

SILVER.

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. RAWLINS,
OF UTAH,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1893.



WASHINGTON.
1893.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOSEPH L. RAWLINS,

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. RAWLINS said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] who spoke this morning complained that the people from the mining States had an undue representation and an improper number of votes in the Congress of the United States. I speak as the representative of more people, I take it, than are contained in the district from which the gentleman himself comes. My constituency is composed of about 240,000 people. I have no vote upon the floor of this House; neither have my constituents any vote at the other end of the Capitol.

All that I can do here is to speak in behalf of their interests; and I desire to say that while we have a number of people in that Territory engaged in the industry known as silver mining—or rather they were engaged in it, for they can not be said to be engaged in it now—yet I do not speak for the protection of any industry in the Territory I represent. I am not a protectionist. I speak only for those people as their interests are linked with the common welfare of the country. This Congress has been called together to provide a remedy for a great financial disturbance.

In order to intelligently provide something which will operate as a cure for the ills which afflict us, it is first important to inquire what is the cause, and, in seeking for the cause, intelligent men will find it only in something which has sufficient potency to create the widespread effects which constitute the phenomena of distress not only in this, but the other nations of the world. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] who spoke this morning ascribed all these evils to a little act of the American Congress known as the Sherman act, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. HENDRIX] conceded that that was not an adequate cause. He said that the Sherman act could not have caused the general financial wreckage which began in Australia in the early part of this year.

He might have said that it could not have produced the disasters which ensued in England upon the Baring failure. He might have said that it did not cause that continuous and everlasting decline in prices, in the value of all productive indus-

tries, which has been going on from the year 1873 down to the present hour.

The Sherman act! Has any gentleman pointed out what there is in any provision of that statute which could have had such a baleful influence upon business in this or any other country—a measure involving only the expenditure of the value of 4,500,000 ounces of silver every month. If such an expenditure were made for the construction of a man-of-war, to lie idly upon the sea at the threshold of New York Harbor, would gentlemen from that city come here and say that expenditure was going to work the ruin of this country?

Silver is not paid for in gold. The terms of the statute, the contract obligation of the Government of the United States, did not provide that silver should be paid for in gold. By the terms of the contract under which every Treasury note is issued, both parties are bound to understand that the option is reserved to the Government to pay either in gold or silver. From no ethical and from no legal standpoint could any gentleman stand on this floor or elsewhere and claim that this Government has broken its obligation or violated its plighted faith in exercising the option which is thus retained.

Every man who originally takes the note is bound to understand the terms of the contract. Every man to whom it is transferred knows the terms. Any Englishman, any American knows that there is a trust in behalf of the people of the United States that the Secretary shall exercise his discretion in the payment either in gold or silver.

Well, when the silver is purchased and the note is issued, it is put in circulation; and why should not our Government have exercised the option which has been not only in theory but in practice exercised by the French Government for about ninety years—which has been exercised a hundred times within the last twenty years by the Bank of France. That institution always exercises the option to pay either in gold or silver. In that country, possessing \$700,000,000 of silver and about \$900,000,000 of gold, whenever there is an undue demand upon the gold, the Bank of France always exercises the option of tendering silver. France has nineteen or twenty dollars in silver per capita for 38,000,000 of people. When that option is exercised, does it drive gold to a premium?

But it is said that this country, with nearly 70,000,000 of people, with but \$7 in silver per capita, either in coin or bullion, in the Treasury, can not, in accordance with the terms of a contract which everybody was bound to understand, offer payment in silver when gold is unduly demanded. It is claimed that this would drive gold in this country to a premium. Yet the gentleman who so declare depict in glowing terms the greatness in commercial power and strength of this young and all-powerful nation—a nation which was described by a distinguished economist, Jevons, as destined in respect to finance and commerce to grow in the future beyond even the possibility of the dream of its citizens. Why, then, can not this nation do what any other nation can do under similar conditions?

The Sherman act is not, then, the cause of the depression and widespread ruin in this and other countries. It is, indeed, diffi-

cult to conceive how any rational being can ascribe to it such potency for evil—a little harmless four-million piece of legislation—a very Nemesis of destruction. No rational man does believe any such thing. An ulterior end has been in view of enhancing the value of fixed charges and long loans amounting to more than fifty billions concentrated into the hands of a few. But these few are all-powerful for manipulation and deception. They have caused a false cry to be raised by which to deceive and mislead unwary Congressmen.

