

**THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM.**

---

**SPEECH**

**OF**

**HON. JOHN T. MORGAN,**

**OF ALABAMA,**

**IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE,**

**Monday, April 4, 1892.**

---

**WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
THE DEMOCRAT PUBLISHING CO.,  
1892.**



SPEECH  
OF  
HON. JOHN T. MORGAN,  
OF ALABAMA,  
IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE,

Monday April 4, 1892.

THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolutions; which were read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Finance is directed to make examination, and report to the Senate as soon as practicable—

1. What has been the effect on the price of silver bullion, of the provisions of the act of July 14 1890, directing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of Treasury notes thereon, and whether the said act has in any manner contributed to promote or sustain the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals, gold and silver, on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law, as declared in section 2 of said act.

2. Whether the issue of Treasury notes as provided in said act has been and will be a sufficient provision of law for maintaining "the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio." or whether any and what further legislation is necessary to provide a new ratio between gold and silver to keep them on a parity with each other.

3. Whether the Treasury notes that have been issued under the first section of said act of July 14, 1890, have at any time, or at any place, been at a discount in exchange for gold or silver coin; and whether, in the judgment of said committee, they are likely to be at such discount, if said act shall remain permanently in full force and operation. And further, whether said Treasury notes furnish to the people a safe and sound legal-tender currency, as good for their purposes as gold coin or silver coin; and further, whether said Treasury notes have at any time since the date of the act of July 14, 1890, taken the place in our national currency of large sums of gold coin that were sent to Europe for speculative purposes, and whether the presence of those Treasury notes in our volume of currency during the absence of such large sums of gold did not save our people and our Government from a dangerous financial crisis and threatened bankruptcy.

4. Whether the coinage or issue of any dollar of gold or silver is now authorized by the laws of the United States, and, if so, under what laws such coinage permitted, and further, whether it is a safe financial system to authorize the printing and issue of paper dollars, and to forbid the coinage of gold or silver dollars.

5. Whether it is just to the people who are compelled to use the subsidiary coins of the United States in their daily business, and to receive them in payment for labor, and also to use them in payment for food, medicine, raiment, and shelter, that such coins should contain less pure silver than the full legal-tender silver dollar in which their creditors and bankers have the right to collect their debts from them.

6. That said committee ascertain, and report to the Senate, as nearly as they may the proportion of the silver coin and gold coin that is in actual circulation in Great Britain and the European states; in Russia, China, and Japan; in India, Turkey, and Egypt; and in Australasia, Canada, the United States, and each of the other commercial states on this hemisphere; and in Hawaii and the West Indian Islands.

2. *Resolved further*, That inasmuch as great anxiety exists among the industrial classes of the United States as to the causes of the depression of prices and the paralysis of markets for their production: and, as their sufferings are severe, that said committee shall proceed promptly to inform the Senate upon the matters submitted to them under the foregoing resolutions, except the sixth, and, as to that resolution, they shall have authority to send for persons and papers if they shall see fit.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I know that this is a subject which strikes upon the attention of some Senators in an alarming way, because the people of the United States are very earnest in their desire to have some relief from existing financial conditions and embarrassments and some of us are not ready to act. I know that the behests of party stand in the way of a free expression of opinion in this body upon a question of finance that has now been mooted for twenty years in the direction of the free coinage of silver; and I feel the embarrassment that any man would feel under such circumstances in bringing forward and discussing a matter which I think the people of the United States desire and are determined to further investigate; if we of the Senate are not willing to express our opinions by our votes and otherwise upon a question of this kind they will express an opinion for us at the ballot box next November, and on other occasions.

I am not of those who believe that the restoration of the financial system of the country to a condition suited to the wants of the people, depends exclusively upon the remonetization of silver with all of its free-coinage privileges. I think perhaps there are some other things requisite to be done in addition to that, to make the financial system worthy of the American people and our country with all of its vast and wonderful powers and resources.

I believe that since 1878, when we took the first step in the direction of the restoration of the finances of the United States to their former and normal condition before they were revolutionized by the act of 1873, we have made very great progress. We have brought the country up to a very much better condition than it was prior to 1878 and back to 1873, when the demonetization of silver took place. I am encouraged to believe that there are in the act of 1890 several provisions that are worthy of consideration. I think we shall ascertain, upon the investigation to be ordered under these resolutions, that the act has accomplished some good, perhaps a great deal of good, for the people of the United States.

I think that it ought to be amended and reformed, and whatever of movement I should be disposed to make for the relief of the financial conditions would be first of all in the direction of amending and reforming the act of 1890. I would not give up one inch of the ground that we have gained in the enactment of that statute, but improving upon the condition as it has been established, after long and laborious efforts and struggles. I would try still to step to the front and do for the country other things that are just as requisite to be done as were those provided under that law.

I am not a doctrinaire on the subject of the free coinage of silver. I think that is a practical question and not simply a question of political economy. I think that it is no more a doctrinal question of political economy than is the alleged operation of the Gresham law. The Gresham law is regarded by almost all political economists, and especially by doctrinaires, as being an infallible rule for the people of this country in respect to the coinage of gold and silver. The infallibility of that rule has been very severely tested and has been disproved by the experience of the United States in the most signal way on various occasions. I prefer above the Gresham law or any other law of political economies the Constitution of the United States.

I prefer the foundations on which our fathers rested the financial system of this country, and upon which they expected that we should maintain it, and I am unwilling to have any legislation until that Constitution is altered, which abrogates any one of its provisions, which retires to the rear the provisions or guarantees made in that instrument in favor of gold and in favor of silver as the coinage of the United States. The people of this country also have that impression, and have had it since the foundation of our Government, and they are not satisfied now, nor will they ever be satisfied, until full constitutional sway is given in our legislation in respect of both these metals.

Bimetallism was established in the Constitution when gold and silver were wedded together, in the very language of that instrument, and in the only process by which they could be reduced to circulating medium, that of coinage. No man has the right to put them asunder by destroying one of these metals or making either of them inefficient in the service of the country in all of its financial operations and powers.

Our fathers, for good reason and in the most careful way, ascertained and regulated their actual value, and their relative value to each other by comparing each metal with other standard productions through the history of many generations of people. They "regulated the value" of these coins and fixed the proper ratio at 15 to 1, because that was the purchasing power of the coins of each metal through a long series of years. If this had not been disturbed in 1834, so as to advance the relative value of gold, we should have had no trouble with the ratio, but they fixed them at 16 for 1, leaving the fine silver in a dollar at 371½ grains, where it still stands.

The argument is so very strong, so direct, and so impressive in favor of bimetallism that there is not a single gold standard man in this Senate to-day—and there are several here—who is willing candidly to confess that he is not a bimetallist, not one. They will tell you in debate, they will write it in letters, they will print it in speeches, that they are for bimetallism, that that is the chief point to which their hopes are directed, and until that is accomplished they can never be satisfied with the financial situation in the United States, and they will tell you of many expedients and means by which they hope ultimately and after a long lapse of years and of suffering to reach the condition where they can afford to be bimetallists in practice as well as in theory, but those conditions are plainly impossible.

Bimetallism, Mr. President, is indispensable from the very language of the Constitution of the United States. No man can strike out gold as a money metal and obey the Constitution, nor can any man strike out silver as a money metal and obey the Constitution; and it is no obedience to the Constitution of the United States that we are willing to give a small portion of the circulating medium of this coun-

try in the shape of subsidiary silver coins, which are 6 cents on the dollar less in value than the standard silver coins and gold coins of the United States, into the hands of the industrial classes who earn their bread every day.

A man who is willing merely to give the common industrial laboring people of this country only subsidiary coins upon the basis of our present statute laws, which subsidiary coins are  $28\frac{1}{2}$  grains short in weight of the pure metal, the standard metal of the silver dollar authorized to be coined under the laws of the United States, is not a bimettallist. He is a hypocrite. He pretends to be a bimettallist when he is only willing to dole out, as we are doing, about \$67,000,000 into the hands of the common industrial classes of this country in the shape of subsidiary silver coins, at a loss of six cents on every dollar, and compel them to take them in sums of \$10 or under, as legal tender, and then refuses to permit them to pay a \$20 debt in anything but standard gold coin or standard silver coin, or a greenback. He makes our silver coins and gold coins worth 6 cents on the dollar more than the \$10, with which the laboring man could pay a small debt. That is not bimettallism.

That, Mr. President, is "holding the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope." That is a positive wrong committed daily, hourly, and every moment upon those classes of our fellow-citizens in this country who every day labor for wages, and at nightfall buy, with the proceeds of their day's labor, something wherewith to feed themselves or clothe themselves or some shelter, into which they may creep.

I suppose that the sixty-five or seventy millions of people in the United States, those who labor every day for the bread of life and those who do not labor, use in their daily transactions more of this debased subsidiary coin than is used of standard coin in the daily transactions of the men engaged in the commerce of this country by actual exchange from hand to hand. What I mean to say is this: That the people who use and handle and are compelled to use and handle, who are compelled to earn and receive and compelled to live upon these debased subsidiary coins, handle a larger aggregate amount during one day in their transactions in the United States than there is of standard gold and silver coin actually handled in the other transactions of the country.

So then that bimettallist, as he calls himself, who is willing to compel the ordinary laboring population of this country to use this debased silver coin,  $28\frac{1}{2}$  grains below the standard value, in their daily transactions, is a man who has got his own consent, for the purpose of dubbing himself by a title which he thinks is popular, to rob the people he represents. This robbery is the basis of the claims of many to be considered as bimettallists.

The division of opinion and demarkation by lines of action in this country between the silver men and the gold men is simply this: The silver men want bimettallism; they want the metals placed upon a parity with each other and kept there. The gold men do not want bimettallism. They want the silver destroyed, driven out of the currency, dishonored, and reduced to the mere capacity or condition of a commodity.

The money character of silver—that character by which alone we are entitled to call it a precious metal—they ignore and discard and scout, and they are not willing to have it; they are not willing that it shall perform any function in this country, except the same that wheat and corn and cotton perform, of being a mere commodity of commerce, except only that they are willing to pinch out of it enough to furnish the ordinary laboring people of this land debased subsidiary coins to serve them in their daily transactions.

Now, I commend this to those gentlemen who have been so eloquent and so persistent in their efforts to make the world believe that the free coinage men in the United States are desirous of putting a cheap dollar upon the people. You put cheap, debased half dollars upon the people and you compel them by law to take them. Then you cry out fraud against the friends of standard dollars. There is not now in the United States, according to the laws of the United States, the opportunity to coin a gold coin of less than \$5 in denomination. The gold dollar is stricken out by the act of last Congress as a coin, and no man can coin a gold dollar any more in the United States. It is my opinion that not only the theory but the practice under the law of 1890 has had the same effect upon the silver dollar; so that as a matter of fact there is no law, no mandatory statute in the United States for the coinage of a dollar of gold or a dollar of silver.

I can demonstrate, I think, to the satisfaction of anybody, any plain common-sense man, that the power to coin silver dollars to-day, corresponding precisely with the practice, as I will show it now in a few moments, of the Treasury Depart-

ment is a mere discretionary power left in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury which he may exercise or not at his will and pleasure. If I were to go there with any sort of demand, or present any kind of urgency or emergency that an American citizen could feel or experience in respect of the necessity of having silver dollars coined, the Secretary of the Treasury could turn to me and say "the power to coin silver dollars under the act of 1890, which repealed all antecedent acts, is with me entirely a discretionary power, and I can coin them or I can refuse to coin them at my will and pleasure." Therefore, Mr. President, there is no mandatory law, there is no statute having the force and effect of law in the United States to-day for the coinage either of a gold dollar or of a silver dollar.

I suppose that no one in this august and splendid body of men will be heard to say that a permission given by law to the Secretary of the Treasury to coin silver dollars of the standard value for the purpose of redeeming the coin certificates issued under the provisions of the act of 1890, is a law for the coinage of silver.

Left in that situation, without any coinage law for silver or gold dollars at all, you compel the people hereafter, if this law stands just as it is and if the action of the Secretary of the Treasury is to be just what it is now and has been heretofore, you compel the people of the United States by positive law to receive subsidiary coin for their daily toil, their daily productions, whatever they may be, and you refuse them permission to handle or to have any other minor gold coin, I will call it, or any other silver coin except the debased subsidiary coin.

