character," as requires the monthly purchase and coinage of the same into silver dollars of not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver bullion, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. That upon the passage of this act the balances standing with the Treasurer of the United States to the respective credits of national banks for deposits made to redeem the circulating notes of such banks, and all deposits thereafter received for like purpose, shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt, and the Treasurer of the United States shall redeem from the general cash in the Treasury the circulating notes of said banks which may come into his possession subject to redemption; and upon the certificate of the Comptroller of the Currency that such notes have been received by him and that they have been destroyed and that no new notes will be issued in their place, reimbursement of their amount shall be made to the Treasurer, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, from an appropriation hereby created, to be known as national-bank notes redemption account; but the provisions of this act shall not apply to the deposits received under section 3 of the act of June 20, 1874, requiring every national bank to keep in lawful money with the Treasurer of the United States a sum equal to five per cent of its circulation, to be held and used for the redemption of its circulating notes; and the balance remaining of the deposits so covered shall, at the close of each month, be reported on the monthly public debt statement as debt of the United States bearing no interest.

SEC. 7. That this act shall take effect thirty days from and after its passage.

Approved July 14, 1890.

The act of February 28, 1878, commonly called the Bland-Allison act.

An act to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar, and to restore its legal-tender character.

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be coined, at the several mints of the United States, silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy of standard silver, as provided in the act of January 18, 1837, on which shall be the devices and superscriptions provided by said act; which coins, together with all silver dollars heretofore coined by the United States, of like weight and fineness, shall be a legal tender, at their nominal value, for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase, from time to time, silver bullion at the market price thereof, not less than $2,000,000 worth per month nor more than $4,000,000 worth per month, and cause the same to be coined monthly, as fast as so purchased, into such dollars; and a sum sufficient to carry out the foregoing provision of this act is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. And any gain or seigniorage arising from this coinage shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury, as provided under existing laws relative to the subsidiary coinage: *Provided*, That the amount of money at any one time invested in such silver bullion, exclusive of such resulting coin, shall not exceed five million dollars; *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the payment in silver of certificates of deposit issued under the provisions of section 254 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. That immediately after the passage of this act the President shall invite the governments of the countries comprising the Latin Union, so called, and of such other European nations as he may deem advisable, to join the United States in a conference to adopt a common ratio between gold and silver, for the purpose of establishing, internationally, the use of bimetallic money and securing fixity of relative value between those metals, such conference to be held at such place, in Europe or the United States, at such time within six months, as may be mutually agreed upon by the executives of the governments joining in the same, whenever the governments so invited, or any three of them, shall have signified their willingness to unite in the same.

The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint three commissioners, who shall attend such conference on behalf of the United States, and shall report the doings thereof to the President, who shall transmit the same to Congress.

Said commissioners shall each receive the sum of $2,500 and their reasonable expenses, to be approved by the Secretary of State, and the amount necessary to pay such compensation and expenses is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

SEC. 3. That any holder of the coin authorized by this act may deposit the same with the Treasurer or any assistant treasurer of the United States, in sums not less than $10, and receive therefor certificates of not less than $10 each, corresponding with the denominations of the United States notes. The coin deposited for or representing the certificate shall be retained in the Treasury for the payment of the same on demand. Said certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and, when so received, may be reissued.

SEC. 4. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Relating to the act of 1873 demonetizing silver.

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

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

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *April 25, 1870.*

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

"I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"GEO. S. BOUTWELL,

"*Secretary of the Treasury.*"

The report and the bill were referred on April 28, 1870, to the Finance Committee of the Senate, and subsequently, on May 2, 1870, 500 additional copies were ordered to be printed for the use of the Treasury Department. The report says:

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

The amendments proposed by the bill were as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

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

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

"SILVER DOLLAR—ITS DISCONTINUANCE AS A STANDARD.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. E. B. Elliott, of the Treasury Department, gave a complete history of the silver dollar, and suggested the issue of a commercial dollar of nine-tenths fineness, and containing of pure silver just 25 grams, in place of the then existing silver dollar of 412½ grains, the proposed silver dollar being almost the exact equivalent of the silver contained in the older Spanish-Mexican pillared dollar, established in 1704 by proclamation of Queen Anne as a legal tender of payment and accepted as par of exchange for the British colonies of North America at the rate of 54 pence sterling to the dollar, or 4⅘ dollars to the pound sterling.

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

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

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

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

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

* * * * * * *

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

Mr. Kelley on the same day also said:

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The silver coins provided for are the dollar, 384 grains troy, the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, and dime, of the value and weight of one-half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the dollar, respectively, and they are made a legal tender for all sums not exceeding $5 at any one payment. The silver dollar, as now issued, is worth for bullion 3¼ cents more than the gold dollar and 7½ cents more than two half-dollars; having a greater intrinsic and nominal value, it is certain to be withdrawn from circulation whenever we return to specie payment, and to be used for only manufacture and exportation as bullion."

The latter, in commenting upon the bill, says:

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

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

Mr. Kelley also said:

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

"Hence all experience has shown that you must have one standard coin which shall be a legal tender for all others, and then you may promote your domestic convenience by having a subsidiary coinage of silver, which shall circulate in all parts of your country as legal tender for a limited amount and be redeemable at its face value by your Government. But, sir, I again call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentlemen who oppose this bill insist upon maintaining a silver dollar worth 3¼ cents more than the gold dollar and worth 7 cents more than two half dollars, and that so long as those provisions remain you can not keep silver coin in the country."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Statement showing the monthly receipts from customs at New York since January, 1889, and the percentage of each kind of money received.

[United States Treasurer's Report, 1892, page 50.]

Months.	Total receipts.	Gold coin.	Silver coin.	Gold certificates.	Silver certificates.	United States notes.	United States Treasury notes.
1889.		*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*
January	$14,037,625	0.1	0.1	83.0	6.2	10.6	
February	12,954,640	0.1	0.1	85.1	5.3	9.4	
March	13,422,511	0.1	0.1	87.5	3.1	9.2	

Statement showing the monthly receipts from customs, etc.—Continued.

