

REMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN T. MORGAN,
OF ALABAMA,

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1893.



WASHINGTON.
1893.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN T. MORGAN.

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. MORGAN said:

Mr. PRESIDENT, I have come to the Senate to-day, contrary to the advice of my physician, for the purpose of expressing in the final stages of this bill some opinions which I have formed about it after the best deliberation I have been able to bestow upon the subject.

The situation with which we are confronted in the Senate to-day seems to me to be a very lamentable one, one of which I can speak only with pain, and which I can contemplate only with serious apprehensions for the future welfare of our country.

I do not claim, Mr. President, higher patriotism than any other gentleman on this floor who differs with me or agrees with me in sentiment; nor do I claim greater wisdom or greater experience than any, even the most humble and unpretending of the members of this body; but I have my convictions upon this subject, particularly as to what is best and wisest and safest to be done for the constituency I represent here; and I desire to give expression to some of those convictions on this occasion. I trust in doing so that I shall not be considered as trying to procrastinate even for a moment the final calamity, as I consider it, which is about to fall upon the country in the passage of the pending bill.

The people of the country are prepared for almost anything. They have been worried, and provoked, and depressed, and kicked, and cuffed about by the monetary power in this land in such a way as that they find at last that their dependence upon it is such that their material and smallest domestic interests are controlled entirely by the power of those who occupy the high places in the land, and who have been placed in that ascendancy simply by Congressional legislation.

The people of the United States are not born some princes and some subjects; they are born equals, and they are supposed to have equal rights in all of the beneficent heritage we have derived from the wisdom of our fathers, than whom no fathers were wiser or better. They were born to the equal enjoyment of all these privileges, and when the country was first launched upon the experimental idea of self-governing sovereign power residing in the people and in the States there was but very little

of that apparent disparity which now exists between the classes of society in this country. There were not many colossal fortunes existing in the land; there were some which by way of comparison were very large, but they were not colossal in the sense that they are now, and they had not been derived through speculation and speculation, and the handling of the powers of the Government of the United States to the disadvantage of their neighbors and to their own aggrandizement, but they had been built up by the sober and earnest labors of honest men devoted to honest pursuits in an honest way.

We have passed that era and have come into an era in which the most extravagant conceptions and wishes of the human mind in respect of the aggrandizement of wealth have been realized; and we find ourselves beset now by classes in the United States who seem to demand for themselves the power to control everyone else in all his industrial labors, opportunities, and hopes in respect of everything that concerns human existence.

This class in the United States owes its origin, owes its present existence, owes its present power and its future prospects entirely to the legislation of Congress. The States have not done this; the people have not done it; it has been the outgrowth of legislation, which might sometimes be characterized as being corrupt, oftentimes corrupt, and certainly in the line of that human endeavor which always grasps power whenever it is brought within the reach of the mortal hand.

This is the situation with which we are confronted to-day, and the labors of this body for the last ninety days have been devoted to an investigation of the measures, on the one side for relief from this situation, and on the other side, for the increase of the powers of this class of people. The line is a broad and distinct one. There is no human being who is capable of reasoning, who has the responsibilities of manhood in this great republic of ours, who does not recognize the fact that the party divisions or the actual divisions, whether partisan or not, which exist amongst the people of the United States, all exist upon this line, one class standing on one side of it and the other class standing on the other side.

The class who claim Congressional power for the purposes of personal aggrandizement and increase of wealth is in a vast minority when considered numerically. The class against whom the levies and assessments and contributions to be voted to this minority class are demanded, form a vast unorganized mass of industrial people, engaged in a great variety of pursuits, chiefly agricultural, who by reason of their situation are incapable of perfect organization, and are therefore not capable of resisting the movements which are made by this minority class against their interests and against their rights. The feeling of brotherhood and benevolence which characterized the people of the United States in the earlier days of the republic has departed, and it is now the purpose, it seems, of Congressional legislation that the one class shall make out of the other class all that they can realize, everything that can be done through the powers of taxation, the powers of discrimination, and whatever powers can be exercised in a legislative sense by the Congress of the United States.

Well, perhaps unfortunately for me personally, I am thrown with this majority class; my sympathies are with this vast mass of people; my heart is with them; my convictions that they are entitled to the protection of every feature of the Constitution of the United States are keen and sensitive; and therefore, Mr. President, I am ready to defend them according to the best of my ability whenever and wherever I can.

This long debate has reached its final stage and seems to have included almost every phase of financial inquiry, and our opinions, expressed in our votes, are ready to be placed upon the Journal of the Senate.

In the earlier stages of the debate, after this bill had come over from the other House, I was deeply impressed with the conviction that the immense sweep of the questions involved in our mixed, incongruous, and dislocated financial system would lead us into world-wide fields of discussion; not without profit, but without any practical and permanent results for the relief of the country. I attempted to relieve this situation and only succeeded in causing some severe opposition and even severer criticism of myself personally.

These fears have been fully realized in so far as any vote we are to give on this measure is concerned. There is nothing in this bill except the death warrant of silver as a money metal, and only its final execution will follow. A fatal blow to silver was delivered in the first Sherman bill of 1873, and lingering it has lived, until now it is doomed to sudden death by the third Sherman bill, which amends, reenacts, and adopts the second Sherman bill of 1890, and it is masquerading as a Democratic measure. Instead of curing the finances we seem to have caught a new disease, and a loathsome one, if our platform is true. I confess that this last sad phase of legislative hostility to silver as a money metal, sustained by a minority of Democrats and a majority of Republicans in the Senate, has nearly cast out hope for the relief of the industrial classes, and has filled me with sorrow and chagrin.

To my understanding, it is the complete overthrow of Democratic principles and pledges, and is an irrevocable surrender of the whole attitude of the Democratic party to the demands of a tyrannical, corrupt, insolent, and overbearing combination of those corporations and men who measure out money to the people at will for the sole purpose of increasing their gains by the alternate expansion and contraction of the currency.

The first Sherman law of 1873, which destroyed silver as legal-tender money and deprived it of coinage into standard dollars, failed to encounter the veto of President Grant only because he did not discover the fine artifice employed in the demonetization of that metal. Whether or not its passage through Congress was stealthy, it certainly escaped the knowledge of Gen. Grant. Had he known what was being done there is no doubt that his veto would have arrested it.

True, the hope of resurrection is vaguely held out to the silver men, but we prefer not to die in order to test the resurrectionary powers of the Senator from Indiana. The doctor who presided at the deathbed of Lazarus was not expected to do much towards his resurrection. Besides, the Senator from Ohio

will not consent that Lazarus shall come forth: nor is it certain that his resurrection will not be vetoed by the President.

But there is no need to resort to illustration. It is intended by this bill to destroy silver in order to make room for paper currency based on gold, and, to support that currency, the people are to be taxed to provide gold by the sale of bonds to fortify the reserve in the Treasury.

On Saturday the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] informed us that, in his opinion, this measure will not meet the exigency of the financial situation.

I will read from the RECORD what the Senator said:

Mr. SHERMAN. Now, Mr. President, the passage of some such provision is undoubtedly necessary, and I trust that the Senators on the other side of the Chamber who have the control necessarily, who have the majority, will make some such provision as this. I feel at liberty to call their attention to the subject, because I consider it vital. I fear very much that after a little while, as to the results of the measure that we are about to accomplish, the suspension of the purchasing clause of the act of 1890, the people will find out that it has not been the germ and root of the evil under which they are suffering, and they will look to us for having provided an inefficient measure, a measure that will not meet the exigency.

After three months of debate, in which this Senate Chamber has resounded from day to day with the declaration that the purchasing clause of the Sherman act was the cause of the collapse and the paralysis in the financial condition of the people of the United States, the honorable Senator from Ohio rises in his place and contradicts the whole of it, and disproves the whole of it by his statement which shows that we have been following a phantasmagoria; that we have been following a false pretense, which has been set up by the monetary and financial establishments of this country in order to alarm the people into distrust and servitude.

I fear very much that after a little while, as to the results of the measure that we are about to accomplish, the suspension of the purchasing clause of the act of 1890—

He calls that a suspension which is an absolute repeal—

the suspension of the purchasing clause of the act of 1890, people will find out that it has not been the germ and root of the evil under which they are suffering, and they will look to us for having provided an inefficient measure, a measure that will not meet the exigency.

If that was not the germ and root of the evil under which we are suffering, let some Senator rise here and point out what was. There you have reversed the public judgment; there you have taken the bandage off of the public eyes that have been so long in darkness and trepidation, and you have disclosed to the people of the country the fact that they have been in error in their frantic desire to get away from the purchasing clause of the Sherman law.

What, then, has caused the trouble? What has been the germ and root of this evil, the root of bitterness we are trying to extract from the public situation in order that relief may come to our afflicted country? It is nowhere else, Mr. President, nowhere else than in this false clamor gotten up by the banking institutions in the United States and in England and in Germany for the purpose of alarming the people until they could repeal the one law for the purchase of silver by the United States which the Senator from Ohio says has not been the cause of the evil.

Here we have, Mr. President, the third lesson of the programme.

The first is the final demonetization of the silver that is not already owned by the Government or in circulation, the silver that lies in the rocks and the mountains of the West.

The second is the increase of the power of the national banks to issue their notes to the amount of 10 per cent on the bonds that they may hold. That has already been brought forward. It was debated in the Senate and was abandoned for a reason that I never understood until I had the opportunity to read the RECORD of Saturday's proceedings.

I now see it as plain as light. They knew they could not pass it then, but they know now that after this bill passes they can pass it. They know that the weight and power given to the attitude of the national banks by the passage of this bill on their false demand will place them in such a high position of authority amongst the people of the United States as that the Senator from Indiana will have nothing else to do but to move his bill, which he has had already partially debated, to add 10 per cent to the issues of the national banks, and have the people pay the interest upon that in order that they may have money to buy their bread and meat.

The third stage is the sale of gold bonds to the sum of \$200,000,000 to fortify the Treasury against gold raiders. This last proposition called out the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], and he poured a flood of light on several matters that have given the country much concern and alarm recently. I will notice two or three of these matters:

First, the Senator shows that this bill is not what is demanded by the Chicago Democratic platform.

Second, that it is the fruit of a coalition and was dictated to the Senate by the Senator from Ohio. It is in fact the third Sherman bill.

Third, that the consideration of the bill has been delayed by the friends of the bill, and not by its enemies; and

Fourth, that the Republicans in the Senate broke up the compromise to which all the Democrats had agreed except five, I believe, and which was understood at the time to be agreeable to the President.

I will read from the RECORD what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] said in his debate with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] on these points, and I will read literally, Mr. President, because this debate between those Senators is to be immortal. This debate is the key that unlocks the situation. This debate is the last revelation which we have received from an honest, a candid, and a manly source of the sincere truth of the situation, and I thank him; I bow my thanks to the Senator from Maryland that he has had the manhood to come out before the world and to state in the debate with the Senator from Ohio exactly what is the situation to-day in the Senate of the United States upon this very important, yes, this vital measure. The Senator from Maryland said:

Mr. President, I have not detained the Senate many moments in the discussion of the pending question. I have studiously refrained from doing so. But I can not help observing the very remarkable attitude of the dis-

tinguished Senator from Ohio, who is the acknowledged leader on the other side of this Chamber, and of more than half the Senators who support the bill for the repeal of the purchasing clause of the so-called Sherman law.

The army corps of the Senator from Ohio is the largest one that is attacking it.

His anxiety for its repeal, his support of its repeal, is perfectly well understood; but at the same time that distinguished Senator has well known the fact that the passage of the pending bill was impossible at any time except as a nonpartisan measure, except by the support of the twenty-five or twenty-six Republicans on the other side of the Chamber and the twenty-one or twenty-two Democrats on this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

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

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

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

That was the pledge of the Democratic platform at Chicago. That was the pledge to which I have always responded; it is a pledge that I am willing to enact by my vote to-day, the repeal of the Sherman law.

Mr. BUTLER. A part of it?

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

There broke the light in upon this majority that we have on this side of the Chamber, when the Senator from Ohio in his own State announced that he would not vote for the repeal of the entire Sherman law, but would vote for the repeal of the purchasing clause alone. Then a new and sudden light sprung upon the Democrats upon this side of the Chamber who follow

that Senator, and they embraced it with religious fervor. The Senator from Maryland continues:

I am not mistaken in that. If I am, I ask the Senator to correct me. The Senator says that now?

Mr. SHERMAN. I believe that is what the bill professes to do.
 Mr. GORMAN. Yes; that is what the bill professes. I am coming to that. The President of the United States, anxious and earnest in his desire for its repeal, was too astute and learned a statesman not to know that he had not the power in his own party or with his own party to repeal any portion of that law, because the division is so sharp and great among both parties that neither party would have the power to deal with this question and make the repeal, and we were compelled to take the terms offered by the Senator from Ohio.

We were compelled to take the terms offered by the Senator from Ohio.

He held the key of the position. You have dictated the terms to us. It was the only thing we could get you to agree to for the relief of the country.

This falling out amongst these friends, all of whom went outside of the Democratic party to make their coalition, seems to have been sudden and serious. For a time it was a divorce *a mensa et thoro*. Now it appears that it is to be a divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*. It is a pity that such lovers should so early come to grief.

