

REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR P. GORMAN.
OF MARYLAND,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
ON THE BILL TO REPEAL THE PURCHASING CLAUSE OF THE SO-CALLED
SHERMAN ACT, AND IN OPPOSITION TO CERTAIN RESOLU-
TIONS TENDING TO DELAY ACTION THEREON,
August 8 and 23, September 27, and October 28, 1893.

Tuesday, August 8, 1893.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That on and after Thursday, August 10, 1893, until otherwise ordered, the hour of the meeting of the Senate shall be at 11 o'clock in the forenoon.

Mr. GORMAN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I can not, for one, permit the remarks of the Senator from Maine to pass without notice. This Congress has been assembled by the President in extraordinary session because of a great emergency, one that appalls not only the people of this country, but all the world. The President has said, and said well, in his message that the remedy which is to be applied, the measure intended for relief, is above and beyond party in its consideration. I am not astonished, and have not been, at some of the resolutions looking to haste which have emanated from the other side to-day, so that partisan advantage may come from such movements. The mover of each of the resolutions understands as well as I do, and as the country does, that it is only small politics which suggested their introduction.

I am amazed that the Senator from Maine, with all of his experience and patriotism and desire to serve the country, as I have no doubt he has, should have been carried away by the little current which seems to have swept over the other side of the Chamber during the morning hour. As the Senator from Maine knows, and as the country knows, we can not dispose of this question on the moment, and to-morrow. The Senator knows full well that members on both sides of the Chamber are divided in opinion as to the proper remedy to be applied. The President has presented a view clear and emphatic upon one side, but there are other views, and Congress is to determine precisely what shall be done. That decision can not be reached to-day or to-morrow; and in my judgment it is belittling the question, it is trifling with the great commercial interests of this country, for us to seek small advantages on either side of the Chamber.

Mr. HALE. I agree with what the Senator says about the importance of this subject and the fact that men are honestly divided in opinion about it; but does not the Senator, who is equally patriotic with any of us, agree with me that the sooner we can

get this matter before the Senate and begin the debate, wherein every Senator will and should have an opportunity of expressing his mind, the better? The resolution I have offered does not in any way involve any time when we shall stifle debate and bring the question to an issue, but it is in the interest of commencing the discussion of the subject-matter and disposing of it as promptly as possible. Is not the Senator in favor of that?

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator from Maine had been present and had listened to what has occurred to-day, he would have known that the Senator in charge of the great financial committee of the body, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], freely accorded the right to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] to open the debate upon this question. Not a moment is to be lost. No moment has been sacrificed. We have listened to the message of the President, and referred it at once to the Committee on Finance; but before that committee can have time to read the message in cold print or consider the suggestions which have been made on the other side of the question, an attempt is made for partisan advantage—it can not be for anything else—to show that the other side is most anxious to go on.

The Senator from Maine knows that we can not proceed with greater haste. I say to the Senator that whatever differences may be developed—and there are wide differences of opinion on this question, and we all know that fact—the subject should be considered and acted upon without undue haste.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator see any reason on the single, distinct proposition of the repeal of the purchase part of the Sherman act why the majority of the Committee on Finance should not report its conclusions one way or the other on Thursday next?

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the legislation which we are called upon by the President of the United States to repeal is legislation which was considered, not in a partisan spirit, but it took time to enact it, and it will take time, as we all know, to get the committee together, to ascertain their views, and obtain their report to this body. Nobody can know better than the Senator from Maine that the universal experience of this body has been that we absolutely gain time and hasten the moment when we can come to a vote by giving our committees ample opportunity to confer and by giving Senators ample time to confer with each other.

I hope when a measure comes here to be voted upon, in whatever form it may come, that it will come after a conference of members on this side and members upon the other side of the Chamber. I trust that we may all rise above mere partisanship and settle the matter in the interests of the country. I hope that nothing will be done upon the other side to excite party feeling upon this. Whilst we might go back and say that the present condition of affairs is the result of your action, I think anything like crimination or recrimination ought to be discarded at this session.

Mr. President, I do trust that from this time forth it will be thoroughly understood that we are all here to serve our country; it is a serious and awful condition of affairs which we are confronting, and we must take the question up deliberately and calmly, with a view to the enactment of legislation which will give relief.

Wednesday, August 23, 1893.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER], coming over from a previous day. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PEPPER, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to inform the Senate—

First. Whether, and in what respect, the national banks, or any of them, in the cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia are being now conducted in violation of law.

