

By Mr. TERRY: Petition of Rev. J. C. Douglass and others, of Russellville, Ark.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Petition of A. E. Hatch and others of the Eleventh Congressional district of Iowa.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of Rev. R. Kemp and others, of Horsecreek, Ala.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of J. L. Wyatt and others, of Enfield, Ill.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of Charles W. King and other citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of New York.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Mrs. C. Wesley Wootton and others, of Philadelphia, Pa.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 13, 1899.

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

### FINANCIAL STATISTICS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, a statement showing the number of ounces and the coining value of all of the silver bullion purchased under the act of July 4, 1890; the coining value of the seigniorage thereon; the amount of Treasury notes issued in payment thereof; the amount of silver dollars coined therefrom to March 4, 1897; the seigniorage thereon, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

### DESERTIONS FROM THE ARMY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 6th instant, a printed statement showing the number of desertions each month in the Regular and Volunteer Armies from May 1, 1898, to June 30, 1899, and stating that the returns of the regiments of regular and volunteer troops serving in the Philippine Islands covering period since June 30 last have not yet been received; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

### VIRGINIUS INDEMNITY FUND.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, pursuant to the act of Congress approved August 3, 1894, directing the payment to claimants of the amount of the accretions of the *Virginus* indemnity fund which had been received from the investment of the fund itself, stating that the sum of \$16,494.44 was paid out during the incumbency of Mr. Kieckhefer, late disbursing clerk of the Department, and that after an examination of the accounts by an expert bookkeeper there should be \$4,691.87 in the fund, and urging that an appropriation be made to cover the deficiency on behalf of the claimants; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TELLER presented the petitions of William Boyle and sundry other citizens of Monument, S. B. Sansom and sundry other citizens, R. P. Coburn and sundry other citizens of Buena Vista, Dan Wells and sundry other citizens of Pueblo, W. A. Hutchinson and sundry other citizens of Ward, J. D. Slater and sundry other citizens of Golden, O. A. Cramer and sundry other citizens of Montevista, W. P. L. Master and sundry other citizens, and of G. H. Merritt and sundry other citizens of Alcott, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the petitions of Rev. Thomas Tellies and 25 other citizens of Felchville, Albert H. Miard and 6 other citizens of South Stafford, Rev. J. R. Henderson and 8 other citizens of Roxbury, Judson A. Carr and 8 other citizens of Georgia Plain, Rev. J. R. Henderson and 8 other citizens of Roxbury, J. J. Estey and 10 other citizens of Brattleboro, C. S. Mudgett and 5 other citizens of Elmore, Horace E. Ferris and 25 other citizens of Middleburg, James Huntom and 34 other citizens of East Orange, Julian P. Laughlin and sundry other citizens of Baret, Rev. J. P. Mawin and sundry other citizens of West Charleston, P. P. Mead and sundry other citizens of Salisbury, Edwin R. Bell and sundry other citizens, S. Knowlton and sundry other citizens of Danville, Earl S. Fox and sundry other citizens, G. T. Smart and

sundry other citizens of Manchester, M. H. Randall and sundry other citizens of West Newbury, S. H. Barmim and sundry other citizens of Cornwall, Henry E. Loehlin and sundry other citizens of North Hydepark, and of S. N. Hazard and sundry other citizens of North Hydepark, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KYLE presented the petition of M. J. Dewey and 67 other citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Soldiers' Homes, immigrant stations, and all other Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petitions of C. G. Gunderson and 33 other citizens of Toronto, G. H. Chase and 44 other citizens of White, Ranson B. Hall and 45 other citizens of Gettysburg, Richard Jones and 29 other citizens of Faulkton, F. B. Ward and 32 other citizens of Carthage, E. S. Hatch and 6 other citizens of Howard, and of Rev. C. F. De Groff and 17 other citizens of Letcher, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BATE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying that a franchise be granted to the Postal Telegraph Cable Company for laying a cable to connect the United States with Cuba and other West India islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DEPEW presented the petitions of R. B. Sackett and 197 other citizens, of George H. Swift and 75 other citizens of Akron, Fred W. Doughty and 18 other citizens of Poughkeepsie, Arthur N. Stafford and 6 other citizens of Brooklyn, William Reed and 22 other citizens of Troy, S. H. Oliver and 13 other citizens of Glenfield, L. P. Teachout and 19 other citizens of Waterford, M. W. Covell and 18 other citizens of Manchester, Rev. J. Marsland and 51 other citizens of Franklin, R. D. Calkins and 51 other citizens, W. H. Miller and 1 other citizen of Brooklyn, Lansing Bailey and 17 other citizens of Geneva, L. S. Shumaker and 15 other citizens of Buffalo; Mrs. Louise Haywood, of New York City; Carlton M. Sleght and 166 other citizens of Canandaigua, Henry A. Newell, jr., and 5 other citizens of New York City, E. P. Brigham and 32 other citizens of Conklin Center, G. W. Bushnell and 7 other citizens of New York City, S. L. Watson and 8 other citizens, Charles Robbins and 20 other citizens of Dolgeville, James Hetrick and 18 other citizens of Smithville, A. W. Jones and 72 other citizens of Woodhull, Henry Watchus and 50 other citizens of Trenton, Cassius Marsh and 33 other citizens of Antwerp, Thomas Little and 20 other citizens of New York City, Stanley Sloat and 18 other citizens of Patterson, W. L. C. Samson and 18 other citizens of Bovina Center, W. J. B. Williams and 33 other citizens of Holland Patent, W. J. Walker and 16 other citizens of Albany, Lewis H. Miller and 19 other citizens of Katonah, M. L. Royers and 11 other citizens of Watertown, Robert N. Ritchie and 18 other citizens of Lansingburg, Joseph K. Casterton and 14 other citizens of Vernon, Lindsay B. Longacre and 1 other citizen of New York City, D. E. Yarnell and 17 other citizens of New York City, F. Heartfield and 18 other citizens of Brewster, William P. Burnham and 3 other citizens of Brooklyn, A. J. Schroeder and 25 other citizens of Port Leyden, Rev. W. Dempster Chase and sundry other citizens of Carthage, J. A. McWilliams and 201 other citizens of Sing Sing, Alfred J. Saxe and 23 other citizens of Bellona, E. M. Munday, jr., and 28 other citizens of New York City, David J. Biggar and 44 other citizens of Vernon Center, Rev. D. E. Smith and 18 other citizens of Stone Ridge, Addison Gibbons and 19 other citizens of McConnellsville, Rev. J. C. Hendrickson and 5 other citizens of Tottenville, Rev. A. W. Battey and 44 other citizens of Nelson, A. H. Hathaway and 17 other citizens of Greendale and Hudson, Charles E. Tamkin and 18 other citizens of Brooklyn, Thomas B. Dale and 10 other citizens of Buffalo, J. W. Page and 4 other citizens of Brooklyn, Phillip Workman and 52 other citizens of Watertown, J. J. Fitzgerald and 9 other citizens of Brooklyn, William Smith and 8 other citizens of Farnham, Charles H. Colgrove and 28 other citizens of Unadilla Forks, C. J. Holmgren and 13 other citizens of Brooklyn, H. N. Van Deusen and 19 other citizens of Berkshire, James A. Thompson and 17 other citizens of Poughkeepsie, S. F. White and 18 other citizens of Rhinebeck, S. Burnham and 5 other citizens of Hamilton, George A. Bronson and 16 other citizens of Collamer, R. O. Allen and 20 other citizens of Stanfordville, T. H. C. Bain and 15 other citizens of Schaghticoke, William J. Dunlop and 27 other citizens of Hebron, Rev. J. E. Lyall and 17 other citizens of South Millbrook, Rev. J. W. Cole and 18 other citizens, F. A. Graves and 8 other citizens of Hecla Works and Vernon, Rev. R. G. Jones and 18 other citizens of Utica, and of M. E. Rutherford and 99 other citizens of Lisbon Center, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROSS presented the petitions of Earl S. Fox and 17 other citizens of Vershire, J. W. H. Baker and 50 other citizens of Enosburg, S. Knowlton and 17 other citizens of Danville, M. H. Randall and 26 other citizens of Newbury, the congregation of the Congregational Church and the Mission of the Congregational Church of Chelsea, of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal and Congregational churches of Barton, of Edward T. Fairbanks and 19 other citizens of St. Johnsbury, of Edwin R. Bell and 49 other citizens of Royalton, of Henry A. Goodhue and 30 other citizens of Westminster, of Julian P. Laughlin and 124 other citizens of Barre, of G. A. Smart and 25 other citizens of Manchester, of S. H. Barnum and 103 other citizens of Cornwall, of R. J. Barton and 25 other citizens of Salisbury, and of J. P. Marvin and 35 others, of Charleston, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petitions of A. Wilson and 21 other citizens of Indianapolis, of C. F. Thomas and 114 other citizens of Fort Wayne, and of S. M. Congill and 113 other citizens of Floyd County, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Joseph C. Sharkey and sundry other citizens of Massachusetts, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the memorials of Caroline H. Dall and 465 other citizens of Massachusetts; of Edward Dodd and 57 other citizens of Ohio; of Rev. J. P. Philips and 80 other citizens of Maryland; of E. H. Draper, of Rhode Island; of W. O. Bradford and 33 other citizens of Virginia; of E. W. Calvin and 487 citizens of South Dakota; of Sarah H. Hussey and 146 other citizens of New Jersey; of John H. Free and 104 other citizens of Illinois; of Charles Wilson and 19 other citizens of Texas; of F. B. Carby and 91 other citizens of Nebraska; D. C. Allison and 110 other citizens of California; and of H. S. Earle and 2 other citizens of Oregon, remonstrating against any extension of the sovereignty of the United States over the Philippine Islands, in any event, and over any other territory, without the free consent of the people thereof; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McBRIDE presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, Oreg., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the entrance to Tillamook Harbor, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Progressive Commercial Association of Astoria, Oreg., praying for the construction of a free-portage railroad at The Dalles, to facilitate the navigation of the Columbia River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of 24 citizens of Athena, Oreg., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### GILA RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. WARREN. I present the report of James D. Schuyler, consulting engineer, on the general conditions and cost of water storage for irrigation on the Gila River, Arizona, for the benefit of the Indians occupying the Gila River Reservation. I move that the report be printed as a document and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Mr. McMILLAN. I present a paper, being a catalogue of printed works relating to the District of Columbia. I move that the paper be printed as a document, and that 200 additional copies be printed and bound in paper for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 8) construing the act approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," reported it without amendment.

#### REVISION OF THE PENSION LAWS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, on the 25th of February, 1899, during the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, the following resolution was passed:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Pensions is hereby authorized and directed, by a subcommittee appointed for that purpose, to carefully examine, during the recess of Congress, all general laws on the statute book granting pensions to soldiers, their survivors and dependents, and to pursue such other inquiries in connection with the matter of pension legislation as may be deemed advisable; report to be made to the Senate, by bill or otherwise,

at as early a day as practicable after the assembling of the Fifty-sixth Congress, the expense incurred to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The Committee on Pensions, through a subcommittee, have discharged the duties devolved upon them under that resolution, and I am directed to present the report. In doing this, however, I propose to read, for the information of the Senate and of the country, the report the committee have made, of course not including the testimony and other documents that are annexed. I beg that during this reading, which will not occupy many minutes, I may have the attention of the Senate.

"Pursuant to that resolution, the chairman of the committee visited Washington twice during the summer months and made careful examination of all laws bearing on the subject of pensions, with a view of determining what changes, if any, should be made in the existing statutes. He discussed the matter with the officials of the Bureau of Pensions and carefully noted their views. It was evident that, while the laws are broad and generous, much difficulty has arisen in their administration because of the obscure phraseology of some of their provisions, and the necessity for certain amendments was apparent. Subsequently, to wit, on the 29th day of November, a subcommittee of the Committee on Pensions, as provided in the resolution, consisting of Senators GALLINGER and HANSBROUGH, met in the city of Washington and took statements from the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Pensions, the First Deputy Commissioner of Pensions, and Col. George H. Patrick, representing the Grand Army of the Republic. These statements, which will be found exceedingly interesting and instructive, are printed in connection with this report.

"The officials who were interrogated all advocated the creation of a nonpartisan commission to revise and codify the pension laws with a view to making them more uniform and intelligible, thus rendering their administration less difficult and free from existing perplexities. It was also agreed on all hands that the wishes of the Grand Army of the Republic to give a pensionable status to widows under the act of June 27, 1890, who are in possession of an annual income not exceeding \$250, in addition to the proceeds of daily labor, and that in estimating the pensionable status of soldiers under that act minor disabilities shall be aggregated should be complied with and the act amended accordingly. In the matter of aggregating minor disabilities the Commissioner of Pensions assured your committee that that is the practice of the Bureau of Pensions at the present time, so that there can be no valid objection to enacting it into law.

"The Commissioner of Pensions called the attention of the committee to his recommendation on page 21 of his last annual report, from which it appears that while pensions to soldiers commence from the date of filing the claim, pensions to widows date from the death of the husband. The law as to widows was changed in the appropriation act of June 27, 1888, which act removed all limitations as to the date of filing claims. The Commissioner recommends that that provision of the act of June 27, 1888, be repealed, in which recommendation your committee cordially concurs. The attention of your committee was also called to the fact that, under existing law minors' pensions are being paid to people who have reached mature age, some of whom have been married and reared families. In these cases the minor did not apply for pension during the years of minority, but in after life, probably prompted by the ever-diligent pension attorney, application is made and in some instances pension has been granted. A large number of such cases are now held up in the Bureau pending a decision of the honorable Secretary of the Interior as to the pensionable status of such claimants. Your committee is constrained to believe that the law should be so amended that if a minor fails to make application before the age of 16 is reached, such claims should lapse.

"Your committee were instructed to report by bill or otherwise, and accordingly bills will be presented for the creation of a commission on revision and codification of the pension laws, for the amendment of the act of June 27, 1890, as urged by the representatives of the Grand Army, concurred in by the officials of the Interior Department, and, so far as the provision relating to widows is concerned, recommended by the President in his annual message to the Fifty-sixth Congress, and for the repeal of the act of June 27, 1888, relating to the time when widows' pensions shall commence. Later on other bills may be presented designed to correct inequalities and inconsistencies in the laws.

"Following the statements made to your committee there will be printed as an appendix amendments proposed by the Grand Army of the Republic to sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, the report of the national committee on pensions of the Grand Army of the Republic, and a synopsis of all laws enacted since the foundation of the Government on the subject of pensions.

"In conclusion your committee desire to emphasize their belief that a commission of learned jurists, one of whom shall be a representative and member of the Grand Army of the Republic, should be created without delay, to take into careful consideration



the entire pension system, in the hope that they may present a revision and codification that will free the statutes from ambiguities and uncertainties, and construct a code that can be administered to the satisfaction of both the beneficiaries and the Government. Believing that to be practicable, your committee will press the bill for the creation of a commission to early consideration."

Mr. President, I present this report, and as there will doubtless be a large demand for the document from various sections of the country, I ask that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator present also a bill accompanying the report?

Mr. GALLINGER. I present three bills in connection with the report.

The bills were read twice by their titles, and placed on the Calendar, as follows:

A bill (S. 1476) creating a commission to revise and codify the pension laws of the United States;

A bill (S. 1477) in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; and

A bill (S. 1478) to repeal so much of the act of June 7, 1838, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1839, and for other purposes, as relates to the commencement of pension to widows under the acts of July 14, 1802, and March 3, 1873.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent for printing 1,000 additional copies of the report for the use of the Committee on Pensions. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GALLINGER subsequently said: In presenting a report a few moments ago from the Committee on Pensions, I asked that 1,000 additional copies might be printed for the use of the committee. Several Senators have suggested to me that it is a document which will be called for very freely from all over the country and that the number ought to be at least 2,000. I therefore now ask unanimous consent that 2,000 additional copies be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That refers to the report which the Senator made this morning?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that of the report made by him this morning 2,000 additional copies may be printed. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

#### EXPENSES OF VICE-PRESIDENT'S FUNERAL.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. GALLINGER on the 11th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by direction of the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of the late Vice-President of the United States and President of the Senate, Garret A. Hobart, at Paterson, N. J., on the 25th of November, 1899, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That there be printed and bound in cloth 2,500 copies of the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1899, 500 for the use of the Senate and 2,000 for the use of the Librarian of Congress.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 1479) to provide for telegraphic communication between the United States of America, the Hawaiian Islands, Guam, the Philippine Islands, Japan, and China, and to promote commerce; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1480) to amend the military record of John H. Lamson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1481) appropriating money to reimburse Capt. B. Tellefsen; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1482) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa E. McLean; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1483) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States," approved July 24, 1897; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 1484) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1485) to provide for the entry and purchase of coal and oil bearing lands in Alaska; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1486) for the relief of J. W. Leigh; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1487) referring the claim of Robert W. Dunbar to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1488) for the relief of Arthur L. Fish; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1489) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Rogers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1490) to amend the immigration laws of the United States relative to the insane; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1491) for the relief of William B. Fletcher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 1492) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Calvin Weaver;

A bill (S. 1493) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Milton G. Markland;

A bill (S. 1494) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Jacob Bowman, of the National Military Home, Marion, Ind.;

A bill (S. 1495) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Thomas J. Nelson;

A bill (S. 1496) for the relief of Courtney Hays;

A bill (S. 1497) for the relief of Pollard Anderson;

A bill (S. 1498) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Jacob Clark;

A bill (S. 1499) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William Cruse;

A bill (S. 1500) to correct the military record of Hiram A. Benefield; and

A bill (S. 1501) for the relief of John Bass.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 1502) granting a pension to John S. Dukate; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 1503) for the relief of Charles H. Janney, administrator de bonis non of the estate of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 1504) for the purchase of the statue of Salmon P. Chase, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 1505) authorizing and directing the return to the State of North Dakota of the arms and equipments of the First Regiment of North Dakota Volunteer Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Joe Carroll;