The biggest coin that a man can hold by the law of the United States if that coin is struck to-day, whether of gold or of silver, is the half dollar. The Secretary of the Treasury may dole out to him, if he sees proper, a dollar, but he can not issue that dollar except in the redemption of coin certificates; he can not coin it for any other purpose than the redemption of the coin certificates. A man must hold a coin certificate and go there with it for redemption before he can respectfully or respectably insist that he shall put his mint to work and strike a dollar that he wants to use in silver, in place of paper money, that he can take with him and circulate amongst the people.

That is the condition we are in to-day in respect of our gold and silver coinage; and while the world is standing tiptoe—no, not the world, but the financial kings of the earth are standing tiptoe and belching forth aspersions and denunciations and criminations upon us because the price of 371½ grains of silver is not a dollar in the commercial markets; while they are doing that, knowing very well that the present price of silver has been depressed by the iron heel with which they have crushed it down, using the great power of this great Government, knowing that only they are responsible for the present value of silver, commercially, these men tower in their rage and indignation and scorn when they speak to us about wishing to put out upon the people as a dollar that which can be bought in the markets of the United States as bullion for 80 or 85 cents. [To Mr STEWART]. What is it to-day?

Mr. STEWART. Eighty-seven.

Mr. MORGAN. Eighty-seven. They at the same time in order to increase the power of gold, held in large sums from \$5 up, and in order to increase the power of such issues of money as they may see proper to predicate upon that gold, to be increased or decreased in their purchasing power or in their volume according to their good will and pleasure, they hand out to the people of the United States \$67,000,000 in these debased subsidiary coins, debased by actual requirement of law.

Mr. STEWART. The dollar, if the Senator will allow me, is only about 67 cents. That is made of 412½ grains. It is the ounce which is worth 87 cents.

Mr. MORGAN. The dollar is about 67 cents.

Mr. STEWART. Sixty-seven cents.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I propose as well as I know how to do it in the interests of the people to strip the masks off the faces of those gentlemen and let them for one time look the truth dead in the face.

On Saturday I wrote to the Director of the Mint and asked him some questions about what the practice was under this present act of 1890 in regard to the coinage of the bullion we have been buying, and here is his response:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,  
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1892.

DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your inquiry of the 1st instant whether since June 30, 1891, the silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, has been coined, and to what amount and whether the provisions of that act, as to the coinage of silver bullion are held by the Department to be mandatory or only permissive, I have the honor to reply as follows: The number of silver dollars coined at the mints of the United States since June 30, 1891, from silver bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, has aggregated 1,997,620.

That, however, was for the purpose of supplying a demand that existed prior to the passage of that act.

At present a monthly coinage of silver dollars from purchased bullion is being executed at the mints of the United States at San Francisco, Carson City, and New Orleans.

How much he does not undertake to say.

No silver-dollar coinage is at present being executed at the mint at Philadelphia, which is busily engaged upon the recoinage of subsidiary silver coins and the execution of the necessary minor coinage.

It is held by the Department that the coinage of silver dollars from silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, is discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury and that the only coinage required by that act is an amount sufficient to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes issued under the provision of the same law.

Very respectfully,

E. O. LEECH, Director of the Mint.

Hon. JOHN T. MORGAN, United States Senate.

They have, in practice, stopped coining silver dollars, and they have in theory repudiated the idea that the Congress of the United States in the act of 1890 did anything more than merely to grant a discretionary permission to the Secretary of the Treasury to coin as much of the bullion he may purchase under the provisions of that act as he might consider a necessary provision for redemption. Now, that act means upon its face, as construed fairly and properly and as understood at the time of its passage, that to provide for the redemption of a dollar note issued to the hands of a citizen, there must be a dollar of silver coined and held ready to redeem it, and so with a million dollars. But the Secretary of the Treasury, in practice and in theory, has adopted a rule of the Department by which it is held that it is entirely discretionary with him what amount he shall coin and when he shall coin it.

Mr. President, if the act of 1890 being thus construed is not amended then we acquiesce in having confided into the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury the mere discretion to coin or not to coin the money that has been bought through the labor and toil of the people for the purpose of furnishing a quota of silver money for the use of these great communities that we represent. Who can call that a law? It is a mere protection to the Secretary in exercising his discretion. It saves him from impeachment, and that is all it does, for not obeying what would otherwise be his duty, for we buy that silver, not for the purpose of hoarding it merely in the form of bullion, but we buy it in order to supply silver coinage to the people of the United States and to maintain what? I will read what we have got to maintain as expressed in this act, and a more solemn pledge was never made in the world.

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.

What did we mean by putting that language in that act? Did we mean to maintain a parity between silver bullion and gold coin, or gold bullion and silver coin, or did we mean to maintain a parity between the coins struck from these metals?

It is said, in the words I have quoted, to be the established policy of the Government of the United States to maintain this parity, and yet the Secretary of the Treasury, in view of that solemn declaration on the part of Congress, concludes from the language of the act that he is entirely safe and correct in construing this act to be a mere permission to him to coin the silver bullion in the Treasury at his will and pleasure.

Mr. BUTLER. If I do not disturb the Senator from Alabama, I should like to ask a question for information, if he can give it.

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. I see the Director of the Mint makes no reference to it, but is it true that these monthly purchases of bullion are still going on and that the bullion is being piled up in the Treasury of the country?

Mr. MORGAN. Four and a half millions a month.

Mr. BUTLER. That is still going on, and that is still being piled up in the Treasury, I understand.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I will come to that presently, for I will want to know from the Senator from Kentucky in my rear [Mr. CARLISLE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], who work together in the same line I understand—I will want to know what they are going to do with this bullion when it gets to be a thousand millions or two thousand millions in the Treasury.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to ask the Senator a question, and that is, whether he is not entirely satisfied as a lawyer that the discretion is entirely left to the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir, I am not as a lawyer nor as a Senator nor as an American citizen nor as a man of plain common sense.

Mr. SHERMAN. I can only say there was not the slightest doubt in the minds

of the conference committee that that was to be entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MORGAN. But when that conference committee made its report I happened to rise on the floor of the Senate and say I did not know anything about what they were doing or what was the motive of their action, and it was piteously pleaded that it was indecorous for a man on the floor of the Senate to inquire into the secret performances of any committee. Now, what secret reservations that Senator may have had for the purpose of qualifying the words of this solemn statute, I do not know. All I can go by is the text of the law itself, the face of the text, and there is not a man of ordinary common sense in the United States who would not, I think, believe that it was the purpose of Congress that the two metals should be put upon a parity in their circulation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Undoubtedly. Allow me to say that the language of that law is so plain that I do not see how any Senator, especially so good a lawyer as the Senator from Alabama, could doubt it. It declares that the Government of the United States shall maintain the parity of gold and silver coin.

Mr. TELLER. No; it does not.

Mr. SHERMAN. The gold and silver metals.

Mr. TELLER. That is quite a difference.

Mr. SHERMAN. Not a bit of difference. It also provides distinctly that for every dollar the Treasury of the United States issues under that law, there shall be behind it a dollar's worth of silver according to the gold price at the time it is bought.

Mr. MORGAN. Very good.

Mr. SHERMAN. And that the Secretary of the Treasury shall not coin these silver dollars except as they were needed; and who is to decide that except an executive officer?

Mr. MORGAN. That last clause is not in the law by expression or by intendment or by inference or by a guess of any man, except the man who knows the heart of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understood it so.

Mr. MORGAN. You so understood it, and the conference committee may have so understood it. The Senator from Ohio shaped this measure in the conference committee, and when they got through with it he brought it to the Senate and denied the privilege to a Senator to get up and ask the whys and wherefores and what was meant by this and that and the other thing found in the report of the conference committee.

Mr. CARLISLE. The Senator from Alabama has referred to me in connection with the act of July 14, 1890. I simply desire to say in response to that allusion that I did not support the act of July 14, 1890, either in the committee or in the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I know the Senator did not support it, but I have a letter of the Senator here which supports something worse than that.

Mr. CARLISLE. Possibly I have supported a great many things worse than that.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I think you have, several.

Now, Mr. President, before I get further into this subject I wish to call attention to the point in the letter of the Senator from Kentucky, where he deprecates the results, I suppose, of the act of 1890, or, at all events, he deprecates the policy of that act without designating it in his letter, because he says that it will hoard up enormous masses of metal in the Treasury, and he cites the fact that there are now 12,000 tons of metal in the Treasury of the United States, all of which is hoarded up under the act of the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Ohio both agree that there should not be any of that coined unless the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion should find some convenient opportunity—I will not say of what kind, I will limit it to him no intentions except patriotic intentions and some opportunity to serve his country, not his party or some individual of his party—to coin a modicum of this vast mass of 12,000 tons of silver that lies useless and dead in the Treasury of the United States. Four million five hundred thousand ounces of silver per month will amount to 55,000,000 ounces in a year and the amount of money that may be coined out of those will probably be as much as \$80,000,000 or \$65,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. Nearly \$70,000,000.

Mr. MORGAN. At the present standard?

Mr. STEWART. At the present standard.

Mr. MORGAN. Seventy million dollars a year, and in ten years that is \$700,000,000, and in twenty years' time it is \$1,400,000,000. When does the Senator from

Ohio propose to stop this piling up of bullion in the Treasury? Where does he propose to fix the limit of accumulation of silver put under lock and key and not coined; how long will he keep it in prison bounds and out of competition with gold? What use could the people of the United States make of that silver in the twenty years' during which \$1 400,000,000 of it would be accumulating in the Treasury?

We can not tell exactly when this very peculiar policy of the Senator from Ohio is to stop. When you get ready to stop it, and you have got 200,000,000 ounces or 500 000,000 or 1,000,000,000 ounces of silver in your Treasury, what disposition are you going to make of it when you get ready to stop? Are you to put it up at auction and sell it?

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I suppose if we have to go on we should make the same disposition of it as we do of the three or four hundred millions of silver that lie in the Treasury and can not be forced into circulation with all the power of the Department.

Mr. TELLER. They are all doing money duty.

Mr. MORGAN. The statement of the Senator from Ohio requires to be proved. I am willing to take the Senator's statement about almost any question of fact but just that. When the Government of the United States through all its officials has been retarding the putting of silver money into circulation continually by every manner of device, I must still occupy the ground of doubt upon statements like that. More than that; the Senator speaks of three hundred or four hundred million dollars in the Treasury. We have got the exact amounts here and I will call attention to them.

Mr. HISCOCK. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MORGAN. In a moment. And there are no silver dollars nor is there an ounce of silver bullion in our Treasury this day, unless it has been collected in the way of taxation in some form or other, that is not represented by an active working silver certificate or coin certificate somewhere among the people. Will the Senator deny that?

Mr. SHERMAN. So with the bullion. Every ounce of it is represented.

Mr. MORGAN. I understand that the bullion is so represented as well as the coin.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is easier to keep the bullion than it is to keep silver dollars.

Mr. MORGAN. No, it is not; for a silver dollar has no more power to lift itself up and fly away than a square block of bullion has.

Mr. HISCOCK. Will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HISCOCK. I ask the Senator if he favors the repeal of the act providing for the issue of the certificate issued either upon coin or bullion?

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New York is sitting there and amusing himself with imaginations upon what I may be willing to do upon some proposition not connected with this subject that I am now dealing with.

Mr. HISCOCK. I beg the Senator's pardon, for so long as the certificates are allowed the result will be to pile either the coined silver or the uncoined silver in the Treasury, and it seems to me that to avoid this piling up, of which he complains, there exists a necessity for the repeal of the law which authorizes the issue of the certificates. I have never been able to see any difference between the accumulation of silver dollars and the accumulation of bullion.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator is diverting me from my line of argument; nevertheless, I will stop to say to the Senator that I believe there has been no such institution of paper money found in the United States or any other country as the coin certificate. I believe it has a value far beyond its mere monetary or legal tender value. It has a value beyond a dollar of silver or a dollar of gold. It has a value in being that one instrumentality of the Government of the United States by which all of its credit and all of its power can be brought to do that which is pledged in this act, to maintain the parity between the metals. So I expect not to live to see the day, and I hope that generations will pass before this peculiar American institution of a coin certificate has been allowed to lapse or to fall into decay or into neglect. It is the salvation of the land at this very moment. It has saved the Senator's great metropolis of New York from bankruptcy and ruin within the last nine months.

