Congressional Record.

FIFTY-THIRD CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

Repeal of the Sherman Law.

I have ever found in my progress through life, that, acting for the public, if we do always what is right, the approbation denied us in the beginning will surely follow us in the end.—*Thomas Jefferson.*

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROGER Q. MILLS,

OF TEXAS,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Tuesday, September 19, 1893.

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

Mr. MILLS said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: We have been convened in extraordinary session to consider an extraordinary condition of public affairs. It seems a little singular that in the midst of abundance, with the country blessed with wealth in all its varied forms, there should be distress among many of our people. But it is so. Money, the most subtle and potent of all the agencies of exchange, has, from some cause, become frightened and has retired from the channels of commerce. As a necessary consequence transportation has been checked; production in some departments of industry has been slackened; employment has been reduced, and the rewards to which labor is entitled have fallen off. And to-day, while we are discussing the financial condition of the country, a large part of our laboring people are discussing the question of subsistence for themselves and those dependent on them.

There are various causes assigned for this unhappy condition. The President in his message says to us it is chiefly chargeable to the Sherman law of the 14th of July, 1890. A very large part of the more intelligent of our citizens who are employed in commercial pursuits concur with him in that opinion, while another large part have reached a different conclusion. But, sir, there is a substantial concurrence of opinion among all classes, in Congress and out of it, that the Sherman law is an unwise enactment which should be removed from the statute books of the nation.

The Democratic members of both branches of Congress said it was unwise when they voted against its passage, and remain unchanged in their convictions to the present time. The Republican party, who are responsible for it, say that it has outlived the purpose of its enactment, and they are now ready to join with us in its repeal. If, therefore, we can unite in repealing an unwise law, and if its repeal will result in restoring confidence to those engaged in conducting our commerce and in the revival of business activity, we will be in the discharge of the highest patriotic duty to remove it from the statute books as speedily as possible.

The President in his message calls our attention to the provisions of the law; that it requires the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase monthly four and a half million ounces of silver bullion; that this bullion is to be paid for by an issue of Treasury notes redeemable in gold or silver coin, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury; that said notes are to be reissued when redeemed and kept as a part of the permanent circulation of the country. The law also charges the Secretary to use the discretion confided to him in redeeming these notes, so as to maintain the established policy of the United States to preserve the parity of the two metals at the present ratio, or such as may be provided by law.

This requirement of law limits the discretion of the Secretary and constrains him so to use the power given to him as that the two metals shall remain in our circulation and our standard of value be maintained and secured. He informs us that up to the 15th of July last more than $147,000,000 of these notes had been issued, and that between the 1st of May, 1892, and the 15th of July, 1893, fifty-four millions of these notes had been issued and forty-nine millions had been redeemed in gold. He tells us that gold, the essential instrument required by the Secretary to discharge the trust confided to him by law to keep the metals at par, is leaving the Treasury; that between July, 1890, and July, 1893, the gold in the Treasury decreased more than $132,000,000, while the silver coin for the same period increased more than one hundred and forty-seven millions. Not only is the gold leaving the Treasury, but he calls to our attention the fact that it is leaving the country, and that during the last fiscal year the excess of exports of gold over its imports exceeded $87,000,000.

With this condition confronting us he says, and well says:

> Gold and silver must part company and the Government must fail in its established policy to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other. Given over to the exclusive use of a currency greatly depreciated according to the standard of the commercial world, we could no longer claim a place among nations of the first class, nor could our Government claim a performance of its obligation, so far as such an obligation has been imposed upon it, to provide for the use of the people the best and safest money.

Here is language as clear and as explicit as can be written, that if the present condition continues "the established policy" of parity must fail; that bimetallism must go as an exploded dream, and silver monometallism must come in its stead.

The President has warned Congress and the country against the insidious approach of monometallism, and that in its very worst form—monometallism of the depreciated metal. In the face of this warning, the President has been denounced by persons claiming to be Democrats as a monometallist. It has been said in this debate that we stand face to face with the issue of bimetallism against the single gold standard. The statement of the issue is not correct. The issue is bimetallism against a single silver standard, and the issue is not one made by the President. It is an issue made by existing conditions and the issue so made is one for Congress and the country to determine. If the two metals are to be kept at par in our circulation the Sherman law must be repealed. If the silver standard is to be introduced and our gold standard and gold circulation is to be expelled, then the Sherman law should be retained.

The President has called us together and pointed out the peril to "the established policy" of bimetallism, and the disastrous consequences to flow from its expulsion, and yet he is arraigned before the country as an enemy of bimetallism and a gold monometallist. Batteries have been planted within the lines of the Democratic encampment with their guns shotted to the lips with grape and canister and their muzzles turned upon him and his Administration. He is charged with being unfaithful to the declarations of the party that elected him to the Chief Magistracy of the nation, and that he is off the platform and refuses to execute the pledges that party made to the nation. Sir, I deny the charge. I say that he stands firmly with both feet on the platform of his party, and in his message is doing all that is in his power to induce Congress to redeem the pledges made by the party that elected him. It is not he, but those who are fighting him that have abandoned the platform.

The first sentence of the seventh article of that platform, so often quoted, says:

> We denounce the Republican legislation known as the Sherman act of 1890 as a cowardly makeshift, fraught with possibilities of danger in the future which should make all of its supporters as well as its author anxious for its speedy repeal.

That is all that is said about the Sherman law. Here is a strong denunciation and an unequivocal demand for its speedy repeal. There are no conditions attached. There are no substitutes demanded. A Democratic convention indicted it as a "cowardly makeshift" and demanded its "speedy" repeal, and yet the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, and all of us who want to carry into effect in letter and spirit the pledges which our party made to the nation, are declared to be off the platform and false to the obligations which we have assumed to the American people.

We are told that something else must be substituted. Why should something else be substituted? "Because," they say, "if you repeal the Sherman law unconditionally no more silver will be coined. The President will not sign any bill that provides for any more silver coinage." And on these assumptions the President is to be convicted of infidelity to high public trust. The President is as much entitled to be trusted by the constituency that elected him as we are by that which elected us, and I will never vote for the adoption of any amendment to this bill that puts upon him the brand of suspicion. I am not required to dispel all the doubts that may have taken refuge in the minds of gentlemen as to the President's fidelity to the trusts which the people have confided to his keeping. It is only necessary for me to discharge those duties which have been imposed upon me. My party has indicted and arraigned this "cowardly makeshift" before the bar of the nation. On the 8th day of last November it was convicted and sentenced, and the duty is imposed on me to use whatever power I possess to remove it, and that I intend to do.

Mr. President, it has not been the habit of the legislative department of the Government to embrace all the measures to be enacted in one bill. We have been out of the control of the Government for thirty years, and many measures are required to make its administration conform to Democratic opinion. Many abuses have grown up, many bad measures have been engrafted upon the statutes. They must all have their day in court, and be considered in their order. It is said the Democratic convention at Chicago declared for the equal treatment of gold and silver, and the conclusion is that it must be done in this bill. To that it may be replied that the convention declared against the McKinley law; must its repeal or modification be engrafted on this? Must we wait till the House has prepared and passed a bill to take its place, for everybody knows we can not inaugurate a measure of that kind?

The platform demands the admission as States of New Mexico and Arizona. Are we to wait till the bills for their admission are prepared and then incorporate them in this? It declares for the improvement of the Mississippi River. Are we to wait till plans shall be formed and adopted which will compel the Father of Waters to remain within his banks, and then make these plans a part of this bill? It declares the party in favor of the construction of the Nicaragua Canal. Are we to wait till that canal is built before we repeal the Sherman law? Everyone will say no. Then why should we place silver legislation in the bill intended to repeal the Sherman law? The only reason that can be assigned is that the President will not sign such legislation as Congress will pass. I say that the people have made him their Chief Magistrate. They have trusted him, are still trusting him, and will continue to trust him. Let us examine the declarations of the platform on the subject of coinage, and see who is on and who is off. Turning to the seventh article again, it says:

We hold—

"Hold" is a very significant word. It means to retain, and retain firmly, something already in possession—

We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discriminating against either metal, or charge for mintage; but—

But what? "But" is a disjunctive conjunction, the grammarians tell us. A disjunctive conjunction disjoins and conjoins. Words are the signs of ideas—the vehicles of thought. The thought, the idea that was being conveyed by these words, was arrested by the interposition of that little word of three letters. The idea was disjoined; while the sentence was conjoined. The idea was the equal treatment of both metals in our coinage laws. That idea was arrested and a condition was prescribed that limited the declaration. What was that condition?

but the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic or exchangeable value.

Here is the fundamental condition upon which the equal coinage of the two metals was to rest, and equality of treatment was not to be adopted upon any other condition. The coinage of both metals without limit and without charge must produce bimetallism; not partial bimetallism as we now have, but perfect bimetallism, which is shown by the parity in value of the metals or the dollar coined and uncoined. That is what a Democratic convention said, and that is what a Democratic President says. Equal treatment of both metals if it will keep both metals in circulation. If equal treatment will expel one metal and retain the other then equal treatment is not to be had. We have thirteen hundred millions of bimetallism now and "we hold to" it. If we can not have perfect bimetallism we will retain what we have, which is the next best thing to it.

The position clearly and unequivocally taken in that declaration is that the present standard of value shall not be supplanted. The platform declares that the dollars of each metal must have "equal intrinsic and exchangeable value." There has been some refining on the word "intrinsic" during this debate. When the word is used in reference to gold and silver it means commercial value. It is so used by financiers and political economists. It means the value which individual want gives, in contradistinction to that value which government gives. "Exchangeable" value means money value, and when both are united in both metals there is perfect bimetallism. When both are united in one metal that metal becomes the standard of value and the other, if used, is a subsidiary metal, limited in its volume to prevent its supplanting the standard.

The same is true of the paper dollar. If its volume is limited it is an auxiliary to the standard dollar. If unlimited it supplants the standard and expels it from the circulation. The Government note that promises to pay $1,000 is intrinsically worthless, but with the power given it by the Government it is worth $1,000 in gold. The intrinsic value of 371¼ grains of silver is to-day in the open market about 57 cents; the exchangeable value in coin is 100 cents. When the convention declared that the paper dollar should be kept at par with the coin dollar they explained what they meant by exchangeable value.

If the fundamental condition of equality of the two metals in the markets and the mints does not exist, then it must be produced "through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as shall insure the maintenance of the parity of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar, at all times, in the markets and in the payment of debts." Here is a clear recognition of two opposing opinions as to the proper method of reaching bimetallism; one by international agreement and the other by national legislation. It was well known in that convention that the Democratic party, as well as the Republican party, was divided as to these two opposing policies.