A bill (S. 1507) for the relief of P. Emile Arceneaux;

A bill (S. 1508) for the relief of W. G. Wheeler;

A bill (S. 1509) for the relief of Mollie S. Wossman;

A bill (S. 1510) for the relief of J. M. Charpentier;

A bill (S. 1511) for the relief of John E. B. Giquel;

A bill (S. 1512) for the relief of Julien Semaire;

A bill (S. 1513) for the relief of Alonzo L. Boyer;

A bill (S. 1514) for the relief of Joseph D. Mittelbronn;

A bill (S. 1515) for the relief of the estate of Domingue Pochelu, deceased;

A bill (S. 1516) for the relief of Edward J. Kennon;

A bill (S. 1517) for the relief of the estate of John Shelton, deceased;

A bill (S. 1518) for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Slack, deceased;

A bill (S. 1519) for the relief of Marguerite Arnaud;

A bill (S. 1520) for the relief of Mary C. Cleveland;

A bill (S. 1521) for the relief of Harriet A. Mills;  
 A bill (S. 1522) for the relief of Thomas Kergon;  
 A bill (S. 1523) for the relief of the estate of Raymond Pochelu, deceased;  
 A bill (S. 1524) for the relief of Arther Taylor;  
 A bill (S. 1525) for the relief of the estate of Jean Delille, late of Winn Parish, La.;  
 A bill (S. 1526) for the relief of Belote Auguste Donato;  
 A bill (S. 1527) for the relief of the estate of F. O. Darly;  
 A bill (S. 1528) for the relief of the estate of Margaret E. Woodward, deceased;  
 A bill (S. 1529) for the relief of the estate of Patrick Gilfoil, deceased;  
 A bill (S. 1530) for the relief of Cornelius Donato, administrator of Joseph Gradengo, deceased;  
 A bill (S. 1531) for the relief of the estate of Charles Armelin, deceased; and  
 A bill (S. 1532) for the relief of estate of Phillip Poete, deceased.  
 Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 1533) granting a pension to David Carroll; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.  
 He also introduced a bill (S. 1534) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to rehear and render judgment in the case of William Donnelly and Patrick Egan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.  
 Mr. HALE. I introduce two bills relating to matters in the Navy Department. I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and printed with the accompanying letters.  
 The bill (S. 1535) to provide for the examination of certain officers of the Navy, and to regulate promotion therein, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the accompanying paper; which was ordered to be printed.  
 The bill (S. 1536) to enable naval courts-martial and courts of inquiry to secure the attendance and testimony of civilian witnesses was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the accompanying paper; which was ordered to be printed.  
 Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 1537) for the relief of Daniel Martin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.  
 Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1538) to provide for the reserves of national banks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.  
 He also introduced a bill (S. 1539) for the relief of Sarah R. Dresser; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.  
 He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:  
 A bill (S. 1540) for the relief of David A. McKnight;  
 A bill (S. 1541) for the relief of Thomas Smith; and  
 A bill (S. 1542) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Sexton.  
 Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 1543) for the relief of M. D. Crow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.  
 He also introduced a bill (S. 1544) for the relief of Harry A. E. Pickard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.  
 He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.  
 A bill (S. 1545) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Cornelia I. Skiles;  
 A bill (S. 1546) granting a pension to Thomas Madden;  
 A bill (S. 1547) granting a pension to Cyrus A. Bowers;  
 A bill (S. 1548) granting a pension to James Byrne;  
 A bill (S. 1549) increasing the pension of Isaiah Mitchell;  
 A bill (S. 1550) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Kate Ezekiel;  
 A bill (S. 1551) granting a pension to John G. B. Masters;  
 A bill (S. 1552) granting an increase of pension to Helen L. Dent; and  
 A bill (S. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Samantha Barnes.  
 Mr. TELLER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:  
 A bill (S. 1554) granting an honorable discharge to George S. Raymond;  
 A bill (S. 1555) to correct the military record of Charles A. Wahl;  
 A bill (S. 1556) to remove the charge of desertion against Charles L. Thompson;  
 A bill (S. 1557) granting an honorable discharge to John Kinchlow;  
 A bill (S. 1558) for the relief of the First Colorado Mounted Militia;

A bill (S. 1559) for the relief of the estate of Emmet Crawford, deceased;  
 A bill (S. 1560) granting an honorable discharge to James Brown;  
 A bill (S. 1561) removing the charge of desertion in the case of John Holderby;  
 A bill (S. 1562) for the relief of Wilbur F. McCue;  
 A bill (S. 1563) removing the charge of desertion from the name of Frank A. Land; and  
 A bill (S. 1564) to reimburse the State of Colorado for moneys expended in the suppression of Ute Indian depredations during the year 1887.  
 Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 1565) for the relief of the estate of Dennis O'Dea, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.  
 He also introduced a bill (S. 1566) for the relief of Moses B. Smart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.  
 Mr. ELKINS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 1567) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of the legal heirs of John Harper, deceased, to certain lands in the State of Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.  
 He also introduced a bill (S. 1568) authorizing the President to appoint and retire George W. Harrison, with the rank and grade of captain and assistant quartermaster; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.  
 Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 1569) granting a pension to Mrs. Phebe E. C. Priestly; which was read twice by its title.  
 Mr. COCKRELL. I present, to accompany the bill, the petition of Mrs. Phebe E. C. Priestly, née Humon, for relief for services as nurse, etc., verified by her affidavit with affidavits of William H. Dooley, William O. Mead, Sarah S. Ritchter, Josephine Nance, Joshua Frost, L. P. Crunk, Mrs. M. A. Scoggins, J. H. Garrison, Archibald Hopper, T. H. B. Dunnegan, L. Lindrey, James J. Akard, T. A. Wakefield, and G. H. Higginbotham.  
 I move that the petition and affidavits be referred, with the bill, to the Committee on Pensions.  
 The motion was agreed to.  
 Mr. KYLE. I reintroduce, with a slight change in the wording, the joint resolution which I introduced the other day, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage and divorce.  
 The joint resolution (S. R. 40) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage and divorce was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SHIP CANALS OF THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:  
*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate:  
 1. The number of days during the season of 1899 on which navigation was blocked by reason of an accident occurring in St. Marys River and in the St. Clair Flats Canal, respectively; also the approximate money loss to the vessel interests by reason of such delays.  
 2. Whether in his judgment additional canals should be constructed in the two waterways above mentioned, or in either of them.

ANNUAL REPORT OF MAJ. GEN. E. S. OTIS.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:  
*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to print in excess of the 1,000 copies authorized by the act of January 12, 1895, 5,000 copies of the annual report of Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, United States Volunteers, commanding the Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps and military governor in the Philippines, dated August 31, 1899, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate, 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 2,000 copies for the use of the War Department.

TEXT-BOOKS IN INDIAN SCHOOLS.

Mr. DANIEL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:  
*Resolved*, That the Commissioner of Indian Affairs be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate the following information:  
 The name of each text-book used for instruction in the Indian schools under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, and the person, firm, or corporation publishing the same;  
 The number of copies of each book so used, purchased by direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for use in the Indian schools during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1899, and June 30, 1900;  
 The gross amount paid each person, firm, or corporation publishing the books so used during said years, said amount to include the amounts paid to said publishers direct and the amount paid to agents or others selling their publications.

AFFAIRS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution relative to affairs in the Philippines, coming over from a former day, submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW].



Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask that the resolution may lie over until to-morrow without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Calendar under Rule VIII is now in order. The Secretary will announce the first bill on the Calendar.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 330) to restore to their original status as to promotion officers of the Navy and Marine Corps losing numbers by reason of the advancement of other officers for exceptional and meritorious service during the war with Spain.

Mr. ALLISON. The bill may lead to some little debate. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator from Iowa will allow the bill to be passed. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is one we have all agreed on.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not familiar with it; but I shall not interpose the motion at this time.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a bill which passed the Senate unanimously at the last session, but was not acted on in the other House. It is a bill that is entirely proper and defensible, and I do not think any Senator will object to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 14, 1899, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 13, 1899.*

##### GENERAL APPRAISER.

William D. Bynum, of Indiana, to be general appraiser of merchandise, to succeed Joseph B. Wilkinson, jr., resigned.

##### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

William M. Hoey, of Indiana, to be collector of customs for the district of Arizona, in the Territory of Arizona, to succeed H. K. Chenoweth, resigned.

Charles M. Moses, of Maine, to be collector of customs for the district of Portland and Falmouth, in the State of Maine, in place of Weston F. Milliken, deceased.

##### INDIAN AGENT.

Maj. George W. H. Stouch, United States Army, retired, of Colorado, to be agent for the Indians of the Cheyenne and Arapahoe Agency in Oklahoma, vice Maj. Albert E. Woodson, United States Army, relieved from duty as acting Indian agent.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

###### TO BE SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Capt. John R. Hereford, assistant surgeon, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899, vice Armstrong, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, deceased.

###### TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF CAPTAIN.

First Lieut. William H. Cook, assistant surgeon, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 4, 1899, vice Hereford, Thirty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, promoted.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

###### THIRTIETH INFANTRY.

###### To be second lieutenant.

First Sergt. John Campbell, Company M, Thirtieth Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 11, 1899, vice Abbott, promoted.

##### PUERTO RICO BATTALION.

###### To be captain.

First Lieut. Allen D. Raymond, Puerto Rico Battalion, United States Volunteers, December 7, 1899, to fill an original vacancy.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

George H. Kearny, formerly a chief engineer in the Navy, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 3d day of March, 1899, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States."

William S. Moore, formerly a chief engineer in the Navy, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 3d day of March, 1899, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States."

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles T. Vogelgesang, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899, to fill an existing vacancy.

Lieut. Commander George Cowie, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Commander Henry S. Ross, retired.

Lieut. Charles C. Rogers, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander George Cowie, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles B. McVay, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Charles C. Rogers, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Charles P. Howell, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Commander John L. Hannum, retired.

Lieut. John T. Newton, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Charles P. Howell, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lay H. Everhart, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. John T. Newton, promoted.

Lieut. Waldemar D. Rose, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander William H. Driggs, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude Bailey, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Waldemar D. Rose, promoted.

Lieut. Charles F. Pond, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander John H. Moore, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John H. Dayton, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Charles F. Pond, promoted.

Lieut. Walter McLean, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Hawley O. Rittenhouse, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lucius A. Bostwick, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Walter McLean, promoted.

Lieut. Washington I. Chambers, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Robert G. Peck, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William A. Moffett, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Washington I. Chambers, promoted.

Lieut. James C. Gillmore, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Commander Herman F. Fickbohm, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Julian L. Latimer, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. James C. Gillmore, promoted.

Lieut. Benjamin Tappan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Gustavus C. Hanus, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Doctor E. Dismukes, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Benjamin Tappan, promoted.

Lieut. Charles A. Gove, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Henry H. Barroll, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John R. Edie, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 1st day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Charles A. Gove, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Reginald R. Belknap, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Franklin Swift, retired.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) De Witt Blamer, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 6th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Walter M. McFarland, resigned.

Lieut. Commander Charles P. Perkins, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Commander Richard Rush, retired.

Lieut. De Witt Coffman, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Charles P. Perkins, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John K. Robison, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. De Witt Coffman, promoted.

Commander Charles H. Stockton, to be a captain in the Navy,

from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Capt. James Entwistle, retired.

Lieut. Commander Charles G. Bowman, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Commander Charles H. Stockton, promoted.

Lieut. William G. Hannum, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Commander Charles G. Bowman, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arthur L. Willard, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 8th day of July, 1899, vice Lieut. William G. Hannum, promoted.

Capt. Alexander H. McCormick, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Rear-Admiral Henry F. Picking, deceased.

Commander Asa Walker, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Capt. Alexander H. McCormick, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William P. Potter, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Commander Asa Walker, promoted.

Lieut. Richard Henderson, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander William P. Potter, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edwin T. Pollock, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 9th day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Richard Henderson, promoted.

Lieut. Commander William H. Beehler, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899, vice Commander Robert T. Jasper, retired.

Lieut. Thomas D. Griffin, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander William H. Beehler, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Clark D. Stearns, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 22d day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Thomas D. Griffin, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry C. Kuenzli, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. William H. Faust, retired.

Commander Oscar W. Farenholt, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899, vice Capt. Joseph Trille, retired.

Lieut. Commander Giles B. Harber, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899, vice Commander Oscar W. Farenholt, promoted.

Lieut. Henry Minett, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Giles B. Harber, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John H. Rowen, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 25th day of September, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Henry Minett, promoted.

Capt. Albert S. Barker, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899, vice Rear-Admiral Henry L. Howison, retired.

Commander Edward T. Strong, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899, vice Capt. Albert S. Barker, promoted.

Lieut. Commander John B. Briggs, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Commander Edward T. Strong, promoted.

Lieut. Richard T. Mulligan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander John B. Briggs, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry H. Hough, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 10th day of October, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Richard T. Mulligan, promoted.

Commander Robert E. Impey, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899, vice Capt. Nicoll Ludlow, retired.

Lieut. Commander Newton E. Mason, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899, vice Commander Robert E. Impey, promoted.

Lieut. William Braunersreuther, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Commander Newton E. Mason, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Milton E. Reed, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of November, 1899, vice Lieut. William Braunersreuther, promoted.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harley H. Christy, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 21st day of November, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Lieut. Franklin B. Sullivan, retired.

Commander Eugene W. Watson, to be a captain in the Navy,

from the 22d day of November, 1899, vice Capt. John Schouler, retired.

Lieut. Commander Arthur P. Nazro, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law), vice Commander Eugene W. Watson, promoted.

Lieut. Francis H. Sherman, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 22d day of November, 1899, vice Lieut. Commander Arthur P. Nazro, promoted.

*To be lieutenants (junior grade).*

John P. J. Ryan.  
John R. Morris.  
Chester Wells.  
Irvin V. Gillis.  
Ridley McLean.  
Raymond Stone.  
David F. Sellers.  
Charles Webster.  
John T. Tompkins.  
John M. Hudgins.  
Provoost Babin.  
Simon P. Fullinwider.  
Lewis B. Jones.  
Boling K. McMorris.  
Stephen V. Graham.  
Alfred W. Hinds.  
Ernest L. Bennett.  
Roscoe C. Moody.  
Fritz L. Sandoz.  
Leland F. James.  
John McC. Luby.  
Ralph H. Chappell.  
Joseph M. Reeves.  
William P. Scott (subject to examination).  
Arthur G. Kavanagh.  
Ignatius T. Cooper.  
Carlton F. Snow.  
Henry T. Baker.  
Frank Lyon.  
Charles S. Bookwalter.  
Hutch I. Cone.  
Roscoe C. Bulmer.  
Gilbert S. Galbraith.  
Emory Winship (subject to examination).  
Roscoe Spear.  
Robert W. McNeely.  
Walter S. Turpin (subject to examination).  
George L. P. Stone.  
William S. Whitted.  
Robert H. Osborn (subject to examination).  
Walter J. Manion.  
George E. Gelm.  
Clarence England.  
Edwin H. De Lany.

**POSTMASTERS.**

Frank H. Hudson, to be postmaster at Clifton, in the county of Graham and Territory of Arizona, in the place of C. K. Holt, resigned.

Horace B. Gardiner, to be postmaster at Crockett, in the county of Contra Costa and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Harry E. Meyers, to be postmaster at Yuba City, in the county of Sutter and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Albert L. Paulsen, to be postmaster at Weaverville, in the county of Trinity and State of California, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William P. Harbottle, to be postmaster at Salida, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado, in the place of F. W. Brush, resigned.

John F. Morgan, to be postmaster at Colorado City, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado, in the place of C. A. Crane, removed.

Charles T. Wade, to be postmaster at Buena Vista, in the county of Chaffee and State of Colorado, in the place of C. H. Holt, removed.

Edmund E. Crowe, to be postmaster at South Norwalk, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of G. W. Benedict, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

William Holmes, to be postmaster at Shelton, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, in the place of Horace Wheeler, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.



George Glass, to be postmaster at High Springs, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

R. S. Hanna, to be postmaster at St. Petersburg, in the county of Hillsboro and State of Florida, in the place of W. A. Sloan, removed.

William J. Watson, to be postmaster at Marianna, in the county of Jackson and State of Florida, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lizzie Hamilton, to be postmaster at Buford, in the county of Gwinnett and State of Georgia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George L. Walker, to be postmaster at Toccoa, in the county of Habersham and State of Georgia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Hugh Bennett, to be postmaster at Coal City, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lucian Bullard, to be postmaster at Forrest, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Addison B. Hallock, to be postmaster at Peotone, in the county of Will and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Oscar H. Harpham, to be postmaster at Havana, in the county of Mason and State of Illinois, in the place of F. A. High, removed.

James P. Mathis, to be postmaster at Toluca, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles F. Renich, to be postmaster at Woodstock, in the county of McHenry and State of Illinois, in the place of J. A. Dufield, removed.

Amos A. Covalt, to be postmaster at Greentown, in the county of Howard and State of Indiana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Edward L. Mandlin, to be postmaster at New Carlisle, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana, in the place of G. H. Service, removed.

Samuel H. Hedrix, to be postmaster at Allerton, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Edward Madigan, to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa, in the place of J. J. Eichar, resigned.

Cornelius C. Platter, to be postmaster at Red Oak, in the county of Montgomery and State of Iowa, in the place of W. W. Merritt, whose commission expires December 18, 1899.

Lovett E. Sherwood, to be postmaster at Shellrock, in the county of Butler and State of Iowa, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Joseph P. Bozarth, to be postmaster at La Grange, in the county of Oldham and State of Kentucky, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George W. Evans, to be postmaster at Aberdeen, in the county of Harford and State of Maryland, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Minot Wales Baker, to be postmaster at Randolph, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. W. Wales, whose commission expires January 7, 1900.