Months.	Total receipts.	Gold coin.	Silver coin.	Gold certificates.	Silver certificates.	United States notes.	United States Treasury notes.
1889.		*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*
April	$11,962,153	0.1	0.1	88.8	2.7	8.3	....
May	11,096,791	0.2	0.1	81.5	5.9	12.3	....
June	10,697,716	0.1	0.1	74.5	6.5	18.8	....
July	13,791,000	0.1	0.1	85.6	3.8	10.4	....
August	13,324,514	0.2	0.1	86.5	2.9	10.3	....
September	12,015,653	0.2	0.1	89.7	2.1	7.9	....
October	12,201,906	0.1	0.1	90.5	2.0	7.3	....
November	11,175,885	0.2	0.1	92.6	1.3	5.8	....
December	10,997,977	0.2	0.1	92.4	2.0	5.3	....
1890.							
January	15,223,480	0.1	0.0	92.5	2.8	4.6	....
February	13,888,075	0.1	0.1	95.0	1.8	3.0	....
March	12,569,867	0.1	0.1	95.7	1.4	2.7	....
April	13,617,857	0.2	0.1	95.4	1.6	2.7	....
May	10,671,516	0.2	0.1	93.6	2.5	3.6	....
June	14,492,128	0.1	0.0	94.5	2.7	2.7	....
July	17,173,016	0.1	0.1	95.3	2.0	2.5	....
August	12,978,335	0.1	0.0	91.7	1.7	3.0	3.5
September	15,767,331	0.1	0.1	85.5	1.4	1.9	11.0
October	16,093,061	0.2	0.0	80.9	1.3	2.1	15.5
November	10,154,328	0.3	0.1	80.4	1.7	2.9	14.6
December	10,704,055	0.3	0.1	87.8	1.9	3.0	6.9
1891.							
January	16,794,456	0.1	0.0	88.5	2.1	4.1	5.2
February	12,280,373	0.1	0.0	81.0	6.6	5.0	7.3
March	10,520,414	0.2	0.0	64.9	16.5	6.0	12.4
April	7,711,917	0.2	0.0	47.0	20.0	7.2	25.6
May	7,449,775	0.2	0.0	27.8	26.8	15.0	30.2
June	9,131,418	0.2	0.0	12.3	14.0	44.6	28.9
July	11,303,169	0.2	0.0	14.9	8.5	49.0	27.4
August	10,460,330	0.2	0.0	12.6	5.2	50.5	31.5
September	9,951,740	0.1	0.1	11.7	4.4	55.3	28.4
October	9,337,291	0.2	0.0	19.8	4.4	44.0	31.6
November	8,502,785	0.1	0.0	43.5	2.8	31.3	22.3
December	9,314,666	0.1	0.0	65.3	3.1	14.8	16.7
1892.							
January	11,960,445	0.1	0.0	66.1	4.3	15.0	14.5
February	11,628,815	0.1	0.0	25.8	9.3	36.2	28.6
March	10,871,923	0.1	0.0	18.7	5.7	42.5	33.0
April	8,879,912	0.2	0.0	14.9	6.9	46.4	31.6
May	8,103,436	0.1	0.0	9.9	13.0	40.6	36.4
June	9,591,270	0.2	0.0	8.0	15.9	26.8	49.1
July	12,295,908	0.1	0.0	13.8	15.5	28.4	42.2
August	13,175,485	0.0	0.0	12.1	10.4	25.6	51.9
September	11,335,347	0.0	0.0	3.6	10.9	45.8	39.7
October	10,341,120	0.1	0.0	6.6	6.4	51.9	35.0
November	9,951,385	0.1	0.0	7.8	6.3	52.8	33.0
December	10,570,853	0.0	0.0	4.4	9.2	46.4	40.0
1893.							
January	15,291,892	0.0	0.0	8.9	15.8	42.1	33.2
February	12,439,280	0.0	0.0	9.2	20.7	33.3	36.8
March	12,805,673	0.0	0.0	7.8	15.7	28.0	48.5
April	9,717,539	0.1	0.0	2.9	23.3	41.0	32.7
May	9,967,707	0.1	0.0	0.0	37.8	26.2	35.9
June	9,337,798	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.0	53.0	35.0
July	10,220,733	12.5	0.0	4.6	12.3	55.6	15.0

Statement showing amount of gold coin and bullion in the Treasury, and of gold certificates outstanding, from latest returns received at the end of each month.

[United States Treasurer's Report, 1892, page 85.]