The convention was too smart to espouse one of these and antagonize the other. There were too many voters in the ranks of each who might forget when election day came. They substantially said to the country: We are Democrats; we believe with Thomas Jefferson that error of opinion may be tolerated when reason is left free to combat it; let reason and the wrong go together; our faith is that reason will survive and the wrong will perish. Put both propositions in the arena of debate; discuss them, turn on the light, try them by the crucible; seek and find the right. Remember that "in essentials there should be unity, in nonessentials liberty, in all things charity."

The essential here is that the two metals must remain in our circulation. If possible as equals, but if that is not possible, one must be the principal and the other the auxiliary; but under no circumstances is either metal to be expelled. The President expressed a sentiment that lives in the bosom of every Democrat in the land when he said that the people were entitled to a sound and stable currency and their government had no right to injure them by financial experiments.

Sir, I am a bimetallist myself, and have been ever since the question of silver coinage has been agitated in this country, and since I have been in public life. I am for the free and unlimited coining of both gold and silver, and the language of the national Democratic platform expresses my sentiments as clearly as if I had written it with my own hand. I am for the free and unlimited coinage of both metals, "but"—that free and unlimited coinage must result in the preservation of that bimetallism which we have to-day, and keep both metals circulating in our country at par.

Nothing in the business of the country can be of such transcendent importance to its labor as the fixity and stability of the standard of value that measures all its products in the market. I wonder if our friends have ever thought how immense are the products that are thrown upon the world by the daily labor of the American people. Every article made by that labor has to be valued before it goes from the producer to the middleman and from him to the consumer, and every exchange that is made when the article leaves the producer and is on its way to the consumer has to be valued, and before it can be valued there must be a standard by which it is to be valued. One of the most intelligent statisticians in the United States says that the annual exchanges of our country amount to more than $40,000,000,000 a year.

Let us think for one moment that every man who is laboring is laboring five or ten times as much for some one else as he is for himself. His products have to be exchanged; and before they are exchanged there must be a standard by which they are to be valued when exchanged. The great mass of our 22,000,000 of persons who are engaged in gainful occupations in this country must have a stable standard of value or they will be cheated every day and every hour of the day throughout the whole year. When the President declares in his message for a stable standard of value and warns us of the perils that are in the way, he is standing in the steps and repeating the declarations of Thomas Jefferson, the great author and founder of our party. In 1813, when the country was similarly situated, he wrote to Mr. John W. Eppes a letter, from which I extract the following passage:

To trade on equal terms the common measure of values should be as nearly as possible on a par with that of its corresponding nations, whose medium is in a sound state—that is to say, not in an accidental state of excess or deficiency. Now, one of the great advantages of a specie medium is that being of universal value it will keep itself at a general level, flowing out from where it is too high into parts where it is lower. Whereas if the medium be of local value only, as paper money, if too little indeed, gold and silver will flow in to supply the deficiency; but if too much, it accumulates, banishes the gold and silver not locked up in vaults and hoards, and depreciates itself; that is to say, its proportion to the annual produce of industry being raised, more of it is required to represent any particular article of produce than in the other countries.

The best possible standard of value is a universal standard throughout the whole world, where every part of the globe recognizes the same article as the measure of values for the rest. The variation then would be a mere trace, as chemists say in their analyses. If gold were the universal standard, the only variation in its price would be determined by its own demand and supply; but gold alone is not the best standard, and silver alone is not the best standard. Many of our greatest men have contended for the single standard of one metal, and many for the other. Gen. Jackson's Secretary of the Treasury made a strong report in 1830 in favor of a single silver standard. The subject was thoroughly investigated from 1818 to 1834, and reports were made on the subject to the House of Representatives. A very able report was made by Mr. Campbell P. White, from the Committee of Coinage to the House of Representatives, advocating the single silver standard.

But I agree with Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Hamilton, and the other great fathers of our country, that the bimetallic standard is the best for the world. There are two prominent reasons why I believe so. Silver and gold have been perpetual rivals of each other through all the ages. Each has been contending in the market for the control of exchanges. Each has had its advocates, and now has its advocates in every country, asserting that it shall be accepted as the standard, to the exclusion of its rival. This persistent struggle between the two metals and those who espouse them constitute a disturbance that unsettles business and makes a variable standard of value that subjects producers to a constant tax. When they are indissolubly united their rivalry is dissipated and their controversy determined. The second reason is that when the two metals are united in one the amount of the volume of money of the commercial world is doubled, and commercial exchanges are so much the more facilitated.

We may in this country increase the volume of paper or of silver, and other countries may do the same; but neither paper nor silver is the money of commerce. Neither of them is sent to foreign countries to pay balances. When there is a balance of forty, fifty, sixty, or one hundred millions to be paid by this country or to be paid to this country, it is not paid in silver nor in paper but in gold, because the gold dollar or pound or franc has the same value when the stamp of the government is taken off as when it is on. Gold is a commodity, but money is a creature of law. The commodity that measures the value of all other commodities which are to be exchanged in the world's commerce must have the same value itself in the world's markets as it has in the mints of its different governments. If the commodity which serves as the standard and which goes out and comes in to pay balances be increased by doubling its volume, it will to the same extent increase the activity in the movement of commerce and also in the production of the articles that are exchanged throughout the world. It will increase production, increase transportation, and increase the employment of labor in all branches of industry and bring increased prosperity to every country on the globe. For these reasons, sir, I am a bimetallist, and I believe that nine-tenths of the American people of all parties are bimetallists.

It is a singular thing, Mr. President, that when Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson came together in the establishment of our mint, while they differed as far as the North is from the South, or the East from the West upon all the fundamental principles in relation to the organization and distribution of the powers of government, they were in perfect accord on the question of coinage of the two metals. It was regarded by them both as purely a business question, and out of the range of partisan politics. They both agreed that the unit should stand on both metals, and that the two metals should be coined at ratios so fixed by law as that each should be of the same value in the markets as when coined at the mint. They both agreed that there were great difficulties to be overcome in finding those values; that the work was a very delicate and difficult one.

Mr. Benton says that "refined calculations were gone into: scientific light was sought; history was rummaged back to the times of the Roman Empire," in order to ascertain the exact relative values of the two metals, so that the dollars of each would remain in our circulation. Again he says:

The nicety of the question was aggravated in the year 1792 by the difficulty of obtaining exact knowledge of the relative value of these metals at that time in France and England, and Mr. Gallatin has since shown that the information which was then relied upon was clearly erroneous. The consequence of any mistake in fixing our standard was also well known in the year 1792. Mr. Secretary Hamilton in his proposition for the establishment of a mint expressly declared that the consequence of a mistake in the relative value of the two metals would be the expulsion of the one that was undervalued. Mr. Jefferson, then Secretary of State, in his contemporaneous report upon foreign coin declared the same thing. Mr. Robert Morris, financier to the Revolutionary Government, in his proposal to establish a mint in 1782, was equally explicit to the same effect. The delicacy of the question and the consequence of a mistake were then fully understood forty years ago, when the relative value of gold and silver was fixed at 15 to 1

Here are three of the greatest financiers, and in that line certainly three of the greatest men the country has ever produced, all agreeing that the question of the exact relative value of these two metals was a very delicate and a very dfficult one, and that if a mistake were made in fixing their relative values that the metal which was undervalued would be expelled from our circulation. After rummaging all history back to the Roman Empire, as Mr. Benton says, and after all the aid which they could obtain from scientific investigation, they fixed the relative value at fifteen parts of silver equal to one of gold, and it was a mistake. Gold was undervalued and left the country, and silver became the standard of value. There was gold coined at our mints, but it remained in the mints in boxes until it was called for to be shipped out of the country. About the year 1818 an investigation was started to correct the mistake made in 1792 by these three great men.

Several reports were made by committees to Congress. Mr. Secretary Crawford made an able report on the subject in 1820, and in 1829 Mr. Gallatin, who had been for many years Secretary of the Treasury under Jefferson and Madison, wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, in which he stated, after a thorough investigation of the subject, that safety was to be found by coining one part of gold to an amount of silver to be found somewhere between 15.58 and 15.69. Mr. Gallatin's opinion was overruled, notwithstanding a report was made to the House fixing the ratio at 1 to 15.62½, and a law was passed changing the ratio from 15 to 1 to 15.98 to 1. The result was, as Mr. Gallatin had foretold, silver was undervalued, and then silver left the country as gold had done before 1834, when it was undervalued.

Now, Mr. President, with all this history showing the almost insurmountable difficulty in the way of fixing the relative values of these two metals and keeping them together in our circulation, we find some of our statesmen who propose to jump at a ratio whether right or wrong, hit or miss, and put to peril the whole of a vast financial system upon which rests the prosperity of all the labor and all the commerce of our country. Our experience ought to teach us how difficult and how dangerous is the work before us. If we fix a ratio and miss it far enough in undervaluing one metal to make it profitable to export it, it will all leave us as it did before. The question presents itself to our minds, how can we by national action fix the price of gold and silver so that that price will remain stable, invariable and immovable.

We may as well talk about Congress fixing the price of wheat and cotton throughout the world as to talk about fixing the price of silver and gold throughout the world, and unless the price of gold and silver in this country is practically the same as in other countries they will separate. Each will go, like every other product, to that market where it finds the highest price. If we are able by law to say that 10 pounds of cotton shall be equivalent in value to 1 bushel of wheat and fix the prices of these two articles at that ratio throughout the globe, then we can fix the prices of all other articles, and then we can determine the price which the people of all other countries have to pay for such articles. When I say that if we overvalue silver and undervalue gold that gold will leave this country I do not mean that it will all go at once, nor do I mean that all the coined silver of the world will be dumped upon us.

A great deal of foolishness of that sort has been talked. I have answered that years ago. The coined silver of the world is coined at a standard of higher value than our silver, and will stay at home, in accordance with the same law that our gold will go away. The only silver that will come to our mints will be the silver that comes from the mines. Not a dollar of silver which is coined in Europe will come to this country to displace a dollar in gold; but the silver annually produced from the mines will come to us. It will not all come in a day, nor will all our gold leave in a day, but we will see a steady going out of one and coming in of the other until the gold will disappear entirely from our circulation and the silver dollar will become the standard of value. When that takes place, 57 cents' worth of silver will become 100 cents.

How is that to be avoided? It can only be done by a combination of powers sufficiently strong to buy and sell all the gold and silver in the world at a fixed price agreed on by themselves. Is there any power in the world that can do this? Are there any number of nations in the world which can make this combination? Can it be done without England's coöperation? I say yes, unequivocally. I say the continent of Europe with the United States can make a combination, an agreement, by which they will throw open their mints to the unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at 15 to 1, 15½ to 1, or 16 to 1, and they can fix the price so that it will be as steady and as immovable as the mountains themselves on their bases. Suppose that all of those countries say: "We will take all the gold in the world and give 16 ounces of silver for 1 of gold: we will take all the silver in the world and give 1 ounce of gold for 16 ounces of silver."