Charles H. Cummings, to be postmaster at Attleboro Falls, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts, in the place of J. E. Doran, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

George A. Hibbard, to be postmaster at Boston, in the county of Suffolk and State of Massachusetts, in the place of H. A. Thomas, resigned.

William L. Lathrop, to be postmaster at Orange, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts, in the place of G. W. Merrill, removed.

Henry S. Moore, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of Henry S. Moore, whose commission expires January 7, 1900. (Reappointed.)

Corydon Beach, to be postmaster at Galesburg, in the county of Kalamazoo and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Archibald K. Dougherty, to be postmaster at Elk Rapids, in the county of Antrim and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Willard E. Holt, to be postmaster at Bellevue, in the county of Eaton and State of Michigan, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Victor Gillrup, to be postmaster at Albert Lea, in the county of Freeborn and State of Minnesota, in the place of L. P. Lorenson, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Charles F. Hendryx, to be postmaster at Sauk Center, in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota, in the place of W. O. P. Hilsdale, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

Nels A. Lilyquist, to be postmaster at Winthrop, in the county of Sibley and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

James H. McCune, to be postmaster at Benson, in the county of Swift and State of Minnesota, in the place of Julius Thorson, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

Peter S. Nelson, to be postmaster at Argyle, in the county of Marshall and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles W. Paige, to be postmaster at Dawson, in the county of Lac qui Parle and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles F. Searle, to be postmaster at Milaca, in the county of Millelacs and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Justin E. Stiles, to be postmaster at Wells, in the county of Faribault and State of Minnesota, in the place of Robert Andrews, whose commission expires December 19, 1899.

Samuel L. Stanchfield, to be postmaster at Camden Place, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

David G. Dunlap, to be postmaster at Sardis, in the county of Panola and State of Mississippi, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William A. Albright, to be postmaster at Kirkwood, in the county of St. Louis and State of Missouri, in the place of F. J. Heinemann, removed.

Eugene B. Pegram, to be postmaster at Montgomery City, in the county of Montgomery and State of Missouri, in the place of C. T. Hamilton, resigned.

Lewellen P. Robinson, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Caldwell and State of Missouri, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Leon C. Olmstead, to be postmaster at Bigtimber, in the county of Sweet Grass and State of Montana, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Edmund J. Burke, to be postmaster at Bancroft, in the county of Cuming and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Ambrose M. Colson, to be postmaster at Plainview in the county of Pierce and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

James McNally, to be postmaster at Edgar, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska, in the place of J. D. Baker, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Jessie W. Phillips, to be postmaster at Table Rock, in the county of Pawnee and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Samuel H. Reesman, to be postmaster at University Place, in the county of Lancaster and State of Nebraska, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

J. D. Stine, to be postmaster at Superior, in the county of Nuckolls and State of Nebraska, in the place of J. F. Bradshaw, whose commission expires January 15, 1900.

Lewis W. Davis, to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, in the county of Cheshire and State of New Hampshire, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Ellen S. Griffin, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, in the place of W. H. Stewart, deceased.

Fred S. Huckins, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire, in the place of W. F. Hardy, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Lewis E. Jeffries, to be postmaster at Mays Landing, in the county of Atlantic and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Daniel M. Merchant, to be postmaster at Morris Plains, in the county of Morris and State of New Jersey, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Thomas H. Dickinson, to be postmaster at Champlain, in the county of Clinton and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George T. Eveland, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Delaware and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George E. Marcellus, to be postmaster at Leroy, in the county of Genesee and State of New York, in the place of John Wiss, removed.

William Holden, to be postmaster at Portville, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Clarence E. Parker, to be postmaster at Nepera Park, in the county of Westchester and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lillian I. Pearsall, to be postmaster at Sea Cliff, in the county of Nassau and State of New York, in the place of Lillian I. Pearsall, whose commission expires January 7, 1900. (Reappointed.)

Frank M. Preston, to be postmaster at Oswego Falls, in the county of Oswego and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George L. Rapelye, to be postmaster at Corona, in the county of Queens and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Isaac S. Slaughter, to be postmaster at Tottenville, in the county of Richmond and State of New York, in the place of R. W. Wood, whose commission expired July 18, 1898.

Hans A. Alm, to be postmaster at Hankinson, in the county of Richland and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Millard F. Kepner, to be postmaster at New Rockford, in the county of Eddy and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Mathew Lynch, to be postmaster at Lidgerwood, in the county of Richland and State of North Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Clarence H. Ashar, to be postmaster at Carthage, in the county of Hamilton and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lee L. Cassidy, to be postmaster at Dresden, in the county of Muskingum and State of Ohio, in the place of W. M. Miller, resigned.

Robert S. King, to be postmaster at Glouster, in the county of Athens and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Edgar M. Kane, to be postmaster at Vermilion, in the county of Erie and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Nellie F. Sheridan, to be postmaster at Somerset, in the county of Perry and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Leonidas H. Smith, to be postmaster at Arcanum, in the county of Darke and State of Ohio, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Robert H. Robison, to be postmaster at Arlington, in the county of Gilliam and State of Oregon, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Robert S. Bowman, to be postmaster at Berwick, in the county of Columbia and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of L. J. Townsend, removed.

Lotta J. Kintner, to be postmaster at Wyalusing, in the county

of Bradford and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George D. Leonard, to be postmaster at Newberry, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William H. Logan, to be postmaster at Clifton Heights, in the county of Delaware and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Samuel G. Wilson, to be postmaster at Bridgeport, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Alexander Griffith, removed.

John A. Allen, to be postmaster at Peace Dale, in the county of Washington and State of Rhode Island, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Lyman J. Bates, to be postmaster at Lake Preston, in the county of Kingsbury and State of South Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George G. Jennings, to be postmaster at Clark, in the county of Clark and State of South Dakota, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Reuben Matson, to be postmaster at Brookings, in the county of Brookings and State of South Dakota, in the place of Joshua Downing, whose commission expires December 21, 1899.

David E. Ward, to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota, in the place of Augustus Huntemer, whose commission expires December 21, 1899.

Clarence V. Rattan, to be postmaster at Cooper, in the county of Delta and State of Texas, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

E. R. Booth, to be postmaster at Nephi, in the county of Juab and State of Utah, in the place of Charles Andrews, resigned.

Catherine M. Dougall, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Utah and State of Utah, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Martha W. Arnold, to be postmaster at Bethel, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont, in the place of Fred Arnold, deceased.

Harlow C. Ayer, to be postmaster at Richford, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of Oscar McGregor, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Henry G. Blanchard, to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Orleans and State of Vermont, in the place of C. N. Brady, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Henry J. Fisher, to be postmaster at Morrisville, in the county of Lamoille and State of Vermont, in the place of D. C. Spaulding, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Charles E. Hall, to be postmaster at Swanton, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of E. A. Ayers, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Edward J. Tyler, to be postmaster at Enosburg Falls, in the county of Franklin and State of Vermont, in the place of W. E. Fuller, resigned.

Oscar C. Truax, to be postmaster at Tekoa, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Alexander Watt, to be postmaster at Cheney, in the county of Spokane and State of Washington, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

William Chambers, to be postmaster at Point Pleasant, in the county of Mason and State of West Virginia, in the place of G. B. Thomas, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

William H. Glover, to be postmaster at Terra Alta, in the county of Preston and State of West Virginia, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

Charles A. Booth, to be postmaster at Monroe, in the county of Green and State of Wisconsin, in the place of F. C. Bennett, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

Wilbur H. Bridgman, to be postmaster at Stanley, in the county of Chippewa and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

George W. Dodge, to be postmaster at Menasha, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Charles Reed, whose commission expires December 30, 1899.

John F. Gillmore, to be postmaster at Durand, in the county of Pepin and State of Wisconsin, in the place of P. J. Ryan, deceased.



Moses E. Williams, to be postmaster at Foxlake, in the county of Dodge and State of Wisconsin, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1899.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13, 1899.*

##### THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

Edwin C. Madden, of Michigan, to be Third Assistant Postmaster-General.

##### COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

William M. Hoey, of Indiana, to be collector of customs for the district of Arizona, in the Territory of Arizona.

##### CONSULS-GENERAL.

Philip C. Hanna, of Iowa, to be consul-general of the United States at Monterey, Mexico.

John G. Long, of Florida, to be agent and consul-general of the United States at Cairo, Egypt.

##### CONSULS.

Julio Harmony, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Corunna, Spain.

Jay White, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Hanover, Germany.

Hugh C. Morris, of Michigan, to be consul of the United States at Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Solomon Berliner, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Teneriffe, Canary Islands.

John Howell Carroll, of Maryland, to be consul of the United States at Cadiz, Spain.

Frank D. Hill, of Minnesota, to be consul of the United States at Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Adelbert S. Hay, of New Hampshire, to be consul of the United States at Pretoria, South African Republic.

Harlan W. Brush, of New York, to be consul of the United States at Niagara Falls, Canada.

Richard M. Bartleman, of Massachusetts, to be consul of the United States at Malaga, Spain.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### GENERAL OFFICERS.

##### *To be brigadier-generals.*

Col. Edwin V. Sumner (since retired from active service), Seventh Cavalry, March 27, 1899.

Col. Thomas M. Anderson, Fourteenth Infantry, March 31, 1899.

Col. Alexander C. M. Pennington (since retired from active service), Second Artillery, October 16, 1899.

Col. Royal T. Frank (since retired from active service), First Artillery, October 17, 1899.

Col. Louis H. Carpenter (since retired from active service), Fifth Cavalry, October 18, 1899.

Col. Samuel Ovenshine (since retired from active service), Twenty-third Infantry, October 19, 1899.

Col. Daniel W. Burke (since retired from active service), Seventeenth Infantry, October 20, 1899.

##### PAY DEPARTMENT.

##### *To be Paymaster-General with the rank of brigadier-general.*

Col. Alfred E. Bates, assistant paymaster-general, July 12, 1899.

##### ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

##### *To be Chief of Ordnance with the rank of brigadier-general.*

Col. Adelbert R. Buffington, Ordnance Department, April 5, 1899.

##### *To be first lieutenant.*

First Lieut. Edward P. O'Hern, Third Artillery, October 23, 1899.

##### QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

##### *To be assistant quartermasters with the rank of captain.*

First Lieut. George McK. Williamson, Eighth Cavalry, July 21, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert Sewell, First Cavalry, September 1, 1899.

First Lieut. Thomas H. Slavens, Fourth Cavalry, November 13, 1899.

##### GENERAL OFFICERS.

Col. Edgar R. Kellogg, Sixth United States Infantry, to be brigadier-general, December 5, 1899.

Col. Gilbert S. Carpenter, Eighteenth United States Infantry, to be brigadier-general, December 5, 1899.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

##### *To be brigadier-generals.*

Col. William A. Kobbé, Thirty-fifth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

Col. J. Franklin Bell, Thirty-sixth Regiment of Infantry, United States Volunteers, December 5, 1899.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. George W. Melville, United States Navy, to be Engineer in Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 16th day of January, 1900.

Naval Constructor Philip Hichborn, United States Navy, to be Chief Constructor and Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Capt. Arent Schuyler Crowninshield, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 8th day of April, 1901.

Capt. Charles O'Neil, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 1st day of June, 1901.

Capt. Royal B. Bradford, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Equipment, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Medical Director William K. Van Reypen, United States Navy, to be Surgeon-General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 18th day of December, 1901.

Civil Engineer Mordecai T. Endicott, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, until the 4th day of April, 1902.

Pay Director Albert S. Kenny, United States Navy, to be Paymaster-General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear-admiral, for a term of four years.

Commander George E. Ide, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. Clifford J. Boush, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William H. Buck, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 25th day of March, 1899.

Capt. Benjamin F. Day, to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Commander George M. Book, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. James H. Sears, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) George W. Williams, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 29th day of March, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Claude B. Price, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of April, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Montgomery M. Taylor, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 2d day of June, 1899.

Lieut. Abraham E. Culver, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 4th day of June, 1899.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry S. Ritter, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, from the 4th day of June, 1899.

Commander Thomas Perry, to be a captain in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899.

Lieut. Commander Julien S. Ogden, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899.

Lieut. Henry T. Mayo, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 11th day of June, 1899.

Asst. Surg. Reginald K. Smith, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 3d day of April, 1898.

Asst. Surg. Jacob C. Rosenbluth, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 14th day of October, 1898.

Medical Inspector Abel F. Price, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Surg. James R. Waggener, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

P. A. Surg. Thomas A. Berryhill, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Medical Inspector Michael C. Drennan, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899.

Surg. Thomas H. Streets, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899.

P. A. Surg. Eugene P. Stone, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 16th day of April, 1899.

Asst. Surg. Robert S. Blakeman, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

Asst. Surg. George D. Costigan, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 11th day of August, 1899.

P. A. Surg. George Pickrell, to be a surgeon in the Navy, from the 19th day of September, 1899.

Medical Inspector James A. Hawke, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899.

Surg. Manly H. Simons, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 24th day of September, 1899.

Medical Inspector Robert A. Marmion, to be a medical director in the Navy, from October 25, 1899.

Surg. John C. Boyd, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 25th day of October, 1899.

Medical Inspector Dwight Dickinson, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 11th day of November, 1899.

Surg. George E. H. Harmon, to be a medical inspector in the Navy, from the 11th day of November, 1899.

Pay Inspector George W. Beaman, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Paymaster William J. Thomson, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry E. Jewett, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster William T. Gray, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 9th day of April, 1899.

Paymaster Henry G. Colby, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Ziba W. Reynolds, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster George P. Dyer, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 23d day of April, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Eugene D. Ryan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 3d day of May, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Robert H. Woods, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 3d day of May, 1899.

Pay Inspector Arthur Burtis, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Paymaster John B. Redfield, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Samuel McGowan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Robert H. Orr, to be a passed assistant paymaster, from the 5th day of May, 1899.

Pay Inspector Edwin Putnam, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Paymaster Ichabod G. Hobbs, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Henry A. Dent, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster William A. Merritt, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

Pay Inspector Robert P. Lisle, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Paymaster Joel P. Loomis, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Walter L. Wilson, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Franklin W. Hart, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 6th day of June, 1899.

Pay Inspector Leonard A. Frailey, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 29th day of August, 1899.

Paymaster Henry T. B. Harris, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 29th day of August, 1899.

John Clyde Sullivan, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 16th day of June, 1899.

Pay Inspector George E. Hendee, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Paymaster Stephen Rand, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster William J. Littell, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Harrison L. Robins, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 1st day of September, 1899.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Philip V. Mohun, to be a paymaster in the Navy, from the 15th day of September, 1899.

Assistant Paymaster Webb V. H. Rose, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 15th day of September, 1899.

Paymaster Lawrence G. Boggs, to be a pay inspector in the Navy, from the 12th day of November, 1899.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Capt. Cyrus S. Radford, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in said corps, from the 8th day of March, 1899.

First Lieut. Robert P. Faunt Le Roy, United States Marine Corps, to be an assistant quartermaster in said corps with the rank of captain, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

First Lieut. William B. Lemly to be an assistant quartermaster with the rank of captain in said corps, from the 27th day of May, 1899.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS. TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS.

*From the 8th day of April, 1899.*

George C. Thorpe, a citizen of Maine.  
Smedley D. Butler, a citizen of Pennsylvania.  
William B. Lemly, a citizen of North Carolina.  
Henry Leonard, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Charles S. Hill, a citizen of New Hampshire.  
Robert M. Gilson, a citizen of Vermont.  
Robert P. Faunt Le Roy, a citizen of Virginia.  
David D. Porter, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Frederick L. Bradman, a citizen of Montana.  
Henry C. Davis, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
George C. Reid, a citizen of Ohio.  
Robert H. Dunlap, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

*From the 13th day of April, 1899.*

Henry W. Carpenter, a citizen of Virginia.  
Randolph C. Berkeley, a citizen of Virginia.  
Arthur J. Matthews, a citizen of Rhode Island.  
Charles G. Andresen, a citizen of New York.  
Charles S. Hatch, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
James C. Breckinridge, a citizen of Arkansas.  
Arthur T. Marix, a citizen of Illinois.  
Philip S. Brown, a citizen of Maine.  
Harry Lee, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

*From the 26th day of May, 1899.*

John F. McGill, a citizen of Virginia.  
Frederic H. Delano, a citizen of New York.  
Louis M. Gulick, a citizen of New York.  
Hiram I. Bearss, a citizen of Indiana.  
William H. Parker, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Robert F. Wynne, a citizen of Pennsylvania.  
Edwin A. Jonas, a citizen of Louisiana.  
Benjamin F. Rittenhouse, a citizen of Virginia.

*From the 8th day of June, 1899.*

Thomas F. Lyons, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

*From the 1st day of July, 1899.*

James T. Bootes, a citizen of Delaware.  
Ernest E. West, a citizen of Georgia.  
William G. Powell, appointed at large.  
Logan Feland, a citizen of Kentucky.  
William H. Clifford, jr., a citizen of Maine.  
John H. A. Day, a citizen of New Jersey.  
John S. Bates, appointed at large.  
James W. Broatch, a citizen of Nebraska.  
Benjamin B. Woog, appointed at large.  
William Hopkins, a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Dickinson P. Hall, a citizen of Ohio.  
Arthur E. Harding, a citizen of Illinois.  
William W. Low, a citizen of Connecticut.  
James W. Lynch, a citizen of Maine.  
Charles H. Lyman, appointed at large.

#### TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS.

*From the 1st day of July, 1899.*

Charles C. Carpenter, a citizen of New Hampshire.  
Norman G. Burton, a citizen of Massachusetts.  
Louis M. Little, a citizen of Rhode Island.  
Leof M. Harding, a citizen of Missouri.  
Frederic M. Wise, jr., appointed at large.  
Richard M. Cutts, a citizen of California.  
Stephen Elliott, a citizen of South Carolina.  
Harold C. Snyder, a citizen of Virginia.

*From the 27th day of July, 1899.*

Wirt McCreary, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

*From the 2d day of October, 1899.*

Richard P. Williams, a citizen of Arizona.  
Wade L. Jolly, a citizen of Iowa.  
Alexander S. Williams, a citizen of New York.  
John N. Wright, a citizen of South Dakota.  
Olof H. Rask, a citizen of Minnesota.  
Richard G. McConnell, a citizen of Pennsylvania.  
Julius S. Turrill, a citizen of Vermont.  
Lee B. Purcell, a citizen of Indiana.  
James M. Huey, a citizen of Louisiana.

#### TO BE MAJORS.

Capt. Thomas N. Wood, United States Marine Corps, from the 18th day of June, 1899.

Capt. Littleton W. T. Waller, United States Marine Corps, from the 25th day of July, 1899.

#### TO BE LIEUTENANT-COLONELS.

Maj. George F. Elliott, United States Marine Corps, from the 11th day of September, 1899.



Capt. Harry K. White, United States Marine Corps, from the 11th day of September, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

*Assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy.*

George Brown, jr.  
Walter B. Izard.  
David Potter (subject to examination).  
Samuel Bryan (subject to examination).  
George M. Lukesh (subject to examination).  
John W. Morse (subject to examination).  
Arthur F. Huntington.  
Harry H. Balthis.  
Charles Conrad.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

*To be assistant paymasters.*

George R. Venable, a citizen of Virginia, from the 6th day of March, 1899.  
Howard P. Ash, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 6th day of March, 1899.  
Hugh R. Inslay, a citizen of California, from the 6th day of March, 1899.  
James S. Barber, a citizen of Ohio, from the 6th day of March, 1899.  
George M. Stackhouse, a citizen of South Carolina, from the 13th day of April, 1899.  
Grey Skipwith, a citizen of Virginia, from the 13th day of April, 1899.  
Trevor W. Leutze, a citizen of New York, from the 15th day of April, 1899.  
McGill R. Goldsborough, a citizen of Maryland, from the 25th day of April, 1899.  
David V. Chadwick, a citizen of West Virginia, from the 25th day of April, 1899.  
Eugene C. Tobey, a citizen of Maine, from the 28th day of April, 1899.  
Arthur H. Cathcart, a citizen of Minnesota, from the 15th day of May, 1899.  
Jonathan Brooks, a citizen of Massachusetts, from the 22d day of May, 1899.  
Eugene F. Hall, a citizen of Kentucky, from the 27th day of May, 1899.  
Dexter Tiffany, jr., a citizen of Missouri, from the 31st day of May, 1899.  
Franklin P. Sackett, a citizen of Rhode Island, from the 3d day of June, 1899.  
David M. Addison, a citizen of Kansas, from the 3d day of June, 1899.  
William T. Wallace, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 3d day of June, 1899.  
Victor S. Jackson, a citizen of Indiana, from the 9th day of June, 1899.  
John R. Sanford, a citizen of New York, from the 9th day of June, 1899.  
Herbert E. Stevens, a citizen of Massachusetts, from the 5th day of July, 1899.  
Charles R. O'Leary, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 18th day of September, 1899.  
Charles W. Eliason, a citizen of the District of Columbia, from the 18th day of September, 1899.  
Cuthbert J. Cleborne, a citizen of New Hampshire, from the 18th day of September, 1899.  
Philip Delano, a citizen of the District of Columbia, from the 1st day of December, 1899.

*To be assistant surgeons.*

Barton L. Wright, a citizen of Pennsylvania, from the 13th day of May, 1899.  
Ralph W. Plummer, a citizen of Illinois, from the 17th day of June, 1899.  
Olin Martin Eakins, a citizen of New Jersey, from the 21st day of October, 1899.  
Henry E. Odell, a citizen of Ohio, from the 8th day of November, 1899.  
James S. Taylor, a citizen of New Jersey, from the 8th day of November, 1899.  
Edwin Davis, a citizen of Kentucky, from the 21st day of November, 1899.

*To be assistant naval constructors.*

Naval Cadets William G. Du Bose, of Georgia, Ernest F. Eggert, of Michigan, and Ensign Joseph W. Powell, of New York, from the 1st day of July, 1899.

*To be a professor of mathematics.*

Milton Updegraff, a citizen of Iowa, from the 5th day of June, 1899, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

*To be chief boatswains.*

Charles F. Pierce, from the 7th day of May, 1899.  
Henry Hudson, from the 27th day of August, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law).  
Hugh Sweeney, from the 27th day of August, 1899 (subject to the examinations required by law).  
Michael Wogan, from the 21st day of October, 1899.

*To be a chief carpenter.*

Edward W. Smith, from the 7th day of May, 1899.

*To be ensigns in the Navy.*

Harry E. Yarnell, Iowa.  
Harlan P. Perrill, Indiana.  
David E. Theleen, Wisconsin.  
Daniel S. Mahony, Michigan.  
Arthur J. Hepburn, Pennsylvania.  
Needham L. Jones, Mississippi.  
Thomas C. Hart, Michigan.  
Alfred W. Pressey, Nebraska.  
William H. Reynolds, Georgia.  
Cyrus R. Miller, California.  
Orin G. Murfin, Ohio.  
Leonard R. Sargent, Minnesota.  
Luther M. Overstreet, Nebraska.  
William R. White, Arizona.  
Henry L. Collins, Pennsylvania.  
Victor S. Houston, South Dakota.  
David F. Boyd, Alabama.  
Gilbert Chase, Virginia.  
Louis C. Richardson, South Carolina.  
Walton R. Sexton, Illinois.  
Walter M. Falconer, Ohio.  
Joseph W. Graeme, Pennsylvania.  
Albert H. McCarthy, Iowa.  
Frederic R. Holman, Iowa.  
Henry N. Jenson, Wisconsin.  
William D. Leahy, Wisconsin.  
Andrew T. Graham, Illinois.  
Arthur St. C. Smith, Iowa.  
Peter L. Pratt, at large.  
Oscar D. Duncan, Alabama.  
Willis McDowell, Pennsylvania.  
Austin Kautz, Washington.  
Charles T. Owens, Pennsylvania.  
Hilary Williams, Indiana.  
Robert W. Henderson, Ohio.  
William C. Asserson, New York.  
Clarence S. Kempff, California.  
Alfred C. Owen, District of Columbia.  
Samuel G. Magill, jr., North Dakota.  
Irwin F. Landis, Kansas.  
Ernest C. Keenan, New York.

TO BE A FIRST LIEUTENANT IN THE MARINE CORPS.

George Van Orden, Michigan.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Herbert Mather, New Jersey.  
Henry L. Roosevelt, New York.  
Fred M. Eslick, Tennessee.  
Jay M. Salladay, Illinois.  
Rush R. Wallace, Tennessee.  
Macker Babb, West Virginia.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

John R. Brady, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 10th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.  
Clarence A. Carr, formerly passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 24th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.  
Allen M. Cook, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 24th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.  
Edward H. Scribner, formerly passed assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a chief engineer in the Navy, from the 28th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.  
Emmet R. Pollock, formerly assistant engineer, United States Navy, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy, from the 28th day of February, 1899, to the 3d day of March, 1899.

SUPERVISORS OF THE TWELFTH CENSUS.

James A. Place, of South Berwick, York County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Maine.  
Samuel A. Eddy, of Canaan, Litchfield County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the — supervisor's district of Connecticut.

George H. Webb, of Providence, Providence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the supervisor's district of Rhode Island.

Horace G. Wadlin, of Boston, Suffolk County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the ——— supervisor's district of Massachusetts.

Elmer P. Spofford, of Deer Isle, Hancock County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Maine.

Edmund L. Dunn, of Red Sulphur Springs, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Thomas A. Brown, of Elizabeth, Wirt County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Walter B. Gates, of Burlington, Chittenden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the ——— supervisor's district of Vermont.

John M. Cheney, of Orlando, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Florida.

Lamar C. Powell, of Fairmont, Marion County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Harvey W. Harmer, of Clarksburg, Harrison County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of West Virginia.

Charles S. Cairns, of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Elmer E. Adams, of Fergus Falls, Ottertail County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Richard Turnbull, of Monticello, Jefferson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Florida.

James G. Hamlin, of Blue Earth City, Faribault County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Lewis D. Frost, of Winona, Winona County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Arthur N. Dare, of Elk River, Sherburne County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of Minnesota.

John Blowe, of Camden, Camden County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of New Jersey.

Edward Yanish, of St. Paul, Ramsey County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Harry B. Wakefield, of Hutchinson, McLeod County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of Minnesota.

Samuel A. Smith, of Newark, Essex County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of New Jersey.

William L. James, of Riverton, Burlington County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of New Jersey.

James M. Denton, of Paterson, Passaic County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of New Jersey.

Walter B. Atterbury, of Brooklyn, Kings County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Second supervisor's district of New York.

John H. Westell, of Jersey City, Hudson County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of New Jersey.

Charles S. Tunis, of Imlaystown, Monmouth County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of New Jersey.

William B. Collins, of Gloversville, Fulton County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventh supervisor's district of New York.

Frank D. Cole, of Cairo, Greene County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Ninth supervisor's district of New York.

John Batchelor, of Utica, Oneida County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Thirteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Matthew A. Heeran, of Rensselaer, Rensselaer County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourth supervisor's district of New York.

Warren S. Hodgman, of Painted Post, Steuben County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Edgar M. Gordon, of Port Jervis, Orange County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Tenth supervisor's district of New York.

Joseph Schnell, of Binghamton, Broome County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eleventh supervisor's district of New York.

John T. Roberts, of Syracuse, Onondaga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Twelfth supervisor's district of New York.

John W. Hannan, of Rochester, Monroe County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Nineteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Charles S. Wilbur, of New York, New York County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the First supervisor's district of New York.

Frank S. Steenberge, of North Bangor, Franklin County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fifth supervisor's district of New York.

James R. Stevens, of Cohoes, Albany County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighth supervisor's district of New York.

Reuben J. Myers, of Auburn, Cayuga County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Fourteenth supervisor's district of New York.

Frederic A. Weed, of Potsdam, St. Lawrence County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixth supervisor's district of New York.

James L. Williams, of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Third supervisor's district of New York.

Albert J. Slight, of West Sparta, Livingston County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Eighteenth supervisor's district of New York.

James A. Hamilton, of Buffalo, Erie County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Seventeenth supervisor's district of New York.

John A. Warren, of Fredonia, Chautauqua County, to be a supervisor of the Twelfth Census for the Sixteenth supervisor's district of New York.

#### POSTMASTERS.

Frank V. D. Bogert, to be postmaster at Paullina, in the county of O'Brien and State of Iowa.

Will B. Barstow, to be postmaster at Manilla, in the county of Crawford and State of Iowa.

William A. Kelley, to be postmaster at Story City, in the county of Story and State of Iowa.

William D. Jacobsen, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Clinton and State of Iowa.

Simon D. Breuning, to be postmaster at Ackley, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa.

Charles W. Rhinesmith, to be postmaster at Harlan, in the county of Shelby and State of Iowa.

James W. Miller, to be postmaster at Winterset, in the county of Madison and State of Iowa.

Charles F. Le Compte, to be postmaster at Corydon, in the county of Wayne and State of Iowa.

William F. Stahl, to be postmaster at Lisbon, in the county of Linn and State of Iowa.

Edward A. Snyder, to be postmaster at Cedar Falls, in the county of Blackhawk and State of Iowa.

Hamline W. Robinson, to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of Jasper and State of Iowa.

John H. Bartlett, to be postmaster at Portsmouth, in the county of Rockingham and State of New Hampshire.

Benjamin C. Wise, to be postmaster at Cascade, in the county of Dubuque and State of Iowa.

Clarence P. Swarm, to be postmaster at Oakland, in the county of Pottawattamie and State of Iowa.

Henry Robinson, to be postmaster at Concord, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

Prescott B. Kinsman, to be postmaster at Somersworth, in the county of Strafford and State of New Hampshire.

Charles Eaton, to be postmaster at Littleton, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

Irene Frazee Elliott, to be postmaster at Okolona, in the county of Chickasaw and State of Mississippi.

Katie Edwards, to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Jones and State of Mississippi.

Natt F. Roberts, to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Strafford and State of New Hampshire.

John R. Matthews, to be postmaster at Wesson, in the county of Copiah and State of Mississippi.

Thomas F. Logan, to be postmaster at Friar Point, in the county of Coahoma and State of Mississippi.

Andrew J. Hyde, to be postmaster at Meridian, in the county of Lauderdale and State of Mississippi.



Putnam Beckwith, to be postmaster at Wenona, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois.

Thomas E. Ballinger, to be postmaster at Chenoa, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois.

David H. Baker, to be postmaster at Tiskilwa, in the county of Bureau and State of Illinois.

Lewis H. Miner, to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Sangamon and State of Illinois.

Samuel Mather, to be postmaster at Naperville, in the county of Dupage and State of Illinois.

Thomas S. Green, to be postmaster at Gardner, in the county of Grundy and State of Illinois.

Harry E. Spear, to be postmaster at Polo, in the county of Ogle and State of Illinois.

Richard R. Puffer, to be postmaster at Odell, in the county of Livingston and State of Illinois.

Chauncey H. Parmely, to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois.

David F. Wilcox, to be postmaster at Quincy, in the county of Adams and State of Illinois.

William T. Thorp, to be postmaster at Litchfield, in the county of Montgomery and State of Illinois.

Robert B. Thomas, to be postmaster at Lacon, in the county of Marshall and State of Illinois.

Madison Thornburg, to be postmaster at Santa Maria, in the county of Santa Barbara and State of California.

Charles S. Graham, to be postmaster at Pleasanton, in the county of Alameda and State of California.

William B. Sampson, to be postmaster at Skagway, in the Territory of Alaska.

Fredrick G. McHarg, to be postmaster at Walsenburg, in the county of Huerfano and State of Colorado.

Charles A. Huxley, to be postmaster at Goldfield, in the county of Teller and State of Colorado.

Frank E. Baker, to be postmaster at Fort Morgan, in the county of Morgan and State of Colorado.

John A. Merritt, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and District of Columbia.

John C. Twombly, to be postmaster at Denver, in the county of Arapahoe and State of Colorado.

Daniel M. Sullivan, to be postmaster at Cripple Creek, in the county of Teller and State of Colorado.

James L. Bradford, to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of Grant and State of Indiana.

William J. Turner, to be postmaster at Mountain Home, in the county of Elmore and State of Idaho.

Fred S. Stevens, to be postmaster at Blackfoot, in the county of Bingham and State of Idaho.

Charles C. Fesler, to be postmaster at Clay City, in the county of Clay and State of Indiana.

Floyd E. Farley, to be postmaster at Crown Point, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Edgar H. Cole, to be postmaster at Knightstown, in the county of Henry and State of Indiana.

John C. Row, to be postmaster at Osgood, in the county of Ripley and State of Indiana.

Arthur H. Rockafellar, to be postmaster at Brookville, in the county of Franklin and State of Indiana.

William H. H. Pitman, to be postmaster at Hagerstown, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana.

Joseph L. Worthington, to be postmaster at Tahlequah, in the Cherokee Nation of Indian Territory.

Frank D. Ungles, to be postmaster at Hartshorne, in the Choctaw Nation of Indian Territory.

Thompson Turner, to be postmaster at Walkerton, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

Grenville G. Redding, to be postmaster at West Medford, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

William L. Nickerson, to be postmaster at Chatham, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts.

Paul R. Bridgman, to be postmaster at Ware, in the county of Hampshire and State of Massachusetts.

William C. Stoddard, to be postmaster at Fairhaven, in the county of Bristol and State of Massachusetts.

William H. Sprague, to be postmaster at Stoneham, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Calvin W. Smith, to be postmaster at Wellesley Hills, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

Burton F. Browne, to be postmaster at Harbor Beach (late Sand Beach), in the county of Huron and State of Michigan.

Charles H. Baird, to be postmaster at Holly, in the county of Oakland and State of Michigan.

Charles E. Wallace, to be postmaster at Fitchburg, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Cline, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Ogemaw and State of Michigan.

George Burkhardt, to be postmaster at Saline, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan.

Willard C. Brown, to be postmaster at Brighton, in the county of Livingston and State of Michigan.

William McGillivray, to be postmaster at Oscoda, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan.

Edward F. Evarts, to be postmaster at Chesaning, in the county of Saginaw and State of Michigan.

Hutson B. Colman, to be postmaster at Kalamazoo, in the county of Kalamazoo and State of Michigan.

Loren A. Sherman, to be postmaster at Port Huron, in the county of St. Clair and State of Michigan.

Gerrit Van Schelven, to be postmaster at Holland, in the county of Ottawa and State of Michigan.

Charles Quick, to be postmaster at Lowell, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

Stephen P. Barker, to be postmaster at Richfield Springs, in the county of Otsego and State of New York.

Lewis O. Fullen, to be postmaster at Carlsbad (late Eddy), in the county of Eddy and Territory of New Mexico.

George Wever, to be postmaster at Marlette, in the county of Sanilac and State of Michigan.

George D. Davis, to be postmaster at Mount Kisco, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

George L. Carver, to be postmaster at Lyons, in the county of Wayne and State of New York.

Henry R. Bryan, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Columbia and State of New York.

Harry M. Glen, to be postmaster at Seneca Falls, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

Delevan C. Ford, to be postmaster at Mohawk, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York.