You have dictated the terms to us.

That may be said of the coalition; but I, as a Democrat, thank Almighty God that the Senator from Ohio has never had the power to dictate terms to me. He may dictate them to the President, to the Committee on Finance, to the Democracy on this side who follow his lead; but he can not dictate terms to me.

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

That seems to have been ascertained here. I was not here to know how the situation was; but it seems to have been ascertained by the wiseacres who lead these respective parties in their legislation in this Chamber and elsewhere that a majority of the Senate was against the repeal of the entire Sherman act without a substitute, and they were against the repeal even of the purchasing clause.

Mr. BUTLER. Unconditional.

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

So the President and the Senator from Ohio, when this pet scheme was opened before the Senate of the United States, knew that they did not have a majority of either party here for its repeal, or a majority of both parties.

Complaints have been made of delay in this matter. I am glad of the opportunity to say, and I say it in justice to those who have fought this bill, that those of us who intended to vote for its final passage believed that we were in the minority, and a delay of weeks became necessary that we might convert enough to our side to pass the bill.

During this delay of weeks that occurred, because the friends of this bill knew that they could not pass it through this body, while opportunity was thus afforded for whatever of assistance could be given to it, the whole of the metropolitan press of the United States and the little resounding creatures that catch their words and their inspirations from these greater sources roared out their indignation against what they were pleased to call the minority in the Senate, which according to the Senator from Maryland was then the majority, because they would not pass the bill. Anathemas have been heaped upon us until if they could be believed by the Almighty he would consign us to eternal perdition for what we have been doing here, when the fact was that the delay that was being occasioned in the Senate was because the promoters of the pending bill knew they could not pass it and were gambling for time.

Now, I thank God again that the light of truth has come to life. We stand here to-day vindicated before the American people, as men who have been badgered, put upon, imposed upon in the most outrageous and scandalous manner on this floor and elsewhere, because when they found at last, or supposed they found, they had a majority for passing this bill, they could not get us instantly to shut our mouths and come up and vote for our own execution. Says the Senator from Maryland:

The fact of it was that we were not ready for its consideration. As time went on the debate became sharp. And, Mr. President, I want to remark right here that it has been a great debate. The annals of Congress will not show one equal to it, and those who participated in it will go down to posterity as men who were equal to any who have preceded them.

He is mistaken about that. There will be a greater debate than that before the people when this bill gets out before them, and the people will be the debaters. They will debate it at the ballot box, and when their oratory comes to be heard it will resound throughout this Union and down through all the tides of coming time.

When the contest became sharp the doubt was then expressed as to the power of the Senate to pass it, not as to the power to reach a vote, but the power to pass unconditional repeal with a majority.

The doubt was not about reaching a vote, but it was about passing the bill unconditionally by a majority of this body.

In the very midst of the fight, in the hottest of it, when men were anxious, when every Senator was desirous that something might be done (and when I say every Senator I mean all on both sides of the Chamber) to relieve the great distress in the financial interests and in commercial affairs, the first note of warning that we had, publicly uttered, came from the Senator from Ohio, the Senator who led more than one-half of the repeal column, that it was impossible to pass it. Here is his interview, published October 5, 1893, in a telegram to the Cincinnati Enquirer dated Washington, October 4:

“[Cincinnati Enquirer, October 5, 1893.]

“WASHINGTON, D. C., October 4.

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

“His answer was frank—direct:

“‘I do not,’ said he.

That was October 4.

“Then,” said I, “what next?”

“I can not,” said he, “be explicit as to what next. The position of the Republican members of the Senate is now passive. The Democrats are endeavoring to arrange a compromise. If they succeed, they can pass a com-

promise measure no matter if the Republican Senators are solidly arrayed against it. Our side, or rather the large majority of our side, stand ready to vote for unconditional repeal whenever the Democrats fix the time to vote. We are even ready to support a closure."

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

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

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

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

Now, then, if the compromise was made and it was a fair one and a just one and one to reconcile conflicting interests, it would tend in every respect, if it had any tendency or any effect whatever, to relieve the country. If the President has refused to sign it, in the opinion of the Senator from Ohio, he breaks his party down, destroys his prestige. There is no blessing to fall upon the venerable head of the Senator from Ohio which I dare say would be so delightful to him as the consummation of that very well-arranged plan to put the President a second time in controversy with his friends in this body. Political manipulation for the sake of party success has become in the United States of America the substitute for every honorable and elevated sentiment of statesmanship, and all of our destiny is measured to-day, it seems to me, entirely by the question what effect it will have upon the party. The Senator from Ohio said:

I think the reporter has been rather more accurate than usual in that interview.

Here is confirmation:

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

That is a strange condition; that because a proposition was made to compromise and it was agreed to, and ultimately it fell through, it was the reason why this bill should pass. So it seems to me it makes no difference to us what we do or in what direction we tend, whatever we do is to be visited upon us as a judgment inflicted. If we agree to a compromise, that is regarded as a surrender. If the compromise is broken up the bill must be passed, because, not that we did not agree to the compromise but because it could not be carried into execution, the President being unwilling to execute it.

October 4--

Says the Senator from Maryland--

is the date of this interview. The Senator from Ohio knew perfectly well, as every other man in the country knew, that he was laying down a condition for the Democratic party to unite.

He laying down a condition for the Democratic party to unite! What is the Democratic party worth to itself, to the country, or to posterity when the Senator from Ohio has the key to its situation and can lay down conditions to it? What is your majority worth here in thus trifling with the people, thus deceived, thus

overrun, and finally handed over to the tender mercies of the Senator from Ohio.

And we are told that—

Heknew—

That is, the Senator from Ohio knew—

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

But, Mr. President, there was an earnest desire, there has been from the beginning of the session an earnest desire on this side of the Chamber, to frame such legislation as might redound to the interest of all the people of this country. Sharp as the division was upon the particular measures, there is not a Democrat upon this side of the Chamber who was not impressed with a desire to harmonize the party, to sustain the Democratic Administration.

Bold words, yet true and full of comfort and consolation, because they are manly and because they are true; and I trust that they may disabuse in the mind of the President of the United States the injustice which is being done to many a sound Democrat far older in the party than he is, with the idea, doubtless, often suggested to him, that his best friends are traitors to him and to the Democracy. If he wishes to do so now, after this declaration, coming from an eminent man who has all the time sustained this policy of repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, let him remain in darkness and help himself.

All were willing to make sacrifices of opinion and to set aside the convictions of a lifetime and unite in doing something which would relieve the business distress, and save their Administration from defeat. They tried to get together. They tried to do what was right. There were many of them who shared the conviction that it is extraordinary, unusual, and unfortunate to strike down summarily, without an hour's warning, any great interest that we had built up or made possible by laws, no matter how vicious and bad the laws themselves. Their deliberations could have been carried to a consummation with the bonds that the Senator from Ohio speaks of.

Yes, sir; it could have been done. There is not a man on this floor or anywhere else in the United States who deprecates more sincerely than I do the further taxation of the people of the United States to sustain the reserve of gold in the Treasury, which I always considered to be a useless and needless thing in a country like ours. There are none who would go further than I would to prevent an increase of taxation for this purpose.

But Mr. President, I would do it only for the sake of peace and harmony, not amongst the Democrats alone, but amongst the people of the different sections of this country, for that sort of peace and harmony and quietude and deliberation of action and caution in progress of legislative expedient and provision which would save to five or six States in the West the millions of money that they have invested on our invitation in the opening up of the silver mines of that country—not merely under our invitation, but under bounties and beneficencies that we

have extended as an inducement to them to stake the whole battle of life upon their success in the opening up of silver mines for the benefit of the people and the Treasury of the United States.

Not for the benefit of the makers of trinkets and ornaments, but for the benefit of the substantial foundation of the great circulating medium and the debt-resolving and debt-paying power of silver money in the country, that should underlie, along with gold, the eternal union of the whole structure of our financial system as it has done since this Government was a government, and long before, while these colonies existed, and long before, during the ages and cycles of time where civilization has been found to have addressed itself in its growth and in its prosperity to this strong foundation as its sure and steadfast support.

I should have voted, Mr. President, even to tax the people; I should have gone to a constituency who would have blamed me at first most seriously for having done a thing of that kind; but, appealing to their reason and their judgment, I should have said to them: "You have made many sacrifices and you have done it in a manly way, and the reward has come to you in the end in an abundance of progress, which perhaps you had not yourselves contemplated; and now, rather than to tear the structure down rudely, rather than to yield summarily to the removal of silver from the basis of its powers as a debt-paying money, I preferred further to tax you; I did not wish to do it, but I had it to do in order to ease the situation until the people at the ballot box could get control of this Government and have the power to pass their final decree that there was to be no more of this kind of legislation."

I signed that paper, and I did it, Mr. President, under these views, and indorsed every word and syllable in it—I mean that part of it—but I signed it in order to have peace and fraternity in the Democratic party. Now, when it is broken up by the refusal of the Senator from Ohio to accept it, while it does not accord with his views of the policy which he has been commissioned by somebody to dictate to the Democratic party as wise, it passes out of existence, and the next, and only resource, we are told, is to vote for the bill, commit suicide because you can not get a chance to live on fair terms with your friends and neighbors. That is the proposition.

I am very glad, Mr. President, that this matter has come to light. I feel greatly relieved personally, and I know my colleagues here—the majority of the Democrats on this side of the Chamber—who are opposed to this bill all feel relieved that they are no longer to occupy the category of disruptionists and obstructionists: that they are no longer to be classed as men who are fit only for being gagged and choked and bound hand and foot and made to sit in silence while other men conduct the affairs of the Government.

I feel gratified that the truth has come to light, and that our vindication did not depend and does not depend upon posterity or upon history or upon asseveration or disclaimer upon our part; but it comes from the mouth of an eminent Senator, who has been all the time opposing our views on this question.

From 1873 to this the supporters of this cruel law have been

in the minority, and the people have condemned it at every election when the question has been raised. But only on one occasion have they had the power in Congress to overcome a Presidential veto with a two-thirds vote. To do that they were forced to make the compromise of the Bland bill. The Presidential veto has always stood ready as a reserve corps to shield this law of 1873, and the will of the people has thus been thwarted. Why both the great political parties, as they have come successively into power, have been forced to lend the veto power to the protection of the first Sherman law is a matter that is not in the least obscure to the campaign executive committees of both parties. It is a simple story, but a very sad one, which runs thus: they could not, when successful, refuse to protect the interests of the moneyed classes who furnished the means to conduct the political campaigns.

Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood as to this statement. I do not mean that the candidates for the Presidency, on either side, are pledged in advance to the use of the veto power, or any other power, for the doing of anything that is not promised in the platform of the party.

I mean that they have no moral power to refuse the demands made upon them when they are reconcilable to their personal opinions, no matter how far they may disappoint the will of the people expressed in the ballot box. They find excuses for refusing to obey the will of the people.

We have had one example of this moral coercion which this country can never forget. I allude to the counting in of Mr. Hayes as President, when Mr. Tilden was elected. Mr. Hayes had no power to resist the fiat of his party managers and would have been disgraced, as a traitorous poltroon, if he had declined to accept the office after his party had thrust him into it, even if he had been conscious, as millions of people believed was the fact, that he was not elected to the Presidency.

There is in the United States a distinct political class, known as the managers of Presidential campaigns, who exercise unwonted powers in the control of executive and legislative measures.

They are consulted first, if not exclusively, by their respective parties, upon every great public question. In effect they too frequently hold and control the veto power. They are "the power behind the throne, greater than the throne itself," and while they are irresponsible to the people they rule largely in their affairs.

This class of politicians must needs be very close to the moneyed classes and corporations from whom they obtain the sinews of war, and can not take sides with the people against those classes. This is a terrible and growing evil. All of these party dictators, on both sides, have fenced in the Sherman law of 1873 with barriers that the people have not been able to surmount.

While their sway continues, the people will get no relief as to the use of silver as a money metal. No President since Gen. Grant has had the power to withstand them. He would never have consented to the destruction of silver as a money metal, if he had known or suspected that it was slain in the Sherman

law of 1873, or in the Revised Statutes. When this bill has become a law, I can not now see any remedy for the people save in the election of a President who is friendly to silver as a part of the American system of finance.

After the effect of the Sherman law of 1873 was known, and its operation had filled the land with tramping wanderers in search of work, to earn or beg their bread, the Democratic party, in obedience to its traditional duty, took up the cause of the suffering multitudes, and with earnest promises won their votes to its standards.

This is the cause, Mr. President, of the strength of the Democratic party to-day. After five years of effort they had gained enough power to pass the Stanley Matthews resolutions for the restoration of silver and the Bland-Allison act for the purchase and coinage of silver dollars, and to reestablish its debt-paying power. The people voted this relief to themselves, and their representatives in Congress were only prevented from granting it as fully as it had existed from the foundation of the Government until 1873 by the threatened use of the veto power. That power of a minority, used by a President who acted in harmony with them, was the barrier to the full exercise of the will of the people in the remonetization and free coinage of silver.

The minority thus triumphed over the people and sustained their oppressors, and perpetuated their power to fill all the marts of commerce with bankruptcies and all the homes of industry with idleness and want.