Second. Whether said banks are paying depositors' checks promptly in lawful money.

Third. Whether said banks, or any of them, are demanding rates of interest higher than those provided by law for the loan of money or in discounting notes and bills.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GORMAN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am aware that it is the custom of this body to pass any resolution asking for information from a Department of the Government that any Senator may think he requires in the discharge of his public duty, but I submit that there are exceptions to all rules. There comes a time, as it has come before, when patriotic duty would require nonaction if action were to bring further distress upon the people of this country. There are some things, Mr. President, that we are bound to take note of. They are as public as if they were in the written law. For the third or fourth time during our present monetary system we have reached a period when the national banks of the country are powerless to furnish sufficient currency to provide for the current business.

Mr. President, it is not a new case. The same thing occurred in 1873, 1877, and 1890, and now, in 1893, when it was impossible for the banks to literally comply with the law. They violated it by refusing to pay checks when presented, though the amount was on deposit. They issued clearing-house certificates by the millions, as they are doing to-day. They did it openly. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, whose sworn duty it is to enforce the law, may not have had official information of it; but they must know that the strict enforcement of the law would close the doors of many of the best banks in the country. Such action would not only impair the usefulness of the banks; but would affect injuriously every commercial interest. Mr. President, never during the existence of the national banks has a period arrived half as threatening as the one which confronts us now.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Maryland allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. HOAR. Suppose the Comptroller of the Currency shuts up the banks, will not the result be that everyone of them will have to be put into the hands of a receiver and nobody will get any money until the receiver pays it out?

Mr. GORMAN. Why, Mr. President, the Senator states the law. He knows that is the law; and the mover of this resolution, and every gentleman of intelligence in the United States,

understands that that is the fact. There is not a man I know of outside of this Chamber, no matter what his views may be as to the remedy, who does not know that there is a technical violation of the law, and that it is the patriotic duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to forbear and not add to the distress, but wait until we shall act and give relief.

Now, Mr. President, heretofore on each of the occasions when there was such action as the banks are now taking, there was but one remedy. There is but one remedy under the system of finances by which the country is operating. The banks are powerless to act except as they have done. No relief ever has been given the country except through the Treasury Department, which came to their relief by the sale of bonds and the deposit of the currency in the national banks, or anticipating the interest on the public debt, thus increasing the currency in circulation. That was the action on each of the occasions of congestion and panic during Gen. Grant's Administration, and afterwards by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] during the Hayes Administration. When he was Secretary of the Treasury, he was criticised for placing hundreds of millions in the possession of the national banks.

Under Mr. Cleveland's former Administration, Mr. Manning, Secretary of the Treasury, deposited sixty-odd millions within a few months in the national banks, because the banks were then helpless as they are now. They could not then honor all demands. The relief given by the deposit of Government funds stayed the panic. But now Mr. Carlisle, the Secretary at the head of the Treasury Department, is powerless to give relief for the reason that the money is not in the Treasury and bonds can not be redeemed. You have left nothing there to redeem them with. No deposit can be made in the national banks, because the money is not in the Treasury.

And now, Mr. President, by the action of this august body, by the passage of a resolution of inquiry so drawn that it would be understood by the country—and I take it it would be understood by the Executive—to mean an expression of opinion by the Senate that he must enforce the law—to do this, without first having provided the Treasury with money to relieve this distress, means increased embarrassment. Congress had better never have assembled than that such action should be taken.

As I understand this matter, we have met here not to add to the embarrassment of the people of the country, not to bring further distress upon financial institutions or to throw more labor out of employment, but we have met for the purpose of giving relief. In whatever form it comes, divided as we are on both sides of the Chamber as to the details of the bill to be passed, I do not doubt (as I never have doubted the wisdom of any Congress) that we can rise above our own views, our own partisanship, sink it all in this hour of distress—a distress greater than any which has occurred from 1861 until now. Mr. President, under such circumstances the rule of the Senate, the custom of the Senate, more binding than law, that every member shall have what information from a Department he may deem necessary for his public duty, ought, in my judgment, to be set aside in the interest of the common weal.

Mr. President, I trust the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance for its consideration.

