

SILVER.

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS J. HUDSON,

OF KANSAS,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

SATURDAY, AUGUST 19, 1893.

WASHINGTON.

1893.

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. HUDSON.

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. HUDSON said:

Mr. SPEAKER, AND GENTLEMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: I am conscious of the fact that it will appear presumptuous on my part to occupy the attention of a body containing so many older and abler men, and my only apology for claiming your attention is the fact that I represent a people as much entitled to be heard upon this floor as those of any other district in our common country, and the question now before this House is of such far-reaching and overshadowing importance to them that I feel that I should be recreant to the trust confided in me should I remain silent. My only regret is that I am not better equipped for the discharge of that great responsibility.

It is the first time in the history of our country that the Congress of the United States has been called together in extraordinary session to pass upon a demurrer filed by the Executive branch against the acts of a former Executive and Congress.

It is a well-established rule of practice that a demurrer leveled at the answer or pleading of a defendant may be carried over to the original complaint or initiatory pleading. I therefore propose, Mr. Speaker, to insist upon applying this demurrer to the so-called Sherman silver-purchasing act, to the act of 1873 demonetizing silver, which was the primary pleading in this case—the provoking cause of the Sherman law.

The wrong does not begin, sir, with the Sherman law, but began with the act of 1873, which stopped the coinage of, and consequently debased silver.

A skillful patient in treating a patient seeks for the primal cause of his disease, and, in eradicating that, cures the patient. Therefore, being called together to prescribe for this dreadful Sherman act, let us like good physicians dispose of the whole question by restoring silver to the place it occupied in this Government prior to the 14th day of February, 1873.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWN], on the first day of the debate upon this question, made an able appeal to this House for a mere surface treatment of our financial trouble, asking us to ignore for the time being the root of the evil. His plan would

give us no substantial relief, and would leave us, in my judgment, in a worse condition than we are to-day.

I trust, therefore, that we shall not subject ourselves to the criticism of having shirked our whole duty. No, sir; the mere repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, which is all that is contained in the bill now before us for consideration, will not meet the expectations or the demands of the American people. We should, here and now, either adopt a paper standard or firmly and positively reestablish bimetallism by giving silver her old place under our Constitution and laws, equal with gold at 16 to 1.

The people whom I represent in the Third Kansas district are farmers and miners, and those whose interests are directly dependent upon the success of those two industrial classes; and they know that they want more money; that they must have more money or lose all the property they now possess, together with all hope of future success. While they do not believe that the free coinage of silver will give them the immediate relief which is now needed, they believe that it will gradually, but certainly, give them more money and better prices; that the unconditional repeal of the silver-purchasing clause of the Sherman act will decrease the volume of the currency by reason of the holders of the coin certificates issued under that act taking them to the Treasury and demanding and receiving gold for them, and result in their ultimate retirement from circulation and the checking of the further issue of such notes.

Give us free coinage of silver and the silver miners will at once resume work, and as fast as bullion is taken out it will be taken to the mint by the miners, coined for them, put in circulation by them in the purchase of food and clothing and in supplying their general demands, thereby rapidly increasing the volume of currency in the country, stimulating labor and prices everywhere, giving employment to the idle and unemployed, and bringing back to the country the prosperous times of 1873.

We are told by the gold-standard advocates that it is not more money that we need, but more confidence. I hope they will permit me to say to them, without any intention on my part to be humorous, that if they will give us their money we will give them our confidence. We have been confiding in them for twenty years and have constantly grown poorer, and the prices of our labor and our products have steadily gone down, with a spasmodic exception here and there.

Confidence without money has deprived tens of thousands of people of their homes, of their property, and of their employment. The gold advocates have maligned and slandered our people through ignorance or malice, the result being the same to us, and charged us with dishonesty in not paying our debts, the interest and principal of mortgages held by them, thoughtlessly assuming that our people were giving up their homes and all they had of this world's goods as a mere pastime, or for the simple enjoyment of hearing the complaints of the mortgage holders.

No people on earth are more intelligent, industrious, or honest, as a whole, than the people of Kansas; and all this talk and newspaper twaddle about the people of Kansas suddenly becom-

ing law-breakers, anarchists, and criminals is the outgrowth of mendacity and want of information. Can any man possessed of reasonable decency expect an intelligent farmer to remain docile with wheat selling at 35 cents, oats at 13 cents per bushel, cattle and horses at less than one-half that which they sold for in 1873, and all other products at about the same ratio—all at less than the cost of production, with here and there a nominal exception—with land constantly falling in price, while bonds, mortgages, interest, and taxes retain all their elephantine proportions?

Will you be kind enough, my gold-standard friends, to tell me how, under such conditions, our people can pay their debts (the securities held by you), their taxes, educate their children, and provide their families with the comforts of life? No, sirs; they are losing their homes, shortening the terms of their schools, buying fewer manufactured articles, and buying less and less of the necessities of life, not because they want to do so, but because they must.

There is not a supporter of the single standard in the United States, or all Europe, that would suffer as patiently the injustice that has been done them as the people of Kansas, and of the West, and of the South. Instead of being maligned and reviled, as they have been, they should receive applause for their moderation. But, sirs, this condition can not continue much longer. We must have relief, and that speedily, or the mutterings that you have heard from the West and the South will break forth so loud that they can be heard not only in Wall street but at Buzzards Bay.

Men recklessly tell us that we are extravagant, and yet these same men would sneer at the cheap clothing and coarse fare of our Western and Southern farmers and laborers, and of their wives and children—and their sensibilities would be terribly shocked if they were compelled to so dress and live. Our farmers' wives, many of them intelligent and well qualified to grace any station in life, are compelled not only to do their own household work and care for their children, but also to go into the field and aid their husbands in farm work, or in taking care of the stock, and a great majority of them are wholly debarred from the time or opportunity to read and cultivate their minds, or otherwise enjoy the amenities of social life.

In the senseless abuse of our people their traducers frequently say that they do not work enough, and then, when driven from that assertion, they say that our want of good prices is brought about wholly by overproduction. In other words, we work too little and produce too much. What a masterpiece of logic! These charges are untrue and wholly unjust.

The whole truth of the matter is that there is not money enough in the country to give profitable employment to our people and enable us to pay our debts and live. Those who growl about our people in the West failing to meet their expectations remind me of a circumstance that occurred when I was in Montana some years ago. Some highwaymen or "road agents," as they were called there, held up a miner at the outskirts of Virginia City, and on examining his pockets they found only \$5,

which they relieved him of, and then kicked him soundly because he had no more.

I do not expect paid newspapers to stop abusing Kansas and the people of the West, although every word I have uttered can easily be verified by any honest investigator. If they told the truth about us, like Othello, "they would lose their occupation," and yet, strange to say, nearly every one of these maligners of our Western people are advocates of a gold standard, and doing all they can to take away from us more than half of the money which we now have.

Every step we take widens the space between the holders of gold and gold-bearing securities and those who must pay. We must pay all our debts finally with labor and its products. Silver and farm products are all that America can rely upon. The only leverage we have left us to prevent our creditors from absorbing our property is silver, and that is why they are so clamorous against it. Will some supporter of the gold theory please tell us how we are to get the gold of Europe unless we increase our trade with her and have something to buy her gold with? Do they suppose, or do they expect the people to believe, that gold will flow to this country simply because we favor it? Do they regard gold as a sensate being or a cupid to be won by smiles?

Shylock wanted his pound of flesh, but the gold advocates want three pounds where their bonds call for but one, as \$1 will now purchase three times as much of the products of the farm and mines as a dollar would at the time our debts were contracted. The holders of the securities say that it is not our fault, and blandly reply that we want our contracts fulfilled to the letter, and we say, "grant it;" but while you demand the fulfillment of our contract, we demand that you accept without complaint the kind of money we contracted to pay you.