It reminds one of the old days of ignorance and superstition. When some calamity had happened, in looking about for the cause a harmless hag was likely to be discovered. Immediately all the misfortunes of the people would be ascribed to her witchcraft, and she would be dragged forth, with manifestations of fiendish delight, to be publicly burned. So with the Sherman act.

The gentleman from New York who last spoke saw fit to cause to be read a message which had been sent from Lombard street across the Atlantic, setting forth the thought and the sneer of bankers over there, as if he expected that we were to legislate in this country with respect to the sneer of Englishmen in Lombard street.

Gentlemen say they are in favor of "a sound currency and an honest dollar." I wish to say to gentlemen who represent that side of this issue, that they can not gain any victory by attempting to beg the question. It is all-important in discussing any question, and especially the question which is now under consideration, that we should speak with accuracy and with clearness. What do gentlemen mean by "an honest dollar"? A dollar is a cold, spiritless thing; it possesses no moral attribute of honesty or dishonesty. It is true that in the hands of him who uses it, it may be an instrument of great evil or of great good.

But it has no moral agency. Why do gentlemen speak of "an honest dollar and a sound currency"? Do they expect to drive men who view this question from the standpoint of research and economy, which are world-wide, and which are based upon the solid foundations of truth, from their position by the sneering intimation that they are seeking to promote their theories by dishonesty? I say that language like that is but demagogic; it does not tend to elucidate the question; it can only tend to deceive the unwary or frighten the timid. No member of this House will be moved from his position by any such consideration or epithet.

Gentlemen say, "We do not want a dollar worth only 50 cents." Well, they have not any such dollar, and if we should have free coinage at any ratio which is mentioned here they will not have any such dollar. What do they mean by "a dollar worth only 50 cents?" The expression is an absurdity upon its face. We might as well say that the Almighty could create a 3-year-old bull in a minute. [Laughter.] In the Constitution of the United States express power is given to the Congress of the United States to coin money and regulate its value.

What is meant by the language, "regulating its value"? Can not the Congress of the United States say that 410 or any other

number of grains of silver shall be stamped and designated by any name, a dollar if you please? Of course every nation exercises the control of its own currency and designates it as it pleases. Everybody who accepts that dollar knows just what it means. There is nothing counterfeit about it. It is genuine. Any citizen passing it in payment for any commodity, or in liquidation of any debt, understands exactly the currency he is using.

Why, sir, all debts, all commercial transactions, imply a full understanding on the part of the parties as to the nature and characteristics of the transaction. There is no element of false pretense or fraud in relation to the silver dollar. It is not a dishonest dollar. It is just what it purports to be; it passes for just what it is. Why, sir, suppose this question were brought into a court of justice? There are many men here who understand the rules of evidence, which are supposed to be founded upon the rules of logic and common sense. Suppose the question were, "What is this which we call a silver dollar worth?" A gentleman would not be permitted to answer. Why, if you go into the London market you can buy bullion, and if the Government of the United States would permit you to do so you could coin it in a dollar and make a profit on your transaction, because you could purchase the bullion for 50 cents. But what is its market value? What is it worth in exchange for any other commodity in the country? That is the standard by which you must gauge its value. Any other evidence would be excluded as incompetent. Gauged by that, it is to-day in New York at a premium. It sells at 3 per cent above par.

This shows the extent to which the Government can, by giving to a metal a new function and an increased demand, enhance its value. A coin clothed with the function of money is worth 50 per cent more than the metal which it contains as a mere commodity.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] has a theory. It is that it is dangerous to have too much money. I have heard this classification made, not by the gentleman who spoke on this floor, but to which school of philosophy he seems to belong. It divides property into productive wealth, into consumable wealth and coin—that is, it means that coin is not wealth at all.

The gentleman spoke as though he had traveled all of the road and knew all that had taken place on this subject since the days of Lycurgus down to our time. But I venture to say that in all of his travels, through all the centuries, he did not find an economist or a publicist, who devoted any attention to the question, who did not declare that money is wealth of the very highest power. Why, as with a stroke of magic, it can be transformed into anything which will minister to the comfort or convenience of man or the development of the human race.