Date.	Total gold in Treasury, coin and bullion.	Gold certificates in Treasury cash.	Gold certificates in circulation.	Net gold in Treasury, coin and bullion.
1889.				
January	$325,641,856.12	$25,043,518	$130,986,592	$194,655,264.12
February	326,456,697.81	24,802,813	130,210,717	196,245,980.81
March	326,700,938.96	26,586,125	128,826,517	197,874,421.96
April	328,203,900.80	20,783,433	136,614,789	191,589,111.80
May	321,297,376.96	27,350,140	129,044,662	192,252,714.96
June	303,504,319.58	37,235,793	116,792,759	186,711,560.58
July	300,759,572.98	34,669,943	118,541,409	182,218,163.98
August	304,048,189.30	39,557,233	123,393,510	180,654,070.30
September	305,871,772.02	42,073,803	116,675,349	189,196,423.02
October	308,509,615.21	34,925,823	120,937,229	187,572,386.21
November	310,979,791.06	30,668,090	123,483,119	187,496,672.06
December	313,818,941.47	31,316,100	122,985,889	190,833,052.47
1890.				
January	316,043,454.19	20,452,870	138,657,169	177,386,285.19
February	318,593,752.14	28,222,835	130,604,804	187,988,948.14
March	320,225,794.87	24,614,210	134,938,079	185,287,715.87
April	320,878,411.60	24,142,200	134,642,839	186,235,572.60
May	321,333,253.10	27,473,120	130,788,399	190,544,854.10
June	321,612,423.49	26,162,960	131,380,019	190,232,404.49
July	316,536,823.28	27,577,120	132,444,749	184,092,074.28
August	310,220,120.43	33,005,730	124,382,539	185,837,581.43
September	306,086,471.18	16,058,780	158,104,739	147,981,732.18
October	294,489,603.03	36,482,690	138,173,979	156,315,624.03
November	293,755,879.85	43,755,570	131,316,499	162,439,380.85
December	293,020,214.20	31,384,690	144,047,279	148,972,935.20
1891.				
January	297,567,546.04	19,892,050	155,839,449	141,728,097.04
February	296,831,953.14	25,155,770	149,119,129	149,712,824.14
March	292,435,218.50	24,050,460	144,317,069	148,118,149.50
April	280,633,039.99	27,309,200	138,890,799	141,742,240.99
May	255,331,502.93	36,777,810	122,124,339	133,207,163.93
June	238,518,121.59	31,606,030	120,850,399	117,667,722.59
July	236,828,413.24	34,004,820	115,715,389	121,113,024.24
August	240,744,487.66	37,721,280	108,273,079	132,471,408.66
September	244,974,790.94	28,332,490	112,451,569	132,523,221.94
October	263,774,741.81	20,790,420	136,100,319	127,674,422.81
November	271,843,193.35	19,202,170	142,649,969	129,193,224.35
December	278,846,749.90	17,472,720	148,106,119	130,740,630.90
1892.				
January	282,753,863.24	17,486,810	163,178,950	119,574,904.24
February	282,123,391.53	18,150,140	160,001,279	122,122,112.53
March	280,144,269.34	23,673,770	154,329,229	125,815,040.34
April	273,623,455.45	21,931,180	153,713,699	119,909,756.45
May	271,527,091.86	14,470,520	157,295,209	114,231,882.86
June	255,577,705.23	15,363,590	141,235,339	114,342,366.23
July	247,306,220.66	17,738,500	136,861,829	110,444,391.66
August	242,543,695.63	23,847,210	128,387,379	114,156,316.63
September	240,605,908.58	25,345,590	121,210,399	119,395,509.58
October	244,261,468.91	23,181,990	120,255,349	124,006,119.91
November	247,598,465.89	19,632,830	123,188,809	124,409,656.89
December	238,359,801.29	24,254,750	117,093,139	121,266,662.29
1893.				
January	228,827,532.53	15,729,770	120,645,819	108,181,713.53
February	217,672,947.91	7,782,260	114,388,729	103,284,218.91
March	218,378,232.99	5,135,430	111,486,009	106,892,223.99
April	202,283,359.08	8,888,310	105,272,029	97,011,330.08
May	196,518,609.76	3,324,670	101,469,969	95,048,640.76
June	188,455,432.59	1,071,170	92,970,019	95,485,413.59
July	186,813,962.98	93,710	87,611,029	99,202,933.98

Product of gold and silver in the United States from 1792–1844, and annually since.

[The estimate for 1792-1873 is by R. W. Raymond, Commissioner, and since by the Director of the Mint.]

Years.	Gold.	Silver.	Total.
April 2, 1792–July 31, 1834	$14,000,000	Insignificant.	$14,000,000
July 31, 1834—December 31, 1844	7,500,000	$250,000	7,750,000
1845	1,008,327	50,000	1,058,327
1846	1,139,357	50,000	1,189,357
1847	889,085	50,000	939,085
1848	10,000,000	50,000	10,050,000
1849	40,000,000	50,000	40,050,000
1850	50,000,000	50,000	50,050,000
1851	55,000,000	50,000	55,050,000
1852	60,000,000	50,000	60,050,000
1853	65,000,000	50,000	65,050,000
1854	60,000,000	50,000	60,050,000
1855	55,000,000	50,000	55,050,000
1856	55,000,000	50,000	55,050,000
1857	55,000,000	50,000	55,050,000
1858	50,000,000	500,000	50,500,000
1859	50,000,000	100,000	50,100,000
1860	46,000,000	150,000	46,150,000
1861	43,000,000	2,000,000	45,000,000
1862	39,200,000	4,500,000	43,700,000
1863	40,000,000	8,500,000	48,500,000
1864	46,100,000	11,000,000	57,100,000
1865	53,225,000	11,250,000	64,475,000
1866	53,500,000	10,000,000	63,500,000
1867	51,725,000	13,500,000	65,225,000
1868	48,000,000	12,000,000	60,000,000
1869	49,500,000	12,000,000	61,500,000
1870	50,000,000	16,000,000	66,000,000
1871	43,500,000	23,000,000	66,500,000
1872	36,000,000	28,750,000	64,750,000
1873	36,000,000	35,750,000	71,750,000
1874	33,500,000	37,300,000	70,800,000
1875	33,400,000	31,700,000	65,100,000
1876	39,900,000	38,800,000	78,700,000
1877	46,900,000	39,800,000	86,700,000
1878	51,200,000	45,200,000	96,400,000
1879	38,900,000	40,800,000	79,700,000
1880	36,000,000	39,200,000	75,200,000
1881	34,700,000	43,000,000	77,700,000
1882	32,500,000	46,800,000	79,300,000
1883	30,000,000	46,200,000	76,200,000
1884	30,800,000	48,800,000	79,600,000
1885	31,800,000	51,600,000	83,400,000
1886	35,000,000	51,000,000	86,000,000
1887	33,000,000	53,350,000	86,350,000
1888	33,175,000	59,195,000	92,370,000
1889	32,800,000	64,646,000	97,446,000
1890	32,845,000	70,464,000	103,309,000
1891	33,175,000	75,417,000	108,592,000
1892	33,000,000	73,697,000	106,697,000
Total	1,937,881,769	1,146,869,000	3,084,750,769

Statement of the production of gold and silver in the world since the discovery of America.

[From 1493 to 1885 is from table of averages for certain periods compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer. For the years 1886–1892 the production is the annual estimate of the Bureau of the Mint.]