The foundation of all wealth, of all business, and of every industry in this country is farming and mining. Consequently, when we get back to the base, the farmers and miners must pay all debts and all interest, and a burden of any kind cast upon this nation or upon any of its people ultimately reaches the farmers and miners, and they are the greatest sufferers. The American silver mines are now producing \$75,000,000 coin value of silver. Close the silver mines (and that is what a gold standard means), and the farmers and miners must not only make up that \$75,000,000 lost to us, but must supply the 225,000 miners and those dependent upon them with the necessities of life, and have their farm products further depreciated by the loss of the silver, and the further increase of farm products put upon a falling market, should these miners go into the farming business, as they are advised to do by some of the gold advocates. On the other hand, the miner would be compelled to engage in a business of which he knows nothing, his wages would be decreased by more than one-half, and discontent and crime would have thrifty growth among them.

In the face of all this, where is the boasted protection to American labor? Abandoned by the men who so eloquently advocated it a few years ago, while confidence on the part of the workingmen in their sincerity, has vanished like mist before the morning sun. They say truthfully that your talk about pro-

tecting the American laborer was simply for the purpose of misleading him and thereby catching his vote, and I warn you that this bait will not catch him again. In the language of Lincoln—

You can fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you can not fool all the people all the time.

I may be old-fashioned and out of date, but I believe that under the Constitution and laws of this country the rights of the poorest farmer and most destitute miner are just as sacred and entitled to just as much consideration as the rights of the men who manipulate "Wall street," corner our money, and declare a panic at their sweet will.

SHERMAN LAW.

I believe, and am not alone in that belief, that had the Secretary of the Treasury given a fair interpretation to the Sherman law silver would to-day be on a par with gold at 16 to 1. Immediately after the passage of the act silver went up all over the world; but the Secretary of the Treasury was opposed to silver and at once began to construe the law unfriendly to the white metal, and systematically did all he could to disgrace and degrade it, and that plan is followed to-day by those charged with the execution of the law.

You ask us to save ourselves from national dishonor, to give our creditors more than the contract, to give them gold only, when we have the right to pay in either gold or silver, and you ask our people to do this at a time when our products are lower in the market even than silver. You ask us to wipe out \$70,000,000 annually of our money, and to throw out of employment immediately 250,000 miners. You ask us to cut off five-sevenths of our money metal supply at a time when all business and industries all over this land are prostrate.

Let me suggest to you, my Democratic friends, and to you, my Republican friends, that unless you now renounce the single standard heresy and honestly stand by the silver dollar, the money of the laboring and industrial classes, you may write "closed out" in big letters on your banners.

The temper of the people is not to be mistaken for party pride, and empty promises will not deceive them any longer.

This sham nonsense of an honest dollar for labor and for the workingman has grown stale, and he knows that it means for him no dollar at all.

The people want silver dollars, and they want to see them and feel them. No more confidence for them, but dollars—dollars that always supply their needs when they have them. Confidence will not supply homes, clothing, or food. There can be no confidence in business without money or property. Confidence alone is like unto nothing. Confidence and nothing as a copartnership is bankruptcy already. Give us money, more of it, at least \$50 per capita, and confidence will be at once restored.

Gold-standard men say, "How will you get it in circulation?" I reply, "Just as any other money is put in circulation." "If it does not get into circulation, why do you object to it?" "It can not possibly hurt you or your foreign abettors." "It is because it will get into circulation that you oppose it."

LAW MAKES MONEY

What is gold? A metal, an insensate thing, without action or power.

Clothe it in the royal robe of the law and it springs upright into active life, moves the commerce of all nations, employs all labor, controls the tastes and passions of men, mars or gives victory to all human hope and endeavor, and, in fact, like a mighty magician with magic wand, moves the world.

What quality is it, then, that exercises this almost omnipotent influence? Certainly not the cold, lifeless gold. No, sir. It is the law which sustains the same relation to the metal that life, the soul, does to the human body.

Gold is petted, praised, pushed by "Wallstreet," by England and other European nations, and by the executive branch of our Government, while silver is slandered, abused, and spurned, and yet some weak-minded people wonder that silver does not hold its own with gold.

Silver, clothed in the same robe, would be equally powerful, command the same respect, and exercise the same influence. Those who attack silver, on this floor and elsewhere, are not only illogical, but have not carefully read the history of money; or, if they have, they have forgotten its teachings. I find the following in Appleton's Encyclopedia, which is an acknowledged authority of the very highest character:

Money is the currency of the realm or of the country; the standard of payment, whether of coins, circulating notes, or any other commodity. Anything which freely circulates from hand to hand, as a common, acceptable medium of exchange in any country, is in such country money, even though it cease to be such, or to possess any value, in passing into another country. In a word, any article is determined to be money by reason of the performance by it of certain functions, without regard to its form or substance. Money has been termed by Mr. Henry C. Cary "the instrument of association," and the same writer has said of it that it is "a saving fund for labor, because it facilitates association and combination, giving utility to billions of millions of minutes that would be wasted did not a demand exist for them at the moment the power to labor had been produced." Baron Storch terms money "the marvelous instrument to which we are indebted for our wealth and civilization." Mr. Thorold Rogers has said: "Just as the development of language is essential to the intellectual growth of a people, so is a medium of exchange to civilization." Aristotle says of it, "that it exists not by nature, but by law."

How true is this doctrine, or, at least, how potent is the law under a civilized government in imparting the quality of acceptability for the payment of debts and the purchase of commodities to that which it recognizes as money, is clearly proved by the operations of the Bank of Venice during several centuries, throughout which time its deposits, which were never payable, but only transferrable on the books of the bank, were at a premium over coins, because they were the standard of payment furnished by the state and used for all large transactions. Indeed, this bank money was that which established the money of account, and in which the value of all coins was expressed. Further, on the testimony of Thomas Baring, we are assured that it was found impossible during the crisis of 1847 in London to raise any money whatever on a sum of £60,000 of silver.

During a similar crisis in Calcutta in 1864 it was equally impossible to raise even a single rupee on £20,000 of gold. The former was not a legal tender above 40 shillings, while the latter was not so for any sum whatever. About 1855 Holland adopted silver as the only legal tender at a fixed value, but attempted to coin gold coins having no such value, this only being regulated by the market price from day to day. After 200,000 florins (about \$80,000) had been coined the demand entirely ceased.

Some gentleman possessed of a poetical imagination, more accustomed to the drama than practical everyday life, says with a theatrical flourish, "I want an honest dollar, one worth a hun-

dred cents in gold, and good in Europe." This remarkable apostrophy seems to furnish the opponents of silver a battle cry. Let us examine these cabalistic words; they possess no real significance. There is no dollar containing a hundred cents, or honest dollar, or dollar made by the United States that is good in Europe. Three marine leagues from our shore every coin of the United States of gold or silver is bullion, a commodity, nothing more, unless some European state (and I know of none such) has by law made our coin a legal tender. The word "cents" has no signification in Europe as applied to money, and none in the United States except as established by law. Mountains of forensic eloquence have been wasted in the effort to prove that the Constitution of the United States does not confer upon Congress the power to say what shall constitute a dollar unless the thing mentioned by it is worth a dollar as a commodity.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, for a short time to discuss the legal meaning of the word "dollar." The Constitution of the United States declares, Article I, section 8, clause 5, "That Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin to fix the standard of weights and measures," and in section 10, "No State shall coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts."

Stripped of all sophistry this is a plain and direct declaration that whatever Congress declares to be money, no matter what the commodity value may be, that declaration fixes its money value. It is claimed by theorists of the gold standard persuasion that the words "regulate the value thereof" means that Congress shall ascertain its value and then declare what it is, but in the same sentence the Constitution also provides that Congress shall have the power to regulate, not ascertain, the value of foreign coin. The men who framed the Constitution of the United States understood our language, and wrote vigorous English, and had they intended to say "ascertain the value of domestic and foreign coin" they would undoubtedly have done so, and I submit that any man of ordinary intelligence who wishes honestly to ascertain what the framers of the Constitution meant by the words "regulate the value thereof" can have no trouble in arriving at a clear-cut conclusion.

The word "regulate," as used in the Constitution, clearly means to adjust, to fix, to establish, to direct precisely as Congress shall will, and the power to coin money granted to Congress by the Constitution is unlimited; but belongs to Congress alone and can not be delegated. It would be next to impossible to use clearer or stronger language, and as applied to gold and silver the true intent and meaning of the Constitution has never been seriously questioned until recently.