The partial relief gained by the people through a compromise with the money power in the Bland-Allison bill was secured by a two-thirds vote of each House over the veto of President Hayes. If he had been backed by a subservient party even that relief would have been refused. The people moved onward after that for the completion of the great reformation for fifteen years, and again struck for the free coinage of silver on equal terms with gold. Again the veto power was invoked by the minority, and its threatened exercise was potent to defeat their will.

The controversy resulted in another Sherman law of 1890, which was also a compromise. In each of these compromises the people gained ground to the front, and would have triumphed over their oppressors but for the power in the grasp of the minority which was found in the control of the veto power. The bankers and stock gamblers, and the trust manipulators and the men who lurk in ambush to force the markets into corners, after a third trial, had fully ascertained the advantage they had in the control of the veto power.

Knowing that the people were aroused and would demand their rights, these conspirators, as an advance movement in the campaign of 1892, set about to capture the control of the veto power, no matter which of the great leading political parties should elect the President. They directed their supreme efforts to the nomination of candidates for the Presidency by each party who they knew would use the veto power, when needed, to prevent the restoration of silver as a full money metal equally with gold. They succeeded, and, in doing this evil, they inflicted

upon the people a wrong as novel as it was stupendous, and by means that threaten the utmost danger to the Republic.

Money, which is their power, their only power, was used in enormous sums to control the two national conventions as to their membership and the nominations. How much was used, no self-respecting American is willing, it seems, to inquire. The subject is forbidding. There are men who know these facts, but there are none who are willing to disclose them. The result was that the control of the veto power, as a reserved force to check silver legislation, was secured to the minority on these questions of finance, whether the Democrats or the Republicans should elect their nominees.

They had no bargain or understanding to this effect; they did not need this; but they nominated men for the Presidency who were committed in public and official utterances to the sternest opposition to a return to the free coinage of silver, and whose recorded opinions would be their platform. Then in the national conventions they took care that in the pledges made to the people there should be a great show of friendship for silver, resounding promises, glittering generalities, and deceptive flatteries, which could be complied with as the parity fraud in the second Sherman law is complied with, by a total subversion of the plain intent of the law.

It was a sight to inspire mirth among the dead tenants of the catacombs to see two Presidential candidates striving to grasp the scepter of the veto power that they might wield it for the destruction of silver money, and yet professing to be the friends of bimetallism. They led opposing and belligerent forces in a joint campaign against silver. In those candidates and in those platforms the coalition began which is now being consummated in Congress, for the defeat of the will of the people expressed in every Democratic victory, at least since that party began to have a history.

The coalition assumes, with good reason, that it is in a numerical majority in the Senate. A majority of whom, I would inquire? Does one Senator in Georgia, one in North Carolina, one in Virginia, one in Kentucky, one in Texas, one in Oregon claim with any show of reason that he represents the majority of the people in each of these States, as against his colleague, when he votes for the destruction of silver as a money metal?

The doctrine of the Constitution is that within its limitations the majority of the people rules. The doctrine of the coalition is that the numerical majority of Senators present in the Chamber rules absolutely, though the people may have instructed them in the elections, never so plainly, that they are violating the expressed will of a majority of the people. In a parliamentary sense this is true; but is it honest to vote down the expressed will of the people in the Senate unless it is done to check the dangerous execution of the popular will until wiser counsels can prevail?

When the wishes of the voting population in the United States are expressed, it is my belief that the ancient doctrine of the Democratic party, that gold and silver shall have equal privileges at the mint, is largely in the majority. That it is in a majority of eight-tenths in the Democratic party there is scarcely

a doubt. The bare numerical majority of the coalition in the Senate violates and rides down the Democratic majority and chains it to the triumphal car of the minority and of the Republicans.

It violates the Chicago Democratic platform, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] in his speech so truly said, and adopts, with an amendment, the Sherman law—the cowardly makeshift—as the embodiment of sound Democratic doctrine. This is done under the false pretense that this bill is an unconditional repeal of the Sherman law of 1890, or of the purchasing clauses in that law. So far from that being true, this bill is not an unconditional repeal of any part of the Sherman law of 1890. It is only a repeal of one feature of that law, upon the express condition that every other section and feature of it shall remain in force.

There is not the least ground or warrant in the Democratic national platform for this action, unless that platform was designed only as an artful and deceptive method of destroying silver as a money metal. No mere coalition of Democrats and Republicans, with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] in the lead of one faction, or both, can thus depart from and disjoin the Chicago Democratic platform and impose upon me, as a Democrat, the acceptance of this treason to party faith. We are told to vote, and that speedily, upon this travesty of Democracy, dished up and dictated by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. Who made this a Democratic creed? This I will presently show.

If the President had no veto power in reserve with which to defeat the will of the people and the votes in Congress of two-thirds save one, of their representatives, so as to compel Congress to take this or worse, this piping in the market place would go on indefinitely and unheeded, without anyone being found to dance.

As it is, the minority of the Democracy, aided by the reserve force, the veto power must have sway until the whole Democracy can speak. They will speak in no uncertain terms and the Government will yet obey.

The old guard, who have borne the banners of Democracy above harder fought fields than this, will not be alarmed into inaction by the threats of legislative compulsion that are made on this floor. We expect that, when the coalition has accomplished its object by the starvation of the people, we shall be upbraided with the charge of moral cowardice, and it will be said that we shrank from contact with a cloture imported from the British Parliament through the Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Fifty-first Congress. That odious tyranny was not born to rule the Senate of the United States. A General Tom Thumb can not do great harm with the club of Hercules.

If a Presidential policy is to be worked out through a gag held in one hand and the veto power in the other such assumed powers would so far exceed the grants in the Constitution that the most abject party slave would fly from such a ruler.

We have been threatened here both with the gag of the cloture and the veto of the President because we have asked for information as to what will be done for the people when their silver

legal-tender money is destroyed and they are to be taxed to put crutches under the arms of the golden god created by the two Sherman laws of 1873 and 1890 and enthroned by that of 1893. When we are asking these questions we are told to vote!

Vote speedily, for the hungry coalition majority will not wait to be questioned. We are not allowed the right of petition so that we may ask the President what he next proposes to do, after the second Sherman bill, that of 1890, has been amended and made more fatal to silver money by that of 1893. Those in the Senate who seem to be conducting business for the President and are supposed to be informed of what is to become of the people, make no answer to the many bills sent them for consideration. They give no sign to indicate what is hidden in the womb of the future.

Is the State-bank tax to be repealed? Are the people to be taxed to borrow gold to meet the \$650,000,000 of gold obligations, including the national-bank notes, for all of which, by the fiat of the Secretary of the Treasury, we are held liable in gold coin? Are we to add to this another \$100,000,000 in order to cover the balances of trade, or the interest on debts, or the dividends on railroad and other stocks, as fast as we earn them, for our foreign creditors? Are we to have a bankrupt law as a forlorn hope? Are we to have an income tax to help those who labor and starve, by forced contributions from the nonproducing classes? Or are we to be left where we have been for twenty years, a constant prey to the speculations of those who can increase or depress the currency at will, and take tithes and tolls at pleasure from the earnings and property of the industrial classes.

One word of encouragement from the President, or from the coalition, would be a grateful relief to the apprehensions of the people and would tend to establish that confidence the want of which is said to be the cause of all the sufferings of the people. Instead of this we are told that conferences and caucuses are in vain, and that compromise is scouted as an unworthy condescension. This is harsh, arbitrary, and unworthy treatment; all the more painful because our political enemies are invited to become the willing instruments of our coercion. From that rod and that staff we can get no comfort. The funeral knell of the liberty of free speech in the Senate, that came from Rhode Island when the force bill was under debate, and only ceased when Colorado and Nevada interposed their sovereign powers, is again jangling in strange and ominous peals in New York and Indiana, and we are threatened with duress, if not with punishment.

I am afraid that the country will be slow in forgetting this wanton method of hasty and summary dealing with the strangulated silver States—the silver States of the West.

They have not deserved this. The first two Sherman laws and the great rupee theft of Great Britain, it is true, have depressed the market value of silver bullion until 65 cents' worth of pure metal will coin into a full dollar. Yet it is equally true that the Bland-Allison law has made that dollar as good as a gold dollar, both to the Government and the people, and no man has been shaved one cent on any silver dollar. If through our "cowardly makeshifts" we have given this advantage to the

silver miners, shall we forget how their productions saved our people, if not our Government, from bankruptcy when Baring Brothers, by their wild investments, compelled the Bank of England to borrow money from the Bank of France to tide over that shoal?

England turned to us for gold and got it. This draft would have bankrupted our people had not these silver miners poured into our Treasury \$60,000,000 of silver bullion per annum, which, with \$33,000,000 of gold from our mines, enabled our people to conduct all their home industries almost without difficulty.

In some remarks that I was permitted to make on the 28th September, I attempted to demonstrate (not in vain, I hope) that these silver miners were forced into this attitude by the false principles upon which the first and second Sherman laws are based, and that they were deprived by those laws of their constitutional right to mine and use silver as a money metal, a metal that is precious, as the redeemer of promises, and to have it coined at the mints as their property.

A people robbed of rights that exist under the Constitution, and were enforced with extreme care under statutes approved by Gen. Washington in 1792, and by Gen. Jackson in 1837, and were undisturbed for eighty years, are not to be treated with contempt because those who deride them have been successful, in a degree, in a conspiracy to destroy such rights and the market value of their property.

The tyrant may scoff at and deride his mutilated victim, but honest men will help him to assert the holy rights of man. I will abide with the noble people, whose commission entitles me to a voice in this Chamber, in upholding the rights of our sister States in the mountains of the West, and I will not join the multitude in demanding their destruction because they can point to these States in their distress and helplessness and say, "If thou be king, deliver thyself from thine enemy."

In standing by these States and peoples in their hour of great trial I will violate no tradition or creed of the true Democracy. I am anxious to establish my Democracy on these lines as the friend of the equal rights of gold and silver before the law, so that the larger and stronger men who have of late clambered upon the Democratic platform shall not crowd me off the modest back seat where I have been during all my manhood and where I intend to abide even unto the end.

On the 28th October, 1893, the following Democrats voted in the Senate for restoring to the people the right of free coinage of silver as it existed under the act of 1792 approved by Gen. Washington, one hundred years ago, and again by Gen. Jackson in 1837, fifty-six years ago. They are: Senators BATE, BERRY, BLACKBURN, BUTLER, CALL, COKE, DANIEL, GEORGE, HARRIS, IRBY, JONES of Arkansas, MARTIN, PASCO, PUGH, ROACH, VANCE, VEST, and WALTHALL, 18 Democrats voting. And the following Democrats were paired in favor of the free coinage of silver, namely: COCKRELL, COLQUITT, MORGAN, and WHITE of California, making 22 Democrats who support the free coinage of silver in the Senate.

The Democrats in the Senate who refused to support the free coinage of silver are Messrs. CAFFERY, CAMDEN, FAULKNER,

GIBSON, GORMAN, GRAY, HILL, LINDSAY, MCPHERSON, PALMER, RANSOM, SMITH, VILAS, TURPIE, VOORHEES, and WHITE of Louisiana—16 Democrats voting against silver, and the following Democrats were paired against the amendment for its free coinage, namely, BRICE, GORDON, HUNTON, and MILLS—in all, 20 Democratic Senators. Thus we see that it is still the Democratic doctrine in the Senate that the people of the United States demand and will have the free coinage of silver if it is in the power of the Democracy to restore to them that constitutional and Democratic boon. That this is the Democratic doctrine, with majorities running into hundreds of thousands among the people, will soon be demonstrated in a way that will never be forgotten.

In the list of Senators who voted, or were paired, against silver free coinage are several far better entitled to Democratic consideration than I am, so far as the value of their opinions is concerned, with whom I have been voting and acting for many years on the Democratic side of the question. This will appear more distinctly from some records to which I will presently invite the attention of the Senate.

What may be their reasons for their change of attitude towards this subject is not a matter that concerns me personally; but I wish only to state the fact with emphasis that I have not changed my opinions or my votes on this vital question. I have not abandoned the Democratic creed, which has stood the test of a century of experience, and is the same now as it was in 1792.

There seems to be a charm for them in this third Sherman bill which can neither be broken by the denunciations of our party platform adopted at Chicago, nor by the arguments that we have been able to advance to show that it is the last fatal blow at silver as a money metal.

If we part company on this question, the most important that now concerns the country, it will only be because I refuse to leave the old Democratic ground and to accept the leadership of the honorable Senator from Ohio in his relentless war upon silver as a money metal.

Let us see what Democrats have been doing since 1873 in the Senate to defeat the Senator from Ohio in his war upon bimetallicism.

The subject came up in 1878, in the Senate, as it had come up previously in various elections held. On the 5th of November, 1877—

Mr. BLAND moved to suspend the rules and pass the following bill:
An act to authorize the free coinage of the standard silver dollar, and to restore its legal-tender character.

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be coined, at the several mints of the United States, silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy of standard silver, as provided in the act of January 18, 1837, on which shall be the device and superscriptions provided by said act; which coins, together with all silver dollars heretofore coined by the United States of like weight and fineness, shall be a legal tender, at their nominal value, for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise provided by contract; and any owner of silver bullion may deposit the same at any United States coinage mint, or assay office, to be coined into such dollars, for his benefit upon the same terms and conditions as gold bullion is deposited for coinage under existing laws.