Period.	Gold.				Silver.				Percentage of production.			
	Annual average of period.		Total for the period.		Annual average of period.		Total for the period.		By weight.		By value.	
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Coinage value.	Fine ounces.	Coinage value.	Gold.	Silver.	Gold.	Silver.
1493–1520	186,470	$3,855,000	5,221,160	$107,931,000	1,511,050	$1,954,000	42,309,400	$54,703,000	11.0	89.0	66.4	33.6
1521–1544	230,194	4,759,000	5,524,656	114,205,000	2,899,930	3,749,000	69,598,320	89,986,000	7.4	92.6	55.9	44.1
1545–1560	273,596	5,656,000	4,377,544	90,492,000	10,017,940	12,952,000	160,287,040	207,240,000	2.7	97.3	30.4	69.6
1561–1580	219,906	4,546,000	4,398,120	90,917,000	9,628,925	12,450,000	192,578,500	248,990,000	2.2	97.8	26.7	73.3
1581–1600	237,267	4,905,000	4,745,340	98,095,000	13,467,635	17,413,000	269,352,700	348,254,000	1.7	98.3	22.0	78.0
1601–1620	273,918	5,662,000	5,478,360	113,248,000	13,596,235	17,579,000	271,924,700	351,579,000	2.0	98.0	24.4	75.6
1621–1640	266,845	5,516,000	5,336,900	110,324,000	12,654,240	16,361,000	253,084,800	327,221,000	2.1	97.9	25.2	74.8
1641–1660	281,955	5,828,000	5,639,110	116,571,000	11,776,545	15,226,000	235,530,900	304,525,000	2.3	97.7	27.7	72.3
1661–1680	297,709	6,154,000	5,954,180	123,084,000	10,834,550	14,008,000	216,691,000	280,166,000	2.7	97.3	30.5	69.5
1681–1700	346,095	7,154,000	6,921,895	143,088,000	10,992,085	14,212,000	219,841,700	284,240,000	3.1	96.9	33.5	66.5
1701–1720	412,163	8,520,000	8,243,260	170,403,000	11,432,540	14,781,000	228,650,800	295,629,000	3.5	96.5	36.6	63.4
1721–1740	613,422	12,681,000	12,268,440	253,611,000	13,863,080	17,924,000	277,261,600	358,480,000	4.2	95.8	41.4	58.6
1741–1760	791,211	16,356,000	15,824,230	327,116,000	17,140,612	22,162,000	342,812,235	443,232,000	4.4	95.6	42.5	57.5
1761–1780	665,666	13,761,000	13,313,315	275,211,000	20,985,591	27,133,000	419,711,820	542,658,000	3.1	96.9	33.7	66.3
1781–1800	571,948	11,823,000	11,438,970	236,464,000	28,261,779	36,540,000	565,235,580	730,810,000	2.0	98.0	24.4	75.6
1801–1810	571,563	11,815,000	5,715,627	118,152,000	28,746,922	37,168,000	287,469,225	371,677,000	1.9	98.1	24.1	75.9
1811–1820	367,957	7,606,000	3,679,568	76,063,000	17,385,755	22,479,000	173,857,555	224,786,000	2.1	97.9	25.3	74.7
1821–1830	457,044	9,448,000	4,570,444	94,479,000	14,807,004	19,144,000	148,070,040	191,444,000	3.0	97.0	33.0	67.0
1831–1840	652,291	13,484,000	6,522,913	134,841,000	19,175,867	24,793,000	191,758,675	247,930,000	3.3	96.7	35.2	64.8
1841–1850	1,760,502	36,393,000	17,605,018	363,928,000	25,090,342	32,440,000	250,903,422	324,400,000	6.6	93.4	52.9	47.1
1851–1855	6,410,324	132,513,000	32,051,621	662,566,000	28,488,597	36,824,000	142,442,986	184,169,000	18.4	81.6	78.3	21.7
1856–1860	6,486,262	134,083,000	32,431,312	670,415,000	29,095,428	37,618,000	145,477,142	188,092,000	18.2	81.8	78.1	21.9
1861–1865	5,949,582	122,989,000	29,747,913	614,944,000	35,401,972	45,772,000	177,009,862	228,861,000	14.4	85.6	72.9	27.1
1866–1870	6,270,086	129,614,000	31,350,430	648,071,000	43,051,583	55,663,000	215,257,914	278,313,000	12.7	87.3	70.0	30.0
1871–1875	5,591,014	115,577,000	27,955,068	577,883,000	63,317,014	81,864,000	316,585,069	409,322,000	8.1	91.9	58.6	41.4
1876–1880	5,543,110	114,586,000	27,715,550	572,931,000	78,775,602	101,851,000	393,878,000	509,256,000	6.6	93.4	53.0	47.0
1881–1885	4,794,755	99,116,000	23,973,773	495,582,000	92,003,944	118,955,000	460,019,722	594,773,000	5.0	95.0	45.5	54.5
1886	5,127,750	106,000,000	5,127,750	106,000,000	93,276,000	120,600,000	93,276,000	120,600,000	5.2	94.8	46.8	53.2

Statement of the production of gold and silver in the world since the discovery of America—Continued.

[From 1493 to 1885 is from table of averages for certain periods compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer. For the years 1886–1892 the production is the annual estimate of the Bureau of the Mint.]

Period.	Gold.				Silver.				Percentage of production.			
	Annual average of period.		Total for the period.		Annual average of period.		Total for the period.		By weight.		By value.	
	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Value.	Fine ounces.	Coinage value.	Fine ounces.	Coinage value.	Gold.	Silver.	Gold.	Silver.
1887	5,093,984	$105,302,000	5,093,984	$105,302,000	96,189,000	$124,366,000	96,189,000	$124,366,000	5.0	95.0	45.9	54.1
1888	5,316,412	109,900,000	5,316,412	109,900,000	109,911,000	142,107,000	109,911,000	142,107,000	4.6	95.4	43.6	56.4
1889	5,746,950	118,800,000	5,746,950	118,800,000	125,830,000	162,690,000	125,830,000	162,690,000	4.4	95.6	42.2	57.8
1890	5,473,631	115,450,000	5,473,631	118,150,000	133,213,000	172,235,000	133,213,000	172,235,000	4.0	96.0	39.7	60.3
1891	5,830,107	120,519,000	5,830,107	120,519,000	144,426,000	186,733,000	144,426,000	186,733,000	3.9	96.1	39.2	60.8
1892	6,328,272	130,817,000	6,328,272	130,817,000	152,062,000	196,605,000	152,062,000	196,605,000	4.0	96.0	40.0	60.0
Total			397,191,823	8,204,303,000			7,522,507,716	9,726,072,000	5.0	95.0	45.8	54.2

Value of merchandise imported into and exported from the United States from 1843 to 1892, inclusive; also excess of imports or of exports—specie value.