Aristotle, the great Greek philosopher and lawgiver, who flourished about 325 B. C., and who taught Alexander the Great, in speaking of money, says "that it exists not by nature, but by law." But why argue this question? If there is anything settled beyond all cavil by the decisions of the courts, it is that Congress, under the Constitution, has power to coin money and to fix the value of it, without regard to the market value of the substance of which it is made.

The supreme court of Pennsylvania, in 52d Pennsylvania State, page 36, says:

To regulate the value is to declare by proclamation or statute the value of the coin as a currency, and thus essentially, if not necessarily, make it a legal tender in payment of debts.

The court of appeals of New York, the home of "Wall street," in 27th New York Court of Appeals, page 459, uses the following language:

It is the lawful money of the United States only (made such by its authority) that can be effectually used for payment of debts, without reference to the intrinsic value of the thing tendered or paid.

For those who care to look it up, I cite the following cases, which are to like effect: Taylor vs. Robinson, 34 Federal Reports, page 681; 47 Wisconsin, page 557; 13 Wallace, page 604; 8 Wallace, pages 603 and 639; 12 Wallace, page 457; 14 Wallace, page 297; 15 Wallace, page 195; 38 Missouri, page 658; 25 New Hampshire, page 434; 27 New York, page 400; 69 Illinois, page 70; 39 Vermont, page 46, and a great many other decisions too numerous to mention here, hold that the power of Congress is complete to say what shall constitute a dollar.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in 12 Wallace, page 445, says:

It was designed to provide the same currency, having a uniform legal value in all the States. It was for this reason the power to coin money and regulate its value was conferred upon the Federal Government, while the same power, as well as the power to emit bills of credit, was withdrawn from the States. The States can no longer declare what shall be money or regulate its value. Whatever power there is over the currency is vested in Congress. If the power to declare what is money is not in Congress, it is annihilated. * * *

Even the advocates of a strict literal construction of the phrase, "to coin money and regulate the value thereof," while insisting that it defines the material to be coined as metal, are compelled to concede to Congress large discretion in all other particulars. The Constitution does not ordain what metals may be coined, or prescribe that the legal value of the metals when coined shall correspond at all with their intrinsic value in the market. Confessedly the power to regulate the value of money coined, and of foreign coins, is not exhausted by the first regulation. More than once in our history has the regulation been changed, without any denial of the power of Congress to change it, and it seems to have been left to Congress to determine alike what metal shall be coined, its purity, and how far its statutory value, as money, shall correspond from time to time with the market value of the same metal as bullion. * * *

But the obligation of a contract to pay money is to pay that which the law shall recognize as money when the payment is to be made. If there is anything settled by decision it is this, and we do not understand it to be controverted. No one ever doubted that a debt of \$1,000 contracted before 1834 could be paid by one hundred eagles coined after that year, though they contained no more gold than ninety-four eagles, such as were coined when the contract was made, and this, not because of the intrinsic value of the coin, but because of its legal value. The eagles coined after 1834 were not money until they were authorized by law, and had they been coined before without a law fixing their legal value, they could no more have paid a debt than uncoined bullion, or cotton, or wheat.

As I have said there is no such thing as an honest dollar. There is not now, and never has been, a dollar coined which was made by law or was in fact a standard of value. Value has no standard, it is an ideal thing; it is like faith or hope, intangible.

Therefore, when the words "honest dollar" are used they must mean a legal dollar; if they do not mean a legal dollar the expression is senseless.

If legal dollar is meant, the silver dollar is legal, therefore

honest. The silver dollar is a representation of value made so by law.

In the legal-tender cases, 12 Wallace, page 553, the Supreme Court of the United States says:

It is hardly correct to speak of a standard of values. The Constitution does not speak of it. It contemplates a standard for that which has gravity for extension; but value is an ideal thing. The coinage acts fix its unit as a dollar; but the gold or silver thing we call a dollar is, in no sense, a standard of a dollar. It is a representative of it.

Speaking of the idea that gold was a fixed standard of values, Archbishop Walsh, to whom I shall hereafter refer, says:

The popular notion, then, of the sovereign or pound sterling constituting a fixed standard of value is merely a popular delusion.

The sole foundation for that delusion manifestly is that in these countries the values of all commodities are commonly stated in terms of the pound sterling. * * *

The natural result of this method of expressing the values of commodities other than gold, is that, when prices rise or fall, the impression is conveyed to a superficial observer that it is the value of all other things that changes, the value of the sovereign remaining fixed.

DEMAND FOR MORE MONEY.

There are 1,500,000,000 of people on this globe, probably more. The total amount of gold money is \$3,600,000,000, and the supply of gold is rapidly decreasing.

Scientific investigation proves that a gold piece in constant circulation is destroyed in twenty years.

Increasing commerce, developments, inventions, civilization, are each and all rapidly expanding the demand for money. The cry is going up to-day in every nation and among all people for more money, and only a few here and there, not to exceed 3 per cent—the very rich and their attorneys—are resisting that demand; but the few are powerful because they possess the wealth and have a mortgage on the 97 per cent.

All kinds of fallacies are put forth, published, and repeated in behalf of gold; their name is legion. Among others it is claimed that the world is now at a gold standard—this in face of the fact that the last report of the Census Bureau, No. 1, 1892-1893, on imports, exports, etc., but recently issued, page 184, shows that of the gold and silver of the world there is of gold stock \$3,656,935,000, while there is a full legal tender of silver of \$3,401,100,000, and limited tender \$543,600,000, making the total of silver money in use \$3,944,700,000, or \$300,000,000 more of silver money in use than the entire stock of gold.

Thus it will be seen that of silver and gold combined there is sufficient to furnish only \$5 per capita if all in circulation. Drop silver and we have only \$2.40 per capita. No economic writer has ever up to this time had the hardihood to assert that there was money enough in circulation to properly supply the business demands of the world, and almost without exception it is agreed that there is not sufficient money in existence to properly supply the demand.

Every intelligent person knows that by adopting a gold standard our debts will necessarily be increased and prolonged, necessitating the payment of vast interest. Interest is what our creditors want. We want to pay them the principal. This is good sense and good financial policy; let us use every resource at our command to pay our debts, including every dollar in silver that we can get.

We are told that we fail now because we borrowed too much, and owe too much; that we ought not to have borrowed so much. Suppose this to be true. Is that any reason why this Congress, elected by the people, should add to our burdens by depriving us of more than half the means of paying our debts? Wall street banks are here asking relief for their own acts and their own mistakes, for doing business on confidence and not on capital. It is said that we want a sound money as a basis. A gold standard places this Government absolutely at the mercy of its creditors. Our European creditors could call now—on present outstanding securities—for every dollar of gold in this country.

Are we not as a nation doing a far more reckless business than the people of the West ever did? It is proposed to adopt a gold standard at a time when we owe \$50 for every dollar of gold we possess—placing ourselves in the hands of our creditors and the great money centers, giving to them the power to put up the price of gold at will, and absolutely bankrupt all business and all industry.

Does not common sense and common honesty toward our own people require us to protect their interests by standing by our legal right to pay all our debts in silver? If for no other reason we should stand by silver until we have paid our debts—at least every debt which we can legally pay with it—and we should do this at the present standard.

It is claimed, Mr. Speaker, that only the mining States are interested in this question, and I notice that some of the Wall street pictorial papers, Puck, I believe, has a big dog, a very proper illustration of this gold-standard idea, with a small tail. The tail is labeled "Four silver States," and the body of the animal is labeled "All the rest of the States." The illustration would have been much more apt and truthful with a small weasel head labeled "Gold standard," and all the rest of the body, tail and all, labeled "Free silver."

Gentlemen say that they do not see how it can affect the agricultural States, and I am asked, "How can it affect Kansas?" Let me illustrate. Let us suppose that the State of Kansas is indebted to the Eastern and foreign holders, \$300,000,000; the sum is greater, sir, and that the amount of interest that sum is drawing annually is at least 7 per cent. Ten years ago wheat was worth a dollar a bushel in Kansas, and had in fact been above that figure almost continuously since the war. The interest on three hundred millions at 7 per cent would be \$21,000,000. Ten years ago 21,000,000 bushels of wheat would have paid that interest.

