AGAINST THE SILVER-PURCHASING POLICY.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN DALZELL,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23, 1893.

WASHINGTON.
1893.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN DALZELL.

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

Mr. DALZELL said:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the President of the United States, in the exercise of a constitutional right, recently called together the representatives of the people, he assigned as a reason for his action the existence of an extraordinary and alarming business situation, not to be accounted for by natural conditions. That situation he charged to the existence of unwise legislation on the money question.

Almost every gentleman who has taken part in this discussion has announced his disagreement with the President as to the cause of the present deplorable condition of things. In my judgment the want of confidence that underlies the present depression is due in large measure to the declared hostility of the party now in possession of all branches of the Government to that great economic system by whose agency the country during the last quarter of a century has marched to unexampled prosperity.

There is, however, to some extent, a popular impression indorsing the President's views, and the remedy for fancied, as for real evils, is a removal of the supposed cause. And whether the President be right or not, his summons brings us face to face with the necessity of legislating with respect to the immediate future financial policy of the United States, and places upon our shoulders the grave responsibility of determining what that policy shall be.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it was to have been expected that every reasonable facility would be afforded for debate, and the largest liberty accorded for suggestion, to the end that whatever should be finally determined upon might be the ripe fruit of the mature judgment of all the representatives of the people, and not the preconceived scheme of any one man or set of men.

Unfortunately, however, the majority party in this House did not adopt this view. Separated by an impassable gulf of opinion, as the two sections of that party are upon the main question, they were agreed on this: that no suggestion should be allowed from this side of the Chamber, no opportunity offered for amendment; no chance given to vote, save and except upon certain alternative schemes formulated bv them in advance of deliberation and debate. If the country can be saved only in such way that the Republican party shall be entitled to some share of credit in its salvation, the Democratic programme seems to be that it would be preferable to let the country go to ruin.

The majority of Republicans, however, careless in the face of danger of the personnel of their leadership, are found to-day, and will be found when this vote is taken, where the Republican party always has been found in the presence of national peril, following along the pathway that leads to national safety and national honor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

What, now, Mr. Speaker, are the questions to the deliberation and discussion and decision of which the arbitrary action of the majority limits us? They are these: Shall we inaugurate the policy of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at some legally defined but not commercially accurate ratio, or shall we return to the policy of the Bland-Allison act and mo thly emit a limited number of fiat silver dollars: or, lastly, shall we unconditionally repeal the purchase clause of the so-called Sherman act, approved July 14, 1890?

Now, I assume in the first place that almost every one, except the free silver men, who are really monometallists, is desirous of seeing both gold and silver the standard money of the commercial nations of the world: that almost all are in favor, in other words, of international bimetallism. But as we can not now at this time have that, it is material to be borne in mind in this discussion that we are here not to legislate internationally; we are here to legislate simply for the United States of America. And it is material to be borne in mind also that our existing monetary system does not conform to the monetary system of any other commercial nation at the present time.

The year 1873, when silver was demonetized, marked a revolution in monetary history. In the results of that revolution all the commercial nations of Europe acquiesce. We alone dissent. Except in silver standard countries, ours are the only mints that are open to the coinage of silver.

Now, whether it was wise to demonetize silver, how silver was demonetized, whether surreptitiously or openly, are questions which have no pertinence in this discussion except for the purposes of declamation. "It is a condition, and not a theory, that confronts us." The question is. can the United States, single-handed and alone, remonetize silver under existing conditions?

And this brings me naturally to the first question, Shall we repeal the purchase clause of the Sherman act? Now, what is that act, and what have been its results? By its terms the United States Treasury is made a storehouse for silver purchased at the rate of 4,500,000 ounces per month, at its market price, and paid for in legal-tender Treasury notes, there being a provision in the act that these notes shall be payable in gold or silver coin, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

But by the terms of this same act the important declaration is made that it is the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals, gold and silver, on a parity with each other at the existing legal ratio, or at some other ratio to be defined by law.