[Compiled from United States Statistical Abstract, 1892.]

Period—Year ending June 30.	Exports.		Total exports.	Imports.	Total exports and imports.	Excess of exports over imports.	Excess of imports over exports.
	Domestic.	Foreign.					
1843, 9 months-1852	$1,258,331,652	$81,421,729	$1,339,753,381	$1,380,127,002	$2,719,880,383		$40,373,621
1853-1862	2,373,822,537	169,375,911	2,543,198,448	2,905,205,742	5,448,404,190		362,007,294
1863-1872	2,861,812,207	158,225,322	3,020,037,529	3,986,821,828	7,006,859,357		966,784,299
1873-1882	6,509,165,121	149,733,511	8,658,899,032	5,572,700,559	12,231,599,591	1,086,198,473	
1883	804,223,632	19,615,770	823,839,402	723,180,914	1,547,020,316	100,658,488	
1884	724,964,852	15,548,757	740,513,609	667,697,693	1,408,211,302	72,815,916	
1885	726,682,946	15,506,809	742,189,755	577,527,329	1,319,717,084	164,662,426	
1886	665,964,529	13,560,301	679,524,830	635,436,136	1,314,960,966	44,088,694	
1887	703,022,923	13,160,288	716,183,211	692,319,768	1,408,502,979	23,863,443	
1888	683,862,104	12,092,403	695,954,507	723,957,114	1,419,911,621		28,002,607
1889	730,282,609	12,118,766	742,401,375	745,131,652	1,487,533,027		2,730,277
1890	845,293,828	12,534,856	857,828,684	789,310,409	1,647,139,093	68,518,275	
1891	872,270,283	12,210,527	884,480,810	844,916,196	1,729,397,006	39,564,614	
1892	1,015,732,011	14,546,137	1,030,278,148	827,402,462	1,857,680,610	202,875,686	
Total	20,775,431,634	699,651,087	21,475,082,721	21,071,734,804	42,546,817,525	1,803,246,015	1,399,898,098
Total excess of exports						403,347,917	

Monetary systems and approximate stocks of money in the aggregate and per capita in the principal countries of the world.

Countries.	Monetary system.	Ratio between gold and full legal-tender silver.	Ratio between gold and limited-tender silver.	Population.	Stock of gold.
United States	Gold and silver.	1 to 15.98	1 to 14.95	67,000,000	$604,000,000
United Kingdom	Gold		1 to 14.28	38,000,000	550,000,000
France	Gold and silver	1 to 15½	1 to 14.38	39,000,000	800,000,000
Germany	Gold		1 to 13.957	49,500,000	600,000,000
Belgium	Gold and silver	1 to 15½	1 to 14.38	6,100,000	65,000,000
Italy	do	1 to 15½	1 to 14.38	31,000,000	93,605,000
Switzerland	do	1 to 15½	1 to 14.38	3,000,000	15,000,000
Greece	do	1 to 15½	1 to 14.38	2,200,000	2,000,000
Spain	do	1 to 15½	1 to 14.38	18,000,000	40,000,000
Portugal	Gold		1 to 14.08	5,000,000	40,000,000
Austria-Hungary	do		1 to 13.69	40,000,000	40,000,000
Netherlands	Gold and silver	1 to 15½	1 to 15	4,500,000	25,000,000
Scandinavian Union	Gold		1 to 14.88	8,600,000	32,000,000
Russia	Silver	1 to 15½	1 to 15	113,000,000	250,000,000
Turkey	Gold and silver		1 to 15.1	33,000,000	50,000,000
Australia	Gold		1 to 14.28	4,000,000	100,000,000
Egypt	do		1 to 15.68	7,000,000	100,000,000
Mexico	Silver	1 to 16½		11,600,000	5,000,000
Central America	do	1 to 15½		3,000,000	
South America	do	1 to 15½		35,000,000	45,000,000
Japan	Gold and silver	1 to 16.18		40,000,000	90,000,000
India	Silver	1 to 15		255,000,000	
China	do			400,000,000	
The Straits					
Canada	Gold		1 to 14.95	4,500,000	16,000,000
Cuba, Haiti, etc	do	1 to 15½		2,000,000	20,000,000
Total					3,582,605,000

Countries.	Monetary system.	Stock of silver.			Uncovered paper.	Per capita.			
		Full tender.	Limited tender.	Total.		Gold.	Silver.	Paper.	Total.
United States	Gold and silver	$538,000,000	$77,000,000	$615,000,000	$412,000,000	$9.01	$9.18	$6.15	$24.34
United Kingdom	Gold		100,000,000	100,000,000	50,000,000	14.47	2.63	1.32	18.42
France	Gold and silver	650,000,000	50,000,000	700,000,000	81,402,000	20.52	17.95	2.09	40.56
Germany	Gold	103,000,000	108,000,000	211,000,000	107,000,000	12.12	4.26	2.16	18.54
Belgium	Gold and silver	48,400,000	6,600,000	55,000,000	54,000,000	10.66	9.02	8.85	25.53
Italy	do	16,000,000	34,200,000	50,200,000	163,471,000	3.01	1.62	5.27	9.91
Switzerland	do	11,400,000	3,600,000	15,000,000	14,000,000	5.00	5.00	4.67	14.67
Greece	do	1,800,000	2,200,000	4,000,000	14,000,000	.91	1.82	6.36	9.09
Spain	do	120,000,000	38,000,000	158,000,000	100,000,000	2.22	8.78	5.50	16.50
Portugal	Gold		10,000,000	10,000,000	45,000,000	8.00	2.00	9.00	19.00
Austria-Hungary	do	90,000,000		90,000,000	260,000,000	1.00	2.25	6.50	9.75
Netherlands	Gold and silver	61,800,000	3,200,000	65,000,000	40,000,000	5.55	14.42	8.89	28.88
Scandinavian Union	Gold		10,000,000	10,000,000	27,000,000	3.72	1.16	3.14	8.02
Russia	Silver	22,000,000	38,000,000	60,000,000	500,000,000	2.21	.53	4.42	7.16
Turkey	Gold and silver		45,000,000	45,000,000		1.52	1.36		2.88
Australia	Gold		7,000,000	7,000,000		25.00	1.75		26.75
Egypt	do		15,000,000	15,000,000		14.29	2.14		16.43
Mexico	Silver	50,000,000		50,000,000	2,000,000	.43	4.31	.17	4.91
Central America	do	500,000		500,000	2,000,000		.17	.67	.84
South America	do	25,000,000		25,000,000	600,000,000	1.29	.71	17.14	19.14
Japan	Gold and silver	50,000,000		50,000,000	56,000,000	2.25	1.25	1.40	4.90
India	Silver	900,000,000		900,000,000	28,000,000		3.53	.11	3.64
China	do	700,000,000		700,000,000			1.75		1.75
The Straits		100,000,000		100,000,000					
Canada	Gold		5,000,000	5,000,000	40,000,000	3.56	1.11	8.89	13.56
Cuba, Haiti, etc	do	1,200,000	800,000	2,000,000	40,000,000	10.00	1.00	20.00	31.00
Total		3,489,100,000	553,600,000	4,042,700,000	2,035,873,000				