No man will offer to sell an ounce of gold for 12 ounces of silver when he can get 16; no man will offer 20 ounces of silver for 1 ounce of gold when he can get 1 ounce of gold for 16 ounces of silver. Profit is the motive which controls the trades of the whole human family, individually and collectively. Whenever that is fixed, and these powers say "bring your gold here and we will give you 16 ounces of silver for every ounce of gold, bring your silver and we will give you 1 ounce of gold for every 16 ounces of silver," the price will be fixed, and it is not in the power of England nor of the rest of the world to defeat it, because the powers which are united in coöperation in establishing this price compose a majority of the commercial powers of the whole globe, and they make and move the majority of all the commercial products of the globe. That is the reason.

I believed years ago that it was in the power of the United States by a bold stand to have taken the lead, and I believed that Europe would have followed if the United States had thrown open her mints and declared to the world that she intended to take the lead, that she would risk the consequences, and that she would coin without limit at 16 to 1. There was a time when it was my opinion that if she had taken that bold lead the whole earth would have followed her, with perhaps the exception of England. It followed the young Republic in 1776 when she made her great struggle for freedom. When she had torn down all the ensigns of royalty and designated this as the land of liberty, her success shook every throne in Europe, and there was a great struggle all over Europe to imitate and follow her example.

In 1846, after a long discussion, when she determined to abandon the protective system, which was obstructing the great movement of her commerce, and put herself wholly upon the principle of free trade not only England, but all Europe followed her, and there never was a season of greater prosperity over the whole earth than was witnessed during that period.

In 1861, when she retraced her steps and declared for commercial restriction, protection against competition, almost every power in Europe retraced its steps and followed her bad example.

In 1871, when Germany had overthrown France and exacted a thousand millions in gold from her fallen foe, she determined to take up her silver and replace it with gold. It was a bold, bad move, started to destroy one-half the metallic money of the world. The Latin Union and other powers in Europe took a tentative position and waited for the leadership of the great Republic. They suspended silver coinage for one year, then for another, another, another, and this watching and waiting continued till we took a decided stand in February, 1878, the other way; then they made the closing of their mints permanent, and one country after another has fallen into the column, till India, the last stronghold of silver, has thrown up the sponge and put herself in alignment with the commercial world.

That was the time when John G. Carlisle denounced the great conspiracy, at the head of which was the German Empire; that was the time when he made that splendid speech which has been so often quoted and misapplied. Germany and those who were following her leadership were proposing to destroy, as Mr. Carlisle said, from three-sevenths to one-half of the metal money of the world. He denounced it as one of the greatest crimes ever meditated, and to counteract it he proposed that the great Republic should take her place there at the head of the column, boldly throw open her mints to unlimited coinage, and at the same time send commissioners to Europe to insist on their following and supporting us. Then, to restore bimetallism, he urged the forcing of the measure on appropriation bills, in order that perfect bimetallism might be secured to the world. But, strange to say, those who are to-day advocating silver monometallism quote his earnest words to show that he is inconsistent. Mr. Carlisle stands to-day where he stood then, and if the conditions were the same he would urge the same course. But the issue is not the same, nor are conditions the same.

But who to-day is proposing to strike out of the coinage of the world $4,000,000,000 of silver coin? I want to see the color of the hair of the man who dares to advocate it. Is there any man in Europe or America who is advocating the demonetization of the four billions of silver in the world's coinage to-day? That is not the question here at all. Nothing of the kind. The question is now whether we shall open our mints to the continued free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1, not whether we shall destroy the silver dollars that we have.

It has been said on this floor that France has a bimetallic system. France has $700,000,000 of silver and $800,000,000 of gold, and her $700,000,000 of silver is circulating on the standard of her $800,000,000 of gold. If France should take her coins to the mint and melt them she would lose the difference between 100 cents in gold and 57 cents. If France has bimetallism with seven hundred millions of silver dollars and eight hundred millions of gold dollars, what do you call the financial system of this country, with six hundred millions of silver dollars and only six hundred millions of gold dollars? Yet it is denied that we have bimetallism.

We have not the most perfect system of bimetallism, Mr. President. The only perfect system of bimetallism, as I have said, is when both metals at a given ratio are worth in commerce just what they are in money, and when both are freely coined and both made one for the purposes of money. We have not got that; but what we have in circulation is bimetallic. We are using silver upon a gold basis, but it is being used all the same.

Mr. President, I have been thinking for some time that there was some large amount of silver being excluded from the monetary circulation of the world by the closing of the mints. The study which I have been able to give to the statistics which have been furnished me leads me to make this statement: If the mints of the world were thrown open to the free coinage of silver to-day not another ounce could get into circulation. I challenge a contradiction of that statement here and now. Every ounce is either in currency or manufactures, and whether you coin or not, it will go by preference to manufactures, because if a man can take a silver dollar and make it worth five dollars, he has the natural right to expend his labor and make five dollars of it, and he will do it. There is no power in Christendom which can prevent him from doing it, and no rightful power in Christendom which ought to prevent him from doing it. Not another ounce of silver, with all the mints thrown open all over the whole globe, could get into the money circulation of the world, and I am going to prove it, too.

But before I go to the figures I want to quote a statement of a very distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Windom. My friend who sits before me [Mr. DANIEL] quoted it in his magnificent speech a few days ago. The statement has been made before. Mr. Windom, while Secretary of the Treasury, said in an official report that there is no silver in foreign countries which can come here. Mr. St. John, a great leader in the discussion of free coinage and bimetallism, and a man of very great accomplishment, also said there was none. I believe my friend from Virginia admits that there is none.

Then, Mr. President, what does all this controversy mean? The whole country has been agitated from end to end for free coinage in order to swell the circulation, increase the price of commodities, and decrease the price of money, when not one ounce more can get into circulation.

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

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. The money detained from circulation to redeem silver—the overlapping of the currencies, the one part to redeem another part, would cease, would it not, and thus swell the volume of money?

Mr. MILLS. I do not comprehend my friend's question.

Mr. DANIEL. It would subserve the purpose of the gold by supporting itself as a dollar, instead of holding the gold dollar in the Treasury to protect it, and thereby swell the currency.

Mr. MILLS. I reckon my friend from Virginia is a disciple of Thomas Jefferson, and Mr. Jefferson said if you have a metallic circulation, and it is not enough, gold and silver will flow from where it is higher to where it is lower, to restore the equilibrium. We are all Democrats on this side of the Chamber; we are all proud to be called Jeffersonian Democrats, and it makes no difference whether the silver is circulating on the credit of gold or whether the paper dollar is circulating on the credit of gold. All things being equal, the price of commodities is fixed by the amount of money in circulation. I do not mean the money in the Treasury, and I do not mean the money hoarded, but I mean the money that is in the market actively demanding exchange.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator allow me to ask him this question? If no more silver could get into the coinage by open mints, why does he wish to close the mints by a simple repeal of the Sherman act without a substitute?

Mr. MILLS. I answered that some time ago. I said in the opening sentences that if the repeal of the Sherman law would restore confidence and revive business it was the highest patriotic duty to do it, whether we all agree upon the causes of the present difficulty or not.

Mr. President, let me take the statistics of the world's production of gold and silver from 1492 to 1893, a period of four hundred years. The gold was $8,204,300,000, silver was $9,726,072,000, making together $17,930,372,000, when the coinage of the world to-day is less than $8,000,000,000, and more than half of this vast sum, the accumulation of four centuries, is out of the circulation of the world and is in manufactures

The world's present stock of coin, according to the official report of our Treasury Department, is: gold, $3,582,605,000; silver, $4,042,700,000; making altogether $7,625,305,000. Let us take it for the last century and see what has been the result. From 1792 to 1892 the gold production was $5,633,908,000, the coinage was $7,56[illegible],307,452. The world's production of silver for the same time was $5,077,961,000, the coinage was $6,736,784,794.

You see here in the last century that we have coined three thousand millions more gold and silver than the world produced in that century. Where has it gone? Into manufactures. There is where it has gone, and you can not keep it from going there. When the manufacturers want the bars they will take them, and if the bar is not convenient they will take the coin. It is impossible for us to keep all the gold and silver produced in the world in coinage.

But let us take "the dark period" from 1873 to 1892. We produced in gold $2,210,961,206, of silver $2,400,760,533. We coined $2,912,927,456 in gold, and $2,410,962,273 in silver. We coined over $700,000,000 more gold than we produced from the mines, and we coined ten millions more silver than we produced from the mines from 1873 to 1892.

How is this? Why is there so great a disparity between the excess in the coinage of gold and that of silver? Because, as I said a while ago, gold is the basis of values of the world, and when gold goes from this country to England to settle balances, it does not go as dollars and cents, but it goes as a commodity; and if it is not intended to be returned directly to this country it goes to the English mint to be coined into the money of account of Great Britain. The same is true of France, the same of Austria, the same of Germany, the same of all other countries. It is not so with silver except when we deal with silver countries like China and Japan.

I say here, clearly and unequivocally, that there is no gold and silver in the world that is not either in manufactures or in the coins of the world, or on its way to one or the other; and if it is manufactured you can not get it out, because it is more valuable in manufactures than it is in coin.

Then what advantage can there be now (without an international agreement fixing the relative prices of these two metals so that they will be indissolubly tied together) to throw open our mints, if we can not increase our circulation? No advantage whatever can accrue, but evils immeasurable in their extent.

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

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator wish to be understood as saying that there will be less silver coined if we repeal the Sherman law than if it should stand?

Mr. MILLS. I am not talking about the Sherman law alone. I am talking about silver now. My friend is anticipating.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator mean to say that the repeal of the Sherman law will not decrease the coinage of silver hereafter?

Mr. MILLS. If we were to stand perfectly still and no other country was to coin any more silver than they are coining now, there would be a decrease of the coinage; and so, if the skies were to fall we would catch all the birds. If we do not pass any more appropriation bills the Government will certainly come to a standstill. I do not mean to be understood that we are not going to coin any more silver. I am simply making an argument to show that at the very best, if you throw open all the mints in Christendom, you can not put into the world's circulation another ounce of silver. That is what I mean to say. And I do mean to say that if we open the mints to free coinage under existing conditions we will disturb the distribution of silver all over the whole world, and some countries will become silver-standard countries and some countries will become exclusively gold-standard countries. We shall get somebody's silver, and they will get our gold. We shall be a silver-standard country, and 57 cents to-day will become 100 cents to-morrow.

I wish to pause here a moment to ask a question of my friends who are interested in the production of silver. I wish I could benefit them. I shall not be as mean to them as they were to us on the tariff question, voting to take our markets away from us and confine our cotton to the home market, where we only consume one-third of it. I should like to do anything I could to enhance the value of silver; I should like to bring it to $1.29 an ounce; but suppose that your silver dollar at its gold value, 57 cents today, becomes the standard of value of 100 cents, 5 pounds of cotton worth 57 cents would be worth 100 cents, and 5 yards of cloth now worth 57 cents would be worth 100 cents. It is the standard of value, and you would not get any more in exchange than you get now for your silver—not a single farthing.