SEC. 3. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

I have read the whole of the proposed statute in order to show its very identity with the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEPPER] which was voted down in the Senate by Democratic votes last Saturday.

This was agreed to, yeas 164, nays 34, 92 not voting. Among the yeas I find Mr. MILLS of Texas, and Mr. HUNTON of Virginia, and various other of the leading lights of the Democratic party, with whom, Mr. President, I have felt honored in the opportunity of being associated during my political career in this body and long before, so that if a juvenile like myself in political affairs as I was then was misled in respect of the true Democratic doctrine I shall have to ask one of those Senators or both of them to act the part of a scapegoat for me and take my sins upon their shoulders and to run to cover somewhere. They have run to cover, Mr. President, and I am afraid they are going to leave me in my sins.

The Stanley Matthews resolution came up in the Senate on the 16th of January, 1878, which involved the whole of the doctrine contained in the Bland bill, which had passed the House by this tremendous majority, and that resolution I will also read. I put it on the record, not for the information of the Senate, but because I desire my constituents to know what the facts are, in order that they may determine whether they and I have belonged to the Democratic party and have been in line with them all these years, or whether we have been so fatally mistaken in our attitude upon this question. The resolution submitted by Mr. Matthews, who was not a Democrat (he was a Republican from Ohio, afterwards a member of the Supreme Court, and a very eminent one), is as follows:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

Whereas all the bonds of the United States authorized to be issued by the act entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt," approved July 14, 1870, by the terms of said act, were declared to be redeemable in coin of the then present standard value, bearing interest payable semi-annually in such coin; and

Whereas all bonds of the United States authorized to be issued under the act entitled "An act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," approved January 14, 1875, are required to be of the description of bonds of the United States prescribed in the said act of Congress approved July 14, 1870, entitled "An act to authorize the refunding of the national debt;" and

Whereas at the date of the passage of said act of Congress last aforesaid, to wit, the 14th day of July, 1870, the coin of the United States of standard value of that date included silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains each, declared by the act approved January 18, 1837, entitled "An act supplementary to the act entitled 'An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States,'" to be a legal tender of payment, according to their nominal value, for any sums whatever: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars, of the coinage of the United States, containing 412½ grains each of standard silver; and that to restore to its coinage such silver coins as a legal tender in payment of said bonds, principal, and interest, is not in violation of the public faith nor in derogation of the rights of the public creditor.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] proposed to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that mo-

tion was negatived by 19 yeas and 31 nays. Mr. Conkling moved to amend it so as to make it a joint resolution, which was not agreed to—yeas 23, nays 39. The object of Mr. Conkling in making the motion to change it from a concurrent to a joint resolution was obvious. It was that the President of the United States might have a chance to strike it down with his veto.

Mr. Edmunds moved to strike out of the resolution after the word "interest," in the fourth line, etc., and the vote was taken on that—18 yeas and 44 nays.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] moved to strike out the words "are payable," in the fifth line, etc. It was disagreed to—yeas 14, nays 41.

Mr. Edmunds moved to postpone the resolution indefinitely, which was disagreed to—yeas 22, nays 43. Now among the yeas there were the following Democrats:

Messrs. Barnum, Bayard, Eaton, Kernan, Lamar, MCPHERSON, and Randolph.

Among the nays were Messrs. Armstrong, Bailey, Beck, COKE, Davis of West Virginia, Dennis, Eustis, GORDON, Grover, Hereford, Johnston, Jones of Florida, McCreery, McDonald, Maxey, Merrimon, MORGAN, RANSOM, Saulsbury, Thurman, VOORHEES, Wallace, Withers. There were 43 votes in the negative, quite a large number of whom were Republicans. On agreeing finally to the resolution the vote was 43 yeas to 22 nays. Now I will read that vote: The yeas were Messrs. ALLISON, Armstrong, Bailey, Beck, Booth, Bruce, CAMERON of Pennsylvania, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chaffee, COKE, Conover, Davis of Illinois, Davis of West Virginia, Dennis, Dorsey, Eustis, Ferry, GORDON, Grover, Hereford, Howe, Johnston, Jones of Florida, JONES of Nevada, Kirkwood, McCreery, McDonald, McMillan, Matthews, Maxey, Merrimon, MORGAN, Oglesby, Plumb, RANSOM, Saulsbury, Saunders, Spencer, TELLER, Thurman, VOORHEES, Wallace, Withers—43.

And the nays were: Messrs. Anthony, Barnum, Bayard, Blaine, Burnside, Christiancy, Conkling, Dawes, Eaton, Edmunds, Hamlin, Kernan, Lamar, MCPHERSON, Mitchell, MORRILL, Paddock, Randolph, Rollins, Sargent, Wadleigh, Windom—22.

So that resolution passed in the Senate by the vote of all the Democrats in that body except seven. The resolution went to the House, and on the 29th of January, 1878, the preamble and resolution were adopted by a vote of 189 yeas to 79 nays. Of course amongst the yeas the Democrats were very greatly in the majority.

This subject came up again in the Fifty-first Congress, in 1890. It was upon a bill that had passed the House of Representatives and come over to the Senate, if I have it right, and I think I have. It was a bill for the coinage of silver money under the act of 1837, with certain additional provisions in it, which were quite in harmony with the general purport of the act. It passed the House of Representatives, it seems, by a vote of 135 yeas to 119 nays. It was considered in the Senate on a report from the Finance Committee made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] on the 11th day of June, 1890, and after considerable debate and many motions for amendment and postponement, etc.,

Mr. Plumb, of Kansas, presented the following substitute for the bill:

That from and after the date of the passage of this act the unit of value in the United States shall be the dollar, and the same may be coined of 412½ grains of standard silver or of 25.8 grains of standard gold, and the said coins shall be equally legal tender for all sums whatever.

That hereafter any owner of silver or gold bullion may deposit the same at any mint of the United States, to be formed into standard dollars or bars for his benefit and without charge; but it shall be lawful to refuse any deposit of less value than \$100, or any bullion so base as to be unsuitable for the operations of the mint.

Mr. BLAIR proposed an amendment to it and Mr. VEST moved to change the last clause of the first sentence of Mr. Plumb's substitute, so as to read:

And the said coins shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private.

Mr. Plumb's substitute was then agreed to—yeas 43, nays 24. Now, I will read the yeas:

Messrs. BATE, BERRY, Blair, Blodgett, BUTLER, CALL, CAMERON, Carlisle, COCKRELL, COKE, COLQUITT, DANIEL, Eustis, GEORGE, Gibson, GORMAN, HARRIS, Heatst, Ingalls, JONES of Arkansas, JONES of Nevada, Kenna, MANDERSON, MITCHELL, Moody, MORGAN, Paddock, Payne, Plumb, POWER, PUGH, RANSOM, Reagan, Sanders, SQUIRE, STEWART, TELLER, TURPIE, VANCE, VEST, VOORHEES, WALTHALL, WOLCOTT—43.

The nays were:

Messrs. ALDRICH, Allen, ALLISON, Casey, CHANDLER, CULLOM, Dawes, Edmunds, Evarts, FRYE, GRAY, HALE, HAWLEY, Hiscock, HOAR, MCPHERSON, MORRILL, Pierce, Sawyer, SHERMAN, Spooner, STOCKBRIDGE, WASHBURN, Wilson of Maryland—24.

There were only three Democrats in that minority. That bill failed to become a law, it having been substituted by what is now known as the Sherman act of 1890, which was passed on the 14th of July, 1890, every Democrat in the Senate voting against it. There again it appears that I was not only with the Democratic party in my views upon this subject, but that a very large number of Democrats entertained the same idea of what the duty of a Democrat was in respect to the free coinage of silver.

Then the subject came up again in the House of Representatives in the Fifty-second Congress, the 7th of March, 1892, on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules by Mr. CATCHINGS, of the House, that "after the morning hour the House proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4426, being a bill for the free coinage of gold and silver, for the issue of coin notes, and for other purposes, and should said bill be not sooner disposed of the House shall continue the consideration thereof," etc.

That was taken up on a vote of 195 yeas to 73 nays, and after a long struggle in the House of Representatives the bill came over to the Senate.

On July 1, 1892, the bill S. 51, to provide for the free coinage of gold and silver bullion, and for other purposes, was up. It is a mere repetition in substance, not exactly identical in language, with the act of 1837.

Mr. DOLPH moved to recommit the bill, and on that motion there were 28 yeas, and the nays were 31. The votes for recommitment were:

Yeas—Messrs. ALLISON, BRICE, CAREY, Carlisle, CULLOM, DAVIS, Dawes, DIXON, DOLPH, Felton, FRYE, GALLINGER, GORMAN, GRAY, HALE, HANSBROUGH, HAWLEY, MCPHERSON, MANDERSON, PALMER, Perkins, PLATT, PROCTOR, Sawyer, STOCKBRIDGE, Warren, WASHBURN, WHITE—28.

And the nays were:

Messrs. Allen, BATE, BERRY, BLACKBURN, Blodgett, BUTLER, CAMERON, COCKRELL, COKE, DUBOIS, FAULKNER, GEORGE, HARRIS, HILL, JONES of Nevada, Kenna, KYLE, MILLS, MITCHELL, MORGAN, Paddock, PEPPER, POWER, RANSOM, SHOUP, STEWART, TELLER, TURPIE, VEST, WALTHALL, WOLCOTT—31.

The final result was that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] substituted all of the proposed legislation by an out-and-out straight free-coinage bill, the best one, I think, that I have ever seen since the act of 1837, and on its final passage the yeas were 29 and the nays were 25. On that the yeas were:

Messrs. Allen, BATE, BERRY, BLACKBURN, BLODGETT, BUTLER, CAMERON, COCKRELL, DUBOIS, FAULKNER, GEORGE, HARRIS, HILL, JONES of Nevada, Kenna, KYLE, MILLS, MITCHELL, MORGAN, PEPPER, RANSOM, Sanders, SHOUP, SQUIRE, STEWART, TELLER, TURPIE, VEST, WOLCOTT—29.

And the nays were:

Messrs. ALLISON, BRICE, CAREY, Carlisle, CULLOM, DAVIS, Dawes, DIXON, DOLPH, Felton, GALLINGER, GORMAN, GRAY, HALE, HAWLEY, MCPHERSON, MANDERSON, PALMER, Perkins, PROCTOR, Sawyer, STOCKBRIDGE, Warren, WASHBURN, WHITE—25.

And opposed to it were the following Democrats: GORMAN, GRAY, MCPHERSON, PALMER, and WHITE.

Now, I have sufficiently shown, without going into greater details, that the Senate of the United States by the vote which it gave, and the Democrats in the Senate by the vote that they gave, which I have just been reading and which seems to have been recorded on the 1st of July, 1892, gave their definition to the meaning of the platform of the Chicago convention of 1892, which was adopted June 1, just a month before, in which it is stated in Article VII:

SEC. 7. 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. 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 the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, or be adjusted 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; and we demand that all paper currency shall be kept at par with and redeemable in such coin. We insist upon this policy as especially necessary for the protection of the farmers and laboring classes, the first and most defenseless victims of unstable money and a fluctuating currency.

Now, that was the Democratic interpretation in the Senate of the meaning of that platform. The Democrats who voted for the free coinage of silver on the 1st of July, 1892, in this body, did not mean to separate themselves from the party. They knew of the existence of this platform. They interpreted its meaning.

It went to the country, and after that vote in the Senate of the United States I could go to my constituents in Alabama, and did go, to them, and informed them that, whatever there might be of doubt or distrust connected with the vague expressions and uncertainties of the seventh clause of the Chicago platform, so far as the Democracy in the Senate and in the House were concerned it had all been removed: that we had made and affirmed the declaration in favor of the free coinage of silver in accordance with the act of 1837, which had been signed by Gen. Jackson.

There was firm ground to stand upon. We believed it. If I had gone to the State of Alabama and told the Democrats of that State the first thing that should be done by the President of the United States after we should have elected him, or contributed our votes to his election, would have been to have put silver in a position from which there was no possible extrication, that it was to die in the Senate at the hands of its friends or in the House of Representatives and by his command, that State at least would never have cast its vote for him. There is no question about that. I have told him so, of course in the most friendly, cordial, and kindly manner, for that is exactly the sentiment that rules in my bosom in respect to the President of the United States.

Not that only, but I have great pride in him as a Democrat, and great hopes of the success of his power in the relief of the country from other mischiefs besides this which are coming upon us. But I had not any more distrust that the attitude of the Democratic party was known upon this question, was thoroughly established, was beyond doubt or disputation—I had no more distrust of it than I have of my own existence. You can fancy the surprise with which I encountered here, not an appeal to the men who passed that bill, not asking them to go into council with the rest of the Democrats and see whether it were not better under existing conditions and circumstances to waive the attitude we took in July, 1890, but to be confronted with an alliance that had already been formed, a coalition that had already been established by outside arrangements with the honorable Senator from Ohio, to whom was delivered, it appears, the key of the situation, and who had the supreme office delegated to him by some authority—I do not know and I do not care what it was—to dictate to the Senate of the United States and to the Government what should be its policy in respect to silver.