Wednesday, September 27, 1893.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read. The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. DUBOIS, as follows:

Whereas several sovereign States are without full representation in the Senate, which they are entitled to: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the consideration of legislation relating to the Federal election laws, tariff, and finance, matters which materially affect the partially unrepresented States, be postponed in the Senate until Monday, the 15th day of January, 1894, to enable the States of Washington, Montana, and Wyoming to have the votes, influence, and protection in the Senate which are guaranteed to each sovereign State by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. GORMAN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: We all understand perfectly well that the pending resolution is one of a series that has been introduced into this body—

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

Mr. GORMAN. I have but five minutes, and I desire to occupy the time.

Mr. DUBOIS. Several Senators desire to discuss the resolution, and I was going to ask that it might go over until to-morrow.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GORMAN. I am always glad to accommodate the Senator, but can not yield now. Mr. President, this resolution is one of a series which has been introduced in this body which serve the purpose of consuming the two hours of the morning hour. It is perfectly well understood that it is part of the programme of the gentlemen who represent the minority of the Senate, as I believe, those who are opposed to the pending bill, for the purpose of using up the time of the body. That is not strange. That is their right. Nobody can object to it. It has occurred in this body over and over again, and will occur, I suppose, until time is no more with us.

But, Mr. President, the manner of conducting the debate, the scenes that we have witnessed in this body in the last week, are without parallel in the history of the Senate. I beg to call the attention of the Senators who are indulging in this acrimonious debate to the fact that they are doing that which has never occurred before in the history of this Chamber. They are doing more, Mr. President, to belittle this great body in the eyes of the people of the country than anything which has heretofore occurred. I believe the time will come, and that speedily, when some of the actors in it will regret the part which they have taken and will atone as best they may for having brought this great body from a deliberative assembly to the level of a county convention or a board of aldermen.

Mr. President, I have not taken part in this discussion except upon a resolution offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER], which I believe if passed would have had the effect of adding untold distress to the people of this country. I therefore was amazed that the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], for whom I have had great personal respect and fondness,

should so far forget the great duty of an American Senator as to bring into this discussion matters that did not belong to it; that he should indulge in insinuation that Senators were controlled by motives which are not proper. When he first did it I thought perhaps, as he comes from a State whose people are intensely interested in this question, he was wrought up to a state of excitement by a desire to serve them and ought not to be held to the strict account for the expressions made in his speech that Senators ordinarily are held to in this body.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Just one word. May I ask the Senator from Maryland to what he refers? I am unconscious of any intimation of the kind.

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator has intimated that Senators on this floor changed their votes upon the question of the admission of Senators from the three States that are named in this resolution; and he repeated this morning, as did the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], that while he had respect for one Senator who had changed his vote in favor of their admission or against it, he did not know what to think of two others who had changed their votes in an opposite direction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I ask leave to interrupt the Senator. I beg to say that if the Senator will read my remarks as they were uttered he will utterly fail to find anywhere the slightest suggestion of impropriety of motive, for I had none in my breast, I cherish none, and I certainly uttered none.

Mr. GORMAN. I of course will accept the disclaimer of the Senator from Colorado, but I venture to say that no man who can read the English language and understand it would have drawn any other conclusion from his remarks a few days since and those uttered to-day. But I accept his disclaimer, if he did not mean it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

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

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

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] has given notice that he would address the Senate on the pending bill. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. PASCO. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, even with the disclaimer of the Senator from Colorado, which I accept with the further fact of the declaration of the Senator from New Hampshire to-day, I can not permit the matter to rest as it is. I wish to tell each of those Senators and the Senate and the country, if they have any interest in it, that the question of the admission of Senators from a State under the conditions that obtained in Montana, Washington, and Wyoming was a new question in this body. It was a question that taxed the best legal minds of this body. It is no secret that the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who reported the resolution, frankly stated

that he, great lawyer as he is, had had the other view some years ago, but on a further study of the question changed his mind and thought that the right existed for the governor to appoint. I do not misrepresent the Senator, I know.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator substantially represents me correctly. The view which I avowed first was an answer to a question thrust upon me suddenly in debate as a supposed question, and I stated that immediately after the conclusion of my remarks on reflection I came to the conclusion that I had made a wrong answer. But it is the substance.

Mr. GORMAN. It is the substance. I only used the Senator as an illustration because he is recognized in this body as one of the great lawyers here. He is not the only distinguished lawyer who has changed his opinion on this subject. The question came here and was taken up by both sides of the Chamber with a view of determining it in this high court, without reference to politics, without reference to any measure that was pending in Congress or out of Congress or that was likely to come here. It was in that spirit that it was taken up at the last special session and continued at the present session.