Mr. HISCOCK. Then I desire to ask the Senator this question: If we continue these certificates, and the Senator is right that that would increase the currency,

free coinage will accumulate more either bullion or coined dollars than are accumulated under what is known as the Sherman law, and instead of stopping this piling up and accumulation of bullion and coin, he is increasing it.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. HISCOCK. That is the point that I desired to bring out.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the Senator think I am afraid to march up to that point? Not by any means. I embrace it with perfect delight.

Mr. HISCOCK. I understood the Senator to attack the Sherman law because there was such an accumulation of silver or coin under it in the storehouses of the Government, and that is what he was trying to restrain.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from New York, very unfairly to me, was simply anticipating or imagining that I was going to do a very foolish thing. I did not expect to do anything of that sort. I was not attacking it at all. I was bringing some facts to the attention of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio, and I want to know what is to be the outcome of it, not that I am dissatisfied with the present prospect, but want to know what the outcome is to be; but I would connect along with this another feature that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Ohio, I suppose, would never consent to connect with it, and that is the option on the part of the holder of bullion to have it coined into dollars and take it into the currency of the country if he wishes to do it, or to accept silver certificates for it at the par value at the Mint. It would connect that option with it which the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New York would refuse to connect with it. Why? They would refuse to connect that option with it for the platuest of all reasons, and that is to say that the silver that would under this option in favor of the holder of bullion find its way into actual circulation would become the competitor of gold. That is the reason they refuse it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that that option now is given to the holder of every certificate issued under that law. He can go and demand a silver dollar at his pleasure and receive it, and if enough people go there and make that demand, as a matter of course the Department would have to coin more and more and more of the silver. So the Secretary now has the option, and if that is all the Senator desires, I should be very willing to give it to him in some other form.

Mr. MORGAN. That is the best illustration of the delusiveness and the wrong and the hidden evils and the concealed purpose of this law that I have yet heard stated on the floor of the Senate or anywhere else.

The Senator from Ohio says a man can go there with his bullion and sell it and he gets his coin certificate for it, and he can turn right around and demand the redemption of it in silver dollar if he wishes. That is the Senator's statement. The Secretary of the Treasury says "No, this is bullion I have in the Treasury. I have not coined it, and I do not intend to coin it except at my will and discretion. I can not pay you in silver coin because I have not got the coin. I have got the bullion, but I have not got the coin. I can refuse you."

You leave it to the option of the Secretary of the Treasury to refuse to coin, and yet you leave to the holder of the silver the right to go there and demand the coin. How can these two propositions meet and coincide and become harmonious under the construction that the Senator from Ohio puts upon his law? Did the Senator mean to say that when he makes a promise to the holder of coin certificate that he can get silver or gold for it on presentation of his certificate, that he could then turn to the Secretary of the Treasury and instruct him that it was purely a matter of discretion with him whether he would coin that silver or not, for the purpose of redeeming the certificate?

I saw at that time, and called attention to it, the absurd incongruity in that law, and I knew then the use that would be made of it, and here it is laid before this Senate to-day in the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury. He has not coined this seventy or eighty million dollars of bullion, not a dollar of it, that was bought with the people's money, these coin certificates, and he does not intend to, except according to his discretion. He does not mean to have an opportunity furnished to any man in the United States to flood this country with silver. He means that gold shall have the whole field, gold in pieces not under the denomination of \$5, and that when he has got you between these walls he can hold you fast until he has ground you still more with the money power of this land.

To my mind, Mr. President, it is a very simple proposition, and the disclosure made on the floor of the Senate to-day is a mere new revelation of a secret purpose couched in this law, which has attended every measure of legislation connected with silver and gold for the last twenty years or more, to dethrone silver entirely,

make it utterly useless and impossible to get hold of, or impossible to circulate it at the will of the owner of bullion, so that the officers of the Treasury Department can rule month after month, and year after year, to increase the purchasing power of gold in this country or to decrease it at pleasure. What they want, and never cease to strive for, is a field of control over industry in all its departments through the power of gold, without any rival competitor.

I am very much obliged to the Senator from Ohio, although he has now left the Chamber, that he has furnished me this opportunity to expose the internal workings of this act and the purpose which attended its passage. I am glad he has enabled me to show to the people of the United States now beyond all question and dispute, that it was the intention of that act of 1890, as it was framed, and the act following immediately afterwards demonetizing the gold dollar, or rather retiring it, to put more power in the hands of the holders of gold and less in the hands of the holders of silver; in other words, to strike down the power of men based upon the holding of silver entirely and to give extraordinary and increased powers to the holders of gold. The people of the United States now understand, if they have never done before, the real animus of that act.

I have other suggestions which are in line with this part of the debate—which has occurred unintentionally so far as I was concerned and rather interrupted the course of my argument, though I am very glad it happened—in considering the demonetizing act of 1873. We can not understand it unless we look at the surrounding facts and circumstances. I will recite some of them and the motives will be perfectly apparent to the Senate when I have mentioned them.

When silver in 1870 had increased, in ten years, from \$150,000 to \$16,000,000—the product of American mines—the holders of gold, the concentrated and, therefore, concentrated money, became greatly alarmed lest their power over industry and commerce should be snatched from the hands of the few who held gold and disseminated it into the hands of the eager people who stretched forth their hands to grasp the relief then apparently in reach, through the merciful providence of God, when the mountains were stored with silver.

The people then had a public debt of the United States to shoulder of \$2,480,672,-472.81, in addition to the debts of the States, counties, cities, and towns, enormous in their proportions, and their private debts—a very heavy burden. Their daily toil had to pay every dollar of this vast sum. It was their only resource. Even from the mines, then yielding \$50,000,000 of gold per annum, they must pay in labor a full dollar's worth for every penny weight.

The industries of eleven of these States were prostrate, and they could not contribute very much to the lifting of this crushing load. The people hailed with delight the yield of the silver mines, for our bonds were payable in coin of the United States, and silver was at a premium. It was to them as "the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." They had the right to pay their debt in silver, and the earth opened its bowels of compassion to aid them.

Then, for this cause, silver was instantly killed as a money metal, and when, after a time, the murder was out and they and their sympathizers saw, too late, that the fatal blow had fallen, in dismay the toilers left their fields and shops and went wandering in the highways, much as the Russian peasantry are wandering to-day, famine stricken, in search of food.

How was this brought about? The answer is, by the same fatal purpose that is now being declared by the opponents of silver. The *Evening Post*, of New York, dated March 30, tells us what the purpose is.

We say that the day of silver and silver bills has passed. \* \* \* Moreover, as the tabling of a bill carries all the amendments with it so the killing of the Bland bill kills international bimetallism, which sooth to say, is only a shade less absurd than national bimetallism, being an attempt on the part of several to lift themselves by the bootstraps all together, instead of separately. Moreover, the killing of the Bland bill kills the present silver law. \* \* \* Another consequence will be the nomination of Mr. Cleveland by the coming Chicago convention.

The purpose has been always the same that it was when, in 1868, in June, Mr. SHERMAN made a report to the Senate from the Finance Committee, in which he declared in favor of "a single standard, exclusively of gold."

Now, I am sorry the Senator from Ohio is not here that I might ask him if he has given up that idea. If he has he is the only anti-silver man of any consequence in the United States who has given it up, unless he has changed to the other side of the question. He reported a bill confining the use of silver to subsidiary coin, the very thing that he has since accomplished by the act of 1890, and the subsequent act refusing coinage hereafter to gold dollars and confining the coinage of silver to subsidiary coin. That was his proposition then as it is now. That is the result of

his legislation; that is the attitude of the Democratic party of the United States, as well as of perhaps two-thirds of the Republican party of this country on this question.

It was then that the destruction of bimetallism, except for subsidiary purposes, began in earnest, and in 1873 it was accomplished by the act which struck the coinage of the silver dollar from our laws, destroyed its legal-tender power as to sums over \$5, and made the gold dollar the sole unit of value. The act of February 6, 1873, provided for the free coinage of trade dollars of 420 grains Troy after killing off the standard dollar of 412½ grains and destroying its legal-tender quality and preventing its coinage, and made them legal tender for \$5, but destroyed every other right of the free coinage of silver.

A main purpose of this law was to unload this silver on China, Japan, and Mexico. It brought our standard of silver dollar coinage up to the Mexican standard, and furnished the Chinese and Japanese a large margin of profit in melting trade dollars and recoinng them into their cash and other silver coins. It was supposed that China would entice the rival of gold from these to happier shores in the Orient, but the mistake was that their commerce would not afford the commodities for exchange with us to pay for our \$10, 000,000 a year of silver product.

To prepare the way for the single standard exclusively of gold raised over the battlements of the wealthy classes by the Senator from Ohio in 1868, in June the Chinese Empire was being courted and flattered into free commerce with us and free immigration by the leading men of the then dominant party, which resulted in the baneful Burlingame treaty in 1870. We are yet in the struggle to protect the lives and honor of our laboring classes against that treaty, the leading purpose of which was to assist the gold men in banishing silver into China. This dump for silver having been found, as was supposed, two years later came the resumption act of January 14, 1875. Silver legal-tender coin having been stricken from existence except as to trade dollars and subsidiary coins with a legal-tender limit of \$5, the resumption act made our redemption of all Government obligations virtually in gold coin. There was nothing else with which to pay; no other coin to be used in this respect but gold coin.

Mr. GEORGE. The trade dollar never was a legal tender.

Mr. MORGAN. The trade dollar never was a legal tender except for \$5. Thus more than \$2,000,000,000 of public debts and all private debts were changed from coin demands to gold demands by the joint action of the act of 1873 and the resumption act coming two years later than the act of 1873, by which silver was stricken out as a money metal.

At last the golden scepter ruled the Republic, and the people got Chinese immigration, the prostration of their industries, the land filled with tramps, the bankrupt law of 1867, and the unlimited issue of money by the national banks, for giving up the right to pay their war bonds in the standard coin of the United States as it was on the day named in the bonds.

When they found that under the Constitution of the United States, and under the pressure of public opinion, it would be a matter of impossibility that the Government could sustain itself in refusing to pay silver out of its vaults upon the war bonds, when they had stipulated expressly that they were payable in the coin of the United States at standard value at the time when both were legal metals, the plan was resorted to of destroying silver absolutely, its opponents saying "dump as much of it as you can into China, but if you can not get it there, destroy it anyhow, get it out of the way, and then we will pass a law of specie resumption," by which the greenback shall be redeemable in coin at the Treasury of the United States through greenback redemption, for that was the lawful money of the United States and there could not be after that any redemption in silver or anything that stood as the representative of silver, because there was none of it left remaining in the Treasury of the United States. That was the situation and that was the result of the act of 1873.

Prior to this time, and in support of the argument that was advanced then by gentlemen in both Houses and by men outside of the Congress of the United States for the reduction or limitation of this country in its financial operations to the single gold basis or single gold standard, the history of the country was looked over, and it was found that some time in our legislation in the United States, in 1834, the ratio between gold and silver being 15 for 1 was raised to 16 for 1, for the purpose of increasing the purchasing power of gold at that time, for which there was a reason, and the same reason that influenced Great Britain in her gold policy when she, I believe, in 1810—if I am not mistaken in that date—concluded she would strike out

her silver money except for subsidiary coin, and that thereafter the pound sterling should be the unit of value, and there should be nothing coined in British mints except gold and subsidiary silver coin.

The struggle to find relief from the hardships of the demonetizing act of 1873 has been very great; but before I proceed with that I will call attention to the following subjects and inquiry: Why the United States and Great Britain first adopted the single gold standard.

In 1834 we thought that the new discoveries of gold in North Carolina and Georgia were going to make us very rich in gold, there being then very little silver produced in the United States, only \$250,000 against \$7,500,007 of gold for the ten years succeeding 1834, and a sum quoted in our Mint report as "insignificant" in respect of silver, against \$14,000,000 in gold from 1792 to 1834.