They say that every unnecessary dollar is dead capital and an utter waste to the country. Now, if you have money, what can you do with it? You can use it for the purchase of commodities. You can keep it for prospective purchases that you may want to make. You can lend it to be returned with or without interest, or you can give it away. These are all useful purposes. Or, you can destroy it. The last is the use to which the monetallists would devote it. Demonetization is destruction.

Every unnecessary dollar is to be destroyed, especially if it be a silver dollar. Why, Mr. Speaker, according to that logic, if the gentleman had a coat which he had put by, and by which he expected to keep warm in the colder weather, he ought to take it out and burn it. Every unoccupied house ought to be consumed with fire. Every unemployed workman ought to be electrocuted. Indeed the Malthusian is the philosophy of the gold-ite, "whom he could not use he would destroy." Their battle cry to-day is similar to that of the old Romans in respect to Carthage, *Argentum Delendum est*. Silver must be destroyed.

Up to 1873 four billions of the world's wealth—its metallic money—consisted of silver, an equal amount consisted of gold. That had come down as a bimetallic system from the past ages. All the peoples of the earth, you may call it wealth or what you please, for three thousand years had planted their credit and business on this rock.

In 1873, while our superstructure of productive industry was based on this foundation, a cataclysm occurred which shattered the foundation, and the wealth of the world has been sinking in value ever since.

The index numbers of the Economist show that, during the past twenty years in the London market, the gold value of twenty-two leading articles has declined in the same ratio as silver.

In Hamburg Dr. Soetbeer, the noted statistician and economist, shows that articles there have declined in the same manner. Seven great standard commodities in this country have been affected by the same causes, and the same operation has applied to them. Such has been the effect upon the general range of prices. As gold has appreciated, by reason of the increased work put upon it by curtailment of the use of silver, all other things in their gold prices have suffered a corresponding decline. All forms of wealth and property, except gold credits and fixed charges, have been nibbled away by the ever-increasing demands of the money claims.

A commission was appointed by the English Government a few years ago "upon the depression of trade." You, gentlemen, who are so fond of quoting the English as being *ex cathedra* on all questions relating to finance, when you take up the findings of this impartial commission, which extended its investigation not only into that but into all countries where the matters under consideration could be illustrated by experience, will find strong language upon the subject.

These were the conclusions:

First, that the depression dated from the year 1873 or thereabouts.

Second, that it extended to nearly every branch of industry, including agriculture, manufactures, and mining, and that it was not confined to one, but had been experienced to a greater or less extent in all the industrial countries of the world.

Third, that it appeared to be closely connected with the serious fall in general prices which, even then, was most observable, though it has been since more strongly remarked, resulting in the diminution, in some cases even to the total loss, of profit and consequent irregularity of employment to the wage-earners.

Fourth, that the duration of the depression has been most unusual and abnormal. No adequate cause for this state of things was discoverable, unless it could be found in the same general dislocation of values caused by currency changes, and which would be capable of affecting an area equal to that which the depression of trade had covered.

Ernst Seyd, a distinguished economist, in 1873, at the time of the proposed demonetization of silver by Germany and other countries, predicted this continuous depression, as the cause for it would be the curtailment of the money, the basic means of value, represented by four billion dollars' worth of silver; that as that was cut down and demonetized values, would be depressed, and you would have all the evils which have since ensued.

How prophetic was his vision!

But they say gold has not advanced in value. It is in the gold prices of things that all things have declined in value. With reference to all those things gold has advanced in value.

Gentlemen, I want to call your attention to the words of Senator JOHN SHERMAN, a distinguished statesman, to whom all the evils growing out of this unfortunate legislation in 1873 have been attributed. I say that he knows to-day, and that he has declared, that by reason of that act gold has advanced, to the detriment of all industrial enterprises, and to the advancement of the wealth of those whose wealth consisted of credits and fixed charges. I will ask the Clerk to read a letter addressed by Senator SHERMAN to Mr. Groesbeck, of Cincinnati, Ohio, July 15, 1878.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *July 15, 1878.*

DEAR SIR: To that part of your letter of the 12th instant, in which you ask my view of the matters confided in the monetary commission, I have some delicacy in replying very fully.