I want to say to those two Senators that, so far as I know and believe, every Senator upon this floor under his oath voted as he believed to be right in that case. With great doubt in my own mind as to what my duty was I preferred to follow the majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I am one of the few members of this body who is not a lawyer. I leaned necessarily and naturally upon the great men on that committee for my instruction. I followed the majority and voted for the admission of the appointed Senator from Montana, as did my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Finance Committee. When that vote was taken, without pressure so far as I know, without an attempt to influence any member of this body except by fair debate on the legal proposition involved, the verdict of this court was that the governor had not the right to make the appointment.

There was no question as to the vote of any Senator in the body, except the pair of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who was absent upon a public duty and paired, and it turned out that his vote was announced in the opposite direction from that which he would have voted. But that vote would not have changed the result. It would not have changed the result if the Senator had been present and voted. There would still have been a majority of 2 against the seating of the contestant from Montana.

I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Colorado to the statement I am about to make. When the motion was made to reconsider the vote which had excluded the contestant from Montana for the purpose of changing the verdict of this great body, the Senator from Indiana and myself at once said, doubtful as this question has been and is, we will not consent, though we voted for the seating of this gentleman, that any other question shall be brought in here to change the verdict of a body which has been given without reference to silver or gold; and we changed our votes that the record of this great body might remain perfect and appropriate.

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

Mr. GORMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. DUBOIS. I think the Senator is mistaken in regard to the vote. Those who were contending that Mr. Mantle should be seated insisted that the Senator from Alabama would vote that way, and so they moved to reconsider. My recollection is that had the Senator from Alabama been voted correctly there would have been a tie on that vote, and the decision left to the Vice-President.

Mr. GORMAN. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. DUBOIS. My recollection is that there was a majority of but 2 against seating Mr. Mantle on the first vote.

Mr. GORMAN. But there was a majority of 5; and the change would not have affected the result. I have stated it accurately, and if the Senator will examine the record he will find it so. Now, Mr. President, so much for that.

The Senator from Colorado, not content with this, goes one step beyond. I think the Senator will agree to change his statement. I do not believe that the Senator will stand upon the speech which he made to-day, for, I take it, he alluded to myself and to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] when he described the gentleman on the other side as being on a steering committee and the leader of the protectionists on his own side. I ask him if he meant me.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will state I have been advised there has been a consultation of Senators going on for some days. On this side of the Chamber we are advised that the Senator from Rhode Island is marshaling the forces of the friends of repeal, and we have been advised that on the other side of the Chamber the Senator from Maryland has been marshaling the members on that side who are in favor of repeal, with a view of an agreement upon some further and more rigorous measure which shall compel the Senate to sit longer hours than at present, with a view, if possible by that method, to force a vote. I shall be very glad if I am misinformed.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I have been a member of this body for over twelve years. I have been connected with it from the time that I was twelve years of age. I have seen in the last forty years all the great men who represented the sovereign States of the Union on this floor. I have witnessed scenes in this body of great excitement, where the interests of States and sections of the Union were involved. I have seen great measures affecting the currency of the country disposed of. I have seen taxation levied that was a burden which crushed a great section of our common country, as we thought. This is the first instance in that time that I have ever known a Senator to use information obtained at committee-room doors or from information received from eavesdroppers, tell the Senate of the private conferences of Senators upon any subject. It is not necessary, Mr. President, to say more of such an instance as that.

Mr. President, let me say to Senators on the other side that this great measure is being managed and conducted by one who has grown venerable in the public service, whose ability is equal to that of any of his colleagues upon this floor, who has managed it, surrounded as he has been with divisions on both sides of the Chamber as well if not better than it could have been managed by any man within the sound of my voice, with a degree of fairness and liberality to the minority that I have never seen surpassed in the Senate Chamber. Kind and courteous and will-

ing to give you all the time you wanted and to suit your own convenience, he has made it impossible for the Senator from Colorado or for any other Senator to say that he has not been treated with perfect fairness. I have been simply content to follow him. I am not managing or leading for him. He is more able and capable to do it than any man I know of. Yet in return for that generosity, for that forbearance, for that consideration of your personal convenience and your public duties, I repeat there never has been witnessed in this body so much want of consideration for the manager of a bill as has been shown the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

I have as a silent member of this body during the consideration of the measure regretted the fact to which I have just alluded, and hoped that reason would resume its sway and Senators would come back to the rule that has always governed this body. I have not thrust myself into the debate. I have not criticised any one of you. I had hoped that the time would come, possibly not upon this bill, but come immediately after if not upon this bill, when something might be done that would conciliate and accommodate your views. I have stood in that position, and I get for it, uncalled for, the remarks of the distinguished Senators to whom I have referred.