Samuel G. Dorr, to be postmaster at Buffalo, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

George B. Harmon, to be postmaster at Brockport, in the county of Monroe and State of New York.

Henry E. Harms, to be postmaster at Allegany, in the county of Cattaraugus and State of New York.

Alonzo E. Hadley, to be postmaster at Springville, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

John C. Horrigan, to be postmaster at Depew, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

William Haynes, to be postmaster at Hoosic Falls, in the county of Rensselaer and State of New York.

Alexander M. Harriott, to be postmaster at Rye, in the county of Westchester and State of New York.

Milton A. Le Cluse, to be postmaster at Great Neck, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Clarence L. King, to be postmaster at Tupper Lake, in the county of Franklin and State of New York.

Charles C. Johnson, to be postmaster at Antwerp, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Elbert E. Makepeace, to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

Thomas A. McWhinney, to be postmaster at Lawrence, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Aloysius McArdle, to be postmaster at West Seneca, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

John Remers, to be postmaster at Lancaster, in the county of Erie and State of New York.

Samuel H. Parsons, to be postmaster at East Hampton, in the county of Suffolk and State of New York.

Charles G. Norton, to be postmaster at Bainbridge, in the county of Chenango and State of New York.

Willard F. Sherwood, to be postmaster at Hornellsville, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Alexander Ross, to be postmaster at Sherburne, in the county of Chenango and State of New York.

Webster M. Richardson, to be postmaster at Mexico, in the county of Oswego and State of New York.

Melvin H. Taylor, to be postmaster at Fredonia, in the county of Chautauque and State of New York.

Orlando W. Sutton, to be postmaster at Bath, in the county of Steuben and State of New York.

Frank F. Simpson, to be postmaster at Highland, in the county of Ulster and State of New York.

John N. Van Antwerp, to be postmaster at Fultonville, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York.

De Witt C. Titus, to be postmaster at Hempstead, in the county of Nassau and State of New York.

Mortimer R. Tefft, to be postmaster at Greenwich, in the county of Washington and State of New York.

William G. Mitchell, to be postmaster at Minto, in the county of Walsh and State of North Dakota.

Wallace Galehouse, to be postmaster at Carrington, in the county of Foster and State of North Dakota.

Henry C. Dana, to be postmaster at Bottineau, in the county of Bottineau and State of North Dakota.

Emily McKinley, to be postmaster at Kingfisher, in the county of Kingfisher, Okla.

Elita H. Jayne, to be postmaster at Edmond, in the county of Edmond and Territory of Oklahoma.

John A. Regan, to be postmaster at Fessenden, in the county of Wells and State of North Dakota.

William M. Yates, to be postmaster at Hood River, in the county of Wasco and State of Oregon.

Edward B. Roll, to be postmaster at Woodward, in the county of Woodward, Okla.

Thomas J. Palmer, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Grant, Okla.

Elmer E. Waite, to be postmaster at Newcastle, in the county of Weston and State of Wyoming.

Benjamin B. Martin, to be postmaster at Warren, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island.

William M. Gorham, to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Bristol and State of Rhode Island.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, December 13, 1899.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CENTENNIAL OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the following Select Committee on the Establishment of the Seat of Government in Washington, as provided for by the resolution passed last night.

The Clerk read as follows:

Select Committee on the Establishment of the Seat of Government in Washington: Mr. J. G. CANNON of Illinois, Mr. WILLIAM W. GROUT of Vermont, Mr. JOEL P. HEATWOLE of Minnesota, Mr. JAMES S. SHERMAN of New York, Mr. JAMES A. HEMENWAY of Indiana, Mr. ROBERT J. GAMBLE of South Dakota, Mr. J. W. BAILEY of Texas, Mr. MARION DE VRIES of California, Mr. WILLIAM S. COWHERD of Missouri, and Mr. JOHN C. BELL of Colorado.

### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following joint resolutions were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

Joint resolution (S. R. 28) relating to the use of the rooms lately occupied by the Congressional Library in the Capitol—to the Committee on Rules.

Joint resolution (S. R. 26) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the use of the United States post-office and courthouse building at Parkersburg, W. Va., by the circuit court and criminal court of Wood County, W. Va., sitting at Parkersburg—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

### THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the special order the House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 1. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the bankers and bondholders of the world are now winning the greatest financial victory that ever has been achieved in the legislative arena of the world.

When Mr. Spalding drew his greenback bill in 1861 and gave it to the press, the Bankers' Association of the country sent to Washington a committee of nine of its members, who drew and pressed an interest-bearing bond substitute before the Secretary of the Treasury and the committees of Congress, but finally failed except in the compromise they obtained in placing the exception clause in the greenback, which enabled them to make untold millions out of it. From that day to this they have annually declared for the retirement of the greenback and for interest-bearing bonds, and for a quarter of a century for the gold standard, and now they are getting all any ordinary avarice could covet.

Sirs, if there had never been a national-bank note or an interest-bearing bond, there never would have been a silver question in the United States, as there never has been a just cause for such a question.

I do not wonder that our Republican friends are tired of the indictment of 1873. The records of this and of the other Chamber and the confessions of their own great leaders establish it as one of the "most mysterious and diabolical crimes of the century."

The deception and infamy concealed in this bill may divert the attention of the people for a season from the original crime, but

as long as the people read the records of that transaction no bluff or denial will cause the defrauded public to forget or forgive the turpitude involved.

The arguments of the advocates of this bill are made entirely from the point of view of the bondholder and banker, which is just the reverse of that of the economic thinkers or the masters in monetary science.

Mr. Robert Barclay, in his work on Disturbance in the Standard of Value, says:

Monetary science is something different both from finance and from banking, and we know that the full study of it is as much shirked, both by merchants and bankers, as by other classes.

The banker does not study or master Government financing, but is an adept in so handling private funds as to make the largest possible profits with the least possible expenditure of treasure and of human effort.

The banker's property is in money, bonds, and mortgages.

The scarcer wheat is in the market, the higher the price to the farmer. The scarcer workmen are, the higher the wages. The smaller the money supply, the more promiscuous property and necessities of life will the dollar buy. Therefore, the money that serves the banker and bondholder best is least desirable to the Government, and that which serves the Government best is never most beneficial to the money-changing class.

The founders of our Government recognizing this doctrine, understood that no one dealing in national-bank stock or currency could occupy the position of Secretary of the Treasury.

When Hugh McCulloch was appointed from the banking circles it somewhat astonished the public, but from that day to this the bankers have generally dictated the policy of the Treasury Department.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, as good a banker and citizen as he may be, (and he must have been a good banker, because he has long managed one of the greatest national banks on the continent and been the president of the National Bankers' Association), can not be expected to be an ideal Secretary of the Treasury, because his duties here directly conflict with his interests and duties as a banker, and his teachings of a lifetime favor bank rather than national money. The handling of the bonds of the nation has been worth many millions to the banks of the country, and the Secretary's bank must have been a great beneficiary of his acts as an officer of the Government. It is expecting too much of him to expect him to be oblivious to the banking interests. As conclusive evidence that it was never intended that a national banker should control the Treasury Department, the national-bank act prohibits the Comptroller of the Currency or his deputy from being connected with any national bank, and they are under the direct control of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Their bonds are approved by him, and it would be preposterous to say that it is against public policy for the smaller officers to be interested in a national bank and that the larger one, in control, might reap such harvest as these banks have reaped under this and the last Administration where they never sowed.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] adopts the pretended banker's theory that "legal tender adds no value to money." This is not only contrary to all authors on government money, but utterly in conflict with common sense. As well might he say that you could destroy all electrical and steam power without increasing the value of the horse.

Mr. Muhleman, deputy United States Treasurer, in his splendid book entitled *Monetary Systems of the World*, opens his first paragraph with the sentence—

Perhaps the most important attribute of any form of money is its legal-tender power; that is, the power conferred by law to discharge a debt payable in money.

And this is the assertion of all men versed in monetary science. But the banker whose bank paper is not legal tender and those to whom he furnishes arguments must be expected to conflict with the disinterested monetary scientists.

The value of money is the salable or exchange value, and is governed by the law of supply and demand.

And so says every author writing upon monetary science. The value of money, its salable or money value, is governed by the law of supply and demand just the same as wheat or any other commodity is governed by the law of supply and demand. But few intelligent writers on this question ever refer to such a thing as intrinsic value, because it is becoming an obsolete term as applied to the value of money. You might as well talk about the intrinsic value of the air or the sunshine as to talk about the intrinsic value of gold and silver. Its value is chiefly as a money metal, but it has a salable or usable value for other purposes, but the great part of its value is occasioned by the world's demand for monetary purposes.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] also unfortunately dropped into the sophistical argument that prior to our present silver dollar we only had 8,000,000 silver dollars in the United States, and that by the act of 1834 we demonetized silver.



It is unfortunate that the gentleman at the supposed head of a great committee with a bill like this should descend to such an argument. These are not only misleading statements, but the latter is not based on a fact. It was the mere afterthought of Senator Sherman, who was floundering in the boiling indignation of the people for his part in the clandestine demonetization of silver, twenty years after it occurred, and he, like another traditional gentleman, pointed his finger at Andrew Jackson and says he committed the crime of 1834, and the bankers of the country took that up and said silver was demonetized in 1834.

No man had ever learned of it in Europe or America until silver was demonetized in 1873, or ever thought of such a thing for many years afterwards. Does not the gentleman from Indiana know that prior to the civil war we had practically no commerce, no railroads, no rich men in the nation, and that our transactions were small; that we had the most of our silver coined in pieces less than a dollar and that full legal-tender qualities were by law given to the Spanish milled dollar and to the dollar of all foreign nations, and that while we only had about 8,000,000 of silver dollars we had over 150,000,000 of full legal-tender silver circulating in our channels of trade up to the time of the demonetization of foreign coin?

Does not the gentleman realize that under the beneficent influence of the present silver dollar we developed our commerce, manufactures, transportation, and does he not know that in our changes in the value of the silver dollar that we were simply trying to make it correspond to the ratio of other countries, with no idea of any reference to the supposed intrinsic value of the two metals? England was doing the same thing. Every country in the world was trying to make the ratio correspond to the then French ratio of 15½ to 1 by adjusting their transportation charges to the different ratios.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] says that the divergence between the two metals caused the demonetization of silver. That is utterly fallacious. Everyone familiar with American finance knows full well that when silver was dropped from our coinage laws it stood at the ratio of 15½ to 1; that the people neither had knowledge of nor desire for demonetization. It is also well known that by reason of the mints of France being open at 15½ to 1, this fixed the price in every part of the world at 15½ to 1, less transportation to the French mint.

For eighty years, however much the production of gold might increase over the production of silver, or the production of silver over that of gold, the relative value of the two metals never materially changed. Not only this, but during the eighty years that the French mints were open to the world at 15½ to 1, causing the people of the United States and other countries with a ratio of 16 to 1 to move their silver to the French mint in bars, it proved no particular detriment to the nation exporting her silver, as she received gold or its equivalent in exchange for it or paid its foreign exchange in bar silver instead of in coined metal; and you do the same thing to-day if you send your coined gold to London. It is not taken as coin; it is weighed as bullion without detriment to the home government, and while the gold and silver were held at parity by reason of this open mint it had the same effect on commerce and prices as though the whole stock of gold and silver had been gold or had been silver alone, as the two metals conjointly measured the values of the world and conveniently made the exchange of the world.

Some seem to be alarmed at the increase of the gold production. However, this is incomparable to the scare of Europe when the great discovery of Australia and California caused the demonetization of gold in the German governments. When the Comstock was at the height of its silver production the European experts warned their governments to abandon silver, as these mines would soon be producing 500,000,000 ounces per year. These alarms were without foundation, as the present will prove.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] dropped into the further money changers' argument that we have too many silver dollars, and says we could not circulate them, while the facts are that in the panic of 1893 there were standing premiums posted in New York for silver dollars, and they could not be had; and there has been a scarcity recently, and as quiet as the gentlemen are upon this subject the Government is constantly coining the silver bullion in the Treasury at the rate of \$1,500,000 per month.

Ah, but, says the gentleman, the people will not use the silver dollar: when they have any connection with it at all they use only the silver certificate. The banker's argument again. I ask my friend, the representative of the gold standard, if anybody in this country or any other country uses gold except through the gold certificate?

It is the rarest thing to find a gold piece or a silver dollar in circulation in the Eastern and Northern States, but you find the gold and the silver certificate freely circulating side by side.

The advocates of this measure glowingly console themselves in their general stultification in going from the bimetallic to the gold standard, because they say that the recent prosperous times have exploded all old theories.

The very reverse is true. By reason of the unprecedented crops in this country and a great shortage abroad, and by reason of the unexampled strides of the American people in the production and export of iron, steel, petroleum, and machinery, our balance of trade has been such, when taken with our domestic output of gold and the large coinage of the silver bullion in the Treasury, together with the wars, starting all the machine shops and gun and ship factories of the country, and taking up all of the idle men, either for work or for soldiers, that things have necessarily been reasonably prosperous, and the supply of money has been so abundant that it has raised the general prices, confirming beyond question our cardinal theory that every increase in the ratio of money to property or of working capital to labor increases the prices of property or labor, and every decrease in the ratio of money to property or labor decreases the price of property or labor under the unvarying law of supply and demand.

There really never has been a good-faith battle of the standards. The leading bankers and money changers never have cared any more for gold than for silver.

It has always been a question of bank paper and interest-bearing bonds, with as little Government money as possible, on their side.

Gold has never been sacred to the bimetalists, neither has silver, except that they have always believed that from their durability, their homogeneity, divisibility, portability, and comparative stability in values, they are the best materials from which to coin money, and as the two conjointly never have been produced in sufficient volume to furnish the money supply of the world, but from time immemorial supplementary paper money in large volumes has been necessary, therefore we insist that this paper currency should be a national currency instead of bank paper.

#### TRUSTS.

But, sirs, what benefit we should have had out of rising prices has been largely neutralized by the great syndicates and trusts so raising their prices that it absorbs the advantages of the people not having their products protected by a trust.

The Bowling Green Democrat has just gone through its markets and exposes the leopardlike prosperity appearing there.

It finds that October 13, 1898, wheat was worth 62 cents per bushel; October 13, 1899, wheat was worth 64 cents per bushel.

October 13, 1898, corn was worth 38 cents per hundredweight, and October 13, 1899, it was worth 28 cents per hundredweight.

October 13, 1898, 3-inch iron pipe was worth 5½ cents per foot, and October 13, 1899, it was worth 15 cents per foot, or nearly three times as much.

Nails on October 13, 1898, were worth \$1.65 per hundred pounds, and on October 13, 1899, they were worth \$3.40 per hundred, or more than twice as much.

Wire fencing, plain, in 1898, was worth \$1.85 per hundred, and in 1899 it was worth \$4 per hundred, or more than double.

On October 13, 1898, for 2½ bushels of wheat a farmer could buy 100 pounds of nails; on October 13, 1899, it took 5½ bushels, or about twice as much, to buy them.

On October 13, 1898, the farmer could buy 100 pounds of plain fence wire for 3 bushels of wheat, and on October 13, 1899, it took 6 bushels, or just twice as much.

Tin plate two years ago was worth \$2.25 per box, to-day \$5.30 per box.

Now, sirs, that is your trust prosperity, which robs the poor and further fills the coffers of the rich.

It is this blessed system for which so many of you so proudly stand sponsor.

Sirs, there are some curious things transpiring in this trust agitation as well as in this financial controversy.

For a generation the Republican party has persisted in acclaiming that it was the genuine friend and advocate of bimetalism, and secured all branches of the Government under this plea, then hurries its cohorts to the gold Democracy, the only party that has ever conducted a national campaign on the gold standard.

Senator THURSTON, the chairman of the last Republican national convention, which nominated President McKinley, said recently, in addressing the Republican clubs in Baltimore:

Capital in every form, alarmed by the threatened disaster and danger of free and unlimited coinage at the forced ratio of 16 to 1 by this nation alone, rushed to the support of the Republican party, and it happened thereby that the financial jugglers and manipulators and great trusts and combined, that had always been with and of the Democratic party, were forced into the Republican party.

Notwithstanding this support, the President, in his recent message, with great political diplomacy, ingeniously referred to the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the Sherman anti-trust law and gave color to an inference that he favored curbing the trusts.

His personal and official defender on this floor, General GROSVENOR, has hurried to the same pedestal and acclaimed that he could think of nothing that could be added to this great Republican measure.

These things are significant from the fact that the stock operators of New York have been floundering in chaos and falling

prices, giving as a reason the message of the President and anti-trust decision.

This is significant, because for a quarter of a century this same class has been feigning to disturb values and wreck prices when any legislation was enacted or was threatened in the interest of more liberal financial legislation for the American people, and are now conquering the people in the securing of this measure, and the same tactics and results may be expected with the other trusts.

If one could not read the handwriting of the trained politician between the lines, he might be convinced that the President intended to "out-Bryan Bryan" on the antitrust agitation, as he did for a quarter of a century on bimetallism; but the trail of the golden serpent, indelibly embedded in his whole silver record, will be a burning warning to the often-deceived American voters. They must see that this bill will become the incubator of an untold number of money syndicates to oppress and further burden a patient and confiding people. And his action on other trusts will be the same as on this money trust.

Now, sirs, I construe the diplomatic utterances of the President in his message and the position assumed by his ever-ready representative here, General GROSVENOR, that the law is now sufficient, in their opinion, and that this Congress is to make no good-faith effort to further control the trusts. Enough has been done and enough has been said upon which to mislead the voter without hunting the trusts. It is hardly possible that the President and his party can be everything to all men on this question, as they have been on the silver question, without the deception being exposed.

#### STANDARD OF VALUE.

The first section of this bill makes the dollar consisting of 23.21 grains of pure gold the unit of value and gold the standard.