As the President of the United States says in substance, this second clause is really a control of the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, so that these Treasury notes are practically payable in gold. The consequence is that the gold obligations of the Government are being increased each month to the extent of the value of 4,500,000 ounces of silver.

In other words, we are paying each month gold for silver. This act has been in operation since the 13th day of August, 1890, thirty days after its passage.

Mr. WALKER. It was passed on the 14th of July.

Mr. DALZELL. The act was passed on the 14th of July, and went into operation on the 13th of August. And what has been the result? I have here a statement from the Treasury Department showing the amounts of gold and silver coin and certificates, United States notes and national bank notes in circulation August 1, 1893. How many of our obligations are payable in gold? These: first, gold certificates, amounting to $87,704,739; second, Treasury notes under act of July 14, 1890, amounting to $148,286,348; third, United States notes, amounting to $346,-681,016; in other words, there is now payable in gold by the United States $582,672,103. These are our gold obligations, and how much gold have we to pay them with? Only $100,000,000 in gold.

Why, my friends, if you put aside the immense resources and the credit of the American people, the national Treasury is to-day, according to legal definition, bankrupt. Such being the state of our accounts, what does it mean to continue this policy? It means simply to widen the breach between our liabilities and our assets, and the time must ultimately come when our gold reserve, in proportion to the burden it has to bear, will be simply an insignificant bagatelle. Do we want to continue that policy indefinitely? Do we want to continue to buy 54,000,000 ounces of silver each year without limit as to time, and pay for them in gold?

How long do you suppose that even the imperial resources of our magnificent domain, the energy and interprise, the honesty of purpose of the American people, will persuade the world of our ultimate solvency measured in the world's standard of value—gold? It is not the monthly addition for a few months of silver purchases under the act of 1890 that has shaken confidence; so far as the money question has anything to do with the existing depression its influence is derived from the dreary prospect of the indefinite continuance of such violation of the laws of sound finance.

We were told when the Sherman law passed that the effect of it would be to put up the price of silver. We were told that silver and gold would approach each other towards the legally defined ratio of 16 to 1. What has been the result? I have here from the Treasury Department, Bureau of the Mint, under date August 1—this present month—a statement of the highest, lowest, and average price of silver bullion, and value of a fine ounce, bullion value of a United States silver dollar, and so on.

I find that in 1878 the value of the fine ounce, based on an average price of exchange, was $1.11; and I find, coming on down the list, that in the month of July of this present year the value of the same quantity of silver was 72 cents.

The schedule showing fall in values is as follows:

1878-'79	$1.11616	1884-'85	$1.09226	1890-'91	$1.04780
1879-'80	1.14397	1885-'86	1.03295	1891-'92	.93723
1880-'81	1.13508	1886-'87	.98148	1892-'93	.84263
1881-'82	1.13817	1887-'88	.95617	July	.72037
1882-'83	1.11912	1888-'89	.93510		
1883-'84	1.11529	1889-'90	.96839		

In the meantime, while the price of silver has been going down from day to day and from month to month and week to week, the production of silver has been increasing until this precious metal is every day getting to be less and less precious.

I have also, here, issued by the Treasury Department, a schedule showing the production of gold and silver in the world, and I find that whereas in 1873 silver was produced to the extent of $81,800,000, it was produced in the year 1892 to the extent of $196,605,000. The schedule showing the increase in production is as follows:

1873	$81,800,000	1881	$102,000,000	1889	$162,159,000
1874	71,500,000	1882	111,800,000	1890	172,235,000
1875	80,500,000	1883	115,300,000	1891	186,733,000
1876	87,600,000	1884	105,500,000	1892	196,605,000
1877	81,000,000	1885	118,500,000		
1878	95,000,000	1886	120,600,000		5,104,961,000
1879	96,000,000	1887	124,281,000		
1880	96,700,000	1888	140,706,000		

The production of silver has quadrupled within the last three decades; it has more than doubled within the last two.