Now, sir, wheat is only worth 40 cents per bushel, but the interest remains unchanged. Therefore, it requires 52,500,000 bushels of wheat to pay that interest. Three hundred million bushels of wheat would have paid the principal ten years ago or previous to that time, but now it requires 750,000,000 bushels of wheat to pay that debt. Kansas is an agricultural State, almost pure and simple, and she can from no discovered process become anything else for generations. The figures I have given you regarding wheat holds good with almost every other product of the farm and of the State. Not only that, but the enormous drain upon our resources to pay our interest necessarily compels us to increase our debt.

Taxes throughout the State average over 3 per cent, and all this great tax upon the energies of our people to pay interest and taxes which I have mentioned, is sapping life and hope. There is in the decline of prices absolutely no prospect of the redemption of this great debt. All the earnings must go to pay interest, and that interest pays no taxes or tribute to the State of Kansas, and leaves but little to defray the constantly increasing burden of tax necessary to carry on our State and municipal governments. And what is true, sir, of Kansas is substantially true of all the agricultural States. It is useless to tell the people of the agricultural States that it makes no difference to them whether we have a gold standard and less money, or whether we have the combined standard and more money.

As I have said, our people want to pay their debts, want to relieve themselves of these enormous burdens, but in order to do this they must have more money that must be accepted by our creditors. We will be satisfied when the volume of money is so increased that wheat will again be restored, on the average, to a dollar a bushel, and we will be satisfied with nothing less.

The mining States will not suffer as much by the adoption of a gold standard as will the agricultural people, because they are not so heavily indebted, and if their mining interest is closed out they have the consolation of knowing that they owe nothing.

From a financial standpoint the people of the agricultural States must have a larger currency, or absolute bankruptcy awaits them in the near future, and this bankruptcy will recoil upon our creditors because they will be compelled to take our lands in payment of our debts, and put tenantfarmers on them. This will result in negligence of the interests of the landowners, decay of improvements and falling off in the value of the lands, and the burden of local taxation will then begin to be felt and understood by them, and the history of Ireland will be repeated in the valley of the Mississippi.

This, sir, is not an idle vision. I have recently examined with much interest a pamphlet prepared by the Most Reverend Dr. Walsh, archbishop of Dublin, entitled "Bimetallism and Monometallism: What they are, and how they bear upon the Irish land question." Archbishop Walsh is now recognized as one of the most learned and conscientious men in the great church to which he belongs, and it is further well said of him that there is no man living who has at heart the interest of the common people of Ireland to a greater extent than he, and after a careful and thorough investigation of the question, bringing to bear upon the subject all his vast learning and splendid ability, he felt compelled to advise the Irish people not to attempt to purchase the farms upon which they live, under the land laws adopted by England in recent years, because of the constantly and necessarily falling prices of their products on account of the gold standard now sought to be forced upon the civilized world by the English Government.

From the examination of the Archbishop by the English Commission, I quote:

Q. The connection, your Grace, between bimetallism and the Irish land question does not seem very close?

A. (By the Archbishop). Yet nothing could be closer. The adoption of

bimetallism, or of some equivalent remedy, if there be an equivalent remedy, is, I am convinced, a matter of imperative necessity; that is, if the agricultural tenants of Ireland—and I do not at all limit this to Ireland—are to be saved from otherwise inevitable ruin.

It is transparently obvious to everyone who has mastered even the elementary facts and principles of the case. But it is disheartening to find that, notwithstanding all this, no interest seems to be taken in this grave question by many of the leaders of Irish opinion.

If things go on as they are, even the excellent land-purchase scheme which is associated with the name of Lord Ashbourne may become, before many years are over, a source of widespread disaster to the tenants who have purchased under it.

And a little further on the archbishop goes on to say:

The principle of the monometallists seems to be that things must become a great deal worse before they can become any better. * * * At all events, they have no practical remedy to propose.

And at page 11 the archbishop continues:

It is indisputably plain that the Irish tenants who have the misfortune to have their rents "fixed" for terms of fifteen years, under the land act of 1881—and, much more so, the Irish tenant purchasers, who have the misfortune to find themselves saddled with the obligation of making annual payments "fixed" for forty-nine years—are simply slipping down an inclined plane, with bankruptcy awaiting them at the bottom of it.

At page 30 the archbishop continues:

Monometallism, as we have it in Great Britain and Ireland, in Germany, and in so many other countries, tends to raise the value of gold, thereby favoring the interests of the capitalists, the interest of all those who have command of gold—money lenders and the like—favoring all such persons at the expense of the general community, and favoring also the interests of all creditors, the interests of all who have a claim to receive a fixed money payment from others, favoring these at the expense of their unfortunate debtors.

The archbishop then goes on to show by statistics that when England only had adopted a gold standard the commercial world was but little influenced thereby, and silver was not cast down as compared with gold until other European nations and the United States, in 1873, adopted a gold standard. At that time the disastrous effect of the gold craze began to make itself manifest, and has continued to grow in importance and increased ruin to the borrowers of money, until now the intelligent people of the world are beginning to understand the monstrous crime that has been perpetrated against them in the effort to wipe out more than half of the money of the world. But in the face of all the history of the last twenty years, monometallists still insist with a dogged resistance that gold has not gone up, but that everything else has gone down.

Suppose we admit for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that their theory is correct. Upon our side we know that it is not; the effect is precisely the same upon the business interests of this country and of the world. That is, that the holder and controller of gold is enriched, while the creditor and the business interests of the country are correspondingly burdened. The necessary result of this increased value of gold is to increase every existing obligation to pay a fixed amount of dollars.

Therefore, sir, if, in the language of Horace White, "We are not called upon to legislate for the debtor classes," let us, to say the least, not legislate against them, and increase their already too heavy burden.

I propose to add to my remarks a few tables of figures, showing that silver has not gone down in value, notwithstanding the

legislation of Europe and America against it, any more rapidly in its commodity value than the average products of labor throughout the world.

A PERMANENT CURRENCY.

The President says, and the gold-standard men say, and bi-metallists say, and we all say, that we want a permanent and stable currency, and we all agree that Congress has the power to establish that currency. For some years prior to 1792, when the first coinage act was passed, a general discussion had been going on among the founders of our Republic, and an earnest effort was made by the ablest men of that day—and no one will maintain that they have ever been surpassed in this country for ability to do precisely what we now claim we should do—Jefferson and Hamilton taking the leading parts. Finally it was agreed between those great men and those associated with them, uninfluenced by England or Wall street, but acting for the best interests of all, that both gold and silver should be coined in the United States at a ratio then fixed.

At that time there were no great security holders clamoring for a gold standard and a high price dollar, nor extensive silver mine owners demanding that silver receive special consideration. But these men, uninfluenced by any motive except the future development of the prosperity and grandeur of the young Republic, at whose christening they had stood godfather, decided on a bimetallic standard, and that bimetallic standard stood the test of eighty-one years without wronging or injuring anyone, and would be standing to-day as a monument of their wisdom and patriotism but for the fact that during the late war an immense debt was saddled upon the people of this country, and the holders of that debt, although a small yet a compact and skillful body, desired to increase the value of their holdings, not by the usual laws of trade, not in the ordinary and fair dealing methods, but through acts of the American Congress; and, among other unjust and wrongful acts, they procured the passage of the law in 1873, known as "the demonetization of silver" law, and from that day to this, sir, they have with organized, systematic, and skillful effort, through the mighty power of untold wealth, labored to maintain that law.

They knew then and they know now that by that legislative act and other acts procured by them the purchasing power of their securities was more than doubled, consequently the burdens laid upon the shoulders of the industrial people of the United States were necessarily more than doubled, and I am, sir, astonished to find the Chief Executive of this nation and a large number of distinguished gentlemen, who owe all they have and are to the industrial people, standing up before all the world to-day and insisting upon a perpetuation of the advantages gained by that act over the masses by the rich few.

Contemplating these wrongs and the position taken by quite a respectable number of distinguished citizens, I am led to exclaim, "Can this be America? Can we be the descendants of the Revolutionary fathers? Can this be the boasted land of liberty, and of equal rights to all?" And I can not refrain from the sad reflection that, notwithstanding our boasted Christian

intelligence, we are following in the footsteps of the great majority of empires that have heretofore sprung into existence, flourished, and fallen, almost universally fallen through corruption in high places and injustice on the part of the rulers toward the people.