I am not apt, Mr. President, to take umbrage at being neglected or overlooked. I do not care anything about the complimentary attentions of any man who lives, if I have a clear conscience and am permitted to act upon a sense of duty formed on my part. Whenever gentlemen can not agree with me about matters of that kind honors are simply easy between us. But I feel as a Democrat and as one of a majority of this body, after that platform had been adopted at Chicago, and after we had made this firm declaration to return to the platform of 1837, old "Hickory" Jackson's platform there was something in the nature of a consideration due to the men who felt thus impelled to give their votes in this body and to define their course on this subject.

But instead of that we have been entirely overslaughed; and

when we presume to enter into a compromise, although we are yet a majority in this body, the compromise is discarded and we are thrown back upon the arbitrary demands that this bill must pass just as it has been framed by the dictation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], no more and no less, and we must look to the future for our relief.

Too Senate would weary with me if I should undertake to trace up the origin of this Democratic doctrine, and yet I can not forbear to quote a very few sentences from that most eminent Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, on this subject, to show that we are in line with him also. He says:

It is a litigated question, whether the circulation of paper, rather than of specie, is a good or an evil. In the opinion of England and of English writers it is a good; in that of all other nations, it is an evil; and excepting England and her copyist, the United States, there is not a nation existing, I believe, which tolerates a paper circulation. The experiment is going on, however, desperately in England, pretty boldly with us, and at the end of the chapter, we shall see which opinion experience approves; for I believe it to be one of those cases where mercantile clamor will bear down reason, until it is corrected by ruin. In the meantime, however, let us reason on this new call for a national bank.

Mr. Jefferson was opposed to national banks, and at that stage of the case he was opposed to paper money, because he did not believe that the Government had sufficient control over the regulation of the volume of paper money to keep it in proper parallel lines with the redeeming power that lay in the gold and silver, which are at the foundation of all these promises.

He says further in criticism of Adam Smith:

The only advantage which Smith proposes by substituting paper in the room of gold and silver money (B 2, c. 2, 434) is "to replace an expensive instrument with one much less costly, and sometimes equally convenient;" that is to say (page 437), "to allow the gold and silver to be sent abroad and converted into foreign goods," and to substitute paper as being a cheaper measure. But this makes no addition to the stock or capital of the nation. The coin sent out was worth as much while in the country as the goods imported and taking its place. It is only, then, a change of form in a part of the national capital from that of gold and silver to other goods. He admits, too, that while a part of the goods received in exchange for the coin exported may be materials, tools, and provisions for the employment of an additional industry, a part also may be taken back in foreign wines, silks, etc., to be consumed by idle people who produce nothing; and so far the substitution promotes prodigality, increases expense and consumption without increasing production. So far, also, then, it lessens the capital of the nation. What may be the amount which the conversion of the part exchanged for productive goods may add to the former productive mass, it is not easy to ascertain, "because," as he says (page 441), "it is impossible to determine what is the proportion which the circulating money of any country bears to the whole value of the annual produce."

He goes on to discuss those questions to which I do not now desire to call attention further. When speaking of cash or money he always speaks of gold and silver. He uses them in conjunction. It never occurred to the mind of that wise statesman that a period could ever arise in the United States when a divorce between gold and silver should become necessary. It has never arisen and it never will arise. Even at this very moment our legislation, our restrictions upon the use of silver, the legislation of foreign countries, will drive the productive labors of the people of the world into the gold mines; and it will not be five years after the passage of this law until the country will do as Germany did, and as other countries in Europe have done, abandon the

gold standard and adopt again the bimetallic standard, because silver has got to be the scarcer metal. There is no doubt at all about that.

On this subject perhaps I had better not volunteer any statement. I have great authority, however, for the statement I have made. There is no doubt at all that the production of gold by placer mining is very much cheaper labor. It yields more abundantly in the way of profit to the mere day laborer than the production of silver, which requires large investments to carry on silver mines. However, I shall not go any further in the effort to illustrate that, but I will read a little further from Mr. Jefferson. This is a letter to Mr. John W. Eppes:

In this state of things we are called on to add ninety millions more to the circulation. Proceeding in this career, it is infallible that we must end where the revolutionary paper ended. Two hundred millions was the whole amount of all the emissions of the old Congress, at which point their bills ceased to circulate. We are now at that sum; but with treble the population and of course a longer tether. Our depreciation is, as yet, but at about 2 for 1. Owing to the support its credit receives from the small reservoirs of specie in the vaults of the banks, it is impossible to say at what point their notes will stop. Nothing is necessary to effect it but a general alarm; and that may take place whenever the public shall begin to reflect on and perceive the impossibility that the banks should repay this sum. At present, caution is inspired no farther than to keep prudent men from selling property on long payments. Let us suppose the panic to arise at three hundred millions, a point to which every session of the Legislatures hasten us by long strides. Nobody dreams that they would have three hundred millions of specie to satisfy the holders of their notes.

Were they even to stop now no one supposes they have two hundred millions in cash, or even the sixty-six and two-thirds millions, to which amount alone the law obliges them to repay. One hundred and thirty-three and one-third millions of loss, then, is thrown on the public by law; and as to the sixty-six and two-thirds, which they are legally bound to pay, and ought to have in their vaults, everyone knows there is no such amount of cash in the United States, and what would be the course with what they really have there? Their notes are refused. Cash is called for. The inhabitants of the banking towns will get what is in the vaults, until a few banks declare their insolvency; when, the general crush becoming evident, the others will withdraw even the cash they have, declare their bankruptcy at once, and leave an empty house and empty coffers for the holders of their notes. In this scramble of creditors the country gets nothing, the town but little. What are they to do? Bring suits? A million of creditors bring a million of suits against John Nokes and Robert Styles wheresoever to be found? All nonsense. The loss is total.

His description of a panic produced by expanding the volume of paper money seems to be a prophecy of the troubles we are now having with the banks.

We have grown very much larger than Mr. Jefferson I think ever supposed we could grow in so short a period, and we consequently have an expanded use and a still expanding use for paper money, and it has got to be one of the established institutions of the country. But, Mr. President, the duty has arisen and has increased in its obligations every step we have taken that we should be more and more cautious and careful in respect of the restraints to be imposed upon the issue of paper money. We have out a vast amount of paper-money obligations of the Government of the United States, and there is no dollar out today in the hands of the people, issued directly or indirectly by the Government of the United States, including the national-bank notes, that the Government is not responsible for its redemption in coin. When you come to the silver certificates the Government has reserved to itself the right and option of re-

demption in silver coin, and yet we are told that as an act of magnanimity, or as an act of pride, or something like that—I can hardly characterize it—as much as \$5,000,000 of gold have been paid out of the Treasury of the United States during this time of distress for the redemption of silver certificates.

We know that the gold has been paid out into the hands of the employés of the Government of the United States. It is circulated here through the hands of these pages and the employés of the Senate. Gold has been distributed among us here in the payment of salaries by the Government of the United States in the midst of all this outcry for its accumulation and retention in the Treasury. The intent and purpose seems to be in every possible direction, both by precept and by example, to compel the rejection of silver and whatever else represents silver, even the silver certificates in that character from the circulation and convert them into gold on demand.

Well, that may be another way of killing silver. They need not resort to any other. They have got enough now. This bill will kill it effectually enough.

We already refuse free coinage to silver on terms of equality with gold at the mint. The people can not have it coined. We repeal this law and say there shall be no more silver purchased by the United States for coinage; and thereupon we break the market entirely; and the silver producers who may hereafter be rash and indiscreet enough to dig it from the earth as a matter of profit will find that they must go abroad with it, and sell it in countries with hostile legislation against silver. They must find Asiatics or some other people to buy it, if they can find anybody using it, or else they must go to the trinket shops, the tinker shops, the jewelry shops, and sell it there; or it must be used for the purposes of decoration, or something like that.

This bill, when it has had its way with silver, utterly destroys it as money in every possible sense and conception; there is nothing of it left.

So now, with this vast mass of paper money issued by the United States, payable in coin, which the Senate of the United States years and years ago, in 1878, voted was payable in silver dollars as well as in gold coin, when all of this mass of money has stricken from its foundation any support of silver, in so much that no Treasury officer will pay out silver in the redemption of any promise of the Government whatever, what becomes of this enormous disparity between the cash spoken of by Mr. Jefferson—the gold, if you please—in the Treasury of the United States, or within the power of the Treasury of the United States to accumulate, and this vast mass of debt amounting to 8 or 10 or 12 to 1? What have you got then to pledge to the people of the United States that this Government will be able or will ever undertake to redeem all of these paper promises in gold that you have got out?

You have one resource, that to which you have never failed to resort. You have the resource of taxing the patient, uncomplaining, patriotic, honest, industrious, and suffering people: and to that you come. There you land. There this bill lands you; and the third chapter in the revelation of this plan is that you shall buy \$200,000,000 of gold bonds supported by taxation upon

the people. You take from the people the money that they live upon, that they live with, that they use in their daily transactions, that they can not get along without. You take from them the dollar, except the limited amount that you have got here, that may yet be coined according to the remains of the Sherman act which you canonize and put in the statute as something worthy of worship by Democrats. You reserve that, and allow it to lie in bullion in these vaults or to be coined according to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. The \$150,000,000 that have been issued under this law you say shall when they are redeemed and paid into the Treasury be reissued, and they shall remain reissued, and as often as you redeem them they shall again be reissued and again received and again reissued and again received, thus leaving a demand upon the Treasury of the United States of a specific character under this bill of \$150,000,000 that can be used just like you use a spigot to insert in a barrel for the purpose of drawing out the contents.

You leave it there and yet you pretend to try to convince the common, plain-minded, simple people of the United States that you are not trying to foist up a goldocracy in the United States, but that you are trying to maintain the parity of silver and gold. Will you maintain the parity of silver by locking it up in the vaults of the United States and taxing the people to get coin to circulate around to pay the men who want to speculate upon the Treasury of the United States continually?

Mr. President, at the risk of wearying the Senate and the risk of my own health I will go a little further into this matter.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] in a speech covering four days of time in this body has made a contribution to the literature and history and philosophy and political economy connected with the subject of silver and gold and money at large which will illustrate the history of the United States as one of its most beautiful chapters in all time to come. I think there is no Senator here, and I think there is no political economist in the United States, who would ever undertake to answer the great argument made by the Senator from Nevada upon this subject. But that has all gone to the winds. The people of the United States are in a condition of turmoil and distress, and they are not prepared to take a dispassionate view of this great question. I found, when he was analyzing the subject, very much to my delight, that he and I had taken similar views of a certain feature, simply one feature of this question, about which I desire to say something, because it is one that is not attended to usually, and it is very important to the industrial classes of the United States.

I allude to the relations of labor to the production of the precious metals.

GOLD AND SILVER THE PRODUCT OF LABOR AND NOT OF THE LAWS.

The money metals, gold and silver, when coined are money. Paper promises when printed and circulated as currency are not money, but promises to pay money. Money and credit are as distinct as paper is distinct from gold or silver. Paper promises are credit; gold and silver coins are money.

Money is given a fixed value in the payment of debts by legal-tender laws. In all other respects the value of money is calcu-

lated only with reference to the amount or quantity it will purchase in the markets of what are called staple commodities, such as food, drink, clothing, shelter, and medicine.

This power of money is called its purchasing power, and that element of its power can not be fixed or regulated by law. Sometimes this purchasing power of money is wildly exaggerated, or as irrationally depressed by the lusts, passions, or follies of men. But these exceptional departures from the ordinary admeasurements of the relative values of money and property are not considered when we compute the actual value of money as compared with the actual or commercial value of property.

It is true, beyond candid disputation, that money and the descriptions of property that are indispensable to civilized life, are measured, as to their selling or exchangeable value, by the abundance of the one and the scarcity of the other in the markets where the exchange takes place—the open markets of commerce.

Money is bought and sold in the open markets, just as goods are bought and sold. In that sense, all money is a commodity; but of all other commodities it is a measure of value. A dollar is sold in such markets for a bushel of wheat or for two bushels of wheat, according to the abundance of the one or the scarcity of the other; but the measure of the dollar and the measure of the bushel are both fixed by law, and are equally arbitrary. The dollar has a value imputed to it by law and measured by law, whether it is statute law or the law of custom, or the law of commercial usage; but the quantity of the wheat given in exchange for the dollar is measured by agreement. The intrinsic usefulness of the wheat creates the market, and the impulse of necessity forces the sale. The incentive of gain or of hunger stimulates the market, but human necessity creates it. And in all cases the price or value of the wheat is ascertained by agreement.

Supposing the money to be sound, without which attribute it could not be money, but would be only a token or a mere crude commodity, the abundance of it in the market is the fact that determines how much wheat a dollar will purchase. The law of necessity operates first, and with the greater pressure, upon the owner of the wheat. It is his necessities, either actual, real, or speculative, that causes him to bring his grain for sale to the open market. He is forced to sell it for money, because that is the convenient or customary method of exchanging it for other goods. He has more than he needs for consumption, and he must sell his surplus or lose it; or he needs other things which he can only buy with money, or he owes debts that he can only pay with money.