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT, *August 16, 1893.*

Coinage of nations of the world from 1792 to 1892.

Countries.	Years.	Gold.	Silver.
United States	1793-1892	$1,585,302,060	$611,358,811
Great Britain	1816-1891	1,160,960,074	151,925,944
France	1795-1891	1,689,785,518	1,025,314,200
Mexico	1792-1891	79,725,408	1,733,298,368
Belgium	1832-1891	115,538,049	103,128,149
Switzerland	1866-1891	3,201,484	6,910,027
Italy	1851-1891	92,965,850	113,250,035
Germany	1857-1891	623,291,883	277,769,824
Netherlands	1847-1891	31,488,365	189,719,348
Scandinavian Union	1873-1891	29,613,957	11,673,564
Russia	1800-1891	965,411,163	234,098,081
Japan	1871-1891	63,429,611	111,671,255
Chile	1872-1888	65,927,408	38,306,775
Australasia	1855-1891	550,418,328	1,479,416
India	1835-1891	11,710,832	1,575,343,309
Austria-Hungary	1857-1891	94,439,473	278,687,921
Spain	1876-1891	192,677,344	154,580,160
Portugal	1854-1891	8,185,138	20,813,755
Greece	1867-1885	2,316,000	5,068,732
Servia	1882-1885	1,930,000	868,500
Roumania	1879-1884	734,365	15,092,600
Bulgaria	1883-1885	....	2,160,120
Argentine Republic	1882-1888	26,438,817	2,710,639
Brazil	1849-1891	6,488,301	11,412,565
Egypt	1830-1891	13,539,113	9,219,605
Turkey	1844-1891	143,756,546	42,333,102
Central American States	1829-1877	2,318,381	373,919
Colombia	1868-1891	3,053,464	5,719,179
Venezuela	1874-1891	660,500	2,495,991
Total	....	7,564,307,452	6,736,784,794

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Bureau of the Mint, August 18, 1893.*

Table showing the amount of metallic reserve, circulation, and uncovered notes of the principal European banks.

Names of banks.	Gold.	Silver.	Notes.	Uncovered notes.	1893.
Bank of France	$334,172,822	$249,266,996	$771,722,995	$188,283,177	June 29
Bank of England	146,087,502	....	124,432,974	....	June 28
Sixty-six English private banks	....	....	4,379,329	4,379,329	May 27
Thirty-seven English joint stock banks	....	....	5,889,668	5,889,668	May 27
Irish banks	*15,579,769	....	31,639,219	26,059,450	May 20
Scotch banks	*24,689,847	....	32,895,097	32,895,097	May 20
Bank of Germany	163,504,667	81,751,873	234,857,290	10,399,050	June 24
Other German banks	*26,507,690	....	45,538,920	18,941,230	June 22
Belgium	*21,179,008	....	79,003,761	57,824,753	July 2
Netherlands	15,636,064	34,932,210	75,133,893	14,765,619	June 25
Bank of Spain	36,965,934	24,940,812	161,825,724	99,918,978	June 25
Bank of Austria-Hungary	28,801,813	80,667,104	193,745,098	84,273,181	June 22
Bank of Italy	39,815,900	21,527,413	116,014,616	54,671,303	May 10
Other banks of Italy	36,129,600	31,271,404	104,895,500	36,494,496	May 10
Imperial bank of Russia	190,954,897	....	696,661,411	....	May 27
Ottoman Bank	*8,287,613	....	4,818,438	....	Feb. 28
Bank of Roumania	*15,573,363	....	25,306,546	9,733,183	May 8
Bank of Portugal	2,354,600	4,207,400	53,383,800	46,821,800	May 24
National Bank of Denmark	*14,282,000	....	20,207,100	5,925,100	Apr. 30
National Bank of Greece	*424,600	....	21,731,800	21,307,200	Apr. 30
Bank of Sweden	4,498,900	984,300	10,827,300	5,346,100	Apr. 30
Other banks of Sweden	2,026,500	2,605,500	6,236,900	1,604,900	Apr. 30
Bank of Norway	*6,716,400	....	14,629,400	7,913,000	Apr. 30
Swiss banks	13,417,167	3,683,598	31,843,456	4,742,691	May 31
Bank of Servia	1,659,800	791,300	5,106,780	2,655,680	May 8
Bank of Bulgaria	907,100	135,100	212,300	....	Mar. 14

*Includes silver.

Highest, lowest, and average price of silver bullion, and value of a fine ounce, bullion value of a United States silver dollar, and commercial ratio of silver to gold by fiscal years, 1874 to 1893.