Mr. President, as was well said by the Senator from Indiana, this extraordinary treatment of the case is not confined alone to intimations of want of good faith on the part of Senators, but it has gone farther. It has gone to the extent of attempting to indict the Chief Magistrate of the Union, by making a declaration that he has used the power and the patronage of the Government for the purpose of forcing this bill through.

Mr. President, I am not the mouthpiece or the spokesman of the President of the United States. His patronage I know nothing of. I care nothing for it. I neither have it nor wish it. But there is no man in the whole Union, and it is due to him to say so, who, during the whole time he has occupied the Presidency, has been more careful to avoid using the great power of his office. If I may criticise him at all, it would be to say that he has been so careful of it that he has scarcely done his party justice.

Mr. President, I trust that notwithstanding the great interests and the warm feeling Senators have upon this question we will yet, and that speedily, after full and fair debate, come back to that unwritten law of this body which has always heretofore been more binding than the written rules—the rules so well and so ably described by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE]—and after all, while hardships will come to your people possibly if you are right, and further distress may come to the agricultural as well as to the mining sections, let us remember that is as nothing compared with the duty of sustaining the Senate in unimpaired vigor and in keeping its reputation for fair dealing, for full and free discussion, and for securing final action without personalities.

Mr. President, but for the allusion of the two Senators I should have contented myself with simply going on with the business of the Senate, and would probably have not participated in the discussion. Notwithstanding what has been said, I still occupy, as I have always done, upon all occasions and upon all measures, a position where I can at any time meet a question such as this,

or any that may come, without personal interest, without personal feeling, and with a full desire and determination to do, so far as I know how to do, exact justice not only to this, but to every other interest that is involved in legislative action.

Saturday, October 28, 1893.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes its session. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

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

Mr. GORMAN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have not detained the Senate many moments in the discussion of the pending question. I have studiously refrained from doing so. But I can not help observing the very remarkable attitude of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who is the acknowledged leader on the other side of this Chamber, and of more than half the Senators who support the bill for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the so-called Sherman law. His anxiety for its repeal, his support of its repeal, is perfectly well understood; but at the same time that distinguished Senator has well known the fact that the passage of the pending bill was impossible at any time except as a nonpartisan measure, except by the support of the twenty-five or twenty-six Republicans on the other side of the Chamber and the twenty-one or twenty-two Democrats on this.

Its only hope of success from the beginning until now has been unity of action between gentlemen who have such diverse views upon general political questions, and not to bring in the mere party question and attempt to take party advantage of the delays, of the mistakes, if there have been mistakes; and now, in the closing hours of the struggle, which will go down in history as one of the most remarkable that has ever taken place in this Chamber, that distinguished leader tells us and tells the country that the measure itself will be impotent, that it eliminates silver or the further use of it for the present.

Mr. SHERMAN. I did not say a word to that effect. On the contrary, I spoke strongly in favor of silver to its largest extent, so that it would not demonetize gold.

Mr. GORMAN. If I have misunderstood the Senator, all around me here seem to have shared with me in misunderstanding him. He has said that the passage of the bill as it stands will not give the relief to the country that the country has expected.

Mr. SHERMAN. I said it might not meet the expectations of the people.

Mr. GORMAN. If his argument was understood at all on this side of the Chamber, he said that when the bill is passed the Treasury will not be in a condition to meet the wants of the country, or to keep the finances in a healthy condition; and the only relief suggested by the Senator is to issue bonds, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to use them not only for the purpose of maintaining the parity between the two metals, but for the ordinary expenditures of the Government.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. SHERMAN. How does he propose to pay the deficiency in the revenues of \$50,000,000, reported by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. GORMAN. I will come to that, if the Senator will pardon me a moment.

Now, Mr. President, if I understood the position of the Democratic party in the beginning of this controversy, it was that we pledged ourselves to the repeal of the Sherman law.

Mr. BUTLER. A part of it?