We then had the same motive, based on our hopes and our experience, that Great Britain has had from 1818 to this time for making her gold the commanding metal in finance, over the silver of Mexico and South America. We then did not dream of the ownership of California, Nevada, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico, with their enormous wealth in silver. In 1854 we produced \$60,000,000 in gold and \$50,000 in silver, and held to our false policy of 1834. In 1864 we produced \$46,000,000 in gold and \$11,000,000 in silver, and the white metal began to be a public rival of gold. Then began the struggle to hold the supremacy of gold, this time against a domestic competitor. Not any longer against Mexico and Peru and Bolivia and Ecuador, but this time against our own mines and our own country.

In 1873 it was a neck-to-neck race between the two metals, the production in that year being, of gold \$36,000,000, and of silver, \$35,750,000, only a difference of \$250,000 between them. The capitalists who had measured the property of the debtor class by the single gold standard, seeing that silver—the unit of value, fixed by law, was about to double the debt-paying ability of the people, resolved that it should die the death.

Silver was then at 3 per cent. premium over gold. It was a rival too powerful and too popular to live, and in a mysterious way it met its death at the hands of Congress. Too many of my Democratic brethren are now, it seems, rejoicing over that taking off to make it agreeable for me to dwell upon the dark picture of its untimely death. In 1883 the production of gold was \$30,000,000, and of silver \$46,200,000, and in 1890, the production of gold was \$32,800,000, and of silver \$70,464,000. In fifty-six years our production of silver grew from \$50,000 to this enormous sum, or 1,409 times its bulk. In fifty-six years it increased 1,409 fold.

Mr. GEORGE. Annual production?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, annual production.

For ten years past the yield has been about one-third gold to two thirds silver, and this ratio is likely to be maintained without material alteration.

The experience of bankers since that business was first begun has been that one-third in volume of coin, as compared with the issues of paper money, is an ample fund for its full redemption. So that, if gold were the sole metal in which our coin certificates could be paid, as has been the case with our bonded indebtedness, and if the silver, on which the coin certificates are issued, should lie dead in the Treasury, we would still be able from the products of gold from our own mines to redeem every dollar of our coin certificates in gold, as they might be presented for redemption.

In 1890 the gold product in Great Britain and all her colonies was about \$35,000,000 and her silver production was about 12,000,000 ounces, say \$15,000,000. Great Britain and her colonies it seems are producing as much gold as the United States and one-sixth as much silver. We are equally as much interested as Great Britain is in the commercial and financial power of gold and six times as much interested in the purchasing power of silver.

Is there not room here for the deep foundations of an American financial policy, based on the yield of our mines, and employed to sustain our great staples of cereals and textiles, our iron, copper, zinc, lead, coal, petroleum, lumber, and the yield of our fisheries; in all of which we have a redundant production, far beyond our wants, to enter into our foreign commerce?

How an American can contemplate the power, influence, and wealth that must flow from this opportune combination of money and material, in reach of the enterprise of this great people, and fear to grasp the golden scepter and wield it in peace and benevolence for the benefit of the world, for the glory of his country, and for the promotion of liberty secured by free constitutional government, is something I must refuse to realize.

Mr. President, we here find that the motive for action on the part of the two governments is a selfish one. There was never anything but a selfish motive for the action of any government, and there never will be. The motive on the part of the Government of Great Britain was that she and her colonies produced very largely of gold and very small quantities of silver. Up to 1834 we did not have that motive, for between the foundation of the Government or, rather, the passage of the coinage acts of 1792 and 1834, we had coined from the products of our own mines and our own mints less than \$10,000,000. I think it is, both gold and silver.

So that ours was not then a country that was a yielder of the precious metals in either form, and we were indifferent at that time in respect of the one metal in its power over the other; hence we adopted both upon the advice of men like Hamilton and Jefferson and others, who took a broad and world-wide examination of questions of finance, and who concluded it was best in accord with the spirit of liberty found in our written Constitution and the spirit of our people and their prosperity and safety for all time to come, that they should have an opportunity of enjoying the benefits of both of the precious metals that the Almighty had placed in the bosom of the earth, doubtless for the purpose of assisting in the civilization and Christianization of mankind.

You may look back over the history of this world in all its parts, national or individual, collective or singular, and you can not find any production of the earth or any other factor that has been so valuable and so indispensable in the promotion of civilization as the divine ordination of silver and gold in their twin connection. It seems to have been established through the providence of Almighty God. Up to 1834 we had no peculiar or selfish motive in this matter. In 1834 the whole country was electrified by the discoveries of what were then supposed to be vast and unexampled deposits of gold in North Carolina and in Georgia.

I remember even as a child the thrill that ran through the country at that time at the marvelous discovery of gold in Georgia and in North Carolina, and when I got to be a boy of 12 or 15 years of age it had gone over into Alabama, and when I got to be a man, making a stump speech one day in Alabama on a little branch at Arbacoochee, a little placer digging there, a barelegged boy with his pants rolled up to his knees came running into the crowd holding a nugget above his head shouting, and that broke me down, and we did not have any more exercises except a jollification over this finding of a nugget of gold that weighed 30 pennyweights in that branch.

The foundation of our financial system gave way under pressure of our gold discoveries, and we adopted straightway the ratio of 16 to 1 in order to make the purchasing power of gold greater—a most unfortunate movement that has led from that time to this, in consequence of the unbalanced condition of the philosophy of the financial system of our Government, to continual wrangling and controversy between silver men and gold men. Great Britain discovered, I think it was in 1818, what I have just stated—

Mr. GEORGE. In 1816.

Mr. STEWART. The law was passed in 1816, but it did not go into effect until 1818.

Mr. MORGAN. That was her wise, selfish policy with respect to gold? She wanted to make it the most powerful metal in the world, more powerful than silver, for the double reasons that her colonies produced it in what was then considered pretty large abundance, but her commerce naturally put her in the lead of the nations of the earth in financial affairs, and she wanted the concentrated money just as every wielder of power, political or religious or moral or financial or any other kind of power, always wants his power concentrated in the hands of a very few people in order to make it entirely effectual.

Then we went on in our new policy, and when gold was discovered in California—which was discovered before any silver—then a question occurred about the demonetization of gold, whether it was not getting too powerful and whether there was not too much of it coming in, and it was largely discussed.

After awhile discoveries of silver were made, some in California and some in Nevada, New Mexico, and elsewhere, and silver thus commenced piling up the column and got pretty nearly to an equilibrium of production with gold, and in 1872, when it had reached the equilibrium, with \$250,000 difference, then the desperate men, who were resolved that they would keep gold far in advance, decreed the death of silver, and it went to its death under the act of 1873. It was rather a sudden death and an obscure one. The people did not know it for some three years after it was dead, and Gen. Grant did not know it for two years, when he expressed his great sur-

prise, in a letter he wrote, that silver had been destroyed as legal-tender money.

Mr. GEORGE. He did not know it when he signed the act.

Mr. MORGAN. No, nor did anybody else, except a few members of Congress, as far as we are informed. That was another conference committee business. That was another one of the glories that come from under these hidden arrangements to surprise and enlighten the world. Then the fight for restoration commenced that I have described. It progressed, and it has been a fight all the time from that day to this; but since 1878, or thereabouts, when the first attack was made upon the act of 1873, and the country received really its first information as to what had been done in respect to the demonetization of silver by the act of 1873.

We have not in our efforts asked to have an advantage given to silver over gold, but we have asked and are continually asking and will continue to ask that silver shall be restored to its relation to gold as it is fixed in the Constitution of the United States, and that the obstructions which have been in its way and which have thrown the whole weight of the power of this Government against silver from 1873 to the present time, shall simply be removed and let it have a chance to live.

The people first took up this question of restoration and pressed it upon the attention of Congress. I do not remember that any Congressman came forward voluntarily, except as he was moved by the urgent petition and clamors of his people, to make any demonstration against the fearful power of gold, consolidated as it was through the demonetizing act of 1873 and the resumption act of 1875. It was a fearful ordeal for a man to stand up against the powers of the Government at that time and proclaim a doctrine which might be held to impair or impugn in some sense the credit of the United States in the payment of its bonds.

It was a fearful experience that drove the people to find out about this matter. The politicians, housed up and drawing their salaries, and comfortable and unused to the toils of the field and the mine and the workshop and the fisheries and the forests, could not feel the disturbance that a laboring man, a toiling man felt when he saw that his labor was all in vain, that he had an enormous amount of public debts to pay out of his own toil; for no debt is paid except out of toil applied to agriculture, to the fisheries, to the forests, to the mine, to the factories, to the machine shops, and the like.

Labor earns every dollar that is paid on a public debt. The lawyers, the preachers, doctors, members of Congress, and the like, do not earn a dollar of that. They help distribute it, enjoy it, take their commissions out of it, but, after all, every dollar of the debt of the United States and every other debt in this country is shouldered right down upon labor and production. You can not get away from that proposition. That is true and no man can deny it. It enters as a factor into every consideration relating to finance and taxation, and we had as well meet it on the ground floor as up in the air.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT in the chair). The Senator from Alabama will please suspend. It becomes the duty of the Chair, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 2729) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals, and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. DAWES. I ask that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it will be so ordered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not desire to object to the request, but I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, in charge of the Indian appropriation bill, whether he intends to call that bill up to-day?

Mr. DAWES. It is my intention to call it up at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] unless the Senator should feel it his duty to consume the time of the afternoon.

Mr. MANDERSON. Then I should like some intimation from the Senator from Alabama whether he proposes to consume the afternoon?

Mr. MORGAN. I have never been able to measure the time, Mr. President, if I was going to make a speech, not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Alabama is entitled to the floor according to the precedents, but if there be time to take up the Indian appropriation bill this afternoon I hope to conclude it.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope, then, that we may understand definitely whether

the appropriation bill will be taken up this afternoon or whether it will not be. There are a number of Senators here who are desirous to be present when the vote shall be finally taken upon the bill and upon the pending question.

Mr. DAWES. If it were in my power to give any more definite information, I should. If it be more agreeable to the Senators to have the time fixed to-morrow or something of that kind, I shall not object.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it better to have some definite time fixed, so that we shall not be required to dance attendance here in the Senate when we do not know whether or not this bill will be reached.

Mr. DAWES. In reply to the Senator from Nebraska, I do not see how, under the usages of the Senate, I can now fix a time. I appreciate all the Senator says. I will endeavor to have the bill taken up to-morrow morning without question.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire the least disrespect towards the Senator from Alabama by my inquiry. I simply have some other matters to attend to that are important in the line of my official duty, and I can attend to them this afternoon if the Indian appropriation bill is not to be considered.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator sees just how I am situated. I would be more definite if I could.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am unable to see why the Senator in charge of the Indian appropriation bill can not say whether he proposes to take up that bill this afternoon or not.

Mr. DAWES. I have said all I could, that I did propose, if there were time after the Senator from Alabama got through, to call up the bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. That is a very indefinite solution of the problem.

Mr. DAWES. I know it is. I appreciated the Senator's interrogatory, and I wish the Senator would appreciate the embarrassing position in which I am myself placed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to laying aside the unfinished business informally. The Senator from Alabama will proceed.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I repeat the people first took up the question of restoration. A fearful experience drove them to it. The politicians, including the President and many of our greatest men, were aroused by the anguish of the people, and, rubbing their dreamy eyes, found that the Senator from Ohio had slain silver.

The first significant protest of the people was a Democratic majority in the House and then in the Senate, with Allen G. Thurman, the real hero of the restoration, in the lead. There was no great tariff issue then before the people. Justice, relief, and restoration to financial soundness were the demands of the people. The demand has never ceased and will never be hushed until the people are restored to their constitutional rights.

The Bland bill was the first great move. The Bland bill was intended to make an approximation, and did make an approximation towards the rehabilitation of silver. Silver had to be replaced in various respects. First of all, it had to find its way in some form or other into the mints and Treasury of the United States. Then it had to be restored to its legal tender quality, and then some respect had to be paid to the standard of value and the ratio of value, whether it should be 15 to 1 or 16 to 1 or 15½ to 1; whether, having destroyed silver coinage by the act of 1873 and driven it out of the statutes entirely, when we replaced it it would go back with its original ratio of 16 to 1 for gold, or whether it would go back with the English ratio of 15½ to 1 for gold.