These wants force him to sell his surplus wheat. His necessities are absolute and imperative. He must sell his wheat. This situation describes the relation that every production holds to money in every open market, and also the relation that labor holds to money in every human vocation. Supplies for human consumption perish, while coin is nearly imperishable. The necessity of sale of the leading productions of labor is all-pervading and irresistible, and it is this that creates markets. It is the offer to sell that opens the market. As a rule, almost

without exception, this offer must be made by the producer to his disadvantage. Money, after it has supplied to its owner according to his necessities, real or imaginary, what is needed, if any surplus is left over, becomes capital.

When the offer to sell produce or labor is addressed to capital, as it most uniformly is, the price of the produce or labor is fixed by the capitalist. This is always the case unless an abnormal scarcity of productions causes money to seek investment in them. This seldom occurs, if ever, when money is scarce. When money is scarce the producer is forced by necessity to hunt it up and to offer great inducements in the way of bargains to the capitalist. The scarcity of money enables its holder always to depress prices, even when produce is comparatively equally scarce. This is due to the fact that money is in demand always and for every necessity.

The demand never ceases, because it represents every human necessity.

Capital can not increase in the hands of its owner without taxing the necessities of mankind. It has no growth except through this form of taxation. It can not grow, it can only be added to. Interest laws, usurious contracts, and the markets are the chief instrumentalities through which this taxation is imposed and collected. In either form its power is irresistible, and its exactions are without limit unless the laws control and limit the pressure of capital, the money power, upon the necessities of mankind, and this can only be done by increasing its volume. Capital will tax necessity to the uttermost, and to the degree of the absolute confiscation of property unless it is restrained as to the interest on loans, or its power is weakened or scattered by the counteracting power of the laws in the increase and diffusion of its volume.

If money is scarce in the markets (and, being scarce, it is always in the hands of a small number of people), the tax upon the necessities of the man who brings his produce or his labor to that market is proportionally heavy. The only safety of persons thus situated against the exorbitant taxation of their necessities must be in the amount of money in the market, and in the competition that is created by its being in the hands of numerous persons, seeking for speculative profits or commissions or interest or usury.

If the necessities of life and civilization compel wheat-growers to send 100,000,000 bushels of wheat to New York for a market, and \$100,000,000 are in that market ready to be invested in wheat, for consumption, to meet human necessities, the price of the wheat would be \$1 per bushel. If only \$50,000,000 were found in that market for the purchase of wheat, the price would be 50 cents per bushel. At a higher rate, wheat could not be sold for cash. If the necessities of the people at large, in reach of the New York market, were equal to the consumption of the 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, they would be so imperative and unavoidable that the wheat thus "cornered" by the scarcity of money or by its concentration in the hands of a few capitalists, would yield them 50 per cent profit.

In the case supposed, which is illustrated, if it is not demonstrated in practical commerce, very frequently the evil to be rem-

edied is the too great scarcity of money as compared with the productions of the wheat-growers and with the demands of consumers. I do not care now to enter upon any discussion of the effect of overproduction in lowering the price of wheat in certain seasons, as is sometimes alleged, but was never true of any great staple of food or raiment. It is enough for my purposes that a scarcity of money in the markets, no matter how it comes about, is a disastrous tax upon all production and all labor.

Such a scarcity of money, of legal-tender power, as compared with the volume of the indebtedness of the people, must be totally destructive of the substance of the people and the death of industry, enterprise, credit, and commercial morality. It would fall like a blight upon a vast number of people, who could only have even hope restored to them by bankrupt laws. Turning aside from the temptation of a wider treatment of the subject, my inquiry is addressed to the people, for it awakens no response here. What is the duty of government in respect of the supply of money—not promises or credits, or tokens, but money—to the people? By money I mean coins made of the only precious metals, the only money metals now known to mankind, gold and silver.

These are the only metals that the common opinion of mankind and the universal usages of the markets and the laws of trade recognize as money metals. This is the one fact that can not be denied or displaced even by the imagination. The duty of our Government, and, indeed, of all governments, which they everywhere obey and perform, is to coin these metals into money and regulate by law their ratio of value when coined with each other, and to impart to them the compulsory power of legal tender in the payment of debts.

The laws of our country can go no further than this in regulating the value of money. Whatever other commercial value these coins may have is a matter of agreement between the buyer and seller, which is properly described as their purchasing power. Our Government can not engage in the business of producing these metals by digging them from the earth. That is a private employment which the people may engage in but the Government has no right or power to pursue. These metals are the product of labor and skill, as much so as cotton, silk, wool, or grain.

In the experience of mankind, as established through centuries and cycles, the product of a day's labor in producing these metals is nearly equal to a pennyweight of gold or an ounce of silver, and this fact is very influential in the admeasurement of the ratio between them. Indeed this is the safest basis for a ratio between gold and silver. The labor that yields an ounce of silver will, as a rule, yield a pennyweight of gold. When gold or silver is coined it is the conversion of labor and skill into money by operation of law. To say that too much of this labor can be bestowed upon the production of these metals is absurd. It has never been true and can never be true that the world has been or will be overstocked with the precious metals or either of them. If the labor of the miner does not pay when measured with the price of the products of labor in other pursuits it will cease, and when the labor stops the production of precious metals ends.

When the petroleum wells came in the labor expended in whale fishing ceased, or nearly so. When cotton came in the flax culture nearly ceased; when iron ties came in the production of hempen ropes was nearly ended. But when labor ceases to produce silver, because of its low purchasing power, there is no substitute but gold that can take its place. Its rival—gold—will usurp the field of consumption, but instead of supplying its loss it will make its loss doubly felt among the poor, in the increase of the burden of debts and the corresponding decrease of the prices of their labor.

The labor that produces gold and silver is bestowed on personal account and not on Government account. In the same way labor is bestowed in the production of wheat or cotton, and so of the capital employed in mining for precious metals. In the United States as, indeed, in all countries except in the prison mines of Siberia, the Government never works a mine of gold or silver on Government account. It would reverse, if it would not revolutionize the entire theory of the Government of the United States and of every State in the Union, to engage in the mining of gold and silver on Government account, even upon the public lands owned by the United States, where the mines yet undiscovered are most likely to be found. The United States could not open mines and work them on Government account any more than the Congress could open and cultivate wheat farms or vineyards, and convert the wheat into flour and the grapes into wine, on the public domain.

The supply of gold and silver must come entirely from private sources and not from governmental action, and the supply of these metals can neither be increased or diminished by any power of the law directly forbidding or limiting the production. The supply of all other productions useful for man comes from the same source, personal labor and personal skill, and, as the quantity of other productions increases, and as the demand for them is greater day by day and year by year, labor will find profitable employment in the production of precious metals, which when coined are the representatives in commerce of the growth of the fruits of all other labor.

It is the labor employed in gold and silver mining and in all other industries that is found engaging in the one pursuit or the other, according to the profit it will yield to the laborer. The labor shifts back and forth from the mines to the farms and factories, and increases the yield from the one employment or the other by a law that is as common and as effectual in commerce as the law that rules the waters of the earth in the unceasing effort to produce and maintain a common level.

There is never too much wheat. Hungry mouths are always ready somewhere in the circuit of commercial intercourse in the world to consume more bread than they can get. If the price of the wheat is not remunerative, because the money to buy it is too scarce, production is shortened, hunger increases and the poor who labor in other industries are taxed on their bread by corners and combinations which the scarcity of money invites, and no law, it seems, is strong enough to prevent these cruel exactions.

The only possible relief in the supply of real money is to permit or induce the miner to increase the supply of gold and silver

to correspond with the demands of commerce. I do not consider that it is a real relief to such a situation to supply the deficit of gold and silver by the issue of promises to pay money, on demand, for their redemption at some future time, and to secure that promise by taxation of the people.

That is a temporary makeshift in which the people are to loan their credit to the Government, or to the banks, and pay taxes to make the credit good. If such credit is not based on gold and silver, or upon taxation, it is a costly delusion and a fraud which only adds to the distress of the people. It is fiat money, which is always followed by the fiat of destruction.

Why were banks ever created by law with power to issue bills to circulate as money if there was no need for an expansion of currency beyond the supply of gold and silver money? Will it be said that this was done, and this new machine for making money was contrived for the mere purpose of greater convenience in transporting wealth from place to place? If such had been the purpose why did they in the very beginning of banking issue three dollars of paper for one of gold and silver in the vaults of the banks? Banking by the issue of paper money was first practiced in the fourteenth century in Venice, and other great commercial cities along the Mediterranean Sea.

The necessity for banks arose from no other cause than the want of sufficient gold and silver coinage to supply the purchasing power necessary to the handling and interchange of the productions forming commerce in those marts of trade at prices that would invite their presence there. They began as a convenience, and soon became a necessity; but banks, which are the coiners of credit, have never been able to supplant or substitute the powers of governments to coin money of gold and silver, and their issues have had no par value except as they have been redeemable in coin.

A bank bill that is not redeemable in coin is branded as a fraud the world over, and has been so condemned during all periods since they were first issued to circulate as money. Yet their supply of currency to the commercial world became indispensable. If this substitute for money were driven from circulation in the transactions of commerce, it need scarcely be said that it would bankrupt the commercial world. Or if either gold or silver were removed from the foundations upon which such issues are based, it is quite as true that the confidence of all commercial dealers would correspondingly cease to the destruction of the business of millions of people.

Labor, then, coined into money, is the basis of all banking, as well as the life-blood of all civil government. Labor, thus coined, is the only money basis that has ever existed, or that can be devised; for the world of mankind will have no other basis of the redemption of promises. Labor supplies every human want; the metals that are, when coined, the measures of value in every human transaction that is based upon contract; and the means of redeeming every promise, express or implied, for the payment of money. In producing the metals that admeasure values, labor is employed, voluntarily, either in the mining of gold or silver, and gets its rewards from commerce.

To stop the production of either metal or to disparage it by

laws is to cut off from mankind a useful employment to the extent of the restriction so imposed upon it. This would be bad enough if it was applied to wheat in order to give to corn or rice a greater value, but when it is applied in its effects to the entire mass and volume of commerce, and to every business transaction, it is a blight upon every industry and a direct tax upon every producer.

If the restriction is upon silver in order to enhance the price of gold, when the cooperation of both metals in supporting the credit system called banking is never sufficient, even at the extreme possible limit of production, the disastrous effects are always perilous, and frequently they wreck the business and paralyze the industries of whole nations, and sometimes of half the civilized world. Of this fact recent events are a demonstration.

This is the policy we are now pursuing; this is the scheme of the single gold standard and coinage prescribed by the Sherman act of 1873, and its legitimate offspring, the "cowardly makeshift" of the Sherman act of 1890; and the present still more cowardly makeshift in the amendatory act we are now considering under the false and fraudulent assertion everywhere believed, that it is a bill for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman act of 1890. And all this is done to give the national banks a wider field for speculation in paper credits, and the stock gamblers, brokers, and corner ambuscaders a safer and more complete control of all corporations, factories, mines, fields, farms, and forests; and to aid trusts and conspiracies with the national credit, based on the taxation of the people.

The United States Government in its financial policy is a bank of issue and redemption, and it also receives on deposit silver and gold coins, for which it issues paper promises. Except in the single matter of coining gold on the demand of one who deposits bullion, the Government is a banking institution of the sort I have just described. The national banks have, as banks of issue and as banks of deposit for public money, become merely fiscal agencies, instrumentalities of the Government, which is the mother bank.

They are a favored lot of public pets and leeches, and one is not surprised when they "wax fat and kick."

As for their issues of bank notes as money, they have no responsibility. The Government pays them $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest in quarterly payments on all the bills they issue. This is taxed out of the people, and averages, I think, \$15,000,000 each year, and redeems their circulation when they break. A case is easily possible with these banks, that their officers, with a capital of, say, \$100,000, can invest it in United States bonds, and draw interest on them at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; they can then get a line of deposits from the people of, say, \$300,000, and get \$90,000 of national-bank notes from the Government. They can steal the whole sum and convert it into foreign exchange, send it abroad in the form of gold or foreign exchange, and leave the Government with \$390,000 less gold in the Treasury; their depositors without a dollar of indemnity; and get away with the whole face value of their bonds, except \$10,000. That is the whole sum that the banks put up as security for their honesty and good faith. True, the Government gets \$100,000 of its bonds, but the

thieves have pocketed \$90,000 of its gold in the Treasury and \$300,000 from depositors, and have escaped with it.

This case has not happened, so far as I know, though I have heard of such a case, it may never happen, but none the less does the possibility of such an occurrence show that the banking system is not sufficiently protected. The depositors have virtually no security against peculating bank officers. Their only real security is in the honesty of the officers of the banks, which has not very often been disproved but sometimes it has.

That many of them are well adapted to the perpetration of even such frauds as I have shown to be possible under our ill-guarded system, is shown by the graphic and burning description of them which I find in the following interview of the Senator from Indiana, in a Chicago gold-standard newspaper of recent date. This is a bitter arraignment, that if made by me, I could only make it at the expense of the contemptuous scorn and villification of every great daily paper in New York. The Senator is fortunate in the forbearance of his recent allies.