Mr. GORMAN. No, sir; the whole law. Our platform demanded it. Every newspaper that has breathed a Democratic breath at first demanded that Congress should carry out the decree of the party. I take it that other Senators like myself were questioned by the great metropolitan press as to whether we were in favor of the absolute repeal of that law, the whole law, without conditions. When that was being strongly urged I do not think I am mistaken when I say that the distinguished Senator from Ohio in a speech or an interview in his own State denounced the repeal of the entire Sherman law, and stated that he would favor the repeal of the purchasing clause alone. I am not mistaken in that. If I am, I ask the Senator to correct me. The Senator says that now?

Mr. SHERMAN. I believe that is what the bill professes to do.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes; that is what the bill professes. I am coming to that. The President of the United States, anxious and earnest in his desire for its repeal, was too astute and learned a statesman not to know that he had not the power in his own party or with his own party to repeal any portion of that law, because the division is so sharp and great among both parties that neither party would have the power to deal with this question and make the repeal, and we were compelled to take the terms offered by the Senator from Ohio. He held the key of the position. You have dictated the terms to us. It was the only thing we could get you to agree to for the relief the country.

Then, Mr. President, when Congress met, we came here with forty-four Senators on this side of the Chamber, elected as Democrats, only one-half of this body, with the perfect knowledge on the part of every intelligent man in the Union that the party was hopelessly divided upon this question, as your party is also hopelessly divided. It may be said with truth that a large majority of the Democrats were at the beginning of the session against the repeal even of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act.

Mr. BUTLER. Unconditionally.

Mr. GORMAN. The unconditional repeal. It was known that you had from thirteen to fifteen Republicans opposed to repeal. It was believed, and I think it was a fact easily made perfectly plain to everybody, that a clear majority of all the Senators elected were not in favor of the unconditional repeal, but they wanted some modification.

Complaints have been made of delay in this matter. I am glad of the opportunity to say, and I say it in justice to those who have fought this bill, that those of us who intended to vote for

its final passage believed that we were in the minority, and a delay of weeks became necessary that we might convert enough to our side to pass the bill. It was not brought into this body from the Committee on Finance until days after we had met. The Senator from Ohio, a great member of that committee and an authority in this body on financial questions, and with a reputation such as few men have ever had in the country, was too astute a man to try to force its early consideration in this body. When his colleagues on the other side, impetuous and anxious to put the Democratic party in a false position, demanded a vote upon the bill the first week of the session, the chairman of the Finance Committee, and even the Senator from Ohio, checked their impetuosity, and said, "Oh, no; let the Committee on Finance first consider the bill."

The fact of it was that we were not ready for its consideration. As time went on the debate became sharp. And, Mr. President, I want to remark right here that it has been a great debate. The annals of Congress will not show one equal to it, and those who participated in it will go down to posterity as men who were equal to any who have preceded them. When the contest became sharp the doubt was then expressed as to the power of the Senate to pass it, not as to the power to reach a vote, but the power to pass unconditional repeal with a majority. In the very midst of the fight, in the hottest of it, when men were anxious, when every Senator was desirous that something might be done (and when I say every Senator I mean all on both sides of the Chamber) to relieve the great distress in the financial interests and in commercial affairs, the first note of warning that we had, publicly uttered, came from the Senator from Ohio, the Senator who led more than one-half of the repeal column, that it was impossible to pass it. Here is his interview, published October 5, 1893, in a telegram to the Cincinnati Enquirer dated Washington, October 4:

[Cincinnati Enquirer, October 5, 1893.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 4.

I called on Senator Sherman to-night. More than any other quantity in the Senate he represents his party. I asked him bluntly if he believed the law which bore his name would be repealed?

His answer was frank—direct:

"I do not," said he.

"Then," said I, "what next?"

"I can not," said he, "be explicit as to what next. The position of the Republican members of the Senate is now passive. The Democrats are endeavoring to arrange a compromise. If they succeed, they can pass a compromise measure no matter if the Republican Senators are solidly arrayed against it. Our side, or rather the large majority of our side, stand ready to vote for unconditional repeal whenever the Democrats fix the time to vote. We are even ready to support a closure."

"Have you any idea," I asked, "of the terms of compromise?"

"No," said the Senator, "I am not in the secrets of those arranging it. There have been several propositions involving the issue of bonds and the reduction of the monthly purchases of silver. My judgment is, and it is, however, a judgment, that in the end the Democrats will unite on a proposition to extend the provisions of the Sherman law three years, with a reduction of the monthly purchases of silver to 2,500,000 ounces of silver instead of 4,500,000 ounces as now."