When this bill was under discussion, gentlemen advocating the free coinage of silver talked to us glibly about the double standard; how, under the double standard, silver went up and gold came down, until they got exactly together. They read to us, and gentlemen on the floor now read to us, from books, quoting axioms and illustrations and experiences that have no relation to the experience of the present time, nor any conformity to existing conditions. They read to us axioms founded upon the experience of the world prior to 1873, when it was in the practice of bimetallism. I put against their theories, their axioms, and their maxims our own actual experience, and quote to them the maxim, the homely maxim, that "example is better than precept."

Now, how much has this experiment with silver cost us? I have a letter from the Acting Director of the Mint, Mr. Preston, in which he says:

The amount of silver purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, aggregated 161,521,000 fine ounces, at a cost of $150,669,000.

The value of the same at to-day's market price, 73 cents and a fraction, would be $118,714,000. In other words, we have lost by this experiment, or rather paid for this experiment, the sum of $31,955,000. Who pays that money?

Who but the people of the United States, including the poor people, whose self-vaunted champions on this floor threaten us with war if we do not break down the dikes and welcome to our mints the disasterous flood of European silver. Think of it—adding what the Bland act cost us, it amounts to $2 apiece, and more, as a tax upon every man, woman, and child within all our broad domain. This is the price that we pay for our experience with limited free coinage of silver. "If these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

But this policy which we have been pursuing is dangerous in another direction. It is dangerous in the possibilities that it offers for the contraction instead of the expansion of our currency. Pour good money and bad money together into the channels of trade, and the bad money will drive out the good, in pursuance of a law as inexorable as the law of gravitation.

What is good money? Henri Cernuschi, one of the ablest and most distinguished of bimetallists says:

That only is good money that will stand the test of fire, and which is worth as much as bullion when melted as it had been worth in the coin itself.

Take a gold dollar, for example, and subject it to the furnace, destroy every vestige of the Government stamp, and the bullion left is worth just 100 cents. Take a silver dollar and subject it to the furnace and destroy every vestige of the Government stamp, and the bullion left is worth 56 cents or thereabouts to-day. In this latter case you have destroyed the Government's promise to pay the other 44 cents.

Mr. BROSIUS. We "trust in God" for that.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes, as my colleague from Pennsylvania suggests, we "trust in God" for that.

Mr. BROSIUS (handing Mr. DALZELL a silver dollar). The legend on that dollar, "In God we trust," is supposed to sanctify the theft.

Mr. DALZELL. Now, if the proposition that I laid down a moment ago, that bad money will drive out good, be true—and it is an admitted axiom in political economy, and is known as Gresham's law, but it is the law of human nature, of selfishness, and of self-defense—if that be the law, then to continue this policy is to bring us to the situation where, as sure as pitiless fate, we shall part company with the leading commercial nations of the world and take our place beside Mexico, China, and Peru.

Let me call attention to a matter that has been referred to many times upon this floor—some of the facts of our own financial history. Because of what was afterwards proved to be an error in fixing the ratio of silver and gold in our original mint act of 1792, gold was undervalued and silver overvalued. Silver then was bad money and gold was good, and from 1805 until 1834 this nation was on a silver basis. Then the ratio was changed from 15 to 1 to 16 to 1. A mistake was then made in the other direction; silver was undervalued and gold was overvalued; gold became bad money and silver good; and from 1834 down to this present time, substantially, we have been on a gold basis.