Those questions had to be approached one by one, seriatim. It was more than the power of Congress could compass to take up the whole subject of silver coinage and its relations to gold and re-establish and reinstate it in a single act. So it appears. The Bland bill was the result. That bill re-established the legal tender of silver coin. It re-established the 412½ grains standard silver dollar nine-tenths fine. It required the coinage—not merely the purchase, but it required the coinage—by the United States mints of not less than two nor more than four million dollars per month. It permitted the use of silver certificates. Gold certificates had been permitted to be issued by a separate act. It made those silver certificates receivable in the banks of the United States as part of their reserve.

The Bland bill with the Allison amendment—the honorable Senator who now stands before me being responsible for the provisions for the purchase of silver by the Government of the United States in that act—the Bland bill with the Allison amendment became the law of the United States and we worked under that till 1890. The banks in the meantime had refused to accept deposits of silver certificates. They would accept deposits of silver and give certificates of special deposit,

but they would not accept them on general account, because they said they could not carry them through the clearing houses. The fact was that they did not want to carry them through the clearing houses.

After a long struggle we compelled them to receive these certificates by the act to extend the charters of the national banks, of July 12, 1882.

The last clause of section 12 of that act was inserted on the motion of my colleague [Mr. PUGH]. Then we went further and forced subsidiary silver coin as a legal tender up to the sum of \$10 by the act of June 9, 1879.

Before that time the subsidiary coin had been a legal tender only for \$5. By a long and serious effort we at last forced the gold men to receive subsidiary legal coins for \$10, with great benefit to the people at that time. That was an astounding concession to the men that elected the House of Representatives and the Senate, the President, and everybody else.

The House continued to be Democratic, with Randall and CARLISLE warring over the tariff; and that their warfare was bitter and "up to the hilt" there is no one can doubt who remembers the history of the United States. That it was honest and sincere no one can doubt. At the same time the tariff and its modifications and the correctness of the principles upon which many of its levies were made was then more seriously a question of dispute amongst the leading Democrats of the United States than the question of free coinage or the abolishment of silver is to-day amongst the Democrats of the United States.

Silver was then a cord of union that had not been loosed, to bind the Democracy together. That cord had not then been loosed nor had the golden bowl been broken at the fountain. There was still an opportunity for life of the Democratic party, and that opportunity was chiefly founded upon the fact that they were all striving to reinstate the people of the United States in the possession of their ancient constitutional right of having gold and silver, as we declared in that act of 1890, maintained on a parity, and that the Government of the United States should lend its powers in that direction rather than in the opposite direction of breaking down the parity between the metals.

Then Mr. Cleveland came in 1885, with a Wall street congestive chill on him about a coming flood of silver, and he commenced prophesying, and prophesying evil, and according to the evils that he apprehended, threw the whole weight of his Administration against silver, beginning with a letter which he addressed to members of Congress before he had been inaugurated as President of the United States, in which he begged them to repress and destroy silver coinage.

We had already encountered the veto of the President of the United States [Mr. Hayes] upon the Bland bill, and had overcome that. The political parties of the United States, or the men who composed them in both these great bodies here in Washington, were so earnest in their determination to restore to the people of this country that of which they had been robbed that they waived for a time their fidelity to party lines and party principles, and they voted upon these questions according to their convictions as to what was best for their own constituents. The result was that the Bland bill was passed, which did rehabilitate silver to a very large extent, which expressed the approbation of the people of the United States that silver should be a legal-tender coin, and that it should have a large coinage, if not a free coinage.

Mr. President, every movement that we have made since 1878 has been a march to the front, and while silver has not yet accomplished all that was expected of it and desired of it, it has not by any means suffered a defeat on any part of its ground. It has been set back time and again, the opposing forces have been frequently of sufficient power to drive it from its lines on the battlefield, but nobody has ever captured and occupied its camp, and those gentlemen in Wall street who vainly fancy now that because the Bland bill was not taken up in the House of Representatives the silver question is dead are utterly mistaken in their conjecture.

They will find sooner or later, and they will find it very soon, that the people of the United States have got a sedate and fixed policy about that matter which they are pursuing, that they will be turned neither to the right nor to the left, and that there is no man and no party in the United States that has or ever can have power enough over the true representatives of the industrial classes in the United States to cause them to swerve for one moment in the march to the restoration.

I lock hands with any man and every man who is marching for the restoration of silver. I want to see the Government and Constitution of my country put back to that degree of power, recognition and influence where they were prior to 1873, and I want the bonds of matrimony that were celebrated between gold and silver in

laying down the very foundations of our creed so established, so reinstated, and so preserved that no man shall put them asunder.

Mr. President, in referring to the condition of our present legislation and the struggles we have been making to try to get the country back to the recognition of gold and silver coinage, I have had occasion to speak of the money power. I do not speak of that in any invidious manner. I do not blame men for loving money, or wanting money, or having money, or using money. It is their right and their privilege to do it. If they get it honestly, that is all we need to ask. Its power and influence will be felt, and has always been felt, in society and in government, and we can not control men in the use of money, nor ought we attempt to control them in its use, beyond what we would do in respect of the use of any other species of property, or any other power, or any other influence they have got.

When rightly used it is the handmaid of civilization, and the source of blessings to mankind; when abused it is a tyrant, and its tyranny reaches both to soul and body. It is a corruptor, a beast of prey that feasts on the blood of human society, leaving the carcass to decay and poison the pure air of heaven.

Money, the measure of all values, must receive its own measure from the laws. Outside the law there is no power "to coin money, or to regulate the value thereof." If you can not find the power expressed in the law to coin money or to regulate its value, you will not find it anywhere. It never has existed outside of positive law.

When money is good, the law makes it good, when it is bad, the law is responsible.

The only natural and accepted basis of all promissory money is gold and silver. This has always been so, and will always be true. Other foundations than gold and silver have been found on which to rest bills of credit, such as bonds, bank notes, and Treasury notes, as temporary makeshifts, but these, when they are liquidated, must be resolved into gold or silver coin.

A note payable in gold may support the judgment of a court that the defendant must deliver so much gold to the plaintiff; but when the sheriff comes to execute the judgement, and he is met with a legal tender of number of dollars stated in the mandate of the writ of execution, he is bound to accept the legal tender so offered to him in satisfaction of the judgment or he repeals the law. If he has not the power to repeal the legal tender law he is bound to accept the legal tender of a proper number of dollars in satisfaction, and you can not have it otherwise.

Just in this connection I should like to observe upon the futility, the absolute folly, of those provisions that are found in the Bland act and also in the act of 1890—I am not quite so sure about the act of 1890—that the coin certificates for the legal tender silver dollar shall be a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, except where a contract for payment in gold or some other commodity is couched in the agreement itself.

Mr STEWART. It is in the act of 1890.

Mr. ALLISON. And in the act of 1878 as well.

Mr. MORGAN. I knew it was in the act of 1878. Now, there can be nothing more absurd than that. It is very true that the Supreme Court of the United States have said that where a contract contains an agreement, we will say for the payment of \$500 in gold coin, they can render a judgment for \$500 in gold coin. It does not vitiate the judgment if they render it in that way; it does not improve it any; it does not alter its legal effect. They can render a judgment for \$500 in gold coin, but when their marshal goes out with his writ of execution to collect that judgment and the debtor tenders him five hundred dollars in greenbacks, pronounced also to be lawful money by the Supreme Court of the United States, or five hundred dollars in legal tender standard silver dollar coins that marshal is bound to release him and his property, and to receive the five hundred dollars in satisfaction. Then what becomes of the contract to pay in coin? It amounts to nothing. It is a privilege put in the statute that if a man wants to make a fool of him self the law will not object. That is the whole business.

As I have stated it that must be the law, or else two persons may by agreement amend a constitutional law of Congress. A paper legal tender will thus extinguish a judgment for gold founded on a contract payable in gold.

In such a transaction it is only the power of the law that preserves the parity between legal-tender paper money and a judgment of a court for the payment of so many dollars in gold.

It is the power of the law that maintains the parity; it is not the power of commerce. Strip either coin of its capacity as a legal tender, disassociate it from any provision on the part of the lawmaking power to give to it a certain currency

under certain conditions, and it is no longer of any value as money.

In every case where one sort of money has actual control over another sort it is the power of the law that secures it, and not the commercial value of the dominant money. So if gold has any advantage over silver in this country that advantage must be given to it by law, and can be given to it in no other way.

There may be an accidental or fictitious advantage from time to time, a rise and fall with the emergencies of trade, the laws of demand and supply, but when you come to speak about coining money and regulating the value thereof under the Constitution of the United States the parity between the two metals must be maintained by the active power of the laws of the United States, and not by the fluctuating and uncertain power of its mere commercial value.

If the Constitution of the United States had meant that Congress should regulate the parity between the metals according to the commercial value of the metals respectively, it would have said so; but instead of doing that it not only requires that Congress shall pass laws for coining money and regulating the value thereof, but it goes further and prohibits the States, which had the power theretofore to declare what they chose to declare to be a legal tender for debts, from making legal tender between A and B, their citizens, of anything or any commodity except gold and silver coin. Congress had the power to make the coin. The States had no such power. So the States gave up all of their power in respect of legal tender except that they could adopt the law and make gold and silver coin legal tender for debts.

Now, following this idea up, when the demonetization of silver took place in 1873 West Virginia put a statute on her books—it is there to-day—allowing her people to pay their debts in silver coin of the United States. Although the United States Government has demonetized silver and refused its further coining, and had taken from it its legal-tender value unless it was subsidiary coin or trade dollars which run up in legal-tender power to the sum of \$5, notwithstanding all of this action on the part of the Government of the United States West Virginia, in the exercise of her sovereign power, as she had a perfect right to do, provided that debts might be discharged in West Virginia by the silver coins of the United States.

She could not have provided that they should be discharged in wheat or corn or pig-iron or anything like that; but there was the constitutional authority for her that whenever she would find a coin of the United States, old or new, if it was a standard coin and had been issued under the authority of the laws of the United States, she might make it a legal tender, although the United States might have withdrawn that quality from it.

Mr. MILLS. Could she make one metal alone a legal tender to the exclusion of the other?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I suppose she could not by positive enactment. There might be this sort of a case. If all the metal in the State was of one sort she might refer to that as the metal that should be legal tender coin; but if she undertook in making silver dollars a legal tender coin to say that gold dollars should not be a legal tender, I have not any idea she could do it. She would thereupon destroy the unity between the metals which was fixed in the Constitution of the United States and make a distinction between them by her laws, which would be an excess of her authority.

Mr. GEORGE. Did that law of West Virginia ever undergo judicial determination?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know that it ever did.

If silver dollars worth 80 cents each in commerce are tendered to pay a judgment for so many dollars in gold, they can not, lawfully, be refused. To get rid of this result there is but one possible expedient, and that is to demonetize the silver dollar and have the gold dollar as the sole basis—the redeemer of all promises to pay, and all other forms of indebtedness.

This is to be the result of depriving silver of free coinage.

If we strike silver from free coinage, if we say to the people of the United States you shall not have your bullion coined at your option by the Government of the United States, you say in effect to them: "We will take this out of the legal-tender category of money-metals; it shall not any longer be used for the purpose of paying debts contrary to the wish of the creditor; it can not be used for a purpose of that kind;" and being useless for that, it is a mere commodity, and being a mere commodity, the Government of the United States has no power to deal with it any more than it has with wheat, corn, or anything like that.

So the whole question of free coinage of silver and its legal-tender quality is so united and blended together as that no man can separate between them. If you deny to silver its legal-tender quality you kill it as a money metal; you may have

as many laws as you please on the statute book for its use, but you can not regulate the value of it in the ratio of gold to silver.

The two metals were intended under the Constitution of the United States to be identical in respect of the use to be made of them under the laws of the country, identical in all their functions, and whoever undertakes to separate between them will find himself necessarily involved in the category of destroying the one against which the discrimination is made. It can not be otherwise, logically or in fact.

Bimetallism, the free coinage of silver, the legal-tender quality of silver, the right of silver to be considered as a money metal, are all wrapped up in the like powers and conditions and circumstances that belong to gold, and you cannot separate between silver and gold in respect of any of them without destroying the metal that is discriminated against as a money metal.