During the Monetary Conference in Paris, when silver in our country was excluded from circulation by being undervalued, I was strongly in favor of the single standard of gold, and wrote a letter, which you will find in the proceedings of that conference, stating briefly my view. At that time the wisest among us did not anticipate the sudden fall of silver or the rise of gold that has occurred.

This uncertainty of the relation between the two metals is one of the chief arguments in favor of a monometallic system, but other arguments, showing the dangerous effect upon industry by dropping one of the precious metals from the standard of value, outweigh, in my mind, all theoretical objections to the bimetallic system. * * *

JOHN SHERMAN, *Secretary.*

Mr. RAWLINS. He attributes it to the same cause. Now, there was not a delegate to the conference in 1878 who did not appreciate that the demonetization of silver was the cause. There was not a delegate in the conference of 1881 who did not recognize the same fact. There was not a delegate in the conference of 1892 at Brussels who did not declare the same thing; and we have another prediction here, gentlemen, to which I earnestly call your attention, because in this declaration you find the cause of the distress with which we are afflicted to-day predicted in unerring language. Mr. Rothschild, who is not supposed in any degree to be biased in favor of silver, who is not supposed to be a silver lunatic, used this language in November, 1892. Listen to it, gentlemen:

I need hardly remind you that the stock of silver in the world is estimated at some thousands of millions. And if this conference were to break up without arriving at any definite result, there would be a depreciation in the value of that commodity which it would be frightful to contemplate, and out of which a monetary panic would ensue, the far-spreading effect of which it would be impossible to foretell."

Mr. BLAND. They have got the panic now.

Mr. RAWLINS. That conference broke up without arriving

at any definite result. Then came that great decline of silver. Then ensued the financial wreckage and crash in Australia. And let me stop here to call attention to another prediction, one of many made at this conference. It was said there that unless the nations did agree that the next step would be the closing of the mints in India, and what would happen then? Why that would precipitate and cause a decline, an absolute destruction of billions of dollars, represented by silver in its value and all values having relation to it, and that a depression would accordingly ensue.

That has happened. That prediction has been verified by a fall in silver and all other things in one week of 20 per cent. Just think of it! All the wealth in one month has sustained a loss of 20 per cent; and all the accumulation of all the ages of all people to that extent swept away by the fiat of a council of ten men decreeing the closure of the mints in India. But what next was to complete the misfortunes of the human race? Sir Rivers Wilson in that conference said:

What are the results to which this double action of the part of the great purchasers of silver might lead? Certain high authorities believe that the sudden cessation of the purchase of silver in the United States and the closing of the Indian mints, should these events actually occur, would lead to a heavy fall in silver and a disastrous disturbance of commerce.

When I looked into this question, I did so conscientiously for the purpose of arriving at the truth, and as I saw to declare it. I see the destruction of silver bringing disaster. The most distinguished economists throughout the world have declared the results which would ensue from such action of this Government unfavorable to silver. The mind is driven to the conclusion that those men presaged the truth.

The President has sent a message to this Congress, and in that message he has depicted and portrayed the evil effect of hoarding money. I do not wish to underestimate it. During the time money is hoarded it is, so far as active use is concerned, as if it were demonetized or sunk in the depths of the ocean; because the "quantity," which some gentlemen call immaterial and unimportant, has been diminished. What is demonetization but a more destructive and a more permanent form of hoarding. The hoarder will keep it up until he has sense enough to restore it to the channels of trade.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have time to conclude his remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAWLINS. I thank the gentlemen. I shall endeavor not to weary them by an unnecessary waste of time. I say the money so demonetized is lost until the power which can restore it recovers sufficient knowledge to put it back, or reclothe it with the functions by which it may become useful in the channels of trade. You can have no efficiency, which is the desirable thing, without quantity, can you? And as you increase the quantity you strengthen the efficiency; as you diminish the quantity you weaken the efficiency. If there were in the bank vaults to-day throughout this country 10 per cent more of quantity, there

would be a stronger basis on which to restore the confidence of the country.

While the President deprecates hoarding, he recommends the adoption of a policy for its encouragement.

Monetary contraction always leads to a decline in values. As demonetization goes on the purchasing power of the remaining money grows. Hoarding is thus made profitable. Investments can not be safely made without a certainty of loss so long as the decline in values continue. If loans are made upon a good margin to-day, in a short time the security becomes inadequate.