Mr. President, I have shown the difficulties in the way and shown how nice and delicate must be a readjustment. I have shown the difficulties in the constant appreciation of gold, because of the constant demand on gold for manufactures and the constant decrease relatively in its production compared to silver, which make it a constantly disturbing element. How is it possible for us to maintain these two together? And unless we do bring them together, as the President said, we will put the business of this country exclusively upon a silver basis, and then your standard is gone.

Now, let us see what the first effect is going to be. The standard of the commercial world to-day is gold. It has been gold in the United States since 1834. It was silver from 1792 up to 1834. I have stated repeatedly heretofore in the other House that the people of the United States had been laboring under the delusion for a century that they had the double standard. There never has been a double standard in this country from the organization of the mint to the present time. We had a silver standard until 1834, and then gold drove silver out of the country and gold was the standard until 1861, when paper drove both out of circulation until 1879. In 1879 gold again became the standard, which measured all values in this country. It is now the standard, the uniform standard of value of the commercial world. We are invited to abandon this standard and go to a depreciated standard of another metal. It will be just as fatal as if we went to the depreciated standard of paper money.

The only difference between paper and the depreciated standard of metal below that of the uniform standard of the nations with which we trade is that paper admits of further expansion than do the metals. That is all.

Suppose, then, Mr. President, that a gentleman in Liverpool wants to buy $1,000 worth of cotton. He gives $1,000 in gold to his agent and sends him to Texas. That agent, before he can buy the cotton, has to exchange his gold for money of account in this country, which is silver, because the cheaper metal always drives the dearer away. Dollars do not circulate in this country in gold when one gold dollar will buy two silver dollars. When a debt that is promised to be paid in one dollar, one of these silver dollars will pay it, the other will go into the pocket of the man. Therefore the cheaper money always drives out the dearer money. To that rule there is no exception. That man comes to Texas, and first he buys $2,000 of silver with $1,000 of gold. Cotton in Liverpool is worth 10 cents a pound in gold, and it is worth 20 cents a pound in silver in Texas, minus the cost of transportation, etc. He invests in silver, but before he can buy his cotton his silver has decreased in value 10 per cent. Then what has he got to do? He has to buy 10 per cent more silver. Instead of having $2,000 in silver to buy the same amount of cotton, he must have $2,200 worth.

Who is going to lose that? Who in all the ages has lost that? Not the middleman—never. The business can not be carried on in that way. He understands his business thoroughly, and he makes the producer pay it; and the producer is bound to pay it. He can not escape it. It is the law of economy that every producer has to pay all the charges of production, transportation, and movement to the consumer, and then sell at the market price. He has to pay the cost of production. He has to pay the freight, and then he has to pay insurance against loss; and here is another kind of insurance which he has to pay also. The 10 per cent has to be paid out of the pockets of the man who makes the cotton in the field in Texas. That is where it comes from.

Now, take $350,000,000—the value of the cotton crop of the United States—and you will see what a bounty the cotton producers of this country are paying on the one single item of cotton alone on account of the introduction of a variable, exchangeable, elastic, "flexible" standard which a great many of our people are demanding. The old Democratic doctrine was a stable, invariable standard of value.

When we consider that the farmers in this country are mainly interested in keeping a stable standard of value, because they are the people who trade in foreign countries, it is strange that they demand a "flexible" standard. Look at the exports. From 72 to 84 per cent of them are farm products whose prices are fixed in the foreign market by the gold standard; and of all the products that are shipped from American farms cotton stands first. More than 60 per cent of all the cotton raised in this country—upon which the whole prosperity of 20,000,000 of people depends, and not only their prosperity, but their very civilization is dependent upon that plant—is sold according to a gold standard. Gold fixes the value of every pound of cotton grown in the United States.

The farmer knows what cotton is worth in Liverpool every day. He reads in the morning papers that it is worth so much in Liverpool and so much in Galveston. He knows the cost of its movement between these two cities and between his farm and his market. He can not be fooled about that. But when the gold standard is banished and a depreciated silver standard takes its place in the country then he has two standards instead of one, the standard of the commercial world in Europe and a standard below that at home and constantly tending downward. Silver has fallen as much as 10 per cent in one week this year. If the farmer has to insure against the depreciation of silver, which he does, and if the depreciation is 10 per cent, when we remember that the annual value of farm products is $4,500,000,000, the price he will pay for his flexible whistle will be four hundred and fifty millions a year. All of our statesmen have denounced the plunder of labor by a depreciated currency and an unstable standard of value, and none of them have been more emphatic than Mr. Jefferson. He has told us of the continental money and the paper money issued by the States, the whole of which, exceeding five hundred millions, perished in the hands of its holders. He has told us of the French assignats that were issued to the amount of $9,000,000,000, every dollar of which perished, but while it was in existence and continually depreciating and continually being forced by governmental power on the people, was gradually defrauding and ruining them, and when it passed out of existence it left poverty and ruin behind it.

During our second war with Great Britain the country was on a depreciated standard again, and in a letter written in 1813 to John W. Eppes he says:

The overbearing clamor of merchants, speculators, and projectors will drive us before them with our eyes open, until, as in France under the Mississippi bubble, our citizens will be overtaken by the crash of this baseless fabric, without other satisfaction than that of execrations on the heads of those functionaries who, from ignorance, pusillanimity, or corruption, have betrayed the fruits of their industry into the hands of projectors and swindlers.

I submit the following extracts from his writings, which I commend to the consideration of the people to-day.

In a letter to Dr. Thomas Cooper, January 16, 1814, he says:

Everything predicted by the enemies of banks in the beginning is now coming to pass. We are to be ruined now by the deluge of bank paper as we were formerly by the old continental paper. It is cruel that such revolutions in private fortunes should be at the mercy of avaricious adventurers, who, instead of employing their capital, if any they have, in manufactures, commerce, and other useful pursuits, make it an instrument to burden all the interchanges of property with their swindling profits—profits which are the price of no useful industry of theirs. Prudent men must be on their guard in this game of "Robin's alive," and take care that the spark does not extinguish in their hands. I am an enemy to all banks discounting bills or notes for anything but coin, but our whole country is so fascinated by this jack-o'-lantern wealth that they will not stop short of its total and fatal explosion.

(The editor of Jefferson's Works says: "This accordingly took place four years after.")

In a letter to James Monroe, October 16, 1814, Mr. Jefferson said:

Let us be allured by no projects of banks, public or private, or ephemeral expedients, which, enabling us to grasp and flounder a little longer, only increase, by protracting, the agonies of death.

In a letter to M. Correa de Serra, December 27, 1814, he said:

But when called on to name prices, what is to be said? Our dropsical medium is long since divested of the quality of a medium of value.

To Mr. Gallatin, October 16, 1815:

* * * We are now without any common measure of the value of property, and private fortunes are up or down at the will of the worst of our citizens. Yet there is no hope of relief from the Legislatures who have immediate control over this subject. As little seems to be known of the principles of political economy as if nothing had ever been written or practiced on the subject, or as was known in old times when the Jews had their rulers under the hammer. It is an evil, therefore, which we must make up our minds to endure as those of hurricanes, earthquakes, and other casualties; let us turn over, therefore, another leaf.

In a letter to Col. Yancey, January 6, 1816, he says:

Like a dropsical man calling out for water, water, our deluded citizens are clamoring for more banks, more banks. The American mind is now in that state of fever which the world has so often seen in the history of other nations. We are under the bank bubble, as England was under the South Sea bubble, France under the Mississippi bubble, and as every nation is liable to be under whatever bubble, design, or delusion may puff up in moments when off their guard. We are now taught to believe that legerdemain tricks upon paper can produce as solid wealth as hard labor in the earth. It is in vain for common sense to urge that nothing can produce nothing; that it is an idle dream to believe in a philosopher's stone which is to turn everything into gold and to redeem man from the original sentence of his Maker: "In the sweat of his brow shall he eat his bread."

In a letter to Dr. Josephus B. Stuart, May 10, 1817, in speaking of our disposition to imitate England, he says:

The bank mania is one of the most threatening of these imitations. It is raising up a moneyed aristocracy in our country which has already set the Government at defiance, and although forced at length to yield a little on this first essay of their strength, their principles are unyielded and unyielding. These have taken deep root in the hearts of that class from which our legislators are drawn, and the sop to Cerberus from fable has become history. Their principles lay hold of the good, their pelf of the bad, and thus those whom the Constitution had placed as guards to its portals, are sophisticated or suborned from their duties. That paper money has some advantages is admitted. But that its abuses also are inevitable, and by breaking up the measure of value, makes a lottery of all private property, can not be denied. Shall we ever be able to put a constitutional veto on it?

In a letter to Nathaniel Macon, January 12, 1819:

There is, indeed, one evil which awakens me at times because it jostles me at every turn. It is that we have now no measure of value. I am asked $18 for a yard of broadcloth, which, when we had dollars, I used to get for 18 shillings; from this I can only understand that a dollar is now worth but 2 inches of broadcloth, but broadcloth is no standard of measure or value. I do not know, therefore, whereabouts I stand in the scale of property, nor what to ask, or what to give for it. I saw, indeed, the like machinery in action in the years 1780 and 1781, and without dissatisfaction; because in wearing out it was working out our salvation. But I see nothing in the renewal of this game of "Robin's alive" but a general demoralization of the nation, a filching from industry its honest earnings, wherewith to build up palaces, and raise gambling stock for swindlers and shavers, who are to close, too, their career of piracies by fraudulent bankruptcies. My dependence for a remedy, however, is with the wisdom which grows with time and suffering. Whether the succeeding generation is to be more virtuous than their predecessors, I can not say; but I am sure they will have more worldly wisdom, and enough, I hope, to know that honesty is the first chapter in the book of wisdom.

In a letter to Mr. Adams, March 21, 1819, he says:

The evils of this deluge of paper money are not to be removed until our citizens are generally and radically instructed in their cause and consequences, and silenced by their authority the interested clamors and sophistry of speculating, shaving, and banking institutions. Till then we must be content to return, *quoad hoc*, to the savage state, to recur to barter in the exchange of our property, for want of a stable, common measure of value, that now in use being less fixed than the beads and wampum of the Indian, and to deliver up our citizens, their property and their labor, passive victims to the swindling tricks of bankers and mountebankers."

In a letter to John Adams, dated November 7, 1819, he says:

The paper bubble is then burst. This is what you and I and every reasoning man, seduced by no obliquity of mind or interest, have long foreseen; yet its disastrous effects are not the less for having been foreseen. We were laboring under a dropsical fullness of circulating medium. Nearly all of it is now called in by the banks, who have the regulation of the safety valves of our fortunes, and who condense and explode them at their will. Lands in this State can not now be sold for a year's rent.