So I return to my proposition. Whatever effect is given to silver money in the United States to keep it on a parity with gold must be the result of positive law completely disassociated from its commercial value. The commercial value of a dollar of silver has no more connection with its legal capacity and function as a legal-tender coin in the payment of a debt against the will of a creditor, than the amount of paper or rags in a hundred-dollar bill has with the legal-tender quality of the greenback.

It is true that silver is a valuable metal. It is valuable for many things. In the grand aggregate, the silver of the world, however, is not worth one-tenth part of the iron that is in the world. But when you come to pound for pound, or ounce for ounce, the silver may be and is a more valuable metal. It is valued not because it makes a tool for the mechanic to work with, not because it enters substantially into any of the real industries of the world, unless it may be in some chemical solvent for the purpose of taking photographic pictures or the like of that. It has very little value as a metal considered by itself. It pleases the fancy of men and women of good taste and can be wrought into jewelry and articles of decoration that are very splendid and very enticing; but taken by itself simply as a metal, silver is a very poor affair compared with iron.

The world appreciates it for the reasons I have been stating. But it has other reasons of value, the leading one of which is the fact that all civilized humanity, and all humanity in the process of civilization from the dawn of civilization down to this moment, have adopted silver as one of the efficient agents of the great work. We can not ask men to lay down those traits, characteristics, opinions, and sentiments which have come down to them through cycles of ages, through their blood and brain and brawn, and abandon them of a sudden in view of the opinions of some doctrinaires that the further use of silver as money is going to be a disadvantage to any community in which it is found.

The people are not going to do it. The will of the people, if we can ever get ourselves to understand so nothing about what that means, in this great land of laws—the will of the people is something which we must respect, and when it is sedately established and has followed them along through generations for centuries and for cycles, we can not lay it down and abandon it and set up some theory of our own in contradiction of it and to its destruction. That man is not a representative man in his heart or in his action who feels that way toward the people whom he represents.

Now, the people of the United States were never more astonished, never more grieved, never more disgusted, nor were they ever more deeply wounded than they were when they awoke a year or so after the fatal act and found that the silver money, established in the Constitution of the country by the joint act of the great fathers and all the celebrated lights of that age, had perished in a night by the hand of a few men who wanted to destroy it for the sake of building up one class of men in this country against another.

Such a shock as that the people of the United States had never before experienced. They have not gotten over it, and they are not going to get over it. They are going to try silver again, and if they find that the honorable Senator from Ohio has more wisdom than 65,000,000 people in the United States after all, they will insist still that that statute shall go upon the books and let them try it a little while longer, when they will give their permission to us to repeal the act if it does not suit. But once they put it there, the Senator knows it will never come off.

Mr. McPIERSON. They have got it there now.

Mr. MORGAN. No, they have not quite got it. They have got pretty close to it, but not altogether. If the Secretary of the Treasury, under the advice of the honorable Senator from Ohio and with the kind permission of the President and

the particular faction of the party to which he belongs, shall conclude that in the exercise of the discretion conferred upon him by Congress, he will coin silver dollars, when he puts them out the people will get them in exchange for coin certificates and they will be legal tender with gold, equal in all particulars. So while we are badly dilapidated we are not thoroughly wrecked. We are not in as bad a condition as the Senator from Ohio left us in 1873 when he demonetized silver, to say the least of it. Since that fateful hour we have climbed very high; we have our eyes still upon the top of the peak where victory is written; and we are not going to stop until we get there.

Mr. President, there is another very peculiar phase of the money power that I want to discuss before the Senate. I do not pretend that I am, in the statistical view of the question, so well informed upon it as that I can give a fixed opinion about every feature of it; and yet my convictions about it are so strong that I can not possibly get rid of them. I will state some facts that every Senator here who has been an observant reader of events will know. I will go back to 1878, when the remonetization of silver took place in part under the Bland act. Two million dollars a month of actual coinage of legal-tender dollars were to be paid out into the hands of the people or else their representative silver certificates were to be paid out.

Now, take the prices of the great staples of cotton, wheat, and corn. They are the greatest of our staples, although we have some other articles in the United States that are entitled to be considered as staple articles such as the product of our mines, iron and different metals, fisheries particularly, and lumber. These are entitled to be considered as staples, but I refer to the three great staples, cotton, corn, and wheat, the textiles and the cereals peculiarly adapted to the use of man and animals.

You may take the fluctuations of silver bullion since 1878 and, if you please to go farther back, since 1873, month after month, during the whole period down to this very day, and you will find that the fluctuations in cotton and the fluctuations in grain of different descriptions have been almost correspondingly the same with the fluctuations of silver bullion. When the price of silver would go up in the market the prices of these products would go up, and if silver would go down the products would follow. That is a peculiarity of our history. The facts are not to be denied for they are ascertained by every-day records made and kept by men who control the commerce of the country.

Mr. MILLS. That has not been the case with wheat in the last six months.

Mr. MORGAN. It has.

Mr. MILLS. The price of wheat has risen very largely in the last six or eight months.

Mr. MORGAN. What is the price to-day?

Mr. MILLS. I do not know, but wheat has been over a hundred cents a bushel.

Mr. MORGAN. It is now 79 cents, and silver—

Mr. STEWART. That was occasioned by the famine in the Old World and the good crops here.

Mr. MORGAN. I will get to that.

Mr. STEWART. The manufactured commodities there fell 35 or 40 per cent.

Mr. MILLS. Precisely; but it shows that it takes something else to fix the price.

Mr. MORGAN. I know what the Senator says is true, and I agree with him that there are two factors at work. One is the power of the consumer to buy these staples. I understand that perfectly well. But the other, nevertheless, has a fixed relation to it; and the Senator is mistaken when he supposes that recently the history of the upward and downward progress of the four commodities I have named is not nearly the same.

Mr. McPHERSON. Would it interfere with the Senator if I should ask him a question in this connection?

Mr. MORGAN. I will answer a question in a moment. I want to get this idea before the Senate, if the Senator pleases. I will state what wheat is quoted at in the market by reading an extract from a newspaper of yesterday or the day before, which will give the idea more perfectly than I will be able to bring it before the Senate perhaps in this mere discursive way of treating the question. Here is an article taken from the "Post" of this city of day before yesterday.

#### THE LOW PRICE OF WHEAT.

Silver is down very low, not quite but very nearly as low as it has been at any time.

Considerable surprise has been naturally occasioned by the fact that recent prices of wheat have been ruling far below the corresponding quotations of a year ago. Within a day or two

May wheat at Chicago brought only 79 cents a bushel as against 104 cents for the same day last year.

This feeling of surprise is due in a great measure to the exaggerated calculations which were made, up to a comparatively good authority, in regard to the failure of the harvests of the rest of the world and the abundant yield in America.

It was confidently declared that Europe lacked 900,000,000 bushels of its ordinary requirements and that its available supply outside of the United States could not exceed 1,000,000,000 bushels. It was shown that out of its annual harvest at this country could easily spare 725,000,000 bushels, leaving 575,000,000 bushels short of an adequate supply, and thus creating a condition which must logically give rise to famine prices. The other representations may have been strictly accurate, and the various elements of the problem may have been correctly stated, but the logical sequence has not been realized.

The peculiarity of the present market situation lies in the circumstance that, while the granary of Eastern Europe is under starvation conditions and most of its countries are short of their usual food supplies, the American farmer is getting less for his wheat than he has done during the worst years of his recent experience. Doubtless the calculator greatly underrated the wheat supplies available from India and Egypt and in that way arrived at an enormous result. But in all probabilities the chief fact overlooked in reaching a wrong conclusion in this case is that multitudes of men in all European countries have been out of employment this winter, and that men out of work can not and will not consume as much food as they would do when engaged in prosperous occupation.

Now we find the parallelism in this market. As silver goes down wheat goes down. I do not contend that a money that is stripped of its power as a legal tender carries up with it or carries down with it the price of the wheat, the corn, the cotton, that we send to foreign countries or that we consume here, but I contend that when silver is put in the condition that it is in the act of 1890 and it is a mere commodity, it is like wheat and corn and cotton and iron and provisions, and whatever effect causes a depression among the other leading cereals and commodities in the country will always produce a like effect upon silver bullion.

Perhaps it may not be identical. There are fluctuating and varying circumstances attending upon the price of staples, sometimes a greater local demand, or a moment of depression in the demand for one more than in another, but when we relegate silver bullion to the condition of a mere commodity as wheat and corn and cotton, then we put it within reach of the power of the money of the world to buy it at higher or lower prices according to the abundance of money, according to the uses that can be made of money in making such purchases.

Now, to illustrate, wheat goes down in Europe in face of the fact that all of the vast Empire of Russia is now in a state almost of starvation. We are sending off cargoes of wheat to Russia to save the people from actual starvation, and yet the price of wheat goes down in the European markets. We know that there wheat is in great demand. We know that England and Austria and Germany and France and Italy and all of the interior of Europe are short in their crops, and that the draft which is made upon them by the famine in Russia must be a very heavy one, and yet wheat goes down to 79 cents. The reason of that must be that the money of Europe is gold and that gold is in the hands, naturally, of a few men.

Gold itself is a concentrated power as compared with silver, concentrated sixteen times, and the holders of it are also men and corporations in whose hands there is concentrated a great credit and power. There has been a very serious agitation in financial circles in Europe, growing out of the suspension of the Barings during the last year, which took \$79,000,000 of gold in two months' time out of this country and carried it to Europe. There have been other causes of disturbance over there. There is a very uneasy feeling in Germany to-day, the causes of which I need not enter upon, but we understand perfectly that the feeling in Germany is very uneasy. What is France now? What is Paris but a city honeycombed with dynamite explosions from day to day?

What is the cause of the agitation? We do not know so much about what the cause is. The honorable Senator from Texas will say, and probably say with perfect truth, that the cause is that the people are out of employment; that they have not any commerce to depend on any more. He will say that for these causes France is boiling with trouble; that Austria has to hold an army in the field to keep her people in check; that Germans actually invade the palace of the Emperor with working masses who come to demand blood or bread; and so throughout all Europe.

Money naturally retires under such circumstances. Famine drives money into its recesses. War and threatened commotion of a civil character drive money out of circulation. Money is scarce in Europe, and it is being hoarded there; and as it becomes scarcer in Europe, as everywhere else, its purchasing power increases; and wheat that a month or two months ago, when there was a prospect of relief in financial circles in Europe would bring a dollar a bushel brings now 79 cents, if that is the proper quotation.

Mr. GEORGE. The starving people can not get the money to buy it.

Mr. MORGAN. The starving people can not get the money to buy it with.

Mr. STEWART. The money does not exist.

Mr. McPHERSON. Is there starvation anywhere else in Europe except Russia?

Mr. MORGAN. We will say that there is none except in Russia; but there is a shadow of starvation upon every place near to those where the awful condition prevails that exists in Russia.

Mr. President, let us come to the question of the power of money. That is what we are trying to consider. We take out of the category all the silver as they do in Europe, except the subsidiary coin, and we deal with the question of the power of money as it concerns gold and gold alone. We find that when the money is concentrated into gold first and then again concentrated in the hands of men who have the power and the credit to hold it, it is always used either as a weapon of power or a means of enrichment. We see that there is an opportunity, to say the least, for the unlimited spread of the power of gold, which means the unlimited depression of all the fruits and results of industry at the option of the holders of gold.

Now, let us bring that home. We have the same policy here. We have concluded that it is best for the American people that these corporations that have made millionaires and hundred-fold millionaires out of parvenus in twenty-five or thirty years, miserable counters of usury and robbers of industry—we have concluded that the power of corporations and other institutions in this country that are built up in the bosom of this beautiful Republic, shall have still further power to concentrate the money of the United States in their hands, and in order to do it we strike away two-thirds of the money metal of the United States and retain one-third, and thereby increase, as two is to three, their power of accumulation and concentration. We have them in that shape here to-day.

The men in the United States who control the money power of this country control it through the agency of gold, and they do it because silver is driven out of circulation. What we buy under the act of 1890 is banked up here in bullion. The people can not get it back. Make silver and gold what the Constitution made them, twins in financial right and financial power. Then let the people get hold of this two-thirds of the money metal of the land and scatter it out among themselves and employ it in their business. What is the result? You negative the power of the capitalists by bringing two men against one. Here are two men who have a dollar each of silver in their pockets and one who has a dollar of gold, and their combined power is greater than his, if the law keeps them in parity.