So, ever increasing in value, without risk of loss, the money will be safely stored away and held.

Take the Bank of England. In 1881 it had a reserve of £42,000,000; but with the demonetization of silver and the increased demand for gold resulting therefrom, such an encroachment has been made upon it that the reserve in ten years decreased until now it has about £22,000,000 as a reserve. Sir Samuel Montague, in a recent article published in Littel's Living Age, a man of long experience in Lombard street, portrayed more vividly than the gentlemen who take the opposite side of this question that her financial system was like a pyramid standing on its apex; a great superstructure of credit, which, if people lose their confidence, would be toppled over on account of the insufficiency of the base of gold on which it rests, and he says that such would have happened, and the English bank would have gone to pieces as the result of the Barings failure had it not been able to obtain a gold loan of \$15,000,000 from the Bank of France.

Now, the necessity for gold is indicated by its demand for coinage. I can demonstrate, I think, to the satisfaction of any gentleman upon this floor that the gold supply of the world is inadequate. I take the figures for 1889. In that year there was produced \$120,000,000 of gold throughout the world. Dr. Soetbeer estimated that there was consumed in the arts in 1886 \$60,000,000, and that the amount used for such purposes was gradually increasing.

In the Report upon the Mineral Industries of this country it appears that the amount consumed in the arts in 1880 in this country alone was \$10,000,000, and in 1890, according to the estimate of the Director of the Mint, it had risen to \$16,000,000. Therefore, it would be a reasonable estimate to say that the amount of gold consumed in the arts throughout the world in 1889 was \$70,000,000. Taking that estimate, there remained \$50,000,000 for coinage.

Now, what was the amount coined? One hundred and sixty-eight million dollars. After deducting for use in the arts, you find \$118,000,000 more gold demanded for coinage than was produced that year. That meant, of course, a recoinage by one nation of the coins of another, so that what one gained another lost. This demand for gold was so insatiate that it overcame the *vim inertia*, the cost of transportation, the expense of a double or triple mintage, and of the premium (which has been spoken of here as being as high as 1 and 2 per cent) which one country charges as a penalty upon the exportation of its gold to another.

Now, shut down the silver mines, from which from one-third to one-half of all the gold produced comes; take one-third from

\$120,000,000 and you have \$80,000,000 remaining, and in but a few years, if not already, the demand for gold for use in the industrial arts will encroach upon your original stock. Then think of the millions, according to the estimate of Jevons, by which the gold stock annually shrinks from wear and loss of coins. And yet men dream of universal gold monometallism.

No wonder that we look with trepidation upon the passing to and fro between countries of a few million dollars of gold. Austria-Hungary sought to get upon a gold specie basis and passed a law to that effect converting her taxable silver bonds into gold bonds. She put them upon the market, though bearing 4 per cent interest, at 90 or 92, and endeavored to get the gold, but she could not get it anywhere in the wide world until she came over to America to filch it from the Treasury of the United States.

That was the reason why last year \$87,000,000 of gold left this country. But, notwithstanding the sacrifice which Austria-Hungary was willing to make to get upon a gold basis she could not do it, and only a month ago the news was flashed across the ocean that the time at which such specie payments were to be resumed was to be deferred till 1896. Then there ceased to be such a demand for gold and it was permitted to flow back as it has been doing lately.

Now, it is supposed to take, to get upon a specie basis, enough gold to cover the aggregate of the premium upon gold over the inconvertible paper money. Remember that Austria failed and that the result of her attempt was to create disaster to the business interests of the world, causing a financial crash in England itself, and then suppose that Russia and India, and other countries throughout the civilized and uncivilized world should make the same effort, what would happen?

In 1816, when England adopted the gold standard, such was the increased demand for gold that there immediately resulted a fall in the prices of other things. That led to a general financial disturbance which was depicted by Mr. Clay, most eloquently in 1820, pointing out the dire disasters which had come upon our country.