Adopting a standard of value, from the importance of money, is always a great responsibility, but establishing a new standard where many debts exist, created and payable under the old standard, is doubly important. No just standard can be devised for existing debts which permits the creditors to collect more than they lent or permits the debtor to pay less in value than he received. Such a standard must always be based upon full legal-tender money, and must be so fixed that in deferred payments or long-time loans the value paid will be equal always to that received.

#### BIMETALLIC STANDARD.

The present legal standard of this nation is bimetallic, or based on both gold and silver, and \$18,000,000,000 of debts have been contracted under the bimetallic standard and \$1,300,000,000 of United States obligations are now outstanding made payable specifically in coin of the standard value of July 14, 1870, the time when the act was passed which embraced the present silver dollar as well as gold coin. The correctness of this version is proved not only by the decisions of the Attorney-General, but by the declaration of the Matthews resolution, which passed both Houses of Congress with great unanimity in 1877.

#### PAYMENT OF DEBTS IN GOLD.

The second section of this bill provides—

That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into \* \* \* shall be deemed and held to be payable in gold coin.

What does the payment of these debts in gold which were contracted to be paid in gold and silver mean to the creditors of this nation?

It means that after a struggle of over a quarter of a century the money changers and speculators have secured such a change of the money standard as to give them hundreds of millions of dollars in value more than they really lent.

Sirs, this is not a matter of wild speculation; it is demonstrated through the actual offers of speculation for our bonds payable in coin or in gold alone. On February 8, 1895, President Cleveland sold \$62,315,435 thirty-year coin bonds to August Belmont & Co., N. M. Rothschild & Sons, J. P. Morgan & Co., and J. S. Morgan & Co., and obtained an offer at the same time that if he would have Congress provide that they should be payable specifically in gold coin that they would reduce the annual interest payment \$539,159, a saving in thirty years of \$16,174,770.

President Cleveland upon this day in a special message to Congress said:

The arrangement just completed \* \* \* develops such a difference in the estimation of investors between bonds made payable in coin and those specifically made payable in gold in favor of the latter, as represented by three-fourths of a cent in annual interest. In the agreement just concluded the annual saving in interest to the Government, if 3 per cent gold bonds should be substituted for 4 per cent coin bonds under the privilege reserved, would be \$539,159, amounting in thirty years, or at the maturity of the coin bonds, to \$16,174,770.

And this sum was offered the Government to make them payable in gold alone. Now, the same men who made this advanced bid for bonds made specifically payable in gold hold largely our other coin bonds. If it was worth to them over one-half a million

dollars a year to have \$62,000,000 made specifically payable in gold instead of in coin, then it was worth just as much in proportion to have the \$1,300,000,000 outstanding coin bonds made payable specifically in gold; or the market value of the annual interest on the \$1,300,000,000 coin bonds, if converted into gold bonds, would be enhanced in value over \$9,000,000 per annum.

Now, sirs, there is no dodging the question. When this bill is passed, there is taken from the pockets of the people \$9,000,000 per annum by Congressional legislation and without consideration, except love and affection, and which will be thrown into the opulent laps of the bondholders and national bankers of the country.

The legislation of money from the pockets of the taxpayers into the pockets of the syndicates now controlling legislation has become so common and so enormous that it is appalling.

The audacity of this move would be astonishing if Congress had not succeeded in the last few months in voting untold millions into the hands of these syndicates without arousing much public indignation.

Do you not think that the national-bank and bond syndicates have received enough through the vile popular loan scheme wherein there was voted them \$200,000,000 bonds at par, when they were worth in the market at least from 105½ to 106, or \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000 more on the market than face value? And they were voted to them as a gift under the false pretense that they were to go to the poor people of this country, as though they had a right to vote anyone these millions, whether rich or poor. Everyone knows now, and they should have known then, that it was the speculators' scheme to have the eleven or twelve millions of the people's money voted into the pockets of the syndicates. The whole thing was so gauzy and cheap that a great many banks condemned it as a damnable theft. The banks used their customers to subscribe for the bonds, but the banks paid for them and owned them at all times. On the 9th of this month these bonds were worth on the market 109½, or \$19,500,000 above par, a gift voted into the pockets of the purchasers.

The Speaker of this House, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HEPBURN, and many other leading Republicans refused to vote to put "gold" in this issue, though we could save more than \$16,000,000 thereby, because, as said by Mr. HOPKINS, the precedent would cost us a hundred million. However, now these same men are supporting this bill, with its gift of a hundred million, under the pressure of a party caucus and a party pressure.

One of the most essential attributes of a monetary system is to establish a stable standard of value, so that in case of deferred payments and long-time loans the creditor can not collect more than he lent or the debtor pay less than he received.

This standard must be based on full legal-tender money.

While a bank currency forms a good circulating medium when times are normal and confidence is unshaken, however it is credit money and it must be paid or redeemed in gold.

It has been the experience of the financial world that as the standard of value contracts and as confidence is disturbed, instead of bank paper or other redeemable or credit money expanding it contracts in sympathy with the money in which it is to be redeemed as a standard and as a means of storing values.

Because gold has been scarcer, it has generally been used for large payments and for storing great values; and silver, because more abundant, has been generally used for divisional coins and small payments and as a means of storing smaller values, and the two conjointly make an ideal currency for the masses of the people.

If this bill passes, the eighty-nine million Treasury notes, the three hundred and forty-six million greenbacks, and four hundred and eighty-two million silver dollars will circulate among the people or will be impounded as the whims of the dictatorship of some great banker at the head of our Treasury may direct.

The traditional ideas of this class are for scarce and dear money and cheap property, which is a synonym for misery and hard times. These things which so annoyed President Cleveland, lengthens even the endless chain system of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRUNDIDGE] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. BRUNDIDGE. Mr. Chairman, owing to the limited time which has been allotted for the purpose of debating this measure, I had at first thought that I would content myself with recording my vote against it; but when I consider its vital and far-reaching effect upon both the present and future welfare of this country, I deem it a solemn duty which every gentleman on this side of the House owes to the constituency which sent him here to raise his voice against its passage and denounce as unjust and criminal this scheme of plunder and bondage.

Some knowledge of the present financial condition of the people of this Government is possessed by every member upon this floor, and despite the oft-repeated statement and wild cry of prosperity that continues almost hourly to go up from some self-constituted patriot on the other side, the cold fact still remains that we are



to-day overwhelmed with both public and private debts. And to the consideration of these let us for a moment devote our attention.

When the present outstanding interest-bearing indebtedness of the Government shall become due and payable, as it will in the next few years, it will require in round numbers something near one billion five hundred million dollars to pay it. To this public debt must be added the vast bonded debt of cities, towns, and improvement districts, together with that of railroad transportation and other industrial corporations. And to this must still be added the more than six billions of mortgage indebtedness, as shown by our own statistics to exist upon our homes and farms. I doubt if twenty billion dollars, more than five times as much gold as is in circulation in the entire world, would be more than sufficient to pay off and discharge this public and private indebtedness. Let it be remembered that when a majority of these obligations were assumed and contracts made it was with the distinct understanding and agreement that they could be paid in the legal-tender money of this Government, either gold, silver, or paper currency; such was the law and such the contract, and so it should remain. No debtor should be required to pay otherwise, and no honest creditor should demand it.

By the terms of the second section of this bill, "all obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established and payable in gold alone." Thus by an act of Congress it is proposed to not only establish the odious gold standard, but to go further and do what no court in the land would ever dare to do, violate the most sacred obligations of more than a million contracts by depriving the debtor not only of the means of payment, but by making him pay in a different and dearer money! If there were no other reasons, this one gross act of merciless injustice ought to be sufficient to consign this bill to defeat and oblivion.

There are others of no less importance. In section 4 of this bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell interest-bearing bonds, redeemable in gold alone, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to make the sale for the purpose of the maintenance of the reserve fund. Here the unparalleled and extraordinary power is given to one man to increase the interest-bearing bonded public debt whenever in his judgment it is necessary to do so! When before has Congress ever been asked to make a grant of any such power?

When you increase the public debt, a corresponding increase must be made in the heavy burden which is placed upon every industry and taxpayer in the land and will be bequeathed to our posterity. More than 70,000,000 people should rise up and protest against this attempted outrage. For myself, I am opposed to bonds and bond issues. I do not believe that in times of peace even Congress itself should have the power to increase the public debt, much less the granting of such a right to a single individual. But this is not all. By the same section the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, at his discretion, to exchange gold for any other money issued or coined by the United States. And when so redeemed or exchanged said money shall be held in and constitute a part of the redemption fund. To get the gold for this purpose resort is again had to the sale of interest-bearing bonds; and at his discretion the Secretary may here add another increase to the public debt of more than a billion dollars. One can scarcely realize that such a grant of power would ever be thought of, much less tolerated. And yet the majority of this House are determined that it shall be made.

The only reason assigned so far for the consummation of this crime is that conditions have changed since the last election. I admit they have, and would remind you that they have changed in more ways than one. Let it be remembered that in the Congressional elections of 1898 you went before the country claiming that your party was then engaged in the prosecution of a most successful war. You begged and pleaded to be not repudiated, but that a Congress should be sent here that would be in harmony with the Administration and would sustain the President. In addition to this, the enormous sums of money which had just been spent by the Government in the preparation for and the prosecution of the war had increased the circulating medium and enabled you to make a show of returning prosperity.

Still, under these circumstances, your majority is reduced from more than 50 to less than 15 in the present House. Never but once before has any political party suffered such reverses under like conditions, and that was under Mr. Tyler's Administration in 1846. The one great cause which, in my opinion, largely produced this great change was the fear entertained by the people that the infamous Gage bill, or some similar measure, would be enacted, fixing the gold standard upon the country and giving to the banks the control of the currency. I can see but one good result that will follow your action: It will transfer the majority in the Fifty-seventh Congress to this side of the House, and in your places put good and true Democrats.

Some idea of the great advantages that will accrue to the bondholder can be gained by giving attention to the sale made by Mr.

Cleveland in 1895 of \$62,000,000 of bonds. The purchasers of those bonds offered to give a bonus of \$16,000,000 to have them made payable in gold instead of coin. If at that time they could afford to pay \$16,000,000 to have the word "gold" written in \$62,000,000 of bonds, then you are, by passing this bill, making them an absolute gift of more than \$250,000,000, when you make the whole governmental debt payable in gold, which now amounts to more than a billion dollars, as I have stated.

Hence, we see from whence comes the demand for this bill. And who is it that is clamoring for its passage? No party platform has ever declared for such a measure, nor has it ever been submitted to the people for ratification by their votes, and its advocates know full well that they dare not submit it, for the delay would mean its certain defeat.

The scheme is by no means new or untried. It has been the dream of more than a lifetime. It means untold millions and unlimited power to the national banks and the bondholders, and they see in its passage the consummation of long-deferred hopes. When it is passed (as it will be) and receives the signature of the President, it will become their deed, signed, sealed, and delivered to this Government. Their ownership, their power and control will soon become absolute. What they lost by the veto of the funding bill by President Hayes they have now more than gained with compound interest. They have gained the control of the entire currency of the country, and can fix the price of every product and commodity offered on the market. Every man with reasonable intelligence now knows that the prices of commodities are fixed and regulated by the currency in circulation. So when any men or set of men possess the power to expand or contract the circulating medium of the country they thereby necessarily have it in their power to raise or lower prices to suit themselves, and the people are helpless to protest against it. That this is true, Mr. Chairman, has been fully proven and demonstrated within the past few days and since this bill has been pending. The banks have caused a panic in the cities of New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and others, as will be seen from the following dispatch published in one of the leading papers of the city, which I now read as a part of my remarks:

ALMOST A PANIC IN STOCKS—BALTIMORE SECURITIES THROWN UPON THE MARKET AT ANY PRICE—GILT-EDGE HOLDINGS SUFFERED WITH THE REST, AND TRUST COMPANY GROUP WAS CONTINUALLY RAIDED—BANKS REFUSED AID AND CALLED IN ALL LOANS.

[Special to the Post.]

BALTIMORE, MD., December 6, 1899.

This was the most exciting day on the local stock exchange since last spring, though the movement was unlike the one then, in that prices declined instead of advanced. The market seemed to be honeycombed with selling orders. Stock after stock was raided, and important losses were scored throughout the list, many shares making new low-priced records.

No attention was paid to values. Gilt-edged securities were thrown upon the market and sold regardless of the prices they brought. The holders appeared to be panic-stricken.

The trust company group was the center of interest. The selling was heaviest and the losses most severe in that group, though the liquidation was not confined to that quarter.

Even bonds went down in the slump, and large blocks were thrown on the market without regard to price.

Mercantile Trust, Continental Trust, Guardian Trust, Fidelity and Deposit, Maryland Casualty, International, Old Line Real Estate, and American Bonding were severely depressed, declines ranging from 1 to 9 points. Consolidated Gas broke  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{1}{4}$ . United Railways issues were also notably weak, the income bonds breaking to 70 $\frac{1}{2}$  after selling at 71 $\frac{1}{2}$  in the initial dealings.

There was some support to the market in the final dealings, though it was not sufficiently large to stem the downward movement, which was in full progress when the market closed.

Nearly every stock sold went from 10 to 50 points below its book value. Heavy dividend payers like the Fidelity and Deposit, Maryland Trust, and Mercantile Trust went by the board at ruinous prices.

Absolutely no protection was given the market. United Brewery 6 per cent bonds, which are regarded as among the safest investments, sold at 85.

The brokers assign as a cause for the slump the action of the banks in calling in all loans and refusing to render any further assistance in carrying the securities.

Thus it will be seen that the banks now can precipitate a panic at their pleasure under the law as it now is. And they can do so with much greater ease after the passage of the present bill. The overshadowing danger that lurks beneath every legislative enactment which increases the power of monopoly, and especially the money monopoly, has been seen and recognized by wise and thinking men for many years past. Senator Windom, a Republican, and who a short time afterwards was made Secretary of the Treasury by President Garfield, on the 21st day of February, 1881, wrote to the Anti-Monopoly League of New York this letter:

I repeat to-day in substance words uttered seven years ago—that there are in this country four men who in the matter of taxation possess and frequently exercise powers which neither Congress nor any of our State legislatures would dare to exert—powers which, if exercised in Great Britain, would shake the throne to its very foundation. These may at any time, and for reasons satisfactory to themselves, by a stroke of the pen reduce the value of property in the United States by hundreds of millions. They may at their own will and pleasure disarrange and embarrass business, depress one city or locality and build another, enrich one individual and ruin his competitors and, when complaint is made, coolly reply, "What are you going to do?"

What was true then will be true now, even in a more potent sense. Delegate this power, and you will find it will be followed by financial depression, panics, bankruptcy, and ruin. The losses



in honest trade and the misery and want to honest labor will merit and elicit our just complaint, but the reply will only be, "What are we going to do about it?"

While on this line there is one other matter that I desire to speak of before I bring my remarks to a close.

During the Fifty-fifth Congress the same majority who are giving such ardent support to the present bill passed over our objections and earnest protests a bill which they said would protect the American manufacturer and at the same time raise a revenue for the Government. As a revenue-raising measure it was soon made quite clear that it was a failure, but as a protector to the manufacturer and monopolist it was a most dazzling success. Never before in any like period of our history did trusts, combinations, and monopolies spring into existence and being as fast as they have since the passage of the Dingley tariff act, until now you can name no kind of goods, wares, or merchandise that is not controlled by the trusts. Prices have been advanced on all the necessities of life by these same combinations from 25 to 150 per cent, while thousands of men have been thrown out of employment and made dependent.

The unjust and unnatural advance in all commodities has aroused the just indignation of the American people, and they are being heard from in every State, and it is to be observed in the wonderfully reduced Republican majority in the Fifty-sixth Congress. But there are some amusing things connected with it. While the chairman of the Republican national committee, Mr. HANNA, boldly defends trusts and combinations upon the stump and declares them to be a blessing, and while the Attorney-General appointed by the President composedly informs the country that he is powerless to enforce the statutes and laws of the United States already passed against them and that the State governments must do what the United States can not do, President McKinley, in his recent message to this Congress, makes this most remarkable statement:

Combinations of capital organized into trusts to control the conditions of trade among our citizens, to stifle competition, limit production, and determine the prices of products used and consumed by the people, are justly provoking public discussion, and should early claim the attention of the Congress.

It is to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, that the President did not find time to insert into this voluminous and peculiarly worded message some suggestions to Congress as to what he thought should be done by them in this important matter of trusts.

It is also a matter of regret that some of our great public men do not see these gigantic evils until it is entirely too late.

But we are now about to pass this measure, that will legalize and create one of the most stupendous, dangerous, and powerful trusts that has ever been formed—that is, the money trust. It has no equal, and will never have. It will enslave and pauperize its millions. It will spread its dark wings of ruin over this fair land like a blighting and withering curse, and yet it has the indorsement of the President of the United States!

If it must be done, and there is no way to avert it, then I suppose you are right in your hasty action, for the sooner we are over with the agony the better. My people will at least have their undaunted courage and bravery left them, and will continue to fight the great battle of life as best they can, and breathe the ennobling spirit of these beautiful lines:

So live, that when thy summons comes to join  
The innumerable caravan which moves  
To that mysterious realm where each shall take  
His chamber in the silent halls of death,  
Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,  
Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed  
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave  
Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch  
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, how long am I recognized for?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in the academic discussion of finance which has been going on here for the last day or so sight has been lost of the provisions of this bill. Members of the House know how this measure found its way here, but I doubt if there is one man in a hundred outside this Chamber who understands fully what the Republican party did and is doing to fasten the wrongful and ruinous provisions of this measure on our statutes. Those of us who served through the Fifty-fifth Congress know that the Committee on Banking and Currency was so constituted it either would not or could not make a report or present a bill, although the last Presidential election was fought on the subject of finance. It was claimed by the Democrats, and I think rightly, that the then Speaker of this House purposely organized the Banking and Currency Committee so it would never report, hoping in that way to shirk its party's promises made to the Gold-bug Democrats in 1896.