Two standards, our free-coinage friends say. Impossible! as impossible as two yardsticks, two bushels differing in capacity, two pounds differing in weight. You can not have at the same time two measures of value, one of which is money, like gold, and the other of which is a commodity, like silver. You may have them, it is true, but you can not use both at the same time. One or other will prevail. That is the uniform and universal lesson of all monetary history. One other thing let me say. This silver that we are laying away in our Government storehouse is practically of no use for redemption. In times of panic no man who has a certificate payable in gold will take silver for it, and yet while you are paying out gold in redemption of those certificates you can not sell a single solitary ounce of that silver for the purpose of getting the gold required for the redemption.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the purchase clause of the Sherman law ought to be repealed. That law has failed to raise the price of silver. It has a tendency to contract rather than expand the currency. It leads the way to an ultimate loss of credit. It is costly, and it violates fundamental principles of sound finance.

Mark you, I hold that they are deserving of credit who passed that law in the first instance, because it then offered to us the lesser of two evils, one of which we were bound to endure. It was passed to meet an emergency. It was passed as a temporary measure, and ought, for that reason, to be now repealed.

But, aside from that, I want to say here that the Sherman law on the statute book, with a Republican Administration in power, pledged by its party platforms, its party history, and its traditions to the cause of sound money, is one thing, and the Sherman law on the statute book, with a Democratic free-coinage Secretary of the Treasury in power, is another thing. Still another thing deplorable, but possible, would be the Sherman law on the statute book with a Democratic free-coinage Secretary in the Treasury Department and a Democratic free-coinage President in the White House.

Mr. BOWERS of California. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DALZELL. No, my time is too short. I can not yield to anybody.

And, Mr. Speaker, in that possible contingency I very much fear that many Democratic Senators and many Democratic Representatives would reflect only the opinions of the White House.

But, if the Sherman act is bad in principle and in practice, the Bland-Allison act is worse. Under the provisions of that act the Secretary of the Treasury was bound to purchase not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 worth of silver each month, and coin it into dollars of 412½ grains each of standard silver.

The Bland dollars are fiat dollars. Unlike the act of 1890, the act of 1878 contained no pledge of gold redemption, and for every cent in a Bland dollar in excess of its intrinsic value up to one hundred the holder has nothing but the honesty of purpose and the resources of the American people, and as the value of silver goes down the final draft on the honesty of purpose and the resources of the American people goes up.

And, more than that, the Bland-Allison act was a more expensive act than the Sherman act. In this same letter from which I quoted awhile ago from the Acting Director of the Mint, Mr. Preston, he says:

> The amount of silver purchased under the act of February 28, 1878, aggregated 291,292,000 ounces, costing $318,119,000. The value of the same at today's market price, 73 cents, would be $213,371,000.

We thus have a loss of $104,748,000.

But more than that, suppose we had been operating under the Bland-Allison act instead of under the Sherman act since 1890. In that event we would have purchased up to date 368,341,000 ounces of silver at a cost of $380,000,000; in other words, even the disadvantageous provisions of the Sherman law saved to us the enormous amount of $61,881,000. So that I conclude that the Sherman act must be repealed; but I conclude also that we can not go back to the provisions of the Bland-Allison act.

But, mark you, unconditional repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman act means simply that we shall cease to pay out gold monthly for four and one-half million ounces of silver. All this that we hear about driving silver from our money system, destroying one-half of the people's money, as some put it, and one-half of the world's money, as others put it, and all that sort of thing is so much rant and fustian. Not a dollar of the existing silver in the currents of the world's trade will be eliminated nor a scintilla of its value affected. No existing American dollar will be less a good dollar according to the gold standard than it was before. Every American dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, will be the equal of every other American dollar wherever the flag flies.

Now, only one other proposition remains, and that is the proposition for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at some one of several suggested ratios. I shall not stop to discuss rations for this reason: If you can fix the commercial ratio of that which is a commodity in the world in relation to gold by law you can fix it at anything you please. If you can not by law fix its real relation because it is a commodity, then it does not make any difference what ratio you put in your law. Now, what is this proposition for free and unlimited coinage of silver? Reduced to terms of plain English it is this: That every man who has 56 cents' worth of standard silver may go the United States mint and have it marked a dollar. "Resolved," it is proposed we shall say, "by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, that 56 is equal to 100: that 1 is equal to 28.52."