Let us, sir, to-day, at this extra session of Congress, call a halt, and do our best to restore as far as we may, under our Constitution and laws, to the masses, to the yeomanry, and to all the people the rights which have been so unjustly taken from them; and in doing that, as a first step, let us wipe from the statute books all patchwork on the silver question and restore this country to the bimetalism which existed prior to the 14th day of February, 1873. Do this, and generations to come, whose tiny feet have not yet touched the shores of time, will praise and bless the patriotism of this Congress.

It is charged, sir, upon this floor, and in newspapers and magazines throughout the country, that the representatives and people of the silver-mining States and Territories are unjustly trying to compel this Government to buy their silver at an exorbitant price for their own selfish interests and gain.

The State that I partially represent produces no silver; therefore I think I may answer these charges from an impartial standpoint. I have mingled with the people of the mining States very extensively, and I have never yet heard the demand urged by them, or any of them, that the Government buy their products. On the contrary, sir, all they have ever asked, or are asking now, is that silver be restored to its right of free coinage as it existed at the time they settled and begun to develop those States and Territories, and this they have a right to insist upon, and only those who prefer England and Europe, and our creditors, to the people of these States and Territories, are objecting to their claims.

It is universally admitted in works of political economy that any such thing as a commodity with absolute stability of value is unattainable.

The most important characteristic of a good monetary standard is that it should preserve comparative stability of value. The principal reason why, of the multitude of commodities that have been used for the material of money at different times, gold and silver has survived as the fittest, is because their great durability renders the total stock extremely large compared with the annual supply, and thus eliminates one element of instability of value. Another special advantage of gold and silver for monetary purposes is that both the weight and purity of the coins made from them may be easily ascertained.

Only fools believe, or can be made to believe, that gold never falls in price or value as a commodity; and even when coined in money, that it does not change in value.

If the world's stock of gold should run low every man of ordinary intelligence understands that the price of gold would go up, not that other commodities or labor would go down.

As I have stated, there can be no absolute standard of value. Value is a sliding scale and changes according to the demand of each and every particular commodity, even though that commodity may be money itself.

The immense production of gold in California was of great benefit to the human race, not because the gold was needed, but because it was generally accepted as a money standard. I use the word "money" standard distinct from "value" standard. Money was needed throughout the world, and the price of commodities and wages went up everywhere because of the discovery of gold in California and Australia. Inventions, improvements, and civilization leaped into new life, and progressed more in fifty years after the discovery of gold in those two countries than it had for a hundred and fifty years previous thereto.

Money and plenty of it is the spirit of all enterprise, of all commerce, and of all development, and no people at any time in the world's history, with a small circulation of money, have ever progressed to any considerable extent.

Adopt a universal gold standard with the small amount of gold that there is now in the world and you place gold absolutely beyond the reach of the many, clip the wings of commerce, close institutions of learning and churches, stop inventions, and reverse the hand of civilization on the world's dial plate and cause it to run backward instead of forward.

Every gentleman who has discussed this question upon this floor, without exception, I believe, admits that we need more money, that we ought to increase the volume of our currency. In fact, the gold standard men are here asking us to issue bonds with which to buy gold, and the bankers of New York are issuing illegal clearing-house certificates to take the place of money. The universal cry is going up all over the civilized world for a larger circulating medium, and the man would be reckless, indeed, who would say to the American people that we have too much money to-day, or even that we have enough.

How then are we to increase our circulating medium? The answer of the gold standard men is logically, whatever words they may desire to answer in, "by cutting off more than half of the supply." In other words, in order to increase the supply, cut off the production.

In some of the Western States crops can only be produced by irrigation, and even the gold standard men in the United States would regard the farmer who must irrigate his farm as a very foolish man, who would during the dry season of the year, and when his crops most need a supply of moisture, cut off more than half of the water which was obtainable; or having two streams flowing into his ditch turned the larger one adrift. And likewise would they deem a man foolish who had a house that was not sufficiently ventilated, who for the purpose of improving the ventilation would close half the windows and doors.

I was astonished the other day to hear the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] say:

I want to say right here, lest I should overlook it later, that if we had never had the Bland-Allison act, nor the act of 1890, sometimes called the Sherman act, the circulating medium of this country would to-day be over two billions of dollars, and a very large part of it would be in gold coin.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, at the time the gentleman made that declaration that he was jesting, but I afterwards, in private conversation with him, ascertained that he was in real earnest. What a remarkable proposition! What is there to support it?

If we had two thousand millions of gold in the United States, all the rest of the civilized world would only have one billion six hundred millions, and think of the desperate condition of the rest of the human race, if, as he contends, gold is the only honest money.

History does not bear out Mr. HARTER'S proposition. England, conceded to be the wealthiest of all nations, has had a gold standard for seventy years, with the rest of the world most of the time using either a silver or bimetallic standard. Not only that; she is the creditor of the nations which deal with her to the extent of \$10,000,000,000. So says Mr. Gladstone, and yet, with all those advantages in her favor, she only has \$18 per capita in circulation, and that not all in gold.

I was curious to know, Mr. Speaker, upon what theory the distinguished gentleman arrived at his conclusions, and I learned that he based them on the trade balance in our favor for the last twenty years taken in the aggregate. But, Mr. Speaker, that proposition does not hold good, for during those twenty years we have exported silver in excess of our imports to the gross amount of \$290,000,000. Even last year, when the balance of trade was largely against us, we exported in excess of our imports over \$14,000,000 of silver.

Sir, a few years ago our Western people were told that what they needed was protection, that the McKinley bill was the goose that would lay golden eggs for all of us. What was the result? We got the goose, but we never got the eggs. In the year 1892, as shown by the Treasurer's report just issued, we exported \$99,000,000 worth less of breadstuffs, \$70,000,000 less of cotton, and \$10,000,000 less of animals than for the year 1891. In round numbers, of farm products alone we exported \$200,000,000 less in 1892 than we did in 1891, and we sold what we did export at less prices, instead of increased prices.

Now let us see, on the other hand, if we made that up in the increased sale of manufactured articles. I find, on examination of the same report, that we did not; that the increased sale of manufactured articles, if any, was merely nominal, not to exceed \$10,000,000.

Now, sir, while I do not charge all this loss to the demonetization of silver by European nations, and partial demonetization upon the part of our own Government, yet the fact remains that ever since the demonetization of silver Europe has been paying less prices for our products, and the price of our products on the average has gone down in the European market more rapidly as a whole than silver has gone down.

I find, sir, in the July number of the Annals of the American Academy of Science, published in Philadelphia, an article by Prof. Lotz, of the University of Munich, a gold standard advocate, and in that article he admits that the demonetization of silver in Germany caused a great falling off in price of German products in Germany, and he also admits that the landowners of Germany are just as much opposed to the gold standard as are the landowners and laboring people of the United States. In fact, sir, I challenge the attention of this House and of the country to the fact that wherever silver has been demonetized by any nation or people it has resulted in an immediate falling off of the

price of labor and of the products of the soil, and that it is not the farmers or laboring class of any civilized country that has demanded a single standard, but everywhere, and at all times, it has been the bankers and money-lenders, and the wealthy.

In the face of all these facts how can gentlemen stand upon this floor or go before the country and defend their attempt to force a gold standard upon America?

Germany could afford a gold standard better than the United States can, for the reason that she produces only a nominal amount of silver, and in order to get silver for money she must buy it.

England could afford a gold standard better than any other nation, for two reasons—the principal one, because she is the largest creditor nation in the world, and is not indebted, except to her own people; and for the further reason that her colonies produce four times as much gold as they do silver; and for the further reason that all her trade with India, her largest colony, is carried on on a silver basis. Therefore, it is to her interest to force silver down, so that she can buy it cheap and coin it at a ratio of 15 to 1 for India, thereby making enormous profits on the silver she purchases, and thus enabling her, as shown by Uncle Jerry Rusk, to pay for India wheat in rupees which cost her less than half their money value—two years ago she coined \$65,000,000 of silver, as shown by the report of the Director of the Mint—thus enabling her to force down American wheat, which she has successfully done.