Upon the adjournment of the last session of Congress a Republican caucus named certain gentlemen to prepare a bill to reform

the currency. This measure is the product of their labor. It was framed by no authority of this House. It was prepared when Congress was not in session, and the committee of Republicans, who framed it held their meetings behind closed doors at Atlantic City, the most fashionable watering place on the Atlantic coast. Gentlemen may claim the meetings were held at Atlantic City because they were laboring during the summer and they sought a cool retreat, but this will not do. An examination of the membership constituting that caucus committee discloses that a majority come from the Northwest. A more pleasant as well as quieter spot could have been found nearer their homes. If the meeting place at Atlantic City was selected by accident, it was, to take the most charitable view, unfortunate. It is there that many of the most dangerously rich of New York and other places of this country spend their summers. There the committee would be most subject to and most easily reached by the sinister influences which we believe antagonistic to the great body of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it was certainly the greatest man Missouri ever produced, and I believe one of the greatest America ever produced, who warned the American people against the influence of what he termed the "better element" in our politics. I am not of those who wish to taboo the potentiality of bankers, chambers of commerce, and rich men in shaping our financial and fiscal policy, but I think the artisan, laborer, and farmer should be as often consulted and as generously followed. There is not a member of this House who for three years has not received armfuls of papers, pamphlets, and letters from bankers, sound-money leagues, and other gold-standard associations urging the adoption of the single gold standard and the granting of greater privileges to the national banks, but I challenge any gentleman on either side of this Chamber to exhibit a half dozen letters from laborers or farmers asking for the passage of such a law. I have never received one.

In the campaign of 1896 the Democrats contended that as money increased in volume prices advanced and as it decreased values fell. This was denied by gentlemen on the other side. They claimed it was the quality and not quantity of money that fixed prices; but, sir, the position of the Democratic party has been vindicated by almost every gentleman favoring this bill. It is now admitted, even by the authors of this measure, that the increase in the output of gold during the year 1899 is the immediate cause of the advance in prices, and one gentleman [Mr. DOLLIVER] frankly admits this measure could not have been passed a year ago, or even now, unless the gold supply had increased. So, sir, we find the Republican party admitting that whatever there is of prosperity existing in this country is traceable to an increase of our circulating medium, establishing, as I think, the truth of our contention in the last Presidential campaign. The Democratic party is not hostile to gold. We care nothing for the color of our basic money, whether it be yellow or white; but what we want is a sufficient supply of money upon which to do the business of the country and to place beyond the control or influence of money sharks the product of labor, genius, and toil.

The total amount of gold produced in the United States during last year was \$64,463,000, and of this sum \$13,565,879 was used in the arts, leaving a little over \$50,000,000 to be added to our stock of money, less than \$1 per capita. Advocates of this bill point to the world's output of gold—\$287,428,600—during the last year as evidence of the fact that there is plenty of gold. Over one-fourth of the gold produced went into the arts, and the world's supply of money gold during the last year only amounted to \$215,000,000, in round numbers, less than \$3 per capita if every dollar of gold produced in the world had been coined in this country.

Money is a commodity regulated by supply and demand as completely as wheat, corn, or tobacco; and while no man will deny that a great crop of corn or wheat makes the article cheap and a short crop makes them dear, the single-standard man, by logic I can not understand, for reasons utterly unsatisfactory, says, Destroy money and it will be plentiful; increase its supply and you will have none of it.

Sir, if the condition of the American people was as prosperous as the Republicans claim (and I deny there is any general prosperity) and should continue for months, it would not refute our position, because prosperity based on an increase in the supply of gold but proves our contention. If I felt sure enough gold would be mined in the next few years to supply the needs of the people I should not so seriously object to this bill, but I can not persuade myself to believe such a thing probable, or even possible. Mr. Chairman, there are millions of our people who believe the passage of such a measure as this little short of a national crime; and in view of this fact, as well as the further fact that our money is now as good as it is possible to make it, why pass a bill opposed by so many and whose friends claim will not alter existing conditions?

There are provisions in this bill wholly unjustifiable. We have no right to give to any set of men the power to contract or impound our currency—over \$700,000,000—at will; and yet that is



exactly what is done. There is in our currency, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, \$355,000,000 of greenbacks or Treasury notes. This bill provides that when greenbacks reach the Treasury they shall be held and not reissued except for gold. Now, if the great banks of this country wish to contract our currency they can gather up the greenbacks and demand gold from the Treasury on them. This ties up the greenbacks, and it will then remain only to lock up the gold paid out for the greenbacks and \$700,000,000 have retired from circulation. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed by the third section of this bill to impound or hold—

the amount of United States notes held against currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890.

This provision ties up and retires over half the money of this country. How can a citizen, whatever his opinion on the subject of finance, vote for such a bill?

But, sir, not content with establishing the gold standard and with delivering the last blow at silver as money, the authors of this infamous measure absolutely invade the domain of private contract and forbid the citizens of this country to make any contract for the payment of money except in gold. It even goes further than that, and says contracts now entered into for the payment of money shall be discharged in gold. Yes, even though the contract says payment shall be made in silver or bank notes or greenbacks. A more drastic or oppressive measure was never considered by this body.

But, sir, I have yet to mention the most extraordinary, as it is the most infamous, provision of this bill. In the fourth section, defining the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury, this language is used:

He is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said reserve (gold) fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate of not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin, at the option of the United States, after one year.

What other country in the world would give such power to one man, and he not even responsible to the people whose destiny he controls. The right to sell bonds on the credit and faith of the people of this country without limit and without being responsible to any person for his acts is so enormously dangerous it seems incredible a representative of the American people would countenance such a suggestion. The bonded debt of this country now amounts to the great sum of \$1,046,048,750, and of this enormous total \$500,000,000 has been added since 1892, and \$300,000,000 was added by Secretaries of the Treasury, as I think, without a line of law or shred of authority for doing so. The balance, \$200,000,000, was added by the provision of the bill passed in 1898 and known as the war-revenue bill. The interest on this public debt exceeds \$40,000,000 a year.

Our debt is well-nigh as great as it was in 1870, when we had just passed through a most disastrous and protracted civil war, and, sir, the most distressing feature of the matter is, it is constantly increasing. The power to issue bonds for some one else to pay is too dangerous to intrust to any one man. The reason and purpose for conferring such unlimited and dangerous power on one man may be plainly seen by reading the subsequent sections of the bill. It proceeds to create a national-bank trust of the latest and most approved pattern, and whatever rights the people had remaining over their money after they were through with the Secretary of the Treasury it turns over to the banks. The Democratic party is not hostile to banks, but it is unalterably opposed to banks of issue. We believe the right to coin, issue, or make money is the highest prerogative of sovereignty and should never be dislodged from the source of all power—the people. This bill grants to the national banks a demand they have sought for twenty years—the right to issue money to the par value of bonds held by the bank.

I have briefly stated the worst features of the bill; it contains many if not all the objectionable features embraced in the bills advocated by the gold-standard press and champions in recent years. Instead of taking the Government out of the banking business, a thing the Republicans claimed they wished to do, it forms a permanent partnership between the United States and money changers. I would perhaps be going too far to say national bankers are the enemy of the Republic, but in the light of history and experience I am justified in characterizing them as not its friend. The most persuasive argument is an appeal to our selfishness and to contend that enlarged powers to banks is in the interest of the people is against both the judgment and experience of mankind. Had it not been for the iron patriotism of Jackson, seconded as he was by the great Benton, once before in our history a national bank would have had us by the throat; as it was, to break its hold and crush its power gave a shock to our Government second only to civil war.

Sir, when Napoleon's sword was red with the blood of every people, when England alone, gasping for breath, remained free and

almost single-handed staked its existence on the destruction of the most powerful as he was the most dreadful despot of the ages, the governors of the Bank of England calmly informed the younger Pitt that no more gold would be furnished to carry on the war, and the salvation of the Empire was insured only by the issue of paper money. This bill practically eliminates all kinds of money but gold and national-bank notes, and both are controlled by national banks. Should the prediction of the Republicans be realized and \$280,000,000 of gold produced in the last twelve months grow to \$500,000,000 annual product; should the Rand and Yukon prove as rich as is claimed, the sincere advocates of this bill are destined to grievous disappointment. It is dear money, not gold money, the monometallist seeks.

In 1847 Australia began to furnish gold; in 1849, California. The output became so great the money kings of Europe became alarmed and sent to this country a committee to investigate the possible extent of the gold deposit. A report from that committee that gold existed in great quantities so alarmed the very rich that Germany, Portugal, and Holland in 1853 demonetized gold and established silver as the only metal fit for use as money, and the same argument was then made against gold that is now used against silver. Sir, I shall welcome the day that brings so much gold into the world it can not be cornered or controlled by a few, and every believer in the free coinage of silver would learn with delight that Alaska and South Africa were producing a billion of gold each year. Since this discussion commenced \$17,000,000 of gold has been shipped from New York to London, and more is leaving every day. The Bank of England has raised the price of exchange until gold can be shipped from this country at a profit, and the money sharks, hastening to take advantage of it, are sending hundreds of thousands of gold by every ship. Berlin, in fact all Germany, is suffering for want of gold, and in our own country the Secretary of the Treasury is depositing money by the millions in various banks daily in order to prevent a panic, and yet gentlemen calmly go on pressing a bill that contracts our money supply and forever destroys the legal-tender quality of all our money except the gold. The passage of this bill does not settle the question. The American people are yet to be heard from.

The Democratic party can not be suspected of selfish motives in taking the position it occupies. We realize to the full ours is a dangerous way, for every powerful money institution, not only of this country but the world, is against us. Every selfish interest, every entrenched wrong, every special privilege is fighting us. We are fighting a desperate contest. Beginning with Great Britain in 1816, every country of continental Europe has struck colors to the money devil, and, although our people have fought long and hard, we at last are about to go over to him. But, sir, I have an abiding faith in the wisdom and justice of my countrymen. Our retreat is not a surrender. The people will again resume their own. If I looked only for party advantage, I could ask nothing better than the passage of this bill, for I verily believe it will return to "plague its inventors" before another summer is past; but the want and wretchedness it will entail, the unhappiness it will bring to the millions of working people, arouse emotions far more serious and, I trust, nobler than mere partisan advantage.

The establishment of the gold standard will do no harm to the rich; it will make their pathway easier; but, sir, we are not here to legislate for the rich, but for all the people. One circumstance that may well arouse the suspicions of ordinary people is that the provisions of this bill have been advocated by bankers and gold-standard champions for twenty years. These people are manifestly seeking legislation beneficial to themselves, and if their pet measure was alike beneficial to all, no advantage would accrue from its enactment. No one but the philanthropist would press legislation equally advantageous to all but not changing the relative position of men as now existing. The pamphlets, the arguments, resolutions, and speeches constantly emanating from sources deeply interested in large money institutions mean something, and that something is those institutions expect an advantage over other people by the establishment of the gold standard. No country ever had too much metallic money, and the authors of this bill warn us of dangers to be feared not experienced from bimetallism.

In 1884 there was \$917,884,668 of paper money of all kinds in circulation; in 1899 this amount had only increased \$73,000,000, and of the total amount of paper money in circulation in 1899, \$184,000,000 was issued in bills of \$500 and upward to \$10,000 and of course never circulated among the people. In 1890 the so-called Sherman law was passed, and the Secretary of the Treasury commenced to buy silver bullion and issued certificates against it. Our total stock of paper money in 1890 was \$1,004,886,724, and in 1899 \$1,144,256,891. Of this sum, \$406,085,504 is secured by silver held in the Treasury and \$237,832,594 by bonds deposited by national banks, leaving a little over one-half to be secured by the faith and credit of the Government, as well as by the gold held in the Treasury. Each dollar of both the metallic and paper money is good and received by all our people for all debts, so there is



absolutely no justifiable excuse for cutting from under our paper circulation the legal-tender silver that now aids in supporting it.

I wish again, sir, to say something about the bond feature of this measure. I can not conceive how gentlemen will explain an affirmative vote to their constituents. What legal right have we to change the terms of a contract made thirty years ago? You propose to make all of the bonds of this Government payable in gold. Not one of them says so in the bond itself. Who is benefited by such a law? I have not the exact figures at hand, but know that 4,500 banks of the United States hold a large per cent of the bonds. Now, what is it you do? "First," you say to the banker, "buy bonds and you will get interest on the bond, and, moreover, you may issue and loan money to the full face or par value of the bond; second, we will change the contract so as to make your bond payable in gold, although the bond says coin (silver or gold); third, we will destroy silver as money and double the value of your bond and also the money they are to be paid in." Sir, who can justify such conduct? During Cleveland's last term he informed Congress if it would authorize him to insert the word gold in a \$62,000,000 bond issue, he would make for the people \$16,000,000, but his proposition was at once rejected, and you now propose to do for nothing that which even Cleveland admitted was worth \$16,000,000. But, sir, it seems idle to take up further time in discussing this matter. Men's minds are fixed, and anything short of an actual trial will change no one.

In advocating the free and unlimited coinage of silver the Democratic party seeks advantage of no man. Our fundamental tenet is equality before the law for every citizen of the Republic. We have learned, from bitter experience, the difference between a splendid and a happy people. The accumulation of great fortunes is menacing to the spirit of democracy. The policy of the Republican party has well-nigh stifled competition in many avocations, and the gravest problem before the American people is how to prevent the trusts from engulfing our commercial life. The practical destruction of \$355,000,000 of greenbacks and the utter annihilation of silver as money builds up, by operation of law, a bank trust that will dominate the very existence of the people. There should always be enough money in circulation (I mean debt-paying legal-tender money) to enable the farmer to market his crop without mortgaging it for the manufacturer to sell the product of his mill without hypothecating it to some bank for money to operate upon. A few men in New York or London can produce a panic in this country whenever it suits their purpose. This is not even denied by gentlemen on the other side, but they say the output of gold is increasing so rapidly there will soon be enough to supply the world with sufficient money. But is it not better to wait until that time comes before acting?

From 1847 to 1855 the increase in the output of gold was relatively as great as now, but we have not even yet a sufficiency. It requires, Mr. Chairman, far more statesmanship to foresee an evil and provide a preventive than it does to suggest a remedy for an existing and apparent one. The Republicans, taking advantage of a slight increase in the supply of gold, are gathering lessons from the hour which overturn the experience and judgment of years and centuries. If the gold standard will discriminate against labor, if it will aid the creditor and oppress the debtor, if it will depress the products of man's toil and raise the value of money, then the bill should never pass; but you will pass it. You have the power and will use it; your promise made to every selfish interest in 1896 must be redeemed. I am opposed to the principle and every section of the bill. I stand by the declaration of my party and declare nothing short of the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 of silver to 1 of gold will ever settle this question with the people.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] to tell me that I had twenty minutes. I will ask the gentleman how long he understood that I was recognized for?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood for fifteen minutes. If I had more time, I would give it.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I am not complaining, but I did not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER] is recognized for thirty minutes.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this measure with satisfaction because of the first fourteen lines and notwithstanding practically all that follows.

If there had been any possibility of this bill becoming a law as it now stands, I should have offered at the proper time as a substitute the following:

A bill to determine the standard of value, to fix the measure or unit of value, and to establish the parity of all legal-tender money.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the standard of value shall continue to be gold, and the measure or unit of value shall be, as now, the gold dollar, which shall contain 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine or 23.22 grains of fine gold.

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States now existing or hereafter entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be, and hereby are, made redeemable in the gold coin of the United States; and when any of said notes shall have been redeemed in gold coin they shall not be paid out again or exchanged except for gold coin.

SEC. 3. That all the legal-tender money of the United States shall, at the option of the holder thereof, be, and is hereby, made interchangeable at the subtreasury of the United States in New York City, and at such other places as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time designate.

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of meeting the requirements of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall set aside and maintain in gold coin or gold coin and gold bullion a reserve fund of \$150,000,000; and he is hereby authorized and required, whenever necessary to maintain said fund, to issue and sell bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum and payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable at the option of the Government at any time after the expiration of one year.

SEC. 5. That all national-bank notes shall, at the option of the holder thereof, be redeemed in gold coin; and that the fund deposited by the national banks in the Treasury of the United States for the redemption of their notes shall, from and after the passage of this act, be in gold coin.

SEC. 6. Nothing in this act contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the United States notes, Treasury notes, the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or the law making national-bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

For more than sixty years our standard of value has been gold, in actual practice, and to the Democratic party we are indebted for that wise and beneficent selection. Since then the entire civilized world, with a single exception or two, has reached the same conclusion, though at times they, like ourselves, have suffered and paid the frightful cost of change, of hesitation, and of doubt even.

We no longer mention the countries which have adopted the gold standard, but invariably say all have adopted it except Mexico and a few half-civilized and some heathen nations. The benefits of an unequivocal standard, and that the standard of the civilized world, are being reaped in every line of employment and production and in every nook and corner of this great Republic. Never in the history of any nation has there been such a contrast in the same length of time as the years of 1896 and 1899 disclose. This miraculous, indeed almost incomprehensible, change is very largely due to the verdict of the people in 1896.

What was that verdict? It was against the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio 16 to 1, and was written in these words:

We, the people of the United States, do find that all our silver and paper currency must be maintained at a parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

Does the measure before the House carry that verdict into execution beyond the peradventure of a doubt? I do not believe that it does. Let us see. On page 4, beginning in line 9, we find these unfortunate, these fatal words:

If at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary, in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States.