In a letter to Mr. Rives, dated November 28, 1819, he says:

The distresses of our country, produced first by the flood, then by the ebb of bank paper, are such as can not fail to engage the interposition of the Legislature. * * * If we suffer the moral of the present lesson to pass away without improvement by the eternal suppression of bank paper, then indeed is the condition of our country desperate, until the slow advance of public instruction shall give to our functionaries the wisdom of their station.

In this letter he speaks of a plan for reducing the circulating medium, in which he says:

The plethora of circulating medium which raised the prices of everything to several times their ordinary and standard value, in which state of things many and heavy debts were contracted and the sudden withdrawing too great a proportion of that medium, and reduction of prices far below that standard, constitute the disease under which we are now laboring, and which must end in a general revolution of property if some remedy is not applied. That remedy is clearly a gradual reduction of the medium to its standard level—that is to say to the level which a metallic medium will always find for itself, so as to be *in equilibrio* with that of the nations with which we have commerce. * * *

Interdict forever, to both the State and national governments, the power of establishing any paper bank; for without this interdiction we shall have the same ebbs and flows of medium and the same revolutions of property to go through every twenty or thirty years. * * * Certainly no nation ever before abandoned to the avarice and jugglings of private individuals to regulate, according to their own interests, the quantum of circulating medium for the nation, to inflate by deluges of paper the nominal prices of property and then to buy up that property at 1s. in the pound, having first withdrawn the floating medium which might endanger a competition in purchase.

In a letter to H. Nelson, March 12, 1820, he says:

This State is in a condition of unparalleled distress. The sudden reduction of the circulating medium from a plethora to all but annihilation is producing an entire revolution of fortune. In other places I have known lands sold by the sheriff for one year's rent. Our produce is now selling at market for one-third of its price before this commercial catastrophe, say flour at $3.25 and $3.50 the barrel. We should have less right to expect relief from our legislators if they had been the establishers of the unwise system of banks. A remedy to a certain degree was practicable, that of reducing the quantum of circulation gradually to a level with that of the countries with which we have commerce, and an eternal abjuration of paper.

Mr. President, the utterances from Mr. Jefferson are against a paper standard and a paper currency circulating on that standard, but the effect of any depreciated standard of value is the same. The fluctuations of paper can be more extended than that of silver, because of the greater facility of issuing it and the greater amount to which it can be issued. But after the greater and more universal standard has been supplanted by the lesser and local standard, the evils entailed to the extent of its fluctuations are the same. A silver standard that fluctuated from par to 50 per cent under par, when compared with the gold standard of the commercial world, would cost the laboring classes of our people many hundreds of millions yearly.

Day by day as silver fluctuated the products of their labor would pay to speculators, shavers, and brokers the price of that fluctuation. There is no security to labor but in a standard as stable, inflexible, and immovable as possible. That standard which is most universally used is for that reason the most stable. Larger bodies present greater resistance to opposing forces, while smaller bodies give way. A local standard in the United States at variance with the commercial world would be mercurial in its nature, always moving and every move inflicting a loss on some one.

The President in his message has told us that the wage-earner is the first to be injured and the last to be relieved from the effects of a depreciated currency. The Democratic platform says the same thing, and it is really a pleasure to be able to assure our friends that on this point he is certainly on the platform, whoever is off. This is a well-established fact, but I can not deny myself the pleasure of presenting the proofs in such a way that no one can entertain a doubt of the fact he has stated, and if the fact is established beyond a doubt we should hesitate a long time before we introduce a depreciated standard in the stead of the one we now have. When a banker, a capitalist, or trader finds the market not favorable for his investment he can lock up his money or hold on to his property and wait for a more favorable turn, but when the laborer is thrown out of employment and the day is gone his day's work is gone from him forever. He can not hoard a day's labor. It is lost.

Mr. President, the wages of labor in this country and all over the world for a hundred years have been tending upward. They are higher to-day than they have been at any time in the past, and the wage-earner, in whatever occupation employed, is deeply interested in the preservation of a standard of values as fixed and immovable as it is possible to make it. A few years ago our friends on the other side the Chamber directed the Committee on Finance to make an investigation and report to this body the movement of wages and prices for a number of years. They took the year 1860 as a basis and compared it and other years with 1890. They intended to use these figures in their tariff battle of 1892. They intended to show that wages had been rising and prices had been falling, and the credit was due to a protective tariff.

When that time comes, I will discuss with them the conclusions to be drawn from these facts. It is enough here to state the facts. Taking 1860 as the basis and calling it 100, the rate of wages increased to 1864 to 125.6 or 25.6 per cent, and to 1890 to 160.7 or 60.7 per cent. In 1860 and 1890 there was a gold standard, and in 1864 a depreciated paper standard. Wages went up in four years 25.6 per cent, but the money which the laborer earned was only the instrument which enabled him to procure the necessaries of life, and while it went up the ladder a few rounds, the necessaries of life that his wages had to buy to sustain himself, his wife, and children, had ascended the rounds of the ladder till they were lost in the clouds. The annual average wages of laborers in manufactories in 1860 was $288.95. The average monthly wage was $24.08, in gold. In 1864 it was 25.6 higher, or $30.24 cents in paper, and in 1890 it was 60.7 per cent higher than in 1860, and was $38.69 cents in gold. Now taking the official prices given by the Bureau of Statistics and the Finance Committee, the result is shown by the following table:

Purchasing power of wages of labor.

Articles.	1860.		1864.		1890.	
	Monthly wages, $24.08.		Monthly wages, $30.24.		Monthly wages, $38.69.	
	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.	Price per unit of quantity.	Quantity.
	Cents.		*Cents.*		*Cents.*	
Standard sheeting, per yard	8.73	275	52.07	58	6.83	566
Standard drilling, per yard	8.92	270	53.02	57	6.41	602
Bleached shirting, per yard	15.50	155	48.35	62	10.64	363
Standard prints, per yard	9.50	253	33.25	90	6.00	645
Print cloth, per yard	5.44	442	23.42	129	2.95	1,311
Cut nails, per pound	3.13	769	7.85	385	1.86	2,077
Refined sugar, per pound	10.00	240	30.00	101	4.50	859
New Orleans molasses, per gallon	53.00	45	150.00	20	40.00	128
Rio coffee, per pound	13.00	185	36.00	84	18.50	209
Tea, per pound	65.00	37	130.00	23	25.10	154
Ticking, per yard	17.00	141	70.00	43	12.00	322
Matches, per gross	48.00	50	100.00	30	37.00	104
Denims, per yard	15.00	160	88.00	34	11.00	351

The articles given in the table show that his wages with a gold standard bought three times as much as under a depreciated paper standard. And the same would have been the result under a depreciated silver standard if it had fallen to the same extent. Paper money depreciated 50 per cent in 1864, and silver touched 49 within the last six months. To explain, let us take the first article. Standard sheeting was worth in gold in 1860 8.73 cents per yard, and $24.08, one month's wages, would buy 275 yards. In 1864, with a paper standard, a month's wages had increased to $30.24 in paper. The sheeting had increased to 52.07 cents per yard, and his month's wages would only buy 58 yards. His month's wages had lost in purchasing power 217 yards.

In 1890 the gold standard obtained again, his wages went on increasing, but the speculation and cheating and swindling were eliminated from the necessaries of life, and now his wages are $38.69 per month and the sheeting has come down to 6.83 cents per yard and his month's wages under a gold standard buys 566 yards, or nearly ten times as much as he got nnder the depreciated standard. Every other article shows the same result. From 1860 to 1864 the wages of labor advanced 25.6 per cent, but the things he had to buy greatly exceeded the increase of what he had to sell. House-furnishing goods increased 64.6 per cent, food 65.8 per cent, drugs and medicines 70.3 per cent, metals and implements of labor 79.8 per cent, fuel and lighting 80.2 per cent, lumber and building materials 121.3 per cent, and clothing 160.7 per cent, while the average of all was 90.5 per cent. But many of the articles he had to buy far exceeded these. Let me enumerate some of them.

He had to pay in 1864, under a depreciated standard, 60 per cent more for pocketknives, 64.9 per cent more for rope, 68.8 per cent more for refined sugar, 70 per cent more for wash tubs, 79.4 per cent more for two-ply ingrain carpets, 87.7 per cent more for all-wool cassimeres, 96 per cent more for pine plank, 101 per cent more for glass goblets, 105 per cent more for glass bowls, 110 per cent more for pine plank planed, 114 per cent more for shingles, 117.4 per cent more for castile soap, 125 per cent more for glass tumblers, 125 per cent more for pipe lead, 130.6 per cent more for pig lead, 140 per cent more for Turk's Island salt, 145 per cent more for window-glass, 150 per cent more for linseed-oil, 143.6 per cent more for stove coal, 150 per cent more for nails, 166.6 per cent more for shirtings, 166.7 per cent more for scythes, 195.5 per cent more for quinine, 223 per cent more for calico, 246 per cent more for pepper, 279.3 per cent more for denims, 349.2 per cent more for drillings, 404.6 per cent more for sheetings, 620 per cent more for tar, 800 per cent more for turpentine, 858 per cent more for shawls.

These prices show that, while the wage-earner got under a depreciated currency an increase in wages of 25.6 per cent, he had to pay for what he bought all the way from 68 per cent to 858 per cent increase. Well did Mr. Webster say that "a sound currency is an essential and indispensable security for the fruits of industry and honest enterprise;" that the medium of exchange should be "a substantial representative of property, not liable to vibrate with opinions, not subject to be blown up or blown down by the breath of speculation, but made stable and secure by its immediate relation to that which the whole world regards as of a permanent value."

A disordered currency—

Says he—•

is one of the greatest of political evils. It undermines the virtues necessary for the support of the social system and encourages propensities destructive of its happiness. It wars against industry, frugality, and economy, and it fosters the evil spirit of extravagance and speculation. Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind none has been more effectual than that which deludes them with paper money. This is the most effectual of methods to fertilize the rich man's field by the sweat of the poor man's brow. Ordinary tyranny, oppression, excessive taxation, these bear lightly on the happiness of the mass of the community compared with a fraudulent currency and the robberies committed by a depreciated paper. Our own history has recorded for our instruction enough, and more than enough, of the demoralizing tendency, the injustice, and the intolerable oppression on the virtuous and well-disposed of a degraded paper currency authorized by law or in any manner countenanced by government.

On the 12th of March, 1845, when Texas was preparing to enter the Union, General Jackson wrote to General Houston—perhaps the last letter he ever wrote to his life-long friend—urging him to exert his influence to have an interdiction placed in our constitution against a degraded paper currency. In that letter he says:

But to protect your morals and to cap the climax of your prosperity, and to protect the labor of your country, you must provide in your constitution by a positive provision that your Legislature never shall establish a bank, or any corporation whatever, with a power to issue paper; that no banks shall be established by the Legislature except on a specie basis, and then only with the powers of receiving deposits and exchange.