England, sir, seems to be legislating for England, and we find none of her statesmen proclaiming against the injustice done her American debtors. In fact, it is her policy to buy our products at as low figures as she possibly can. England, sir, has never at any time said that she wanted a dollar good in the United States, but has attended to her own business and her own interests, and quite successfully, too.

Germany could better afford a single standard than the United States, for the reason not only that she is not a silver-producing country, but because what she owes as an empire is due her own people. Consequently, whatever interest she pays goes to the Germans, and not to a foreign people.

A sound currency, therefore, must be an honest currency, must be a currency equally fair to creditor and debtor, that will maintain a general uniformity of prices for a long series of years, so that the contracts made this year to be paid in fifty years would require the same amount of labor, and no more, to pay them then than they would if paid now. This definition can not apply to gold. Gold never has been fair. It is a tyrant, taking advantage of necessity. All understand that both gold and silver would make a more flexible currency than gold alone. Therefore the two combined do not answer the true definition of a "sound currency," but they approximate to it more nearly than gold alone, because the two are broader and enable the Government to enlarge and contract as the demands of the people may require.

A "sound currency" means a currency that will give employment to all labor, supply the demands of every industry, and enable every man that strives for a dollar, honestly and indus-

triously, to obtain it. If this is not the definition of a "sound currency," then, sir, I am not in favor of a sound currency.

THE WEST AND SOUTH DEMAND EQUITY.

On the 22d day of April, 1868, JOHN SHERMAN said in the Senate of the United States:

Before we return to specie payments the debt ought to be funded. It can not be funded on as favorable terms after we return to specie payments. The very abundance of the currency obviously enables us to fund the debt at a low rate of interest; and it is just and right, as the debt was contracted upon an inflated currency, that upon that currency the debt ought to be funded in its present form.

Nearly two years later Mr. SHERMAN pointed with pride, in a speech made February 24, 1868, to the above extract.

Continuing his speech in the Senate February 24, 1868, Mr. SHERMAN said, speaking of the power given the Secretary of the Treasury in 1866 to fund the national debt:

Within two years he [the Treasurer] contracted the legal-tender currency \$160,000,000, and the plain United States notes over \$40,000,000 (making a contraction of the noninterest bearing debt of over two hundred millions).

At the time this law was passed, April 12, 1866, the total amount of 5-20 bonds was \$666,000,000, and the great mass of the debt was in what are called currency obligations, the principal of which undoubtedly could have been paid in currency.

Believing, as he did [the Treasurer], that the best way to resumption of specie payments was by rapid and steady contraction of the currency, he entered upon his policy.

Now, what has been the result? Why, sir, in April, 1866, the price of gold was 125. It had steadily declined from the close of the war until it had reached its lowest point in April, 1866, the time of the passage of this law (funding act and resumption acts).

What was the result? From that time to this gold has advanced, varying between 130 and 140, and has never from that day to this reached the price at which it stood at the passage of this act.

Are we any nearer specie payments now than then? Not at all.

Now, sir, what has been the policy of this Government? First, our floating and noninterest-bearing debt has been taken up and funded into an interest-bearing debt, while the interest-bearing debt has been allowed to run and been continued.

Almost every dollar of our war debt was payable in silver, and our Government has steadily, stealthily, and in violation of the rights of our people, year after year, made it a gold debt, and today, sir, we are asked to put the finishing touches upon this masterpiece of villainy by stopping the coinage of silver as money.

I will quote a portion of the law under which legal-tender notes were issued:

Such notes herein authorized shall be receivable in payment of all taxes, internal-revenue duties, excise, debts, and demands of every kind due the United States, except duties on imports; and all claims and demands against the United States, of every kind whatsoever, except for interest upon bonds and notes which shall be payable in coin, and shall also be lawful money and a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, within the United States, except duties on imports, and interest as aforesaid.

I know it will be argued by the opposition that the legal tender there authorized to be issued was limited to \$150,000,000, but before the bonds were issued that limitation was removed. By act of Congress, dated March 3, 1863, the legal-tender act of February 25, 1862, was amended and enlarged.

We find in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Chase, published December, 1863, the following:

On that day, March 3, 1863, the act to provide ways and means for the support of the Government received the approval of the President [Lincoln] and became a law. In addition to various provisions for loans, it contained clauses repealing restrictions, affecting the regulation of the five-twenties, and thus disengaging that important loan from the embarrassment which had previously rendered it almost unavailable.

Almost immediately after this enlarging act was passed the Secretary of the Treasury sold the bonds, and "they were sold under a basis of currency of \$450,000,000," says JOHN SHERMAN in his speech to which I refer.

SHERMAN further says, in that speech (see Congressional Globe, part 5, Thirty-ninth and Fortieth Congresses):

I say that equity and justice are amply satisfied, if we redeem these bonds in the same money, of the same intrinsic value, it bore at the time they were issued.

Gentlemen may reason about this matter over and over again, and they can not come to any other conclusion; at least, that has been my conclusion after the most careful consideration. Senators are in the habit sometimes, in order to defeat the argument of an antagonist, of saying this is repudiation. Why, sir, every citizen of the United States has conformed his business to the legal-tender clause.

SHERMAN was speaking of greenbacks then; they have no intrinsic value.

It will be seen that the entire debt was payable in coin.

I wish, sir, to adopt Mr. SHERMAN'S views as there expressed, as my views now, and to apply them to silver, which is legal money, and when coined a legal tender for all debts.

Gentlemen roar dishonor, repudiation, dishonest dollar, etc. Will you hear our Western farmers and miners when they show that this debt must be paid with labor and products which have fallen more than silver? In other words, silver as a commodity will buy more of the products of the country and more of labor than gold would buy in 1873.

When I hear men talk of national disgrace, dishonor, and repudiation, I feel that I would be more than justified in replying "Shylock!" No, this would be unjust to Shylock, who only wanted his pound of flesh; but extortioner, oppressor, tyrant, robber.

No, gentlemen, stop your rhetoric, stop your lofty periods, stop giving us sentiment, and give us argument; give us justice, allow us the right to pay our debts in both silver and gold.

There is something remarkable, Mr. Speaker, about the radical change of opinion upon the part of our distinguished statesmen and party leaders. And what is most singular is that such changes are always favorable to the money powers.

Such men as SHERMAN and Carlisle, and a number of other distinguished gentlemen not necessary to mention, I trust will be able to explain to their constituents the wherefore of their changes, and I hope I may be pardoned for suggesting to their constituents that they demand a solid reason for their conversion.

There is one other strong point to which I wish to refer before I close, and that is, that our security holders all say that they are laboring for our interests, for the interests of the laborer, yet they seem to lose their temper when the laborer views their action in a different light.

If they really love us, if they are in good faith when they talk of our interests, why do they not give us some real solid evidence of that regard? Why do they not say, "We see that your products and your labor are bringing less and less each year, and in order to place you on a par with us we will reduce the face of our bonds, our mortgages, and the interest on our bonds and mortgages in exact proportion to the reduction of your products?"

Why not bring forward a bill and push it through this Congress, for the purpose of relieving the debtors in this country, that all debts shall be based on the price of leading products at the time of the creation of the debt; and if products and wages go up, more dollars would be required to pay, while if prices went down, less would be required in exact proportion.

Horace White, in his fine literary paper read before the Chicago monetary convention held last June, discloses the dragon's claws when he says "that nobody would be especially benefited by free silver but the debtor class." Mark you, he confesses that it would benefit the debtor class, but he goes on to say blandly, "that Congress is not called upon to legislate for the debtor class."

Now, as the debtor class make up fully 90 per cent of our population, it necessarily follows that we are called upon to legislate for the 10 per cent, or the creditor class.

It was claimed on this floor by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], and concurred in by a number of gentlemen on that side of the House, that the way to compel England to adopt a bimetallic standard was to adopt a gold standard for the United States. I mean no offense, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this fallacy is too apparent to require serious consideration.