"Do you think the President would sign such a bill?"

"I have no reason of knowing. Yet I am impressed he will yield to a fair compromise. If he does not he will destroy his party, and his Administration will be broken down."

Mr. SHERMAN. I think the reporter has been rather more accurate than usual in that interview. I think that was the sub-

stance of what I said. I desire merely to add that I believe the bill would not have passed but for the abortive attempt to compromise, which, falling through, left nothing else to do but to pass it. However that is a mere matter of interview between ourselves.

Mr. GORMAN. October 4 is the date of this interview. The Senator from Ohio knew perfectly well, as every other man in the country knew, that he was laying down a condition for the Democratic party to unite. He knew to unite was as impossible as it was to fly, unless it meant the extension of the purchase of silver to some future period. He knew that the demand in the country for its unconditional repeal coming to us through the press and trade organizations in every section was such that the entire Senate was most anxious to do something to relieve anxiety. He knew another thing, that with the difference of views upon this financial question between the East and the West and the North and the South it was impossible to pass what we call in the Eastern States a sound financial bill with bonds unless we had his cooperation and the cooperation of those on the other side who thought with us; and when you placed the conditions upon the Democratic party, as you had the power to do, holding the key of the situation with your 25 or 26 votes; you forced us into a position to take a measure that would not be satisfactory to the people for whom the Senator from Ohio speaks and whom I have the honor to represent in part on this floor.

But, Mr. President, there was an earnest desire, there has been from the beginning of the session an earnest desire on this side of the Chamber, to frame such legislation as might redound to the interest of all the people of this country. Sharp as the division was upon the particular measures, there is not a Democrat upon this side of the Chamber who was not impressed with a desire to harmonize the party, to sustain the Democratic Administration. All were willing to make sacrifices of opinion and to set aside the convictions of a lifetime and unite in doing something which would relieve the business distress and save their Administration from defeat. They tried to get together. They tried to do what was right. There were many of them who shared the conviction that it is extraordinary, unusual, and unfortunate to strike down summarily, without an hour's warning, any great interest that we had built up or made possible by laws, no matter how vicious and bad the laws themselves. Their deliberations could have been carried to a consummation with the bonds that the Senator from Ohio speaks of.

I do not complain of him for making the suggestion of bonds except as to the time and manner of doing it, for I from the beginning, not of this Congress, but in the last, under Mr. Harrison's Administration, believed that with the extravagant appropriations that have been made, with the growth of expenditures for pensions, and otherwise, which can not be eliminated, there is not revenue enough to pay the current expenses of the Government under your present laws, and at the last session of Congress I voted with the Senator from Ohio to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds for all these purposes.

If, Mr. President, there had been less partisanship in this Chamber when we came to consider a proposition that would have practically united this side, if we had had a response from the Senator from Ohio and those who associate with him politically,

we could have passed a bill repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, no matter whether it takes effect to-morrow or the next day, and we would have strengthened the Treasury, given the Secretary power to issue \$200,000,000 of gold, and it would have been a notice to the world that this country, in that matter as in all others, had the power and the will to maintain our honor and keep our finances to the very highest possible level.

I am not here, Mr. President, to violate the confidences that have been given to me in all the suggestions that have been made by members of this body, or gentlemen outside of the body. I can say, though, with propriety that there is scarcely one of us who in the very heat of this controversy has not been most willing to make the suggestions and look to a better bill than the one we now have. That is past. The responsibility—

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to say a word, if I do not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. GORMAN. Not at all.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am quite sure if our Democratic friends on the other side of the Chamber had made any proposition, such as the Senator now mentions, providing for the coinage of what is called the seigniorage, and providing for the maintenance of all forms of money at par with each other by authorizing the sale of \$200,000,000 of bonds, the proposition would probably have been very agreeable to this side of the Chamber; but, as I understand—as a matter of course I do not ask for any secrets—our friends on the other side of the Chamber declined to agree to any proposition which contained authority to issue bonds. I think that was the general understanding on this side.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, as I said, I would not, to relieve myself from being misunderstood or for any other purpose in the world, violate confidences or repeat conversations which have been had; but I have a right to say that we have been most unfortunate if we were not understood to say that a provision for a proper bond issue could have been passed without much difficulty.