If I have a conviction in respect to this matter that is deeper, and broader, and stronger than another it is that it was among the very wisest provisions of the Divine Father of the human race when He planted in the bosom of the earth for the purpose of using gold and silver as factors in civilization, that He intended that it should be, that the holders of the concentrated metal, the scarcer metal, should not have the power over the rest of the people of the world absolutely, but He would associate with that yellow metal a white sister that should go with it into all the parts of the earth and into all of the enterprises of humanity, and should spread its power into the hands of the people at large, so that a few men should not become the mere representative in their own person of the entire money power of the world.

Napoleon leading his armies in his desperate ventures through Europe was never more completely the master of those on whose necks he trod than the capitalists of this country are the masters of the people, because we have deprived the people of the only possible means of countervailing, and counteracting their influence by the spread of silver, as good as gold, through the country.

In these references, which you can work out with a great deal more precision and with more satisfaction to yourselves than I am able to do, do you not see a reason why prices for wheat decline in the very jaws of famine, and prices of cotton decline because there is no consumer; and there are few who feel able to buy enough of it to keep the mills running and the cotton fields producing?

Do we not see that while that is the case, and the crop of cotton is large, as it is also of wheat and corn, that the larger the crop is the more disastrous it is to the farmer, for the reason that the men who hold the purchasing power have in their hands a capacity for depressing these prices below what is their actual cost of production and their relative value considered in respect of other things? We find the price of silver decline. That is affected by the same cause exactly.

Although we can not measure it, although, perhaps, there is no financial barometer or thermometer by which we can scale the rise exactly in degree, the truth is that the legislation set on foot by the honorable Senator from Ohio in 1873 has had

the effect of putting gold out of its proper level, high on the barometric scale or the thermometric scale of business, as we may call it, leaving silver and the products of the country down on the zero level. The truth is that gold to-day is 40 per cent. above its fair price, and we ought to yoke silver with it to hold it down to a level with other productions. Whenever we consent to divorce them and to allow gold to monopolize the financial power and strength of this land, we may expect to see it rise, and as it rises every commodity and every industry in the United States will be depreciated, and after awhile will be almost destroyed.

I have said that the money metals of this country derive their actual power from positive law. They do not depend upon commercial value for their financial power. Gold will not let anything live anywhere within the realm of its sweep and sway that it does not control—silver, diamonds, iron, corn, wheat, provisions, everything. It is the imperial master, unless you bridle it with the restraining authority of the law. Never was there a wiser conception than when our fathers united it with silver indissolubly in the Constitution of the United States.

So I think we see a reason why it is that our country is so depressed in all of its industries at this time, for the depression includes everyone. We find that the silver mines are being locked up in Arizona. Men can not make wages out there, and the mines are going by the board. The truth is there is but one industry in the United States that is not embarrassed to-day by this cruel arrangement under which silver is dethroned of all its influence and power, and that is the money-shaving business. That is the only business in the United States that is prospering in the present situation. Usury runs riot. Discount has no bounds set to it. It is like the raging sea, it defies the power of man to set bounds to it.

Speculation in money upon the sweat of the brow is not the work of a great many people, but it is the work of a set of people who are armed with all the necessary power to burden the people and destroy them.

The people of the United States have never been, in my recollection, so restless as they are to-day, except after 1873, when they found what had been done to them and dropped their plow and hoes in the fields and their tools in the workshop and took to the high road, straggling about in search of employment that they could not find. Then it was that that desperate and awful character, the American tramp, had his birth. Thousands and tens of thousands since that time have followed along in that weary, lonely, miserable, wretched path, and the authors of the destruction of silver are responsible for the whole of it.

I do not propose, Mr. President, now to undertake to array the facts and propositions to refute the danger of the silver dump in the United States. There can be no danger in it, so far as I can see. Whoever brings an ounce of silver into the United States must bring it for the purpose of carrying something out in the place of it. He does not want to carry the silver back; he wants to exchange it while it is here for something else for which he expects to pay the full value. The people of the United States are quite competent to take care of themselves in any dealings of that kind; and I have not been able to understand and formulate in my own mind a project through which it was possible that silver could or would ever be brought into this country for the mere purpose of dumping it.

It is said that they want to bring it here and exchange it for gold. They can not do that unless they pay for the gold the prices we want to sell it at. If we have gold to sell and they bring silver here they can buy it.

I have some statistics here that I want to call attention to for a moment that I think will throw a little light on the question of dumping.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator sitting nearest to me [Mr. GEORGE] suggests that the only trouble about the dumping process is that there will not be enough to dump for our use.

Mr. MORGAN. I believe that is strictly true. Three will not be as much as we want after it is all dumped.

Mr. STEWART. That is the only trouble there will be.

Mr. GEORGE. Then we ought to be in favor of the dump.

Mr. STEWART. We are.

Mr. MORGAN. Here is an extract from the Louisville Courier-Journal, whose editor has the reputation, and I think justly, of being a very enlightened man. It is the facts, however, that he states here to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. He is telling us why the \$71,000,000 of gold that went away last year does not come back and what is keeping that gold abroad:

The advance in the rate of foreign exchange and the decreased gold movement to this country have been the occasion of much comment, and in some quarters do not seem to be well understood. When it was a thoroughly ascertained fact that the crops last season were

very large in this country and very small in Europe, it was thought that the increased breadstuf export would bring back to the United States the \$75,000,000 in gold which was sent to Europe last spring and summer. Such anticipations have been fulfilled only in part, for less than half the gold has returned to America, and at present the receipts are very small. During November and December the gold imports amounted to only about \$11,000,000 against \$23,000,000 in September and October, and there seems to be no prospect at present of a larger movement.

Yet, the exporter of breadstuffs has fully equaled expectations. During December, 1891, about six times as much wheat was sent to Europe as during December, 1890, while the flour export nearly doubled. In fact, exports have been steadily running far ahead of the imports, and the excess during the last four months of 1891, complete figures not yet being obtainable, was between \$135,000,000 and \$150,000,000. In the face of these figures, many people wonder why more gold does not come to the United States.

But, one important thing not generally taken into consideration is the payment of interest and dividends on American properties owned in Europe, and a very large item it is, sufficient to offset a considerable proportion of the excess of our exports over imports. Of course no one can tell precisely how large the investment of European capital in this country are but they are very great, having been heavily increased during the last five or six years. The English money will amount to more than that from all the remainder of Europe combined, though the Dutch have considerable sums here particularly in railroads, while some supplies have been drawn from Germany and France.

Until the Baring failure European money was coming here in a plentiful stream. The English were buying great properties all over the country, and the English syndicate became a familiar thing. Notable among the purchases were the Minneapolis flour mills and many large breweries. In numerous cases there was a large amount of talk that came to nothing, but the real purchasers were sufficient to draw heavily upon British capital. Though the buying ceased with the Baring failure, which caused a contraction all over the world, the sum left in this country is very large. It is calculated that the interest and dividend payments due from America to Europe will now amount to \$100,000,000 annually, and that is probably a moderate estimate.

But letting it stand at \$100,000,000, the sum paid or to be paid to Europe during the last six months would be \$50,000,000. Between \$35,000,000 and \$40,000,000 in gold have come back from Europe, making eighty-five or ninety million dollars which Europe has put against our excess of exports over imports of about the same amount. Hence, by taking these things into consideration, the problem works itself out, and there is nothing strange about it at all.

No narrow nor hasty view of foreign investments here should be taken, simply because they draw some money back in the shape of interests and dividends. The country wants every dollar of legitimate capital it can get. It benefits in two ways. It is the tool with which the country is developed, creating business and furnishing employment, and when the capital sent here pays the fair interest which it should it enables those who own it in Europe to buy more heavily of our own products, particularly the agricultural.

That factor has not been considered in debate here, to say the least of it, but it is worthy of attention, and the resolutions I have had the honor to offer will draw the attention of the Committee on Finance to the actual situation.

Now, I will suppose that Mr. Watterson, of the *Courier-Journal*, is right in saying that it takes \$100,000,000 a year to pay the interest on British or foreign capital invested in the United States. Some assert that \$300,000,000 is required annually to pay all the interest and dividends we send across the Atlantic.

I will suppose that that is a good thing. I do not really think it is, but I will suppose that it is. What does that represent? We know, although we can not exactly put our finger upon the fact that foreign capitalists own about two-thirds of the capital stock of the railroads of the United States. The dividends paid upon those go abroad. They own, I will say to the Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS], a very large amount of the capital in the protected manufacturers of the United States, and in the mines they own enormous sums of capital.

It occurs to me that if we are accepting and adopting as British policy as something that we can not get rid of, and that we are so feeble and unmanly that we can not escape from it at all; if that is our poor, miserable situation, the misfortune is only doubled by the fact that we have to pay this gold interest of \$100,000,000 a year to be taken abroad by men who come here to speculate on our products. I do not think that it depends so much upon the fruitfulness of the country or the wisdom of their policy as it does upon the capital and credit it has accumulated, for Great Britain did not make her tenth dollar out of her own soil and people, and yet she enjoys the power to control the markets of the world through the markets of London. She has acquired it from all the outside world by her superior credit.

It is not, after all, because she is smarter than the Yankee, but it is her name, her credit, the long standing of her houses brought down from sire to son that have given her what we call credit; the commercial supremacy of one man who has been a long time in successful business over another who, indeed, may be a smarter man than he is, but is just beginning. Great Britain has had this commercial supremacy, and she has the command of enormous sums of money, much of which she borrows.

Great Britain has the power of concentrated capital and credit, every dollar of which she makes count, like gold, against India and all the rest of the world. She comes over here, and when she finds that the other markets are not quite valuable to her, she spends her money in railroads, and factories, and mines, and different

institutions, and she realizes \$100,000,000 a year interest upon it that we have got to ship to her. How? It is said in gold. I say no; as to that \$100,000,000 we will segregate it from the rest of our responsibilities.

I do not consider it a debt to be paid in gold. There is no such obligation either express or implied, morally, or any other way. We have the right to pay that debt just like we pay one of our own people who happens to own a farm, or a sugar mill, or a wheel factory, or iron works, or something of that kind in the United States. That \$100,000,000 has to go in gold, and some Senators here are very desirous of maintaining that situation, so that the \$100,000,000 shall go every year in gold to these people abroad, because they are afraid to break it up. They have not the proper American snap and stamina in them, it seems to me they have not sufficient confidence in this great country and this great people.

There is no reason either in the eyes of God or man why an American should be afraid to trust the powers of his land. In 1873, as I remarked in the beginning of this argument, when we had \$3,000,000,000 of public debt, to say nothing of private debts, and debts of cities and counties and States, when silver was at 3 per cent. premium, it was demonetized and destroyed. That was withdrawn from the people as a factor with which they hoped to meet some portion of this enormous burden. It was enough to have broken the spirit of any people on earth except these. But people who triumphed over embarrassment like these can be trusted to triumph over anybody or any country, supported as they are by the great resources of this imperial land of ours. So I have faith in them; I do not mistrust them.

Now, Mr. President, I will bring my remarks to a close, although I find a field before me that I could occupy with a great deal of pleasure to myself, to say the least of it.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator allow me to propound a question to him before he closes?

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that the annual product of gold in our mines in the United States is about \$32,000,000 a year. If our annual production is of the value of \$32,000,000 in gold, and we send \$100,000,000 in gold every year to pay the British debt, how long would it take us to have the gold of the country exported; and then if we do not have any silver money where shall we have any money at all? That is the question I wanted to propound.