Why, sir, the idea of universal gold monometallism has been justly described as Utopian. It is an effort to cover the financial bed with a golden blanket which is not big enough. You pull it to one side and the other suffers from the exposure. It is indecent even to attempt it. What is the remedy? We have found the cause. The dream of the monometallist is idle. It is an iridescent dream of fatuity and folly, resulting from ignorance. [Applause.] Why, sir, the remedy is to restore to silver the functions of money which it has possessed in all ages—so universally recognized for three thousand years as to be regarded as almost, if not quite, an arrangement of nature itself.

The real cause of the widespread depression is found in the fact that, during the past twenty years the quantity or supply of primary money has not kept pace with the increase of population, of business production, and the growth of commerce. The use of money has been demanded in new and extensive fields, not only in America, but in Asia and Africa. Moreover, the supply of primary metallic money has been curtailed by the demonetiza-

tion and inhibited coinage of silver, while the demand for gold for use in the industrial arts has constantly increased and its production has as uniformly diminished. The tremendous loss in silver has in no degree been compensated by any increased supply of gold.

As the value or price of all other things varies directly as the quantity or supply of primary money constituting the standard of its measurement, it follows that as such money contracts prices must fall; or if the supply of money remains the same, but has a wider distribution, is made to do duty in a wider field and in new channels, a proportionate fall in values must ensue. The same result takes place when the articles or objects which money measures are increased or multiplied.

The correlation of these propositions is, that the money and as fixed charges and liabilities, solvable alone in that medium all gauged by other things, undergo appreciation.

Talk about "evolution." That term is only properly applicable in a scientific sense to the animate, not to the inanimate world: You can not make a vicious theory respectable by bestowing upon it a scientific appellation. Evolution—the survival of the fittest—can only be applied to this question upon the assumption that it means the predominance of might over right. Mr. SHERMAN wrote his letter to the conference in 1867 recommending gold. Was that "evolution?" He afterward, in his letter of 1878, said he had made a mistake, that he did not act upon sufficient information. How is "evolution" going on in England? Why, sir, Barclay, Goshen, and many others, all great statesmen over in that country, are falling rapidly into the theories of the bimetalist. The "evolution" is all the other way.

Now, I want to say a word about the single standard. Why, sir, gold and silver have constituted in all the ages of the world a mode of measuring the value of all articles of utility. We may have a measure composed of two metals—a measure of value as well as of distance—and the best measure of distance is that which is composed of two metals, expanding under the influence of heat or cold both ways, so that the general dimension always remains the same. If you will take the aggregate of gold and silver and put them together, you will find that they have been more stable in this form than when taken separately.

We want a system which shall operate like the compensatory pendulum, so that the radius of oscillation will ever remain the same. That is the bimetallic system: As to the unit, you may call it a dollar, or a shilling, or a rupee, or anything else; the name is immaterial. The unit of account is unimportant; it is the general measure, that which is indicated by the stock of gold and silver and the natural increase growing out of the development of mining industries—growing out of the discovery and production of the metals as God has placed them in the hills.

When men know that their money is based upon this, in making a long-time contract they can measure the stock on hand, and they can estimate the probabilities of production, and they can determine what compensation in the form of interest they should reserve in order that they may not suffer loss. But if the system of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] is adopted, what will be the result? I think the gentleman used somewhat extrava-

gant language; that he spoke somewhat recklessly, though with good will and good nature, and with an eloquence which I highly appreciated. His theory would result in this: when we leave the metallic basis of money, which all the monometallists say is the ulterior end, we shall issue gold bonds which we will place upon the market at a discount, realizing, perhaps, 90 per cent.

Our own bankers will buy these bonds and then issue notes upon them at their par value, thus giving to the bankers of the country the profits arising from a monopoly of making money for the people. Under such a system every contract would have to be made with reference to the caprice of the banks, always controlled by their interest or greed.

Why, sir, gentlemen talk about the bounty or tribute which is to be paid to silver miners of the West. They are not opposed to tribute, but they want its direction to be toward the East, not the West. Where are the votes to come from that will defeat the proposition of justice and right involved in the simple restoration of silver?

Will the votes come from those who are opposed to exactions in the form of bounties, to make profitable unprofitable industries? Will the votes against this proposition come from the West or the South? Or will they come from Pennsylvania, the home of the people who exact tribute; from New York, from Massachusetts, from the people east of the Alleghenies who have built up colossal fortunes upon the accumulations of tribute by means of which the burdens of debt have been multiplied and increased in quantity throughout all this land?