This is what the Senator says about the banks in that interview, which I suppose is correct. I think it is, as it has appeared without contradiction, so far as I have seen:

HE CALLS THEM THIEVES—SENATOR VOORHEES DENOUNCES THE BANKERS OF NEW YORK—BITTER LANGUAGE USED BY THE INDIANA STATESMAN WHEN SPEAKING OF THE FINANCIERS OF GOTHAM—DECLARES THAT MONEY IS THEIR GOD AND CLAIMS THEY WOULD SCRUPLE AT NOTHING TO OBTAIN IT—WHY HE FAVORS THE REPEAL OF THE PURCHASING CLAUSE OF THE SHERMAN LAW.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 19.*

"My full and complete opinion," said Senator VOORHEES, "of that combine of impertinent robbers and thieves, the banks of New York, it would not be politic for you to print. You couldn't get the telegraph company to handle the message. My views of the New York banks and their methods and their attitudes in this present debate in the Senate are that they add insolence to robbery and slanderous lying to highwayism.

"I have been in Congress thirty-two years. Call it success or what you please, its corner stone, at least, was what is my present opinion of these New York banks. I have ever found them plundering, marauding, and stealing the goods and hopes of the people, like so many cattle-lifting Highland caterans. There is not an honest hair in all their heads, not a broad or patriotic motive in all their bosoms. They are narrow, selfish, utterly mean, and dishonest. No honest man takes his eyes off them for a moment; they would pick his pocket if he did.

"If you turn your back they use the assassin's knife upon you like so many lurking, skulking, cowardly Corsicans of money. Go to your Bibles and read what the Saviour said of the New York banks and every member of their tribe. He described them as whited sepulchers filled with dead men's bones, as the robber of the widow and the devourer of the orphan, as willing to barter God for money or negotiate a mortgage on their hopes of heaven, allow a foreclosure and stay away from the sale, and all for money.

DESTITUTE.

"In the eagerness of their sharkish greed they abandon honor, and right, and justice, and decency, and fill and gorge their bellies on the best hopes of a world. They would make a boiled dinner of the brightest prospects of mankind. Never in my life have I been their friend nor they mine. I make no concord, no alliance, with such criminal elements. When I took my position for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law purchasing clause I had neither thought nor care for the New York banks. Neither did I regard my position as being for gold and against silver. Gold and silver and their part in the finances of the country are not disposed of by passing the Voorhees or the Wilson bill. You repeal the silver-purchase clause of the Sherman law, that's all you do: that's all you squeeze out of it. I am a silver man to-day, and a far better friend to silver than are those who obstruct public business in the Senate.

"My position as chairman of the Finance Committee called me to lead this fight. I have led it honestly, fearlessly, courting no man's favor, and I shall lead it to the end. When the New York bankers impute or ascribe to me any hidden motive for silver, any treachery to the measures I am assuming to support, they are liars and foul slanderers whom I shall not hesitate to stigmatize as such. The fact that to-day both I and the New York banks desire the same thing—the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law—need confuse no one as to our relations. My attitude toward them is what it always was and what it always will be to that which is corrupt and utterly venal.

TRAVELING THE SAME ROAD.

"It is not the first time these thieves have traveled the same road with honest men. So far as I am personally concerned they cut no more figure in my future than in my past. The yelping of any other pack of wolves would be as potential in my destinies. I come from the Wabash, not from the Hudson; from Indiana, not from New York. It is not necessary that I be cheek by jowl with the wolves of Wall street. I return when I leave here to my own people, not these pirates of the New York banks, and the fact that I do not suit in my leadership the larcenous, thievish tastes of that robbers' roost will gain me warmest welcome in Indiana which a man can receive."

Yet the Senator reported, and has partly discussed, and is ready to pass a bill through the Senate and enact it into a law to give up to the bank I have described, with its great temptations to fraud, and its staff of thieves that the Senator has described, the \$10,000 reserved from its circulation.

The twin measures so far developed, as yet, by the coalition are the amendment of the Sherman bill, so as to drive out the silver that is not coined, whether in the Treasury or in the ores where nature planted it, from all chance of coinage and circulation as legal-tender money, to seek a market in the jewelers' shops or in a hostile foreign land; and at the same time to increase the powers of the national banks. This double-barreled shot at the silver-miners should not be fired from the American Senate.

This is not fair treatment to the silver-miner who has added so much wealth to the United States, such true support to all other industries, and who with his predecessors has placed monuments of glowing brightness along the shining way of the entire march of civilization, and has assisted in the work of the divine exaltation of the human family in all its history.

It must be known to the Committee on Finance that every national-bank note issued by the Government is ultimately to be redeemed in gold, if that is demanded by the holder.

It has been supposed to require \$100,000,000 of gold in the Treasury to protect the \$346,000,000 of greenbacks that are outstanding. Mr. SHERMAN, when he was Secretary of the Treasury, bought \$80,000,000 of this gold with silver certificates. Since its purchase, in 1878 or 1879, it has cost the people in actual taxes \$60,000,000 to hold this reserve in the Treasury. How soon will it be that we shall have to borrow two or three hundred millions of gold to protect the \$246,000,000 of greenbacks left unprotected, to pay the bonds that secure \$200,000,000 of the national-bank notes, and the \$151,000,000 of notes issued under the Sherman law?

Whatever sums we are compelled to borrow for these purposes will beat the constant and increasing expense of the people. The gold will be held, as the \$100,000,000 now in the Treasury is held, as dead money on which interest must be paid. The people

must be taxed to pay it. How long it is to be thus held no man can foresee or even guess.

Mr. Foster and Mr. Carlisle have added the \$151,000,000 of Treasury notes issued under the Sherman law of 1890 to our gold obligations, when they could as easily, as safely, and as honorably have placed them on the list with the silver certificates issued under the Bland-Allison act, thus increasing the gold debt to within a small fraction of \$500,000,000, at a time when the speculators in gold were shipping it across the Atlantic, not in reality to pay debts or to protect our credit, but to raise a clamor against silver, in order to compel us to abandon it. It is even said that \$5,000,000 silver certificates have been paid by us in gold.

Silver certificates are payable in silver dollars under the statute, and the Treasury notes under the Sherman law are payable in gold or silver at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury. Nothing short of cold effrontery could ever be the attribute of a man who would complain of receiving payment of these Treasury notes in silver dollars and claim that his contract was violated. If such a contract existed between private parties, such a refusal would be considered dishonest. When it concerns the Government and involves the taxation of the people to get the gold to make the payment, such a refusal is an act of public perfidy.

If the gold policy of the Sherman law is made absolute and inflexible by the proposed amendment of that law now under consideration, the borrowing and taxing policy must also be maintained. The Government must be constantly in active competition with our own people to accumulate gold to protect the Treasury, and the people must be unrelentingly taxed and the taxes made payable in gold, to keep up the Treasury supply and to prevent our Secretaries from placing the Treasury into voluntary bankruptcy.

The limited supply of gold must make the burden of this forced loan crushing to the people of the United States.

This same policy must bring our people in competition with the governments of Europe also in this world-wide scramble for that metal. All of those governments must have gold to support their military attitude toward other neighboring powers. Their fate depends on this turning point.

In this competitive contest for gold the hoarding of it by rival and hostile powers must diminish the volume that remains free to support commerce and supply the demands of the arts.

The daily labor of the workingman, which is his bread, is to be paid with 50 cents in silver instead of a dollar in gold. The gold is not for him, but the subsidiary silver coin must suffice for his necessities. That is legal-tender money for ten days' work at a dollar per day, and it is short in weight 180 grains of silver. The labor is reduced in price to 50 cents, because gold prices everything, and is double the value that it should be and would be if silver was its equal before the law. Why is this? Because gold is too scarce to buy the productions of labor at a fair price.

There is not enough of it to go around at a fair price for labor. A dollar's worth of labor is priced at 50 cents. Gold is not

coined in dollars or in smaller coins, and he must accept 50 cents in silver, which is the gold price of one dollar's worth of labor. Thus labor is made to bear the burden of competition with our own Government and with other governments, and with all capitalists and banks everywhere; and it is no wonder that the prices of labor shrink as gold becomes scarcer.

But the laborer in the factory is told that with a single gold standard all prices shrink in nearly equal proportions, and that he can now buy as much with \$1 as he could formerly buy with \$2 of all the necessaries of life. That is in some degree true; but it is a sad truth to laborers.

The greater truth is ignored, in this exegesis of the economy of human toil, that the recompense of every toiler, as a rule, depends upon the wages that every other laborer gets, at least in the same country. There is that brotherhood and mutual dependence in labor, and its fruits, that causes every toiler to feel the weight of any burden that is laid on those of every other class of laborers, and each dripping tear salts the whole cup.

If the slave and the free man work in adjoining fields, the cheapness of slave labor, because it is unpaid, lowers the price of the free labor that must be paid. It is the nonproducer whose necessities compel him to employ labor and purchase its fruits and who pays for them in the profits of capital, loaned or invested in speculative ventures. It is the capitalist who, with his interest, his usury, his exchange, and cent per cent, must still live on the labor of other men, that supplies to labor its net profit when there is any net profit.

The producers and nonproducers are classes almost as distinct as the people of distant countries. Producers as a class must be toilers, while nonproducers as a class "toil not, neither do they spin." Necessity makes toilers of men, and the absence of that law makes them mere consumers. If the consumers, who must furnish the net profit to labor, can price the money in which the producer shall be paid for his toil, the slavery of human labor becomes as abject and servile as African slavery ever was. The limit of its forbearance is only defined by its interests or its benevolence, in which mercy is a quality that is very much strained.

That is exactly what this so-called repeal bill, this makeshift of the capitalized classes and the idlers—mushrooms that spring up on the dung heaps of human waste—inflicts upon labor. This repeal bill prices the toil of honest working men and women to a lower and constantly sinking limit by the increased power of gold to tyrannize over it. When gold is the only metal money, as it must be when silver is only a commodity and its future production is cut off by this bill, all labor will be priced in gold and all commercial credit will be based upon it.

The supply of gold, unsupported by silver, is not enough to furnish a compensating price to labor or production, and they must both sink at the will of the capitalistic classes.

This declaration is sustained by the opinions of financial and political economists, but more conclusively by the better judgment of common sense and the final demonstration of all human experience. The owners of gold, in such a case, become the autocrats of the credit system of banking, and that is the final

ruin of the laboring and producing classes if the alternations of money from scarcity to plethora can ruin them.

In the United States we have now a paper currency, all of which is redeemable by the Government, of not less, as I understand it, than six dollars in paper to one of gold, and that gold must be borrowed money, for which we must pay heavy interest, also in gold.

Our paper money is kept at par only by the power of taxation. Strike that out and our paper money would sink to 50 per cent of its present value or less.

All our taxation is upon current industries—labor. None of it is upon incomes or upon the issues of banks, and the tariff and internal taxation paid by the wealthy give no relief or favors to the producers, so that the duty of redeeming the currency and of paying interest upon our bonds, and the bonds also when due, is shouldered down upon the annual productions of labor.

It is therefore of vital moment to the laboring and producing classes that the banking credit system should be under such restraints, if that is possible, that the volume of the currency should not be under the sole control of the banks, as to its expansion and contraction. It is just at this point that the people are handed over by our banking laws to the mercy of the banks; and their mercy is that of the octopus for its victim. The banks use their money, by preference, to back up the gamblers in food and raiment and stocks and enable them to destroy the people with corners and combinations to raise and depress, at their own sweet will, the selling price of every staple commodity of our production.

While this system exists and the people are taxed to give it credit and power, their sufferings and apprehensions of coming evils will continue and increase. The war provoked by these banks may be a long one, but it will destroy them. The theory of our Government is that the labor of the people, in our rich fields of industry, shall furnish the basis of banking, which is gold and silver. It is not that the Government shall furnish this basis, either by taxation of the people or by usurping their right to mine gold and silver and to have it coined into money.

Give to the people freely this right reserved to them in the Constitution, to supply the precious metals for coinage at the mints, and the bankers will not look to their taxation for these natural and just foundations of credit, but will look to their free and voluntary labor for this indispensable supply. The mining laborers will then get their just reward for their toil, and our treasures of precious metals in the mountains of the West will not be condemned to lay useless in the mines or to expulsion to foreign lands. In our dealings with these problems, if they are in any proper sense problematical, our attention is first demanded by the pending legislation for the benefit of the banks and not the relief of the people.

Even while the country is being warmed with the glow of returning prosperity arising from the confidence of the people in themselves and their Government, that the banks have vainly tried to destroy, they further demand haste and pressure that threatens the Senate with compulsion and duress and Senators with pains and penalties for obstructing the passage of this

bill. The banks and their following, seeing the ship of state rising out of the waves in spite of their efforts to submerge it, are eager to claim the advantage of the *post hoc propter hoc* argument and to assert that they have saved the country, while we know they have only failed to destroy it.

Pass this bill and they will treat the country to another expansion and another boom. Then they will cause another contraction, when it is convenient for the gamblers in stocks and provisions to pocket another year's labor of the people through another depression.

This is the instability of trade that has so often shaken the country like an earthquake, and now threatens to engulf it.