What! Compel England to do what we want her to do by doing as she wants us to do? What would you say of a general commanding an army who would take his army into the camp of the enemy and surrender for the purpose of defeating his enemy? Or what would you think of a Christian church which, for the purpose of converting the Chinese to the Christian religion, would adopt as their creed and articles of faith the Chinese religion? Or what would you think of a navigator who, starting to discover the North Pole, would direct his ships toward the equator?

There is only one theory upon which the argument of the gentleman can be based, and that is the starvation theory. That might in long years win, but in winning in that way we should sacrifice nine-tenths of the American people and send millions of people throughout the world through starvation to paupers' graves. The way to bring England to our view is to be broader and fairer; gain from her, as we can, the trade of Mexico and the South American states, India, China, Japan, and all the rest of the East.

Let us have more money, all the silver that Europe has, and we will take from England the mastery of the ocean, and the Stars and Stripes will be hailed with delight by the people of all nations, and "Yankee Doodle" and "The Girl I Left Behind Me" will be sung by American sailors in every seaport in the world.

This proposition is not a mere idle suggestion, brewed by me

for the occasion of this discussion, but it is concurred in by very able authorities.

I submit a few tables and extracts.

The following table, sets forth, by means of Mr. Sauerbeck's index-numbers, the striking contrast between the relative value of gold and silver in the years preceding and in the years following 1873:

Years from 1873 back to 1854.	Yearly index- numbers of silver.	Year on from 1873 on to 1892.	Yearly index- numbers of silver.
1873	97.4	1873	97.4
1872	99.2	1874	95.8
1871	99.7	1875	93.3
1870	99.6	1876	86.7
1869	99.6	1877	90.2
1868	99.6	1878	86.4
1867	99.7	1879	84.2
1866	100.5	1880	85.9
1865	100.3	1881	85.0
1864	100.9	1882	84.9
1863	101.1	1883	83.1
1862	100.9	1884	83.3
1861	99.9	1885	79.9
1860	101.4	1886	74.6
1859	102.0	1887	73.3
1858	101.0	1888	70.4
1857	101.5	1889	70.2
1856	101.0	1890	78.4
1855	100.7	1891	74.1
1854	101.1	1892	65.4

This table gives, in parallel columns, for the years 1874-'92, the index numbers for the 45 commodities comprised in Mr. Sauerbeck's computation, and the index numbers of silver for the same years:

Years.	Mr. Sauerbeck's index numbers.		Years.	Mr. Sauerbeck's index numbers.	
	Index number of 45 principal commod- ities.	Index number of silver.		Index number of 45 principal commod- ities.	Index number of silver.
1874	102	95.8	1884	76	83.3
1875	96	93.3	1885	72	79.9
1876	95	86.7	1886	69	74.6
1877	94	90.2	1887	68	73.8
1878	87	86.4	1888	70	70.4
1879	83	84.2	1889	72	70.2
1880	88	85.9	1890	72	78.4
1881	85	85.0	1891	72	74.1
1882	84	84.9	1892	68	65.4
1883	82	83.1			

It is sufficient to note that in one case the index numbers show a fall from 102 to 68, and in the other a fall from 95 to 65. What more striking evidence could be looked for that the fall, all round, is the result of the rise of gold?

Let us make friendly treaties with the silver nations of the earth. I quote from a very significant editorial from the London Standard of a few days since, which is the leading organ of English finances. It says:

What if the United States should now join Mexico in declaring for the free coinage of silver, and throwing over gold as too dear? What if the two American continents held out the hand to Asia and said: "Let us have the white metal for our standard?" Chile, now hard-hit, would eagerly respond and all the states of South America and Mexico, with Japan and China and Java—in fact the whole mighty East (which cares little for Simla). It is a great danger to which the present outburst of alarm and fear must not render England oblivious.

And again, the Mexican Financier, the leading paper to-day in all financial and governmental affairs of Mexico, says in its issue of July 22:

If Europe demonetizes silver, if it refuses to exhaust every effort to adjust the two money metals, she will find her export trade with the younger nations of the New World and with the older countries of Asia steadily diminishing, and her factories will close down in proportion to her loss of trade, while in China and India, and in all Latin America, manufacturing will become the favored investment for European capital. The nations which can feed themselves will surely begin to manufacture for themselves; while Europe, which can not feed its starving populations, will certainly lose its best customers.

And again a leading daily paper of the city of Mexico says in its issue of July 22:

A project is on foot here to unite all Latin-American nations in a monetary league to resist the depreciation in silver. The depreciation, it is asserted, is out of all proportion to what it should be and debtor nations should unite to defend their interests against conspiracy. Public opinion would support a monetary league with the United States, transferring the trade of Latin-America to Americans in return for a freer entrance of raw material.

Let us adopt on the other hand a gold standard and we will become the tail to England's kite for a long period of years, and no gold-standard man can give us any idea when we shall get out from under her dominion.

I fully concur in the proposition that values ought to be measured by more than one standard, but if they are to be measured by one standard, and one standard only, that standard, sir, ought to be labor. All debts, if paid by a fixed standard, should be estimated by the amount of day's labor it required to pay them. It would be fairer to the world to ascertain about how much labor should bring in every department and calling of life, and when obligations are to be met, let the calculation be made of how many days' labor, or the equivalent thereto in money or other commodities, it would require to meet them.

On this basis there could be no cornering or monopolizing of prices. I am well aware, sir, that the money-lenders of the world would fight such a plan to the death. But after all the higher and nobler idea of government is the benefit of the many, and the few must yield some of the advantages that they possess over the many for the common good of all.

We are told that the United States can not maintain bimetalism alone. France and the United States did maintain it for seventy years, and the United States is stronger now than the two together were from 1803 to 1873. In fact, we maintained it independently from 1792 to 1803, if the assertions of the gold-standard men are true. During the late war and for a number

of years thereafter we maintained a paper standard, being without both gold and silver, and we suffered no loss but gained by the adoption of a paper standard. We have the power to stop coining money when we have a satisfactory amount of money in circulation for our people, say fifty or sixty dollars per capita, if we should ever reach that amount.

Why, sir, if we coined all the silver, without loss, that comes out of our mines annually, and nobody believes that we would be seriously troubled with foreign silver, and there was no loss of money now in circulation, we would only add about a dollar per capita per annum more money to our circulation, and it would take this continued for twenty-five or thirty years to bring us up to \$50 per capita. Besides, much of our silver would go abroad, if we wished to pay our debts with it, and we have a right to do so, at its coined value without any change in the amount the law now places in the silver dollar, and we ought to do that in order to use our own commodities and protect ourselves against the unjust demands of foreign creditors.

Herewith I give a table of the silver and gold products of the world in 1892:

World's production of gold and silver, calendar years 1890, 1891, and 1892.

[Kilogram of gold, \$994.60. Kilogram of silver, \$41.56. Coining rate in United States silver dollars.]