But, you say, that is not a fair statement for the reason that gold has gone up instead of silver going down. You rail against the gold dollar as a "dishonest dollar;" and one gentleman here even went to the trouble of bringing in a book to quote from, as an authority to show that gold was not an absolute measure of value. He might have saved himself the trouble. Nobody claims that gold is an absolute stable measure of value. What we do claim and what is true is that it is the most stable measure of value.

Mr. WALKER. And the world has agreed on it.

Mr. DALZELL. And, as the gentleman from Massachusetts suggests, it is the measure of value all over the world. It fixes the value even in silver-standard countries. Now, on what basis do you assume that gold has gone up and that silver remains stationary? Because, you say, there are so many commodities that have fallen in price and silver has fallen in price with them, and, therefore, gold has gone up and silver has not moved. Was there ever a more patent *non sequitur?*

Why, you do not need to imagine a scarcity of gold to account for falling prices. New processes, improved machinery, inventive genius, new facilities for intercommunication—these and not the scarcity of gold are the causes of falling prices. The records of the Patent Office, the roll of the great captains of industry whose genius has wedded usefulness and beauty and cheapness, and made the luxury of the past the convenience of the present, refute your silly claim that gold is the only factor in fixing price.

Raw materials, food products, have fallen in price upon the same principle. New fields have been opened, their soil put under the plow. Civilization has pushed its resistless march into new territory, discovered new secrets of nature, opened new mines to the sunlight, bridged new streams, built highways to the hitherto inaccessible; introduced electricity and steam; annihilated time and space.

Why, sir, the history of our trunk-line railroads furnishes the key to falling prices. Let me show you just for a second. In 1865 the Pennsylvania Railroad Company and its lines west of Pittsburg, the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern, the Michigan Central, Boston and Albany, the New York, Lake Erie and Western, carried 11,151,701 tons of freight, or to express it in another way, moved of tons 1 mile 1,654,324,000. And how much did each ton cost for carriage? It cost 2.9 cents per mile. In 1885, twenty years afterwards, this same system of railroads moved of tons at the rate of 1 mile 11,331,306,000, at a cost of six-tenths of a cent a mile.

Now, these railway lines carried somewhat less than one-fourth of the tons moved 1 mile in 1885; yet they saved on the difference between cost of carriage in 1885 and the cost of carriage in 1865 $256,500,000. I might pursue this line of argument, to show the same results, with other roads, but it is not necessary. And yet, in the face of incontrovertible facts like these, you get up ingenious schedules to prove that silver has remained stationary and that gold has gone up.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the characteristic feature of this day is low price of necessaries and high wages. If the low price of necessaries is due to the scarcity of gold, why have not wages gone down also? And how comes it that the poor man's friend on this floor denounces a system under which the poor man gets the necessaries of life for less than they ever cost him before, and gets as a wage more money with which to buy them? [Applause.]

The fall in the price of silver is easily accounted for on the very simplest of economic principles. Increase the supply of any commodity, decrease the demand, and prices go down. Now, since 1873, when silver was demonetized, the production of silver has increased 150 per cent, and the demand has decreased by the amount theretofore called for by the mints of Europe, since that time closed against it like our own, except since 1878.

Mr. WALKER. And the cost of mining is not more than half what it was.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; there is a difference in the cost of mining.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stop to go into the question at any length of the scarcity of gold. I will merely state the facts and put the proof in the RECORD. Since 1873, when silver was demonetized, gold production has constantly increased, and is increasing to-day. The probabilities are that it will continue to increase to a much greater extent in the future. Here are the figures as stated by the Bureau of the Mint of the Treasury Department:

1873	$96,200,000	1880	$106,500,000	1887	$105,775,000
1874	90,750,000	1881	103,000,000	1888	110,197,000
1875	97,500,000	1882	102,000,000	1889	123,489,000
1876	103,700,000	1883	95,400,000	1890	113,150,000
1877	114,000,000	1884	101,700,000	1891	120,519,000
1878	119,000,000	1885	108,400,000	1892	130,817,000
1879	109,000,000	1886	106,000,000		