Fiscal years.	Highest.	Lowest.	Average London price per ounce standard .925.	Equivalent value of a fine ounce with exchange at par, $4.8665.	Equivalent value of a fine ounce based on average price of exchange.	Bullion value of a United States silver dollar, at average price of silver, exchange at par.	Commercial ratio of silver to gold.
	Pence.	*Pence.*	*Pence.*				
1873-'74	59 5/16	57 7/8	58.312	$1.27826	$1.28247	$0.98865	16.17
1874-'75	58 1/4	55 1/2	56.875	1.25127	1.25022	.96777	16.52
1875-'76	57 1/8	50	52.750	1.15184	1.15954	.89087	17.94
1876-'77	58 1/4	50 1/4	54.812	1.20154	1.20191	.92931	17.20
1877-'78	55 5/8	52 1/2	52.562	1.15222	1.15257	.89116	17.94
1878-'79	52 13/16	48 7/8	50.812	1.11386	1.11616	.86152	18.55
1879-'80	53 3/4	51 1/8	52.218	1.14436	1.14397	.88509	18.06
1880-'81	52 7/8	51	51.937	1.13852	1.13508	.88057	18.15
1881-'82	52 5/16	50 7/8	51.812	1.13623	1.13817	.87880	18.19
1882-'83	52 1/16	50	51.023	1.11826	1.11912	.86490	18.48
1883-'84	51 3/8	50 5/16	50.791	1.11339	1.11529	.86115	18.56
1884-'85	50 13/16	48 3/4	49.843	1.09262	1.09226	.84507	18.92
1885-'86	49 3/16	42	47.038	1.03112	1.03295	.79750	20.04
1886-'87	47 1/8	42	44.843	.98301	.98148	.76029	21.02
1887-'88	45 3/16	41 5/8	43.675	.95741	.95617	.74008	21.59
1888-'89	44 1/4	41 15/16	42.499	.93163	.93510	.72055	22.18
1889-'90	49	42	44.196	.96883	.96839	.74932	21.33
1890-'91	54 1/2	43 7/8	47.714	1.04195	1.04780	.80588	19.83
1891-'92	46 3/8	39	42.737	.93648	.93723	.72430	22.07
1892-'93	40 3/16	30 1/2	38.375	.84123	.84263	.65063	24.57
July	34 1/4	32 1/8	33.060	.72471	.72037	.56052	28.52

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of the Mint, August 1, 1893.

Value of silver coin and bullion imported into and exported from the United States from 1843 to 1892, inclusive; also excess of exports.

[Compiled from United States Statistical Abstract, 1892.]

Period—Year ending June 30.	Exports.		Total exports.	Imports.	Excess of exports.
	Domestic.	Foreign.			
1843; 9 months-1852	$62,832,863	$33,874,235	$96,707,098	$30,253,698	$66,453,400
1853-1862	400,451,426	25,883,707	426,355,133	42,707,040	383,628,093
1863-1872	188,187,965	49,611,875	237,799,840	60,754,850	177,044,990
1873-1882	186,073,265	58,439,564	244,512,829	113,503,974	131,008,855
1883	12,702,272	7,517,173	20,219,445	10,755,242	9,464,203
1884	14,931,431	11,119,995	26,051,426	14,594,945	11,456,481
1885	21,634,551	12,119,082	33,753,633	16,550,626	17,203,006
1886	19,158,051	10,353,168	29,511,219	17,850,307	11,660,912
1887	17,005,036	9,291,468	26,296,504	17,260,191	9,036,313
1888	20,635,420	7,402,529	28,037,949	15,403,669	12,634,280
1889	25,284,662	11,404,586	36,689,248	18,678,215	18,011,033
1890	22,378,557	12,495,372	34,873,929	21,032,984	13,840,945
1891	14,033,714	8,557,274	22,590,988	18,026,880	4,564,108
1892	16,765,067	16,045,492	32,810,559	19,955,086	12,855,478
Total	1,022,074,280	274,115,520	1,296,189,830	417,327,708	878,862,092

Value of gold coin and bullion imported into and exported from the United States from 1843 to 1892: also excess of imports or exports.

[Compiled from United States Statistical Abstract, 1892.]

Year ending June 30—	Exports.		Total exports.	Imports.	Excess of exports over imports.	Excess of imports over exports.
	Domestic.	Foreign.				
1843 (nine mos.)–1852	....	$25,602,569	$25,602,569	$58,465,192	....	$32,862,623
1853–1862*	$31,044,651	32,264,862	63,309,513	86,596,255	....	23,286,742
1863–1872	498,264,195	35,442,456	533,706,651	98,954,642	$434,752,009	....
1873–1881	236,234,553	19,997,089	156,231,642	310,243,192	....	54,011,550
1883	8,920,909	2,679,979	11,600,888	17,734,149	....	6,133,261
1884	35,294,204	5,787,753	41,081,957	22,831,317	18,250,640	....
1885	2,741,559	5,736,333	8,477,892	26,691,696	....	18,213,804
1886	32,766,066	10,186,125	42,952,191	20,743,349	22,208,842	....
1887	5,705,304	3,995,883	9,701,187	42,910,601	....	33,209,414
1888	12,560,084	5,816,150	18,376,234	43,934,317	....	25,558,083
1889	54,930,332	5,021,953	59,952,850	10,284,858	49,667,427	....
1890	13,403,632	3,870,859	17,274,491	12,943,342	4,331,149	....
1891	84,939,561	1,423,103	86,362,654	18,232,567	68,130,087	....
1892	43,321,351	6,873,976	50,195,327	49,699,454	495,873	....
Total	1,060,126,391	164,699,090	1,224,825,481	820,261,931	597,836,027	193,275,477
Total excess of exports	....	....	....	....	404,560,550	

*Report of domestic shipments commences with 1862.

Commercial ratio of silver to gold for each year since 1687.

[NOTE.—From 1687 to 1832 the ratios are taken from the tables of Dr. A. Soetbeer; from 1833 to 1878 from Pixley and Abell's tables; and from 1878 to 1892 from daily cablegrams from London to the Bureau of the Mint.]

Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.
1687	14.94	1714	15.13	1741	14.92	1768	14.80
1688	14.94	1715	15.11	1742	14.85	1769	14.72
1689	15.02	1716	15.09	1743	14.85	1770	14.62
1690	15.02	1717	15.13	1744	14.87	1771	14.66
1691	14.98	1718	15.11	1745	14.98	1772	14.52
1692	14.92	1719	15.09	1746	15.13	1773	14.62
1693	14.83	1720	15.04	1747	15.26	1774	14.62
1694	14.87	1721	15.05	1748	15.11	1775	14.72
1695	15.02	1722	15.17	1749	14.80	1776	14.55
1696	15.00	1723	15.20	1750	14.55	1777	14.54
1697	15.20	1724	15.11	1751	14.39	1778	14.68
1698	15.07	1725	15.11	1752	14.54	1779	14.80
1699	14.94	1726	15.15	1753	14.54	1780	14.72
1700	14.81	1727	15.24	1754	14.48	1781	14.78
1701	15.07	1728	15.11	1755	14.68	1782	14.42
1702	15.52	1729	14.92	1756	14.94	1783	14.48
1703	15.17	1730	14.81	1757	14.87	1784	14.70
1704	15.22	1731	14.94	1758	14.85	1785	14.92
1705	15.11	1732	15.09	1759	14.15	1786	14.96
1706	15.27	1733	15.18	1760	14.14	1787	14.92
1707	15.44	1734	15.39	1761	14.54	1788	14.65
1708	15.41	1735	15.41	1762	15.27	1789	14.75
1709	15.31	1736	15.18	1763	14.99	1790	15.04
1710	15.22	1737	15.02	1764	14.70	1791	15.05
1711	15.29	1738	14.91	1765	14.83	1792	15.17
1712	15.31	1739	14.91	1766	14.80	1793	15.00
1713	15.24	1740	14.94	1767	14.85	1794	15.37

Commercial ratio of silver to gold for each year since 1687—Continued.

Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.	Year.	Ratio.
1795	15.55	1820	15.62	1845	15.92	1870	15.57
1796	15.65	1821	15.95	1846	15.90	1871	15.57
1797	15.41	1822	15.80	1847	15.80	1872	15.63
1798	15.59	1823	15.84	1848	15.85	1873	15.92
1799	15.74	1824	15.82	1849	15.78	1874	16.17
1800	15.68	1825	15.70	1850	15.70	1875	16.59
1801	15.46	1826	15.76	1851	15.46	1876	17.88
1802	15.26	1827	15.74	1852	15.59	1877	17.22
1803	15.41	1828	15.78	1853	15.33	1878	17.94
1804	15.41	1829	15.78	1854	15.33	1879	18.40
1805	15.79	1830	15.82	1855	15.38	1880	18.05
1806	15.52	1831	15.72	1856	15.38	1881	18.16
1807	15.43	1832	15.73	1857	15.27	1882	18.19
1808	16.08	1833	15.93	1858	15.38	1883	18.64
1809	15.96	1834	15.73	1859	15.19	1884	18.57
1810	15.77	1835	15.80	1860	15.29	1885	19.41
1811	15.53	1836	15.72	1861	15.50	1886	20.78
1812	16.11	1837	15.83	1862	15.35	1887	21.13
1813	16.25	1838	15.85	1863	15.37	1888	21.99
1814	15.04	1839	15.62	1864	15.37	1889	22.09
1815	15.26	1840	15.62	1865	15.44	1890	19.75
1816	15.28	1841	15.70	1866	15.43	1891	20.92
1817	15.11	1842	15.87	1867	15.57	1892	23.72
1818	15.35	1843	15.93	1868	15.59	1893*	28.52
1819	15.33	1844	15.85	1869	15.60		

* For seven months ending July 31, 1893.

Wages and price of silver bullion per ounce in the United States for fifty calendar years, 1841 to 1891.

The average of wages from Report on Prices, Wages, and Transportation, Fifty-second Congress, second session, Senate Report 139, page 14; the price for silver bullion from International Monetary Conference, Treasury Department, October 12, 1892, page 42.

The average wages paid are expressed by the index number 100 in the year 1860, and in gold.

Year.	Average wages.	Price of silver.	Year.	Average wages.	Price of silver.
	Per cent.			*Per cent.*	
1841	88.0	$1.316	1867	117.1	$1.328
1842	87.1	1.303	1868	114.9	1.326
1843	86.6	1.297	1869	119.5	1.325
1844	86.5	1.304	1870	133.7	1.328
1845	86.8	1.298	1871	147.8	1.326
1846	89.3	1.30	1872	152.2	1.322
1847	90.8	1.308	1873	148.3	1.298
1848	91.4	1.304	1874	145.0	1.278
1849	92.5	1.309	1875	140.8	1.246
1850	92.7	1.316	1876	135.2	1.156
1851	90.4	1.337	1877	136.4	1.201
1852	90.8	1.326	1878	140.5	1.152
1853	91.8	1.348	1879	139.9	1.123
1854	95.8	1.348	1880	141.5	1.145
1855	98.0	1.344	1881	146.5	1.138
1856	99.2	1.344	1882	149.9	1.136
1857	99.9	1.353	1883	152.7	1.11
1858	98.5	1.344	1884	152.7	1.113
1859	99.1	1.36	1885	150.7	1.0645
1860	100.0	1.352	1886	150.9	.9946
1861	100.8	1.333	1887	153.7	.97823
1862	100.4	1.346	1888	155.4	.93897
1863	76.2	1.345	1889	156.7	.93512
1864	80.8	1.345	1890	158.9	1.04633
1865	66.2	1.333	1891	160.7	.98782
1866	108.8	1.339			

Table showing the amount, price paid, and present market value of silver bullion purchased under the laws of 1878 and 1890, stated separately; also the number of silver dollars coined since 1878 and their present bullion value.

[Compiled by the Acting Director of the Mint.]

	Fine ounces.	Cost.
Purchased under act of 1878	291,272,019	$308,199,262
Purchased under act of 1890	160,157,168	149,661,211
Total	451,429,187	457,860,473

Value of same at market price for silver, August 12, at 75 cents per ounce	$338,585,890
Depreciation	119,274,583
Silver dollars coined	419,332,450
Worth at to-day's market price (75 cents per ounce)	243,245,581
Difference between coin and bullion value	176,086,866

The only countries in which the coinage of silver is free are Mexico and Japan, and one or two of the South American states, which have an irredeemable paper currency.

BUREAU OF THE MINT, *August 12, 1863.*

303

O