If this little financial earthquake which was begun by the banks to frighten the people into submission, which was begun as stage thunder to alarm us into the quietude of despair, has opened a real chasm in this forum which must be filled with a living sacrifice, let not our Marcus Curtius (of Indiana) alone fill it. Let it be filled with a holocaust of the Democracy. The Democratic national resolve is that the Sherman law is "a cowardly makeshift." Let us not, by clinging to the worst features of it, make it by adoption our contemptible makeshift.

If anybody in our midst desires to climb down into the chasm on a Republican stepladder and reconnoiter for a chance to fill it with a sham, I am afraid that my admiration for him will not stir in my heart the grateful sympathy that the Romans had for their hero who, having clothed himself in his burnished armor, mounted his brave and faithful war horse, and, thus accoutered, leaped into the chasm, filled it with a glorious sacrifice and closed it, saving his country.

If that legend is to be repeated and realized here, let the Democratic party prove faithful to its heroic traditions and its brave pledges and go headlong into the chasm. Let us all leap together into the abyss that we have selected for our living tomb. I will join hands with the old guard, and we will leave the fatal brink of the chasm together, and bequeath our glory and our usefulness as a legacy and a bequest to a country we could serve in no other way.

If we promised too much to the people at Chicago, let us not ask the Republicans to assist us in revoking the promise. The Democratic party has decorated the entire Sherman law with its contempt and commanded us to slay the cowardly makeshift outright. In obedience to that command I will vote for a substitute for this bill that the Sherman law, every part of it, shall be repealed.

If the coalition will not remain with us after the funeral, if we go to the bottom of the chasm and they refuse to help us out, as they will refuse, we will have the glory of having perished in a good cause and they will thrive on what we leave as the administrators *de bonis non* of our estate.

In the amendment to the Sherman law, which is called "unconditional repeal" by the most audacious and mendacious abuse of language that Satan ever adopted to cover a brazen falsehood, there is found all that silver will ever get if it shall pass, until the people have spoken again in a Congressional or Presidential election.

The proposed amendment, falsely styled "unconditional repeal," is intended to be the final act in the death of the silver metal. That is the purpose of the majority of its supporters. When they get that they will be content, and no movement for its resurrection will be made.

The repeal of the entire bill would leave the people in a more hopeful condition than the repeal of the first section, the purchasing clause. We will have reached the bottom of the abyss at one bound, and the unterrified Democracy will set to work to climb out; whereas, if we amend the Sherman bill and adopt the cowardly makeshift as a Democratic measure, we shall go about the streets like the poor Jewish murderer, condemned to bear the rotting corpse of his victim bound to his shoulders until it has fallen to pieces, crying out, "Who shall deliver us from this body of death."

Out and out repeal of the Sherman law is better for the cause of silver monetization than the repeal of the purchasing clause of that act. That amendment of this law, proposed in this bill, leaves silver coinage, even as to the metal now in the vaults of the Treasury, optional with the Secretary of the Treasury. That such option will be exercised so as to leave the bullion in the Treasury uncoined, is as certain as that the Secretaries have not produced a coin from it in three years.

The alleged option is a false interpretation, both of the letter and spirit of that act. It is a presumptuous usurpation of the one-man power, so odious to all right-minded Americans. The discretionary power to coin money, or to refuse to coin it, is a power more fatal to liberty than would be the power to declare war or to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. The most absolute monarch in the world would be dethroned and executed by his subjects if he, without the advice of a council or cabinet responsible to the people, should undertake so radical a measure as it is claimed that the Sherman law justifies.

Can Mr. Carlisle be permitted, in his discretion, to raise or depress the market for silver, by giving it coinage as legal-tender money or by refusing it? Yet the clauses of the Sherman law that this bill reenacts, with the construction placed upon it by Mr. Secretary Foster and Mr. Secretary Carlisle, gives to him, under that construction, the power to coin the bullion or to keep it locked in the Treasury vaults. He can increase or decrease at pleasure the legal-tender money of the people. I would leave no room in the law for a discretion in that matter. We crown him dictator of finance, of coinage, and of the markets, when we surrender that power into his hands.

The entire repeal of the Sherman law would be better than the repeal of the first section and the reenactment of the remaining sections, because it would take away from the Secretary of the Treasury the express option to redeem the notes issued under its provisions in gold or silver. They would stand on the same footing with greenbacks if the entire law was repealed, and the option exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury in redeeming them in gold or silver would be at his peril.

If he should be a candidate for the Presidency, as all Secretaries of the Treasury are either known or supposed to be, the people could ask him why he chose to redeem in silver, and so

obtain the votes of the common people; or in gold, and so get an election fund from the banks; and he could not reply that Congress required him to redeem the notes in the one or the other coin, and therefore he could not redeem partly in gold and partly in silver.

This law as it is and as this bill preserves and reenacts it, creates a statutory competition between gold and silver coin. When the dealer in gold wishes to raid the Treasury for a profit or a commission, to be paid him by conspirators against the Government, the discretion vested and confirmed in the Secretary by this amendment of the Sherman law enables him to comply with the insolent demand rather than rebuke it with a stern refusal, when he is ready to threaten the Government with this question: "Is the Treasury of the United States bankrupt, that it cannot provide gold to meet my demand?"

When such a demand is made by one holding a promise payable in gold or silver coin, at the discretion of the Secretary, his fright at such a call reminds one of the timidity of an elephant at the nibbling of a mouse. France answers such questions with this response: "The credit of France is pledged for the security of the Republic against the vigilance of neighboring states that are our enemies; and is not pledged to enable you and them to dictate to us a financial policy to suit your greed and their hostility."

A Secretary of the Treasury who had the courage to look for a moment at the credit and resources of the United States, while his eager and longing gaze is diverted from the vision of the Presidency, would say, would have said, indeed, to the man named by the Senator from Kentucky, in his great argument delivered in the Senate on the 4th day of this October, who had conspired to loot the Treasury and were under foreign pay:

"You will not alarm a Government as to its credit that has paid \$5,000,000,000 of debt and interest in thirty years through your mean exploit of attempting to defame its good name by making a corner on the gold in the Treasury. 'Get thee behind me, Satan.' The credit of this Government is not a power in the hands of gold or stock gamblers. Go back to your foreign employers and tell them that this splendid American Republic is not a football to be kicked around by them at their pleasure."

Such a response would have preserved the parity between gold and silver, while the timid submission to their insolent demands only makes the preservation of the parity impossible.

If silver needed lifting up to preserve the parity, it was his duty to lift it up, and not make its full legal-tender value a by-word and a reproach.

If silver had been thus defended by our Secretaries of the Treasury, every holder of an American security in Europe would have said: "The United States declares for the parity of silver coin with gold, and the hoarding of silver in the Treasury must raise its value; the supply is growing short; under European pressure the mines are closing. Silver famine is more likely to occur than overproduction. We will join the United States in its wise policy of bimetallism: we will make the silver as good as gold, and thereby lose nothing on the debts due us and on the dividends coming to us from the vast interests we

own in their railroads. We virtually own many of the factories, banks, breweries, town, city, and State bonds, mines, grazing lands, mortgaged farms, gas works, water works, and town and city property in the United States. We own India, and fix a gold value for the silver rupees of those subjects, which is far above the commercial value of the silver that they are coined from. Why should we not be indulgent to our clients—our former subjects—in the United States?"

They would not "kill the goose that lays the golden egg" because her wings are tipped in oxidized silver gray. When the cowardice of the money dealer infects the Cabinet we may look for conspiracy at home and abroad, and consequent humiliation and distress for the people. All these dividends on stocks owned abroad must come out of the annual earnings of the people, and be sent abroad in gold at an enormously inflated value before the men who create them can eat the bread of their toil, or have the flavor of profit, which must be paid to them in silver eighteen grains short in the dollar.

Yet there are jeremiads in Presidential messages and in all sorts of reports and speeches—sobbing lamentations—lest the laboring man should be paid in legal-tender silver dollars. Having no gold dollars, they having been stricken from the coinage, how is a poor man, who earns a dollar with a day's work and is paid in a paper dollar, to have it redeemed in gold at the Treasury? If such arguments are not sordid in folly, they must be denounced as hypocrisy.

This amended Sherman bill, we are told, is not expected to stand. Something better is promised. They tell us that this "cowardly makeshift" is so great an obstruction to the keen financial vision of the new doctors of finance that it must be torn down. Not demolished entirely, but left to stand as to all but the top section, in deference, I suppose, to the bipolitical leadership of the coalition, one wing of which is led by a chronic gold general and the other by an oft-defeated silver marshal. When the top section is demolished, then the grand marshal of the silver forces will take the field for a rapid march for "the promised land." But then, yes then, the great gold general, entrenched behind the remaining barrier of the unrepealed sections of the Sherman law, will say to the gallant marshal "Halt! and give the countersign. This is the citadel of the gold king and his royal retinue, which you have agreed not to attack during this campaign. You must not, can not advance one step.

If the grand marshal shall then sound the advance, and will permit the weary soldiers of the old guard to follow him, we will struggle to our feet and follow "the forlorn hope" to victory or to honorable graves. But it will then be too late. The surrendered bastions of the Sherman bill, left standing in their deadly array, will repel us, and silver money will die the death.

What are we asked to look to for the restoration of the country to a healthy financial condition after we have re-enacted all that is hostile to silver in the Sherman law?

IT IS THE FAITH CURE.

I leave this subject, Mr. President, with a knowledge that the die is cast. The Senate, the House of Representatives, the coalition, and the President of the United States have deter-

mined that this measure shall prevail, and we have nothing now to look to, so far as I can see, but some vague promises made upon this floor, which are entirely incapable of being realized. The President of the United States would not have driven a majority of the Democrats in this Chamber into this corner and have compelled them into this unfortunate condition—where the Senator from Ohio has exercised the power, it seems, of marking out what we shall do or what shall be done by the majority of this body—that would not have occurred, if the President did not have his face set against the free coinage of silver. I regret it very much, but I do not deceive myself that the President of the United States has made a formal declaration, emphatic and, of course, irrevocable, I am afraid, that there is to be no free coinage of silver in this country, and no approximation to it, until we have first secured the assent of foreign powers.

I am utterly hopeless in that direction. I think it is a matter impossible of accomplishment. I do not believe that the form and theory of our Government is at all adapted to making any such obligations binding upon our people, or binding upon foreign countries. I had the honor and the pleasure of discussing this question with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who is a very able and a very candid man, and I think the result of the brief debate was to satisfy the Senate that it was a matter of legislative impracticability—impossibility, I will say—that we could formulate an agreement with foreign countries in respect of our currency which should be binding upon them and binding upon us. The subject is as indefinite in the future, so far as we know, as the millenium, and I have not the slightest hope of it nor the slightest confidence in it. It may do for a foil; it may do for a measure of amusement; it may do to flatter the people with the idea that something is to be done for their benefit; but the result will never be reached.

In one respect, Mr. President, we have a people to be admired, to be loved, to be revered as a man would reverence an honest and sweet woman who was his wife—it is the confidence and the faith and the abiding trust the people have in the men whom they elect to represent them in the high offices of the country. They seem to be willing to endure almost anything with patience, and the least indication of a promise of relief that we hold out to them will cause them to endure pains and mortifications and distresses which would wring anguish and denunciation from any other people in the world—not denunciations of violence, for they will bear them with fortitude, patience, and submission, trusting in God and in their leaders that all will come right at last.

They refuse no confidence to their representatives and no sacrifices to their country.

Such a people, Mr. President, deserve at our hands an equal recognition of duty and devotion on our part, and we should be tender of their rights, and when the powers we undertake to exercise appear to be in conflict with rights reserved to them under the Constitution of their country, we ought to be very cautious and go very slow in interfering with them.

Now, here we are, the Democratic party in this body, according to all the declarations which have been made, particularly

those of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], knowingly violating the seventh article of the Chicago platform, which contained pledges to the people of the United States which they translated as sacred promises and which they believed to be honorable pledges for the full remonetization of silver. That is what they believed. We are disappointing all of them, and we are creating trepidation, anguish, and resentment, and after awhile we shall create rebellion amongst those people toward our authority; they will dispute our friendship for them, they will commence branding us as traitors to their cause, and men who have tried to serve them honestly and faithfully will be crushed under the feet of the multitude who will rush for redress when they find that their leaders have deceived them.

I lament all this. I feel it very deeply. My attitude is this: The Democratic party is to-day what it was in the days of Gen. Jackson. I see no difference in it. If there is any motive or any power or any principle in the Democratic party which was opposed to the creed of the pure Democrats who supported that faithful and great man and his successors and his predecessors in his office, then, Mr. President, I am out of place in the Democratic party; but I believe that the power still resides with that party which honors the rights of the people under the Constitution of the United States with a sincere respect, to bring them again into the full possession of all their constitutional rights, and there is no constitutional right that I can think of which ought to be prized more than that which enables the people of the United States by their labor in the mines, which God has bestowed upon them, to bring forth the precious metals and go to the mints of the country and have those metals converted into coin.

I leave this subject, Mr. President, not expecting for a long time, if ever, to have anything else to say upon it until the people shall take it up and dispose of it according to their sovereign will. I shall yield to that judgment when it is rendered, and to nothing else.