In 1887 the Queen of England appointed a royal commission to inquire into the recent changes in the relation of the precious metals to each other. In the same year President Cleveland appointed Edward Atkinson, a distinguished statistician, to inquire as to the feasibility of bimetallism by international agreement. Mr. Atkinson states the results of the investigation of that royal commission as follows. He says:

I find in it abundant evidence sustaining the positions which I have taken, to wit:

1. The mass of gold in existence has been sufficient to enable Germany to adopt the gold standard of legal tender, the United States and Italy to resume specie payment substantially on a gold standard, the Latin Union to cease silver coinage and to maintain their existing stock of legal-tender silver at par in gold, without creating any apparent scarcity of gold and without any special influence in depressing the prices of commodities or services.

2. The reduction in the price of commodities has been no greater than would be warranted by and might have been expected from the improvements in the processes of production and distribution. This reduction, having been accompanied by a general maintenance or rise in the price or rate of wages, has been almost wholly beneficial, temporary hardship to special classes being admitted.

I have said that the probabilities are that the production of gold would increase. Let me read you some information contained in a recent edition of the Washington Post:

OUR GOLD PRODUCT.

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

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

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

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

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

Now our friends on the other side say, "discontinue the use of silver; take it out of the world's money, and you necessarily appreciate gold to that extent."

What I have already said refutes the assertion! We have seen that the gold supply has kept pace with the gold demand, and promises to continue to do so in the future. This has been proven by the statistics of gold production, and by the evidence taken before the Royal Commission.

But in addition to this the free coinage argument wholly ignores the function of credit in our modern business life. The volume of money consists not simply of gold and silver and authorized issues of notes, but of credit also. This is an expanding and contracting instrument as the necessities of trade and commerce demand. It serves to conduct from 90 to 95 per cent of the world's business. It has been well said, the progress of civilization is towards diminishing instead of increasing the requirement of large amounts of bullion.

Much stress, Mr. Speaker, has been laid by our friends on the other side on the injustice of making the debtor pay in dearer money than that which he borrowed. If I have proven anything so far I have demonstrated that the only method to prevent such injustice, so far as it can be prevented, is to abide by the most stable of all measures of value, gold. And mark you the injustice to the debtor of paying his debt in dearer money than he borrowed is no greater than the injustice of making the lender take his loan in money which is less valuable than that which he loaned.

That aspect of the question seems not to have presented itself to our friends on the other side at all. They assume that all lenders are rich, millionaires, goldbugs, corporations, and that all the borrowers are poor farmers, and that such being the case it is no harm for the latter to cheat the former. Is there one rule of honesty for the rich man and another rule of honesty for the poor man?

Why, Mr. Speaker, I have been amused here listening to the self-styled champions of the poor man, advocates of the millionaire mine-owners of the West, denouncing millionaires: in one breath denouncing all moneyed institutions, aggregations of wealth, and corporations—the indices of national prosperity—and in the next demanding a market for the product of the Western mines and for the surplus silver of the world. Why not the same kind of legislation for the steel billets from the mills of Pennsylvania, for the pig iron from the furnaces of Tennessee, or the wheat from the fields of Dakota?

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend who spoke here yesterday, representing what we call the "State" of Nevada, that there is not a silver-producing State in this Union, California excepted, that has as large a population as the county in which I have the honor to live; and all of the inhabitants, men, women, and children, in Nevada do not equal the number of voters in that county.

It seems to me, sir, that this indiscriminate denunciation of wealth, this arraying of the rich against the poor, is nothing more or less than incipient anarchy. Whence can it lead but to a war of classes and the eventual overthrow of the State? And is not he an incendiary, against whom society has a right to protect itself, who raises the banner of rule or ruin and appeals to the basest passions of mankind?