Mr. MORGAN. I think I can inform the Senator from the writings of an able paper upon the question. If the Senator from Mississippi will give attention to this paper I think he will find out more than I can tell him about it. I will read an extract from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal. After adding up the amount of gold and silver produced in the respective countries, this paper goes on to give the gold production and the silver production for 1890. It puts down the production of the United States in gold at \$32,000,000, and of silver at \$70,465,000. The whole production of the world in gold for the year 1890 was \$116,003,900, in silver \$166,677,233, of which the United States produced \$70,465,000; Australasia, \$12,968,080; Mexico, \$50,000,000, and so on, and India consumed \$50,000,000 in her mints. India has prospered recently until she takes \$50,000,000 of silver a year and converts it into coin. Then the paper says:

Now, if the Bland bill becomes a law, where is England to get her supply of cheap silver for the manufacture of Indian rupees, colonial forins, shillings, etc.? This is perhaps what is grieving the Tribune. Will she go to Latin America? From the Rio Grande to the Straits of Magellan, every nation except Brazil has either a double standard or a single silver standard. Brazil produces less than one-half million ounces of silver per annum, and uses it in her small transactions, along with a copper currency. Will England go to Austria or Russia for a supply? Those nations maintain a silver standard of value, and the product of their mines is used in their own mints and factories. Will England seek for cheap silver bullion in her own Antipodes and Hyperborean and African colonies? All told, her colonies produce less than 12,000,000 ounces per annum, while the devotion of the colonial Englishman to the mother country is nowhere so pronounced as to induce him to dispose of an ounce of silver bullion for 80 cents when he can obtain \$1 for it elsewhere. England can get no relief from all the lands washed by the Indian Ocean. The silver which is sent to India and China remains there, it never returns. From time immemorial Asia has been the historic grave of the white metal, while England has been for generations the sepulcher of gold. According to the various reports of the Director of the Mint, the mines of the United States have produced—

That is the point, now, that the Senator wishes me to answer.

Since 1845 up to and including 1891 (the latter year being estimated) the enormous sum of \$1,886,498,300 in gold, and yet the stock of that metal in this country at the present time is reported to be about \$650,000,000.

Mr. GEORGE. About one-third.

Mr. MORGAN. Not much more than a third.

Of this amount there is, according to the Tribune, about \$120,000,000 in the Treasury. Here is a direct loss of nearly one and a quarter billions of dollars in gold—most of which has left the country since the California mines were opened.

And of course our supply has increased during all that period.

The country has barely managed to retain one-third of the gold dug out of the ground by her own miners. The Tribune, which is no doubt honest in its devotion to the single gold standard theory, may be able, perhaps, to show the country how it can keep the gold that is dug from its own mines at home. It has not been necessary to send foreign silver here to take it away. Both metals seem to have disappeared almost as fast as they have been taken from the earth, and, what is more, Johnny Bull has taken the lion's share of both. From the previous six years, from 1835-'86 to 1890-'91, she had to import no less than \$265,354,001 in silver bullion for her India mints alone. What does the Tribune think of an international conference to consider the question of the United States keeping its gold as well as its silver at home?

Notwithstanding the tremendous production, overproduction we will call it of our mines here, we have not much more than one-third of the product of our mines in our country. What has carried it abroad? It has been our indebtedness to other countries. Of course a large part of it has been for the war, but it continues to be the case that gold goes off and does not return. Silver goes to China and other places and it never comes back. We are wasting these metals all the time. Perhaps the policy of the Senator from Ohio is a better one than that; I mean the hoarding of bullion in our own Treasury and the issue to our own people of coin certificates, the representative of the dollars found in the Treasury of the United States.

But with that money circulating, every dollar of coin certificate is as good as a dollar of gold, or a dollar of silver; and the whole power of the Government of the United States is brought to bear to maintain what the Senator says in the act of 1890 is necessary to be done, and he solemnly pledges shall be done, to maintain the parity of the metals with each other. How much better is that than the locking up of one of the metals in the Treasury of the United States and having it unrepresented by anything in circulation, or deporting it to China to get rid of it, or striking it entirely out of the category of coin metals and making of it a mere commodity?

If we can enrich our country by the storage in our Treasury and the coinage of the gold and silver bullion that we can collect from our mines, I say we ought to do it, and let a representative of every dollar thus stored go into the community so as to become the active and efficient agent of each dollar in bullion and coin in the Treasury to work among the people in their daily occupations.

It is said that it would make a bank of the United States. What is it now? In that very act of 1890 we withdraw sixty-odd million dollars deposited by the banks of the United States in the Treasury to redeem their circulation, carried it into the general fund of the Treasury, ordered it to be covered there, and hereafter to be used as a fund to be accounted for by the Treasurer of the United States to the Government as a miscellaneous fund. Then we assumed the correlative duty of redeeming the national bank notes. The Government of the United States is a bank of issue and redemption. It is not a bank of discount but is a bank of issue and redemption, full and complete, and has been for years.

That relation of the United States Government towards the financial affairs of our country has been affirmed by every court in the United States, that has ever touched the question, as being entirely constitutional. Never has a court decided that the Government of the United States did not have a right to issue national bank notes and to redeem them on Treasury notes and redeem them, or greenbacks or silver certificates and redeem them, or gold certificates and redeem them, or any other certificates and redeem them.

It has been sixty years since a question of that kind was raised in the Congress of the United States, and the courts have uniformly given their support of the existing attitude of the United States Government towards finance and have affirmed, what no man can deny, that the Government of the United States in operating upon its credit, for a basis of capital instead of money actually lodged in the Treasury has gone on to issue national bank notes through, the national bank instrumentalities silver and coin certificates and gold certificates. We have been issuing money all the time, and it is too late to talk about the United States Government not being a bank of issue and redemption.

Treating it as such, what do you want to have in the treasury of this bank? What can you have in its treasury better than gold and silver? You can not have anything better; and when the bank instead of issuing, as it does now, national bank notes upon the faith of the bonded indebtedness or Treasury notes without

any other basis than the mere taxing power of the country, when the Government of the United States issues dollar for dollar upon a gold and silver basis of money actually lodged in the Treasury, will not that money be as good as gold and good as silver in the hands of every man who wants to use it in this world, and will he not prefer it to either coin?

I am sure that that will be the case. By this means the Constitution is left undisturbed, the money is perfectly secure, the people themselves are the owners of the money in the Treasury, carrying it in their pockets in the form of Treasury demands on which they can get the coin when they choose to take it. So I think that is a safe system.

In marching out of the dreadful morass of 1873 to the high ground that we are upon now we have made many and very valuable advances and improvements upon the former financial condition. The coin certificate is a great improvement upon anything that we have heretofore had, because it is redeemable alike in gold and silver, and it is a pledge of the law power of the Government of the United States, including its taxing power, that the Government will always be ready to redeem. The Government retains the option of redeeming in gold and silver, and why? To prevent fraud, to prevent corners, to prevent combines against the Treasury.

But the Government will always do what any sensible debtor will do, pay the creditor in the money he wants. He could not demand any money from the Government of the United States honestly that he would not get. If he says, "I want gold" he would get gold; if he wants silver he would get silver; until he should undertake to make a corner, which I think would be a matter of physical and moral impossibility. Then he would fail to get the money he wants and he would get the other sort of money. That much of a check is necessary; it is proper; it is right. That feature is a proper protection by the Government, which I admire.

Now, I would improve it in one respect. First of all I would require the coinage of every dollar that is in the Treasury. I would put it into actual coin so as to show that the people of the United States have the recognition of Congress for the coinage of every dollar. And when a man comes with his silver and gold bullion for the purpose of having it coined he should have it done upon the terms of the act of 1837; he should have the option to coin it and take coin certificates for it, or, at his option, have it coined and carried out and put into circulation. He will be certain to put it into coin certificates unless he wants to ship it abroad, and he would not have it coined if he wanted to ship it abroad.

So the result will be that there will be free coinage of gold and free coinage of silver, and there will be a free withdrawal upon coin certificates of gold and silver from the Treasury of the United States. Whenever it is found that the supreme and concentrated power of gold in this country is being handled in such a way as to depress the price of the crops the people will have their resort to the other and equal money, and they will take it and scatter it abroad through their operations of every description, and these men will see at once that they have a rival in the field that is as strong and as great and as rich and as true as they are. Then the concentrated power of a single metal in the hands of a few persons will be obviated by the power being dispersed and disseminated among the great body of the people at large.

So I would let the act of 1890 stand. I would make it compulsory on the Secretary of the Treasury to coin that money. In addition to that, I would give all the free-coin rights to bullion-holders that were given by the act of 1830. I would work the two propositions in concert, and the Government and people could express themselves in all their acts and all their conduct in favor of maintaining the parity between the two metals.

Through this coin certificate the parity is maintained, for the coin certificate represents equally a gold dollar and a silver dollar, and when that is the case, when the gold dollar and the silver dollar owe their peculiar power as money to the law of the land and not to mere commercial value or advantage in this country or in that or the other, then we have accomplished the full duty of the Constitution, and the representative of this gold and silver dollar will go out to the people as being itself equal to gold and silver, and the whole difficulty will disappear, and there will be no more quarrelling between the friends of silver and the friends of gold.

In the midst of our distresses, toilsome, rugged, heartbreaking as they have often been, disappointing to me at least as they have so frequently been, I congratulate myself that we have gone from point to point on higher ground than we occupied before, and that we are about to get an American system here which, if we have the faith to adhere to it and the manhood to use it, will make New York the clearing

house of the commerce of the world, and it will be done in a very short time.

Incalculable power must come from the use of the progressive contribution of \$100,000,000 of precious metals a year from our own mints, one-third gold. Suppose in the recent affair between Chile and the United States, or Great Britain and the United States, it had become the necessity of this people to defend their honor that they should have put themselves in a state of war. My mind and yours ran over these fields of inquiry, and one of the great questions we had to ask ourselves was, "Where are we going to get the money to do this with?" In one other instance we would have been involved with a country from which we have drawn much of our money supplies heretofore. That might have been a most serious problem.

But if we had a thousand million dollars of gold and silver in our Treasury, even if it was bullion, and our people had a thousand million dollars of those certificates in their possession, every one as good as gold, every one as good as silver, and every one a legal tender, we would consider ourselves as being fortified by an enormous power here—the money making power. Suppose you wanted to run the issue of coin certificates to \$2,000,000,000 the use of 2 for 1, we would still be inside of the 3 to 1 limit of the banker. Suppose you wanted to do that, what is to prevent it? A thousand millions of money would sustain 100,000 men, perhaps, during the whole length of the war we might have to fight with such a country.

Provisions are here in abundance. You would exchange your coin certificates with your people for them. Your munitions of war are here in abundance. Soldiers are everywhere. You would pay them, feed them, clothe them, take care of them in sickness and health, you would transport them across vast distances, and do everything that may belong to an army in active exercise, thoroughly mobilized. Every expense would be met by the people of the United States through their own Government with what they treat as being as good as gold and as good as silver, because no man can ever present a coin certificate at any time that it will not be redeemed in one of these coins. The redemption is an absolute certainty with 2 for 1. It is equally absolute with 3 for 1. If we wanted to stretch the issue up to \$3,000,000,000 upon a gold and silver basis of \$1,000,000,000, we could compass it without difficulty.

How independent strong and powerful we should be among the nations of this earth if our people had what they should have, absolute faith in the power of the Government of the United States to exchange into coin all the coin certificates that they might be able to bring against the Treasury at any moment, and in consequence of that great faith of the people, and the power of the Government and the wisdom and helpfulness of our policy we should be able to conduct a great war with the greatest power in the world, without borrowing a dollar to carry it on.

What would we think of our power under circumstances like that? If we would have such power as that under military exigencies what must be our power when we should apply it under similar conditions and like circumstances to the control of the commerce of this world? New York, I say again, would become the clearing house of the commerce of the earth.

If this Senate and this Congress could for one moment forget Mr. Cleveland, and Mr. HILL, and Mr. CARLISLE and Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. CULLOM, and my friend from Iowa (Mr. ALLISON) and other great and good men who are aspiring to the Presidency of the United States, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SHERMAN) if he had not discarded all claim to the Presidency by his voluntary act, I understand, and the honorable Senator on my left (Mr. PALMER) whose modesty prevented me from alluding to him—if we could for one moment forget our justifiable, reasonable friendly aspirations and hopes in favor of our pets and favorites for a great political office and come together and lock our hand on this question and say that we will do for this country all that the possibilities of its resources and a devoted love of its institutions and its peoples will admit, we would have no more trouble about the silver question.

We are very nearly out of the woods now, and if you will add the free coinage of silver on terms equal with gold, and will cause the Treasury of the United States to coin the silver that is there on the same terms that it does gold, I believe that we should soon master every difficulty in our way. Then the honorable Senator from Ohio would have the right to rejoice, and, contrary to his will, he would be led up into such high positions that he would be able at last to bless the country when he did not expect to do it.