There never was, or ever could be, use for any other kind, except for speculators and gamblers in stocks, and this to the utter ruin of the labor and morals of a country. A specie currency gives life and action to the producing classes, on which the prosperity of all is founded.

The Constitution of that year did embrace the interdiction, and its very words have been brought forward in every constitution of the State since, and it so stands in the constitution of to-day. A depreciated paper standard was the evil that affected the country when Jefferson and Jackson and Webster and other statesmen of their time denounced the injustice and wrong of a disordered currency.

At that time the two money metals had not so far separated as to make a remote possibility that one of them would ever be made the instrument with which to perpetrate that train of abuses. But now, when that fact confronts us, if we degrade our standard below that of the commercial world and take silver or any other metal for our local standard, we can and will with it bring the same abuses that was brought in former years with paper. The history of our own country and the facts there given should make the the laboring people cling with the tenacity of the mariner to the last plank of the shipwreck to a stable standard of value which prevents him from being cheated and defrauded by speculators, gamblers, and stockjobbers.

Mr. President, I have seen a table which has been going the rounds in the speeches of Senators and members of the House which showed in parallel columns the fall in the price of silver and corn and cotton and wheat. Some very eminent Senators have copied it. It was a little strange that this table stopped with the principal farm products. It only showed the decline in the price of what farmers sold but not what they bought. This is a very one-sided table. Prices have been going down on all things, but less in agricultural products than on other things, and for a reason which I will give you.

This one-sided table reminds me of a story I heard when a boy. A pious pastor had discovered a young sister who was becoming vain and worldly minded, and so much had she become addicted to the ways of the world that she wound her rich suit of hair into a knot and wore it as a topknot. It was supposed to be charming to the beaux. This vanity vexed the righteous soul of the pious man of God and he went to the erring sister and told her she was incurring the divine displeasure by sporting the topknot, and told her she must desist. She was in a strait, but great as was the cross she resolved to bear it if Bible authority could be produced in condemnation of her topknot, and she so informed her minister. He said, "My dear sister, you come to church next Sunday and I will show you the word of the Lord specially pronounced against topknots." When Sunday came she went to church, and after the morning exercises were over the minister took his text from that chapter in which our Saviour was foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem which was to occur by the armies of the Roman Emperor. He came to the verse, "Let him which is on the house top not come down to take anything out of his house," and then took his text in the middle of the verse "top not come down." [Laughter.]

I do not know whether the pious fraud was a success or not, but the plan outlined by the minister of bringing things down by dividing the text did not die with that generation. Why did not the architect of that table take manufactured products as well. I have constructed a table which I present here for the consideration of the public. I have taken the prices of silver from the report of the Director of the Mint. The prices of cotton, corn, wheat, bacon, lard, pork, beef, butter, cheese, and tobacco I have taken from the Statistical Abstract. These are the articles which the farmer sells. Then I have taken the articles which the farmer buys. Some of them are from the Statistical Abstract and others from the report of the Committee on Finance; the freight rates are from Poor's Manual, a standard authority on railway matters. The articles which the farmer buys are refined sugar, nails, iron, coffee, tea, sheeting, drilling, shirting, standard prints, print cloth, quinine, goblets, window glass, undershirts, ginghams, carpets, pepper, and molasses. I have also included steel rails and freight rates. All these articles have fallen since 1873, as is shown by the table.

Prices of certain products from 1873 to 1891.

Years.	Silver, per fine ounce.	Gold value of silver dollar.	Articles that farmers sell.									
			Cotton, per pound.	Corn, per bushel.	Wheat, per bushel.	Bacon and hams, per pound.	Lard, per pound.	Pork, per pound.	Beef, per pound.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.	Tobacco, per pound.
			Cents.	*Cents.*		*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1873	$1.32	$1.004	18.8	61	$1.31	8.8	9.2	7.8	7.7	21.1	13.1	10.7
1874	1.30	988	15.4	71	1.43	9.6	9.4	8.2	8.2	25.0	13.1	9.6
1875	1.23	.964	15.0	84	1.12	11.4	13.8	10.1	8.7	23.7	13.5	11.3
1876	1.17	.894	12.9	67	1.24	12.1	13.3	10.6	8.7	23.9	12.6	10.4
1877	1.18	.929	11.8	58	1.17	10.8	10.9	9.0	7.5	20.6	11.8	10.2
1878	1.16	891	11.1	56	1.34	8.7	8.8	6.8	7.7	18.0	11.4	8.7
1879	1.12	868	9.9	47	1.07	6.9	7.0	5.7	6.3	14.2	8.9	7.8
1880	1.13	.886	11.5	54	1.25	6.7	7.4	6.1	6.4	17.1	9.5	7.7
1881	1.12	.881	11.4	55	1.11	8.2	9.3	7.7	6.5	19.8	11.1	8.3
1882	1.13	.878	11.4	66	1.19	9.9	11.6	9.0	8.5	19.3	11.0	8.5
1883	1.10	.858	10.8	68	1.13	11.2	11.9	9.9	8.9	18.6	11.2	8.3
1884	1.10	861	10.5	61	1.07	10.2	9.5	7.9	7.6	18.2	10.3	9.1
1885	1.06	823	10.6	54	.86	9.2	7.9	7.2	7.5	16.8	9.3	9.9
1886	.99	.769	9.9	49	87	7.5	6.9	5.9	6.0	15.6	8.3	9.6
1887	.97	758	9.5	47	.89	7.9	7.1	6.6	5.4	15.8	9.3	8.7
1888	.97	727	9.8	55	.85	8.6	7.7	7.4	5.3	18.3	9.9	8.3
1889	.93	.724	9.9	47	90	8.6	8.6	7.4	5.5	16.5	9.3	8.8
1890	1.06	809	10.1	41	.83	7.7	7.1	6.0	5.4	14.4	9.0	8.6
1891	98	764	10.0	57	.93	7.6	6.9	5.9	5.6	14.5	9.0	8.7
Average decrease	26	26	53	6	30	14	25	24	27	32	31	19

Years.	Articles that farmers buy.									
	Refined sugar, per pound.	Cut nails, per pound.	Bar iron, per ton.	Steel rails, per ton.	Rio coffee, per pound.	Tea, per pound.	Sheeting, per yard.	Drilling, per yard.	Shirting, per yard.	Standard prints, per yard.
	Cts.	*Cts.*			*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*
1873	11.6	4.90	$86.00	$120.50	18	95	13.31	14.13	19.41	11.37
1874	10.5	3.99	67.00	94.25	20	100	11.42	11.75	18.04	9.75
1875	10.8	3.42	60.00	68.75	18	60	10.41	11.12	15.12	8.71
1876	10.7	2.98	52.00	59.25	17	55	8.85	8.71	13.58	7.06
1877	11.6	2.57	45.00	45.50	20	55	8.46	8.46	12.46	6.77
1878	10.2	2.31	44.00	42.25	17	45	7.80	7.65	11.00	6.09
1879	8.5	2.69	51.00	48.25	14	40	7.97	7.57	11.62	6.25
1880	9.0	3.68	60.00	67.50	15	40	8.51	8.51	12.74	7.41
1881	9.2	3.09	58.00	61.13	13	35	8.51	8.06	12.74	7.00
1882	9.7	3.47	61.00	48.50	10	35	8.45	8.25	12.95	6.50
1883	9.2	3.06	50.00	37.75	8	33	8.32	7.11	12.93	6.00
1884	7.1	2.39	44.00	30.75	11	33	7.28	6.86	10.46	6.00
1885	6.4	2.33	40.00	28.50	9	33	6.75	6.36	10.37	6.00
1886	6.7	2.27	43.00	34.50	9	33	6.75	6.25	10.65	6.00
1887	6.0	2.30	49.00	37.08	15	28	7.15	6.58	10.88	6.00
1888	6.3	2.03	44.00	29.83	15	23	7.25	6.75	10.94	6.50
1889	7.6	2.00	43.00	29.25	16	23	7.00	6.75	10.50	6.50
1890	7.0	2.00	45.00	31.75	19	25	7.00	6.75	10.90	6.00
1891	5.7	1.86	42.00	29.92	16	25	6.83	6.41	10.64	6.00
Average decrease	50	62	51	75	11	73	48	55	45	47

Years.	Articles that farmers buy.									Freight rate, per ton per mile.
	Print cloth, per yard.	Quinine, per ounce.	Goblets, per dozen.	10 by 14 window glass.	Undershirts.	Ginghams, per yard.	Carpets, 2-ply ingrain, per yard.	Black pepper, per pound.	Molasses, per gallon.	
	Cts.		*Cts.*			*Cts.*		*Cts.*	*Cts.*	*Cts.*
1873	6.69	$2.65	85	$3.40	$1.41	13	$1.14	19	69	2.00
1874	5.57	2.50	80	2.97	1.25	11	1.02	20	71	......
1875	5.33	2.25	70	3.18	1.12	10	.92	17	70	......
1876	4.10	2.00	65	3.08	1.00	10	.82	14	55	......
1877	4.38	3.00	50	2.97	.91	8	.81	14	54	......
1878	3.44	3.50	45	2.42	.87	8	.75	12	40	......
1879	3.93	3.60	40	2.42	.83	8	.67	12	36	......
1880	4.51	3.00	40	2.42	.83	9	.85	14	53	1.26
1881	3.95	2.60	35	2.12	.83	8	75	14	43	1.25
1882	3.76	2.45	35	2.12	.79	9	78	17	50	1.23
1883	3.60	1.80	35	2.29	.79	8	.74	16	52	1.22
1884	3.36	1.43	33	2.16	.75	7	.66	15	50	1.12
1885	3.12	.83	30	1.91	.70	6	.58	14	45	1.04
1886	3.31	.70	28	2.04	.70	6	.58	14	44	1.04
1887	3.33	.53	28	1.70	.66	7	.60	15	40	1.03
1888	3.81	.49	27	1.76	.66	6	.53	15	38	0.97
1889	3.81	.38	26	1.70	.66	6	.52	13	39	0.97
1890	3.34	.35	26	1.70	.64	6	.48	10	40	0.93
1891	2.95	.30	25	1.70	.62	6	.50	9	32	0.92
Average decrease	56	89	70	50	56	54	56	52	53	54

Average reduction in ten farm products, 26.1. **Average reduction in nineteen other products, 55.4.**

It is now and has been contended that cotton, wheat, and corn have been brought down by the closing of our mints to the unlimited coinage of silver. If that be true the same cause must have brought down the other articles. Why was not the fall in cotton the cause of the fall in silver? It has been claimed all along that the increased supply of silver and the decreased demand by the successive closing of the mints of the world had progressively reduced its price. And that is a logical conclusion. In 1873, when silver was at par with gold at 16 to 1, the world's annual production of silver bullion was 63,000,000 ounces; it is now 152,000,000.