Sir, the silver men pretending to be bimetallists are monometallists. What they would have is not a double, but a silver instead of a gold standard. This is plainly to be gathered from the speech of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BRYAN]. I quote him:

If a single standard were really more desirable than a double standard, we are not free to choose gold and would be compelled to select silver. * * * If bimetallism is impossible, then we must make up our minds to a silver standard.

And then he paints the glories of a silver standard. He says:

A silver standard, too, would make us the trading center of all the silver-using countries of the world, and these countries contain far more than one-half of the world's population. What an impetus would be given to our Western and Southern seaports, such as San Francisco, Galveston, New Orleans, Mobile, Savannah, and Charleston.

That is to say, let us cut loose from England and France and Germany—from European civilization—and cast in our lot with India, China, the Straits, Japan, Mexico, and South and Central America.

Truly a suggestion worthy the mind that conceives it to be in the power of legislation to reverse the rules of arithmetic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not time to discuss some other subjects that I had intended to discuss in this connection. But I want to say that the moment you declare that 56 cents' worth of silver is equal to a gold dollar, that moment you open your mints to all the silver of the world. You bid it welcome to come, and it will come; and when it comes gold will go, go into silver purchases, go into hiding, go abroad. With what result? With the result to defeat the very purpose for which free and unlimited silver coinage is urged; with the result suddenly and violently to contract instead of increase the circulation. The American dollar will buy in foreign exchange just as much as and no more than the bullion in it is worth. The United States will be on a silver basis.

Two things, I grant you, the free and unlimited coinage of silver will accomplish. First, debtors will be enabled to scale their debts to the extent of from 40 to 50 per cent and cheat their creditors to that extent; and, secondly, you will furnish a market for the silver mines of the West. But these results will be accomplished at the price of justice and to the eternal disgrace of the American name. [Applause.]

Now, sir, I believe in bimetallism, the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the world, and I expect to see that system come in time. I believe that bimetallism is possible, however, only by international agreement, and I am in favor of every honest effort to bring about that agreement. The United States having been on a gold basis substantially for sixty years past, debts have been contracted on that basis, and prices fixed all over the world on that basis. I am opposed to any measure that would either suddenly or gradually put us on a silver basis. I am in favor of any needed measure for the expansion of the currency that will put behind every dollar issued the guaranty that it shall be equal in purchasing and in debt-paying power to every other dollar.

I believe, with the President of the United States, that this is a question which rises above the plane of party politics. Good men will laugh to scorn threats of party outlawry and treat with the contempt that they deserve low appeals in party interest. This question can be settled; but it must be settled by each man in the domain of conscience enlightened by patriotism. The interests at stake involve the financial future of this great people; they are the interests of country, and country is above all. [Applause]. This is a proposition that will meet with commendation wherever patriotism is regarded as a virtue. But it is especially true with us.

Why, sir; with a pomp and circumstance of peace more glorious even than the pomp and circumstance of war, all nations and peoples and kindreds join to-day to celebrate the discovery of this western continent. In a city whose marvelous growth, wealth, and enterprise outrun the extravagance even of an Oriental imagination, the first fruits of the ripest civilization have been gathered to do honor to the name and rejoice in the achievement of the courageous mariner whose sublime faith carried him across unknown seas to unlock the gateway of the globe's richer half.

In this, the harvest of four hundred years of American history, it is not hard to discern the richest amongst all the golden sheaves. From the treasures of art and science and literature, from the charms of music, from the glories of architecture, from the gathered wealth of genius and labor, with thanksgiving in our hearts, we turn to the colossal Republic, that, founded in self-denial, maintained by struggle, purified by blood, sanctified by the graves of brave men, first and alone in all the annals of time, has demonstrated man's capacity for self-rule and in which under the folds of that flag all men are equally entitled to enjoy the blessings of liberty under law. [Prolonged applause.]

117

O