I agree now with the Senator from Ohio. The day, the hour for all that has passed. I should not have referred to this matter but for the fact that the Senator in his remarks, which will be found in the RECORD of the 18th of October, on page 2758, attempted to place the entire responsibility on the Democrats. He said:

The President suggests, however, that the first and most important measure, before further action, is to clear away the present silver-purchasing clause of the act of 1890. We have thought so too, but if the other side do not think so it can not be done, for their vote is potent. They carry the matter in their own hands. Let them agree upon something.

In times past, when they were in the minority and we were in the majority, we never shrank from responsibility. We were Republicans because we believed in Republican principles and Republican men and Republican measures, and whenever a question came into the Senate Chamber to be decided we never pleaded the baby act and said "we could not agree." We met together in conclave; we measured each other's opinions, some giving way, and finally we came to an agreement. In this way we passed all the great laws which have marked the history of the last thirty years of our country, and it was not done by begging votes of the other side. We knew that, by the usual and almost universal habit of the Democratic party, they would oppose anything we should propose, even the Lord's Commandments or the Lord's Prayer. [Laughter.]

* * * * *

Sir, these are public duties that can not be avoided. You must decide this

silver question some way or other. If you can not do it and will retire from the Senate Chamber we will settle it on this side, and we will do the best we can with our silver friends who belong to us, who are blood of our blood and bone of our bone. But you have the majority on this floor to-day, and therefore I beg of you, not in reproach, not in anger, because I know the great difficulty and the difference of opinion that exists in the two parties; you have the supreme honor of settling this question now, and you ought to do it. That is all I care to say on that point.

And again to-day, wittingly or unwittingly, he endeavored to place upon this side of the Chamber the responsibility of any future failure, or the failure of this act, to give relief. Mr. President, the responsibility does not belong to one party. If the act does not meet public expectation, we must on both sides share the responsibility; but it may turn out to be the wisest thing that this bill shall pass just as it came from the committee. If so, we will share the credit.

Mr. President, that there is to be further trouble with our financial affairs everybody who has watched the operations of the Treasury must know. We have come into power, but we have inherited an enormous debt, imperfect revenue laws, and stagnation in every industry. The Treasury is bankrupt, says the Senator from Ohio. It was bankrupt when we accepted it and when we came into power. Who is responsible for it?

We are \$50,000,000 short, says the Senator from Ohio. Why, Mr. President, I hold a statement in my hand showing that during the last three years there have been appropriated for various purposes, including \$49,000,000 per annum for the sinking fund, \$362,000,000 more than the revenues. The money has, of course, not all been spent, because we did not have it in the Treasury; the obligations of the Government created by law have not been discharged; but after paying the amounts which were absolutely necessary to keep the Government running, including the payment of pensions, there is a shortage of \$50,000,000, soon to be increased to \$30,000,000, which must be met. The Government of the United States can not repudiate its debts. It is not the fault on this side of the Chamber as a party. Conceal the facts as you may, you can not make party capital out of it, for the honest men of the country will know what the facts are.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will ask my friend, if he will allow me, whether the last House of Representatives was not strongly Democratic, and whether all the appropriations for the support of the Government did not originate there? I myself supposed that both parties shared in the responsibility for excessive appropriations.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, it is true that the last House of Representatives was Democratic: it is true that the Republican party have had possession of the executive branch and of this branch of the Government; and it is true that we could not cut down these expenditures unless we had control of all branches of the Government. Now, that we have that control, we hope to cut down expenditures as rapidly as possible.

But we have inherited another thing—contracts which have been made by law, and from which there is no escape. Obligations have been incurred on all sides. They must be met.

All I complain of now is that Senators on the other side of this Chamber at the end of a great crisis in this body, and, I hope, almost at the end of a great financial panic, should bring up this question for the purpose of gaining party advantage.

Mr. President, we shall take the responsibility of all the new laws which will be enacted during the time we are in power. We shall go as far as it is possible for men to go in relieving the country of the bad laws now upon the statute books; we shall insist upon the consideration of legislation for that purpose in season and out of season if necessary, but we do object to being held up to the country as responsible for laws which were not of our enacting.

I trust the Senator from Ohio and Senators on the other side of the Chamber, who unite with the President upon this one measure, will yet withdraw their partisan efforts, and admit that this is a question above party, and which could not be passed if it were a party question. We must all share the full responsibility of whatever may come from this enactment.

701