This shows a very great increase in supply, while demand has been falling off very greatly. Silver therefore has been declining in obedience to law, and cotton and corn and wheat not in obedience to any law, they tell us, but out of pure sympathy with silver. If sympathy instead of a law of trade has caused other commodities to decline, it has not been confined to cotton, corn, and wheat. This table shows that from 1873 to 1891 silver fell 26 per cent, cotton 53, corn 6, wheat 30, bacon and hams 14, lard 25, pork 24, beef 27, butter 32, cheese 31, and tobacco 19. These are the articles which farmers sell. The average decline of the ten articles is 26.1 per cent between 1873 and 1891. During the same time refined sugar declined 50 per cent, nails 62, bar iron 51, steel rails 75, Rio coffee 11, tea 73, sheeting 48, drilling 55, shirting 45, standard prints 47, print cloth 56, quinine 89, glass goblets 70, 10 by 14 window glass 50, undershirts 56, ginghams 54, carpets 56, pepper 52, molasses 53.

These are the articles the farmer buys. Now, if what he buys declines at an equal ratio with what he sells he is just as well off at one time as another. But if what he buys falls more in price than what he sells he is benefited. When we average the articles he buys we find that the decline is 55.4 per cent, so if the logic of our friends is correct the demonetization of silver has been a boon to him. He has been benefited by the fall in prices, but the decline in silver has had nothing to do with it. Our friends on the other side of the Chamber will contend that a protective tariff did it. Some gentlemen in and out of Congress last year contended that "options" and "futures" did it, and the same persons now contend that closing the mints to silver did it. They are all wrong. Closing the markets had a great deal to do with the decline of agricultural products, and the increased productive power of steam and machinery had more to do with reducing the price of manufactured articles.

These prices in the table show conclusively that the farmer has been benefited by the general fall of prices, because his products would buy more in 1891 than in 1873. In 1873 cotton was worth 18.8 cents per pound, and 1,000 pounds was worth $188, and at that time it would buy 766 gallons of illuminating oil, or 1,620 pounds of refined sugar, or 4½ tons of pig iron, or 2 tons of bar iron, or 1¼ tons of steel rails, or 3,832 pounds of nails, or 1,412 yards of sheeting, or 1,330 yards of drilling, or 970 yards of shirting, or 1,653 yards of standard prints, or 2,810 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 1,000 pounds of cotton was worth $100, and at the prices of these same things at that time it would buy 1,428 gallons of oil, 1,754 pounds of sugar, 5½ tons of pig iron, 2½ tons of bar iron, 3½ tons of steel rails, 5,322 pounds of cut nails, 1,464 yards of sheeting, 1,560 yards of drilling, 940 yards of shirting, 1,666 yards of prints, and 3,589 yards of print cloth.

With the exception of shirting, it would buy more of every other article enumerated, and the difference in that was very small. One thousand pounds of beef would buy in 1873 281 gallons of oil, 555 pounds of sugar, 1,282 pounds of nails, 490 yards of sheeting, 462 yards of drilling, 338 yards of shirting, 583 yards of prints, or 888 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 809 gallons of oil, 982 pounds of refined sugar, 3,010 pounds of nails, 849 yards of sheeting, 873 yards of drilling, 526 yards of shirting, 933 yards of standard prints, or 1,898 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of pork would buy in 1873 289 gallons of oil, 571 pounds of refined sugar, 1,319 pounds of nails, 504 yards of sheeting, 475 yards of drilling, 348 yards of shirting, 600 yards of standard prints, or 914 yards of print cloth, while in 1891 it would buy 842 gallons of oil, 1,035 pounds of refined sugar, 3,172 pounds of nails, 863 yards of sheeting, 920 yards of drilling, 554 yards of shirting, 983 yards of standard prints, or 2,000 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of bacon and hams would buy, in 1873, 345 gallons of oil, 682 pounds of refined sugar, 1,554 pounds of nails, 602 yards of sheeting, 568 yards of drilling, 415 yards of shirting, 716 yards of standard prints, or 1,091 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,085 gallons of oil, 1,157 pounds of refined sugar, 4,086 pounds of nails, 1,111 yards of sheeting, 1,185 yards of drilling, 714 yards of shirting, 1,266 yards of standard prints, or 2,576 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of butter would buy, in 1873, 779 gallons of oil, 1,539 pounds of refined sugar, 3,553 pounds of nails, 1,359 yards of sheeting, 1,281 yards of drilling, 938 yards of shirting, 1,616 yards of standard prints, or 2,461 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 2,071 gallons of oil, 2,543 pounds of refined sugar, 7,795 pounds of nails, 2,123 yards of sheeting, 2,262 yards of drilling, 1,362 yards of shirting, 2,416 yards of standard prints, or 4,915 yards of print cloth.

One thousand pounds of tobacco in 1873 would buy 413 gallons of oil, 833 pounds of sugar, 1,886 pounds of nails, 721 yards of sheeting, 680 yards of drilling, 498 yards of shirting, 858 yards of standard prints, or 1,307 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,243 gallons of oil, 1,526 pounds of refined sugar, 4,677 pounds of nails, 1,273 yards of sheeting, 1,357 yards of drilling, 817 yards of shirting, 1,450 yards of standard prints, or 2,949 yards of print cloth.

One hundred bushels of corn in 1873 would buy 279 gallons of oil, 551 pounds of refined sugar, 1,273 pounds of nails, 487 yards of sheeting, 458 yards of drilling, 336 yards of shirting, 579 yards of standard prints, or 881 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 820 gallons of oil, 1,007 pounds of refined sugar, 3,086 pounds of nails, 840 yards of sheeting, 896 yards of drilling, 539 yards of shirting, 956 yards of standard prints, or 1,954 yards of print cloth.

One hundred bushels of wheat in 1873 would buy 590 gallons of oil, 1,176 pounds of refined sugar, 2,509 pounds of nails, 1,030 yards of sheeting, 954 yards of drilling, 611 yards of shirting, 1,225 yards of standard prints, or 1,840 yards of print cloth; while in 1891 it would buy 1,328 gallons of oil, 1,631 pounds of refined sugar, 5,000 pounds of nails, 1,342 yards of sheeting, 1,453 yards of drilling, 853 yards of shirting, 1,550 yards of standard prints, or 2,784 yards of print cloth.

From these figures, and maybe extended to other articles, it is clear and conclusive that the decline in prices has given all farm products a greater purchasing power. And yet it is urged that opening our mints to the unlimited coinage of silver will restore its price of 1873; and as all products have fallen through pure sympathy with it they will still sympathize with it and rise to their prices of 1873. If they did, the farmers would be ruined. If he is oppressed now, he would be confronted with bankruptcy if one-half or one-third of the purchasing power of his products should be taken away, and that would be the effect of a restoration all around of the condition of 1873. In that year the freight rate per ton per mile was 2 cents; in 1891 the freight rate per ton per mile was .929 of 1 cent, and 81,210,154,523 tons were moved 1 mile by all our railroads, for which at the rate of .929 of 1 cent, they received as freight charges $754,185,910.

If the opening of the mints to free coinage is to restore the price of silver and all other articles to the rate of 1873, then that freight would cost $1,624,203,090. And that is much more than twice the sum that was paid in 1891. Did silver bring these freight rates down? Then to restore silver is to carry back the freight rates to 1873. It is said that gold has gone up and left all these articles, and the decline in all prices is taken as the measure of the appreciation of gold. Gold has risen in value because of its relative decline in production and the increased demand for its consumption in the arts.

But the commodities have declined very much more than gold has risen, because the forces operating on their production and consumption are much more potent than those operating on the production and consumption of gold. What are these forces? Reduction of the cost of production, the increased power of production, invention of machinery, steam machinery. Any man who will go through our factories in New England or elsewhere will see machinery doing almost everything that man can do, except talk. You see in many things one man doing ten times the amount of work to-day with a machine that was done by one man twenty-five year ago.

What has brought down the price of nails? It is the nail machine. What has brought down the price of pins and needles but machinery? What has brought down the price of steel rails, which were worth $100 a ton?

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The protective tariff.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator is saying that too soon. He will be saying that a few weeks from now when we get the tariff bill here.

Mr. President, did a protective tariff of $45 a ton on steel rails, which were worth about $45 a ton, bring down the price to $25? Does adding to the cost of a thing reduce the price of the thing? I am not now going to discuss this question with my friend from Oregon. I shall have a day in court when the tariff bill arrives.

Why is it that the prices of manufactured products have gone down faster than the prices of agricultural products? Because machinery is more used in manufactures than in agriculture.

Mr. GRAY. Will my friend allow me just there?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. GRAY. In reply to the suggestion that came from the other side about a tariff, and which will come constantly, I wish to say that if the tariff is the origin of all this beneficent reduction in the prices of the necessaries of life, the reductions the Senator is speaking of in their general trend and condition are world-wide and not confined to the United States.

Mr. MILLS. When we get to the tariff we shall talk about all these things.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. Allow me at that point to say a word.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator can not get me into a discussion of the tariff at this time.

Mr. MITCHELL of Oregon. The protective tariff on steel rails resulted in reducing the price by the building up of and the stimulating of that industry in this country.

Mr. MILLS. That is your old argument. Bessemer had more to do with it than the protective tariff.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not want to lead the Senator away from his extremely interesting argument, but I really wish he would incidentally mention the fact that the rewards of labor have gone up all the while.

Mr. MILLS. I said that some time ago, but my friend was not listening to me. I have said that for a hundred years the wages of labor have constantly been going up and are going up yet.

Why is it, Mr. President, that the wages of labor are constantly going up when the prices of commodities which labor makes are constantly going down? It is simply because the production of things increased faster than the production of labor. Human hands and arms and legs can not be produced as fast as machinery. That is why it is. It is a beneficent law of God for the benefit of humanity, and will continue to be so.

The wages of labor are constantly getting higher and higher, and the wage-worker is constantly getting more and more of the product of his labor in reward for his toil. And this happy result is because his work is becoming relatively scarcer and more and more valuable to his employer. But to secure him in the great rewards of his toil, it is necessary, absolutely necessary, that the standard of the commercial world, which is our standard, shall be preserved. Then he knows, and all the world knows the value of labor and the value of the things which it is to purchase.

Mr. President, the prices of property are regulated, as I have said, all other things being equal, by the amount of money in circulation. I am afraid that we do not observe the distinction between the standard of value and the volume of circulation.

Gold is the standard of value, but we have only a little over six hundred millions of gold in the country, while we have $2,000,000,000 in money of gold, silver, and paper in the country, and $1,600,000,000 in circulation, or outside the Treasury. All money not in the Treasury is said to be in circulation, but it is not. Much of it is never seen in market. Prices are not determined by the six hundred millions in gold, but by the $1,600,000,000 in circulation. The gold dollar is the standard by which every article is valued, whether it rises or falls. A great many of our people want to change the standard of value. What for? They say it will enable them to pay their debts so much easier. But is it right? I have been reminded of the strong language I used some years ago in the other House, denouncing those who wanted to double up the obligations of the debtor class and compel them to pay twice as much as the consideration they received, and twice as much as in conscience they agreed to pay.