75

Countries.	1890.				1891.				1892.			
	Gold.		Silver.		Gold.		Silver.		Gold.		Silver.	
	Kilos.	Dollars.	Kilos.	Dollars.	Kilos.	Dollars.	Kilos.	Dollars.	Kilos.	Dollars.	Kilos.	Dollars.
United States	49,421	32,845,000	1,695,500	70,405,000	49,917	33,175,000	1,814,642	75,416,500	49,654	33,000,000	1,804,377	74,989,900
Australia	44,851	29,808,000	258,212	10,731,300	47,245	31,399,000	311,100	12,929,300	50,964	33,370,800	418,087	17,375,677
Mexico	1,154	767,000	1,211,646	50,356,000	1,605	1,000,000	1,275,205	53,000,000	1,699	1,147,500	1,419,634	59,000,000
European countries:												
Russia	85,296	23,458,000	15,021	624,300	36,300	24,125	13,859	578,000	35,429	23,546,000	13,234	550,000
Germany			182,086	7,567,500			190,600	7,921,330			6190,600	7,921,330
Austria-Hungary	2,104	1,398,500	50,613	2,103,500	2,105	1,399,648	52,020	2,161,951	62,100	1,399,648	652,020	2,161,951
Sweden	88	58,500	4,180	173,700	110	73,100	3,658	152,000	£110	73,100	£3,658	152,000
Norway			5,539	230,200			5,665	235,400			£5,665	235,400
Italy	211	140,320	10,110	426,200	142	94,280	27,583	1,146,370	£142	94,280	£27,583	1,146,370
Spain			651,502	2,140,400			651,502	2,140,400			£51,502	2,140,400
Turkey	£10	7,000	£1,323	55,000	£10	7,000	£1,323	55,000	£10	7,000	£1,323	55,000
France	185	123,000	71,117	2,955,600	£200	133,000	£71,117	2,955,600	£200	133,000	£71,117	2,955,600
Great Britain	4	3,900	9,075	377,200	101	67,000	9,075	377,200	100	66,600	6,156	255,650
Dominion of Canada	2,506	1,666,000	12,464	518,000	1,392	925,000	9,797	407,100	£1,392	925,000	£9,797	407,100
South American countries:												
Argentine Republic	123	82,000	14,680	610,100	£123	82,000	14,918	620,000	£123	82,000	£14,918	620,000
Colombia	5,416	3,600,000	19,971	830,000	5,224	3,472,000	31,232	1,298,000	£5,234	3,472,000	£31,232	1,298,000
Bolivia	101	67,000	301,112	12,514,200	£101	67,000	372,666	15,488,000	£101	67,000	£372,666	15,488,000
Chile	£2,162	1,436,600	73,700	3,063,000	£2,162	1,436,600	70,794	2,942,000	£2,162	1,436,600	£70,794	2,942,000
Brazil	670	445,300									£659	438,000
Venezuela	2,512	1,670,000			1,504	1,000,000			£1,504	1,000,000		
Guiana (British)	1,093	1,125,000			2,708	1,800,000			£2,708	1,800,000		
Guiana (Dutch)	668	444,200			816	542,000			£816	542,000		
Guiana (French)	£825	548,000			1,502	998,229			£1,502	998,229		
Peru	104	69,000	65,791	2,734,300	113	75,000	74,879	3,112,000	£113	75,000	£74,879	3,112,000
Uruguay	140	93,500			140	93,500			£140	93,500		
Central American States	226	150,000	48,123	2,000,000	246	163,492	48,123	2,000,000	£246	163,492	£48,123	2,000,000
Japan	764	507,700	42,468	1,765,000	£765	508,400	£42,282	1,798,800	£765	508,400	£42,282	1,798,800
Africa	14,877	9,887,000			21,366	14,199,600			33,207	22,060,578		
India (British)	3,009	2,000,000			3,754	2,495,000			4,600	3,057,900		

26

Korea	1, 128	750, 000	-----	-----	1, 128	e 750, 000	-----	-----	1, 128	e 750, 000	-----	-----
Total	170, 248	113, 149, 620	4, 144, 233	172, 234, 500	181, 339	120, 518, 849	4, 493, 100	186, 732, 957	190, 814	130, 816, 627	4, 730, 647	196, 605, 184

a Estimate of the Bureau of the Mint. *b* Product of Hungarian mines in 1891. Austrian mines in 1890. *c* Estimated the same as officially communicated for 1888. *d* Estimated the same as officially communicated for 1886. *e* Estimated the same as officially communicated for 1890. *f* Estimated the same as officially communicated for 1889. *g* Estimated the same as officially communicated for 1887. *h* Rough estimates, based on exports. *i* Product of imperial mines, 1891. Private mines, 1889. *k* Estimated the same as officially for 1891.

This clearly shows that we ought to stand by silver in the interest of American products and industry. I challenge any gentleman to produce in history an instance where any country has been injured by having too much silver, or whose decay has been traced or charged to an overburden of silver. Aye, more, I call upon the gold standard advocates to point out what country has been injured by bimetalism, and in what way it has injured it.

I am radically opposed, sir, to a change in the present ratio, for the reason that all debts and contracts now outstanding have been made with reference to that ratio. Our bonds are payable in coin at the present ratio. The ratio throughout the world is substantially the ratio now existing in the United States, and why should we with our debts payable in silver, and the leading silver-producing country of the world, take the lead in debasing our own products? The mere mention of the fact ought to be sufficient to answer the objections to the present standard.

Senator Plumb, himself a banker, but a patriotic and honest Senator, said in the Senate of the United States, a little more than two years ago, that if the United States adopted free coinage there could be no question but what in a very short time the parity between gold and silver at its present ratio of coinage would be established all over the world.

Judge Perkins, on this floor, in the best speech ever delivered by him, said with emphasis, "that every man, woman, and child knew that if we had free coinage of silver that in less than six months it would be on a parity with gold." And Mr. Carlisle, the present Secretary of the Treasury, made substantially the same statements, at different times, once in this House and once in the Senate.

There is no valid reason given, nor can there be, why the United States should favor her debts being paid in gold where they are payable in silver, and saying to the ever-exacting creditor, "We will, as a mere matter of grace, give you more silver than we contracted to give you."

If you increase, sir, the number of grains which shall constitute a dollar in silver, at the same time and to the same proportion as I have shown by tables you will increase the burdens of the debtors throughout this country and throughout the world, because if the United States increases the ratio between gold and silver there can be no question but what Europe will immediately follow.

Europe is awaiting now, sir, to see what the United States will do with silver, and the great mass of the European people, from the best information that I can gain, are hoping that the United States will stand by the silver dollar as it now stands. Aye, sir, more than that. The single-standard men of England and of Germany and of almost all of Europe are becoming more liberal in sentiment; in other words, they are being cured by experience of their gold "fetichism."

There seems to be a studied effort to deceive the people as to the amount of silver coined in the United States prior to 1873. There was coined in round numbers by the mints of the United States prior to 1873 \$146,218,000. It is true that of all this amount only a little over eight millions was in silver dollars. But the

Government of the United States had coined all the silver that had come to its mints, but it needed the major portion for fractional currency.

Gentlemen of golden opinions who talk about paying cheap money to the widows and orphans who hold mortgages and bonds, even if their claim possessed the merit of truthfulness, are wholly forgetful for the widows and orphans that seek employment and food and clothing, while the latter class outnumber the former in the ratio of a thousand to one in the United States alone. I may be wrong, sir, but I can not help feeling that the rights of the thousand ought first to be considered. The fact that the former class possesses mortgages and bonds is sufficient evidence that they do not require immediate relief.

The true difficulty here and throughout all this broad land is unjust usury, the collection of stupendous revenues on paper, with no real money behind it or honest capital to support it.

If the money on which we are paying interest was all in circulation, there would be, and could be, no panic or financial trouble. Prices would be three to five times what they now are, labor would be employed at remunerative prices, and business would be in holiday attire.

I gather, sir, from the last November's report of the Comptroller of the Currency that there is about \$1,000,000,000 of money in actual circulation; \$500,000,000 is held by the banks as a reserve, and the banks manage to do \$4,500,000,000 of business on that reserve, and charge and collect interest thereon, thereby actually doing business on \$4,000,000,000 of confidence.

A few months ago the representatives of these confidence plans had a little meeting in New York, the purpose of which was to bring about a gold standard, and they started the wolf-cry against the Sherman law, and proclaimed a want of confidence and pretended to be scared. The people thought that these representatives of the confidence plan were scared, that they were in earnest, and the people really did get scared and began to demand their money. The \$500,000,000 being exhausted, the banks had nothing left but confidence to meet their demands, and the necessary result was failure.

We wonder, sir, that they are asking the Government to restore that \$4,000,000,000 of confidence. Yes, sir; they want the Government to go into partnership with them in this confidence game, but the people are opposed to the Government becoming a copartner in any such a fraudulent practice, and are asking for money, asking this Government to do its duty and give them money, currency with which to do business. Now, sir, shall we consult the wishes of the people or of the banks? This is the whole question.

In this crisis, let us first provide for the free coinage of silver. Second, let us direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue \$100,000,000 of greenbacks, which under existing laws we have the power to do. This, sir, will save a large amount of interest, and restore confidence on a sound basis.

I wish to remark, Mr. Speaker, right here, that no party can survive the useless issuing of interest-bearing bonds at this time. The American people are aroused, weary of paying interest, and

will not tamely submit to the compounding of interest-bearing obligations, and they ought not to do so.

Let us set our great, big, loyal, national foot down on all foreign and aristocratic influences, and, like men imbued with the spirit of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, legislate for the common people, America and Americans.

75