I do not speak in favor of "protecting" mining industries. I want to tell you here one fact in respect to mining in our Territory. The average life of a mine there is about ten years. When a mine is exhausted it is worthless. Within this time the investor must get back, not merely his interest, but his principal. The people in that Territory have invested \$100,000,000 in that industry. As the matter now stands, that wealth is confiscated. At 20 to 1, scarcely more than expenses of operating the mines can be realized. In the mining States 12,000 miles of railroad are dependent for support upon the tonnage derived from mineral productions. That is the basis upon which are secured some three hundred or four hundred million dollars of bonds. More than a billion dollars is involved.

Our people who went to that country relying upon the continuance of a system older than history is able to record, which they supposed was built upon the "rock of ages," have risked their all for the redemption of one-third of this continent, under unparalleled difficulties, by the sacrifice of much blood, much turmoil and suffering. Yet, gentlemen from New York laugh and sneer and say that in order to get the monopoly of issuing a little currency to the extent of a small percentage upon the bonded indebtedness of the United States they are willing to confiscate all this wealth and drive those people to misery and financial death. [Applause.]

It may be a beautiful picture for those gentlemen to contemplate—the picture of that country remitted to desolation and famine. It may be that they are willing to see that country, now teeming with wealth, activity, enterprise, intelligence, and

patriotism, brought to ruin and desolation; but I invoke the good sense and the common honesty of representatives of the American people to thwart this nefarious object. The work of our hands may generally go to decay, but beautiful structures of stone "more enduring than brass" will stand as the mute and mighty monument of a nation's folly and a people's despair.

Such must be the result if the policy recommended is adopted, and yet it stalks forth, a very demon of destruction, before which any fiend or devil might bow with reverence.

They say we can not do it alone; that we must let Russia start, let England start, let France start, let some other nation start. But, Mr. Speaker, in the name of God, who is more interested in starting than we? We have more than a billion directly or indirectly involved. We produce 28 per cent of the gold and 41 per cent of the world's product of silver. A great industry is involved, as well as the values of all wealth, productive and consumable.

We are the most powerful and capable of all nations and the most interested in starting. We can, as France did for seventy years, by the free and untrammelled coinage of gold and silver, linking the metals together, preserve their parity, standing as we do with two-thirds of the inhabitants of the earth on the silver basis on one side and on the other side only one-fifth on the gold basis.

England had a gold standard for seventy years, and Germany and the rest of Europe were on a silver basis. France during all of these years, by her bimetallic system, preserved the parity of the two metals. Gentlemen may deny it. I assert it to be a fact that the metals during that period did not fluctuate except as the rates of exchange between London and Paris varied. That was conclusively demonstrated in the Brussels Conference, and a table has been attached to the report of its proceedings which illustrates its truth. It shows the extreme variation of the value of silver in the London market did not exceed 5 per cent, and that such fluctuation was wholly due to the rates of exchange between London and Paris and to mint charges in France.

Since that time as silver has been demonetized it has fallen in value, as every man must concede, on account of the unfavorable legislation towards silver, and because of the restriction in its use as money.

Now, gentlemen say you can not remonetize silver or restore it by legislation because it has been depreciated. That is designated by Mr. Goschen as a "vicious circle." Restore it to the condition on which gold is based, with all the privileges of gold, and the two metals will stand together side by side to do the monetary work of the world, as they have done for thousands of years.

But, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen tell us that the test, the crucial test of the silver dollar, is to melt it down in a crucible, and then see what will be its worth after the process. I say to you, first restore to it the privileges that gold has, and then melt it down, and the process will show how it will stand the test. But suppose you apply the fire test to your paper money; put it into the crucible, melt it down, and see what it will be worth after the process.

Now, gentlemen, I have done, and I thank you for your attention. I have no vote in this House in behalf of the people I represent; but I do beseech you that you will so act as to bring heart to the business not only of the people in my own, but in the entire country and throughout the civilized world. The moment we set out in the right direction we shall be followed. We will not go it alone.

A little more than a century ago absolutism and tyranny in government had been evolved, and, as representing the survival of the fittest, dominated the world. Our forefathers did not wait for others to start, but went it alone, and gave evolution a new departure in the direction of individualism and liberty. Let us imitate their example. [Applause.]