I repeat every word of that denunciation to-day. There is a moral obligation that enters into every contract as well as a legal one. When two persons contract, one buys and the other sells. A vast amount of the business of the world, and especially of this country, is done on time. When one promises to pay one hundred cents it is one hundred cents on the estimated value at the time of contract. One hundred cents of consideration, according to the then standard of value, passes from one to the other and the promise of the debtor is based on that standard; and when it was proposed to lessen the amount of circulation one-half to double the legal obligation, I denounced it as dishonest and the attempt to perpetrate a crime. A friend has shown me the speech of an Englishman who puts that language on the front page of one of his. I repeat now the words I then used:

> But, amid the reckless and remorseless brutalities which have marked the footprints of resistless power, some extenuating circumstance may be found to qualify the punishment due to the crime. Some have been the product of the fierce passions of war; some have resulted from the antipathies that separate alien races; some from the superstitions of opposing religions; but the crime that is now sought to be perpetuated on more than 50,000,000 of people comes neither from the camp of the conqueror, the hand of a foreigner, nor the altar of an idolator; but it comes from those in whose veins runs the blood of a common ancestry, who were born under the same skies, who speak the same language, who were reared in the same institutions, who were nurtured in the principles of the same religious faith.
>
> It comes from the cold, phlegmatic, marble heart of avarice—avarice that seeks to paralyze labor, increase the burden of debt, and fill the land with destitution and suffering to gratify the lust for gold; avarice, surrounded by every comfort that wealth can command, and rich enough to satisfy every want, save that which refuses to be satisfied without the suffocation and strangulation of all the labor in the land. With a forehead that refuses to be ashamed, it demands of Congress an act that will paralyze all the forces of production, shut out labor from employment, increase the burden of debt and taxation, and send desolation and suffering into the homes of the poor. In this hour, fraught with peril to the whole country, I appeal to the unpurchased representatives of the American people to meet this bold and insolent demand like men. Let us stand in the breach and call the battle on, and never leave the field until the people's money shall be restored to the mint, on equal terms with gold, as it was years ago.

And there I stand to-day. If it was immoral and wicked for the creditor to demand then twice as much as was contracted to be paid on his debt, is it not just as immoral and wicked now for the debtor to demand payment of one-half of his obligation? I see no difference, yet many of our friends want to change the standard because the debtor thereby can change the contract and pay with 50 cents, instead of 100 cents, the debt he has promised on his honor and conscience to pay.

Now, Mr. President, if we are going to leave out of view all moral obligation of the contract, if it is only a legal obligation from which the debtors seek relief, why not, in the exercise of the constitutional provision pass a bankruptcy law, and why not in passing that bankrupt law provide that the debtor shall pay his creditor with a certificate of discharge and keep all his property? He will get a good deal more money that way, if the moral obligation is to be left out of the contract entirely. If we want to do everything we can to release the debtor without requiring him by law to comply with the contract which he has made, then pass a bankrupt law and acquit him entirely and let him retain everything that he has. I do not believe in impairing the obligation of contracts. I believe in enforcing them, and if one person has obtained the property of another by promising to pay for it, he should be required by law to perform the contract.

Mr. President, I believe, with Thomas Jefferson, that honesty is the first chapter in the Book of Wisdom. I denounced, as John G. Carlisle did (but not in as strong language, because I am not as strong a man as he is), the combination that was being formed all over the whole earth to strike down one-half of the monetary circulation of the world and double the value of all the contracts on the debtors; and I denounce now in this country the attempt to shift and change the standard of values for the purpose of enabling the debtor to cheat and defraud his creditor out of one-half of what he has promised him, and in doing so to put the country upon a variable and shifting standard of value by which the people will be plundered continuously from one end of it to the other.

Every contract now in existence in the United States made since January 1, 1879, is on the gold standard, and where a dollar is mentioned it means a gold dollar or one as good as gold, and I will never vote for any law that enables any man to cancel an obligation to pay 100 cents by paying 57 cents. When a depreciated standard is substituted for the real standard of the contract, all contracts are changed, and as Mr. Jefferson repeatedly says it works a revolution of property. It swindles a whole nation. When the Continental money perished in the hands of its holders that was but a small part of the loss. It did not perish until it had changed a large part of the property of the country. When the French assignats perished the loss was not confined to the $9,000,000,000 worth that were issued, but while they lived they had wrought a revolution in the property of France.

Let me give you a little incident in my own experience with Confederate money. Just before I went into the "late unpleasantness" I sold 320 acres of land in Texas for $960, gold standard. I took the note of the purchaser with 10 per cent interest and a lien on the land, and left it to be paid when I came back, if ever I came back; if I did not I felt that my family would get the benefit of it. But after the gold standard was banished and Confederate money was the standard, and after it had gone down to 50, 60, or 70 to 1, Confederate money was tendered and paid to my family when it was practically worthless. The purchaser got my land, discharged his obligation, and its ownership was changed with substantially no consideration. My experience was the experience of many thousands all through the South.

This is the treacherous working of a degraded standard of value. As Mr. Jefferson said about Continental money, it was our war money; and in war, when life and property and everything are freely offered, I do not complain of any sacrifice, but in peace, when my labor and property are demanded, not by my country, but by dishonest men who want it without consideration, I will not by any act of mine put so pernicious a power in their hands. In 1813 Mr. Jefferson called the attention of the people of Virginia to the fact that their business and their property were going up in a balloon. He appealed to them to begin the work of returning to the metallic basis before the balloon collapsed and came down with a crash. He told them that a yard of broadcloth was then worth $18, and before the metallic standard had been supplanted by paper the same cloth sold for

18 shillings. While the balloon was up lands sold for $150 per acre that were worth $40 or $50. After the collapse came it sold for a year's rent.

And this is the standard we are invited to adopt again in lieu of the present stable and almost immovable standard we have had since 1834, except during the war period. Many of our farmers are demanding this change of standard. Those who are demanding the change get their ideas from the Farmers' Alliance, and the peripatetic philosophers which that secret political organization is sending over the country to enlighten the people on political economy. Some of them have never read the first pages of Peter Parley, and, as Mr. Jefferson says, know as little "as though nothing had ever been written on political economy."

What our farmers need is not the banishment of our standard by the free coinage of silver at a time when it will banish it, but free markets for the sale of their products. They want their Government to secure to them the natural right which God gave to them when He created them, the right to labor and the right to sell the products of their labor where they can sell them for the highest price and buy the products of others where they can buy them at the lowest price. Adding to the volume of money in the country without adding to the actual circulation will not benefit them. There may be five thousand millions of money in the country and the per capita may be $75, and yet it may all be owned by a thousand persons. It will not be in circulation and the country will not be benefited.

In 1850 the per capita circulation was $11.42, in 1860 it was $15.46. Between 1850 and 1860 it never rose above $18.33. The country was full of money taken from the gold mines of California. It went directly into all the veins and arteries of business circulation and there was the greatest prosperity ever known in this country. Farms, farm products, and farm animals were continually rising in value, and the national wealth increased 126 per cent in ten years. And to-day, with a per capita of $24, our people are complaining there is not enough money coined and issued. They want to return to 1873, and we have got more than twice as much money in the country now as we had then.

But, Mr. President, I want to know if the mints are open and the silver miners bring their bullion to the mints and have it coined and given back to them how the people of Texas are to get any of it? They are a people of whom I am very fond. They have been very kind to me for a lifetime. I have been living with them ever since I was a boy. I have fought and bled and almost died with them, and I want to know where they come in? When some one from Colorado or Nevada brings a hundred millions of silver bullion and has it coined he may be benefited and if the gold standard is retained he will have 57 cents' worth of silver made worth 100 cents. And this for Colorado and Nevada is a good thing, but I want to know where Texas comes in?

Five hundred millions of silver has been coined since we began in 1875, and Texas is yet complaining that she is not benefited. One hundred and fifty millions of notes have been issued in payment of silver purchased since 1890, and I have never yet seen one, and Texas complains that the good things have not yet come around to her. Mr. President, Texas will be benefited when a Democratic Senate and House passes a bill that will give a free way to free markets for her farm products. When the products of others are permitted to come and exchange for hers, that will increase the price of what her people sell and decrease the price of what they buy, and that will put money in their pockets. If cotton is worth 8 cents to-day and the increased demand raises it 2 cents, I can see how that will put money in their pockets. Two cents per pound on four and a half billion pounds would put $90,000,000 in the pockets of the cotton-growers.

The silver-owner will be benefited by increasing the price of silver; the farmer will be benefited by increasing the price of cotton, wheat, corn, and other farm products. He can not get a dollar without working for it, and he can get a dollar now by working for it, whether the mints are open to silver or not. I want to remove the obstructions that legislation has placed in the way to his market and thus enhance the price of his products. I would not legislate for him or for anyone to give an increased price in violation of natural right, but I will legislate so as to restore to him the enjoyment of that natural right.

Mr. President, I am going to vote to repeal the Sherman law, and I will vote against every amendment which the ingenuity of the human mind can conceive. No amendment can be offered or adopted that does not impeach the good faith of the President, and that I do not intend to do. In giving my vote I am trying to discharge the duty I owe to the people of Texas and to the whole country. I have not changed my opinion about silver coinage. I am for free and unlimited coinage as strongly as I ever was; but to do it now, without the coöperation of a number of the strong powers of Europe, means, in my judgment, the banishment of our standard of values and the introduction of all the evils of a depreciated standard and a fluctuating currency; and while I will not aid in bringing that calamity on the country, I shall continue to do all in my power to secure the coöperation required to establish bimetallism throughout the world. I stand by bimetallism, I stand by the President in his opposition to the Sherman law, and will stand with those who are working to secure its repeal. When I see so many of my friends around me differing from me, and declining to follow the lead of the brave man who leads on the column of repeal, I feel like John Adams felt when the Declaration of Independence was proposed and many of the great men and patriotic men hesitated, as they stood in the brim of the waters of separation.

Webster puts in his mouth a speech that has gone sounding down the corridors of time—a speech whose courageous and patriotic words have warmed all our bosoms, and in our boyhood spoken from all our mouths; a speech that kindled the patriotic fire to a white heat, nerved every heart, and swept away all fears and divided counsels as chaff is swept before the breath of the tempest. It rescued a continent in an hour of peril and fixed the destinies of a great country and a great people. I can not faintly imitate it, but in the faithful discharge of my duty to my country, I can say with the thrilling words of its first sentence, which I will make the last of mine, "Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I give my heart and my hand to this vote." [Applause in the galleries.]

O