While in an earlier part of this same section he is commanded to redeem United States notes and Treasury notes in gold coin, he is in this subsequent clause remanded to his discretion whether he will exchange gold coin for the same United States notes and Treasury notes, leaving his position precisely where it is to-day. The section, no doubt, taken altogether, would authorize and impel a conscience and discretion leaning toward the gold standard to maintain the parity of all our moneys. But what about a conscience and a discretion that are hostile to the gold standard and wedded in fact by all political associations to silver and, as he may choose to term it, the bimetallic standard?

I am deeply impressed with the fact that the American people are tired of doubts, tired of interrogation points, tired of political straddles, and are looking wistfully for a law so clear and unequivocal that every intelligent citizen can understand it; a law that can not be construed to suit the conscience or discretion of any Secretary of the Treasury; a law that needs no judicial interpretation; a law that is the undoubted echo of the people's verdict in 1896.

The verdict of the people was that "all our silver and paper currency (silver as well as paper) must (not may, at the discretion of a bimetallic Secretary of the Treasury) be maintained at a parity with gold." With that injunction upon us, can we at this session of Congress do anything less than make our silver and paper interchangeable with gold?

Can any man who cares for his reputation as a candid and honest thinker attempt to explain to an American audience why he made a United States note which is worth in and of itself only the value of the paper upon which it is printed, and the Treasury note which is secured with about 80 cents' worth of silver bullion, redeemable in gold coin, while he made no provision for the current redemption of a silver dollar which is worth only 40 cents; unless, forsooth, the silverized fancy of a bimetallic Secretary of the Treasury happened, perchance, to suggest such a thing as the redemption of a silver dollar in gold coin as a wise exercise of his discretion? If we can take them at their word, their discretion



will never work in that direction, for they have already said, from Candidate Bryan and Populist Allen down, that the only policy for the Government to pursue was to simply refuse to pay gold and pay out silver and the parity would thereby be maintained; in fact, that that very act would be the maintenance of the parity.

It would seem, therefore, that this act was specially drawn for just that kind of an experiment. Indeed, one of the best thinkers of this House declared that silver would go to a discount immediately if this measure should become a law as it now stands. He forgot, however, for the moment, that the Republican party was in power, but I fear he spoke with prophetic vision if the latter-day Democratic party should by any mischance come into power and be given the opportunity of exercising a silverized discretion.

The bill before the House provides, on page 1, line 14, that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section, referring to section 1, which means gold payment or its equivalents. From the statement of facts already set forth it is clear, to me at least, that since silver is a legal tender the Government might be compelling its citizens to take silver dollars which were below par, while they in turn would be compelled to pay their creditors gold or its equivalent, thereby losing the difference, which would range anywhere from 1 to 60 cents on each dollar of their obligations.

This Government can not afford to ask or demand a higher degree of honesty on the part of its citizens than it proposes to practice itself. Therefore, why do we attempt, through the legerdemain of words, to escape the responsibility of being absolutely honest with regard to our silver as well as our paper obligations? In his New York speech the President well said more than a year ago:

It will not suffice for citizens nowadays to say simply that they are in favor of sound money. That is not enough. The people's purpose must be given the vitality of public law.

When this is done and all the legal-tender money of the United States is made interchangeable, no legislation will be necessary with regard to contracts, public or private.

Again, on page 4, line 10, we find these words:

Except as hereinbefore in this section provided.

What is the inevitable effect of this clause? Simply this: To leave the Government just where it is to-day with regard to the United States notes and Treasury notes. The endless chain is perpetuated, and the net result can only be to insert a swivel or two to lessen the friction, extract gold as usual, and contract the currency of the country.

I for one have thoroughly misunderstood the American people or else they desire to break the endless chain of demand obligations and set the endless chain of gold coin in motion.

The President, referring to this very subject in his message, said:

Let us remove the only remaining cause by conferring the full and necessary power on the Secretary of the Treasury and impose upon him the duty [not give him the discretion] to uphold the present gold standard and preserve the coins of the two metals on a parity with each other, which is the repeatedly declared policy of the United States.

In this connection I repeat my former recommendations that a portion of the gold holding shall be placed in a trust fund, from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but, when once redeemed, shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

No member of this House, including the committee itself which prepared this measure, will contend that the United States notes and the Treasury notes which may have been redeemed in gold coin can not again be put into circulation in the ordinary course of business and without the deposit of an equal amount of gold coin.

The American people are opposed to a continuation of this dangerous and destructive policy, and have so declared themselves. Let our courage prove a fit counterpart to their honesty and intelligence.

Again, it is not a matter of discretion whether a man shall be honest in the payment of his debts. Nor is it a matter of discretion whether a bank or other commercial company or municipal corporation or State shall be honest in the discharge of their respective obligations.

What is true of the man, the bank, the business company, the city, the county, and the State is equally true of this Government. And if there could be such a thing as comparative honesty in the payment of a debt, the nation should stand as the ideal.

Some of the silver dollars now in circulation were worth 100 cents when coined, and for all of them—now approximating 500,000,000 in circulation, or represented in circulation by silver certificates—the Government has received full consideration for the face value; therefore, whatever depreciation the silver dollars have undergone is a loss of the Government, and should be sustained by it and not by the individual who may happen to have silver dollars in his possession. The citizen who holds a silver dollar has commercial value of 40 cents and a claim against the United States Government for 60 cents, and the dollar itself is the evidence of it and a proper check for the balance due. So

long as the Government keeps that dollar as good as gold the people will continue to use it freely as a fit tool with which to accomplish their commercial work. Therefore, let the Government frankly, honestly, bravely, boldly admit that the loss on the silver dollar is its own loss, and that its citizens shall not be called upon to bear any portion of it under any circumstances, however adverse, even under a Democratic Administration.

Let not this Government assume that there can be any discretion about paying an honest debt. Much less let it gamble upon the political chance of giving that discretion to a silverized bimetallic politician who has declared that he would exercise that discretion to the discredit and everlasting dishonor of this great nation. Let us, before this session closes, make all the legal-tender money of this Government interchangeable, remove the last possible doubt, eliminate the remotest chance, and eternally settle the question beyond the power of any man or party, unless the people shall thereafter will it, of which there will be or can be no possible chance until the world moves simultaneously to some other standard; for the American people are honest, they are the most intelligent and potent nation in the world, and are superlatively brave if their public servants will but blaze the way.

Mr. Chairman, I could have hoped that the committee had accurately defined the scope of its work in these words, taken from its report:

The committee did not consider the general subject of banking, nor did it seek to arrange a complete scheme of finance, but confined its recommendations to those subjects of most pressing demand, as evidenced by the pledges of the Republican party and the general policy of the Republican Administration.

In withholding recommendations relative to the general subjects of banking, bank currency, and the control and general supervision of banks, and also the question of the retirement of the greenbacks, the committee does not want to be understood as having considered such subjects at all nor as passing judgment upon them, but rather to have left the same to the usual channel of consideration through the proper committees of Congress.

The committee was of the opinion that the most urgent subject was the question of a monetary standard and provision for its maintenance. The strengthening of the public credit by the removal of all doubt concerning the policy and practice of the Government relative to the unit of value is of paramount importance. To effect this result by a complete guaranty of the quality and parity of all our money, without any disturbance by change in the quantity or kind, was the chief purpose of the committee.

It is evident from these words that the committee has proposed many things in its excursions into the fields of coinage and currency whose full effect they did not contemplate, and therefore I shall refrain from making any observations upon the other subjects covered by this bill, hoping that at the proper time and place they will be wisely adjusted or omitted for the present to await more deliberate consideration.

Had I said less upon this occasion I should have been recreant to my duty, to my country, my State, and my constituency; and, what is more and more important still to me, untrue to my convictions and unworthy of myself.

I shall vote for this bill, because it is an upward and onward step in the right direction, and because I have absolute confidence that the measure which shall go into the statute books will have the clear and unequivocal ring of a gold coin and will not be marred by marks of indirection, evasion, subterfuge, or paraphrase, suggesting even remotely the possibility of doubt or the faintest recollection of bimetalism; that the measure will be worthy of the great impending problem, worthy of the glorious history of the Republican party, and worthy of the honesty, intelligence, and courage of the American people. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] is recognized for thirty-five minutes.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate, particularly to that on the Democratic side of the House, with great interest. I was amazed at the utterances of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], who aspired to the leadership of that side of the Chamber, when he assured us that in the campaign of 1896 McKinley and the Republican party won because members of the Democratic party had either been intimidated or had sold out. That was an astonishing utterance coming from a leader upon that side of the House.

Mr. BERRY. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. BERRY. Does the gentleman think the Republican party could have won without the aid of the recreant Democrats who voted for the gold standard?

Mr. LACEY. That is another proposition. The gentlemen to whom my friend refers as the "recreant Democrats" who voted for the gold standard neither sold themselves nor were they scared. From the other side were drawn the votes unquestionably that won in that election, and a more honorable body of men never stood up to be counted than the Gold Democrats of 1896. Six and a half million votes were cast for William J. Bryan and for the experiment of free silver. Seven million votes were cast for sound money, protection, and prosperity, and the Gold Democrats who cast their lot with us have had their reward.



Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. Certainly. I will hear now from another one of these leaders.

Mr. SULZER. Were those 7,000,000 votes all of them cast for the single gold standard?

Mr. LACEY. They were cast for the declaration for gold in our platform, and the controversy among Republicans to-day is as to who had the honor of writing the word "gold" in the St. Louis platform. The newspapers are full of that discussion. I see across the aisle to-day an increase in the Democratic membership over the last Congress. Where does it come from? It comes from New York, from Massachusetts, and from men who have secured their election by trampling under foot the Democratic platform of 1896.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. That is not so in New Jersey. We will not stand by that in New Jersey. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. Perhaps not in New Jersey. New Jersey was for a long time out of the Union, but in the last Congress they were unanimously for the Republican cause.

Mr. SULZER. How about Nebraska?

Mr. LACEY. Nebraska! The most pitiable thing in all history is for Nebraska to stand up and be laughed at by Kansas. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The Republican party, like all other such organizations, is a party of promises; unlike many of such organizations, it is also a party of performance.

Its position upon the great question of our national standard of value is well known. Favorable to the upbuilding and fostering of American industries as it has always been, it has attempted, while maintaining the parity of all our money, to "do something for silver."

It has resisted all the attempts that have been made under the name of "bimetallism" to place the country upon the Asiatic and Mexican silver standard. In seeking an "international agreement" it has in good faith attempted to aid the silver producer in securing a wider range of uses for his product. But all these attempts have been in vain. The commercial nations of the earth have accepted the logic of events and have determined to use silver in a subsidiary form and maintain it, when coined, at the standard of gold. The concession that gold is sixteen times more valuable than silver is an admission that there is a proportionate value which must be taken into consideration.

The only actual silver question grows out of the commercial variations in that ratio.

Experience has taught us, as it has taught other nations, that we can only maintain both metals in actual circulation by coining the cheaper one on Government account and redeeming it, either directly or indirectly, or exchanging it on demand for gold. It remains as good as gold only as long as it can be converted into gold.

The silver question has been so fully discussed that it seems idle now to go into details. The country has become thoroughly tired of it.

In the Fifty-fifth Congress the House of Representatives could readily have passed a bill of the general import of that now under consideration. All the bills presented involved numerous matters of detail, and it was perfectly evident at the time that no bill on the subject could pass the then free-silver Senate. Members of this House were averse to taking up and studying the details of a measure that it was obvious could never become a law. The Spanish war intervened, with all its exciting episodes, and there was enough for that Congress to do without attempting the impossible, and the question of settling the standard by law was relegated to the Fifty-sixth Congress.

The settlement of the question by law in the Fifty-fifth Congress was also rendered the more difficult by persistent attempts to couple with it radical, experimental banking legislation. The "gold Democrats" of 1896 abandoned Mr. Bryan and his Chicago platform, and, while supporting General Palmer, they, with great unanimity, voted for "McKinley and prosperity."

These men were anxious in the last Congress that permanent law should take the place of the present plan of maintaining the parity of our money by executive action. It is now declared by law that all our money shall be kept equal, and with a gold-standard President and Secretary of the Treasury the law has been found fully adequate to that end.

With parties divided as they are now, and under existing law, the election of a free-silver President could place this country on the silver standard in thirty days and shipwreck every business interest in the country during the readjustment following the declaration of the people in favor of the change in the standard of value. If our party were to view this subject from a purely selfish standpoint it would be better for it if the question were left open and the country should be compelled to choose between Republicanism and the gold standard and Democracy and the fluctuating standard of silver.

On this question, with the experience of the last four years before their eyes, the people would choose, as they did in 1896, to "open the mills instead of the mints." Viewed from the standpoint of party selfishness, it might be well to leave the statute as it now is—the subject of Presidential good faith. A sound-money President is absolutely essential as the law now stands. Mr. Bryan and his followers stand pledged to redeem the Governmental obligations in the cheapest money that will fill the letter of the contract. They broke permanently with Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Carlisle because the Administration refused to take the chances of redeeming our promises in silver.

On this issue the country has declared in favor of the policy of the Republican party. It is the duty of that party to redeem its pledges, as the Treasury redeems its promises, in the full measure of its party platforms. The party platform of our party in 1898 in the State of Iowa, upon which the Speaker of this House and the other members of its unanimous delegation were chosen, speaks clearly the views of the majority of the people of Iowa.

I will read it:

#### IOWA PLATFORM, 1898.

That the experience of the past two years has fully approved the gold standard policy of the Republican party as declared by the national convention of 1896. We recognize the necessity of comprehensive and enlightened monetary legislation. The monetary standard of this country and the commercial world is gold. The permanence of this standard must be assured by Congressional legislation, giving to it the validity and vitality of public law. All other money must be kept at a parity with gold. Our money, like our institutions, should be maintained equal to the best in the world. In this plank we invite the support of all voters who desire honesty and stability in business affairs and an immediate and permanent settlement of the question of the standard of value.

There is the declaration of the Republicans of the State of Iowa, and sound-money Democrats cast their votes in favor of that proposition. Iowa emphasized its position again in 1899, and a majority of nearly 60,000 were recorded upon the side of the gold standard and of sound money.

The other day I had a letter from one of the sound-money Democrats of Iowa. Said he:

It is reported that the Republicans will not redeem their pledges given to the Democratic sound-money, gold-standard men, because under the present law it is necessary to elect a Republican President in order to maintain the pledges of parity.

I answered him:

DEAR SIR: Your letter is at hand. On next Monday, at 12 o'clock, Washington time, we intend to pass the gold-standard bill; and it will be just 11 o'clock Iowa time. Look out for it.

And we intend to redeem that pledge, my friends, notwithstanding it relieves you from some of the dangers of the campaign of 1900, and may enable you to go to the country and say: "Elect Bryan; he can not do any harm." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the Republican party is passing this measure so hastily because they apprehend that Bryan will be elected because he is in accordance with the sentiment of the American people, and they are going to put it beyond their power to undo the harm that will have been done?

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman's statement is so full of misunderstanding that he does not do credit to the speech which he has just made. I say, sir, that we are about to put in the form of statute law the standard that is now upheld by good faith on the part of the Executive of this country. Mr. Cleveland maintained the gold standard; so has Mr. McKinley.

The Republican party promised to give you this kind of legislation, and propose to carry it out, whatever the consequences to the party may be. Now, the gentleman to my left, the distinguished leader from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], told us also that we were having "prosperity in spots." Is there any gentleman on the other side of the Chamber now that will rise—I will yield him time to do so—and tell us that he represents "a spot" not now prosperous? [A pause.] Where is there one of those barren spots of the Republic? I asked my friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] on yesterday, and he seemed to rejoice that Tennessee was having pretty good times, without free silver and under the Dingley law.

We must not forget, my friends, what took place just a few short years ago by the very threat that our standard of value was to be changed and the existence of a silver basis was proposed. You seem to forget the Coxey army that encamped under the shadows of this Capitol and that were "kept off the grass" by the police just a few years ago. I visited that body of Bryanites when they came to this city. I went with a number of Congressmen. We asked one of them, an intelligent-looking man, what they wanted. He said, "What we want is more money." I asked, "How do you expect to get it?" "Print it." "How are you going to put it in circulation?" "Build roads and canals with it." "Well," said I, "how much do you intend to issue?" "Five hundred million dollars." "You mean to put the stamp of the Government on it?" "Yes." "How are you going to redeem that money?" And he looked at me with a pitying smile, and said, "Redeem her? Never! Just print her, and let her go." [Laughter.]



The people if called upon to recruit a Coxe army or a Kelly navy now would reply: "Too busy! Too busy!"

Experience has proved that the doctrine of sound money and honest recognition of national debts is the best economy. The nation which pays to the uttermost farthing is sure of good credit and a low rate of interest.

The same country where, under threat of the silver standard, the whole world demanded immediate payment of all obligations, national, corporate, and individual, finds itself at this time with sound credit and a surplus in the Treasury.

Good money is the surest foundation for a healthy national financial condition, whilst depreciated money is like blood poison in the system.

In 1892 our opponents denounced protection as a "policy which fostered no industry but that of the sheriff."

In 1893 the sheriff increased his force of deputies, for he was the only busy man in the nation except the free-silver soothsayers. The people voted a want of confidence in the Republican party in 1892. The old augurs of the Democracy prophesied and saw visions, and their young men dreamed dreams and talked and talked, but business men refused to invest, and the goddess of confidence deserted our shores until she was recalled by the decree of the people in 1896. Those were the longest four years in our history.

Out of the old fields of protection and good money comes the new corn of prosperity.

You will remember the great cartoon of McKinley "opening the mills instead of the mints," and of the title bestowed upon him by my colleague [Mr. DOLLIVER] of "the advance agent of prosperity."

The mills have been opened, labor is employed, wages advanced; every promise has been performed and every pledge redeemed. Now let us write in the statutes of the country with the force and effect of permanent law the good faith of our party to the American people, who have so greatly trusted us.

The people of America expect much and demand much from the Republican party. They do not expect impossibilities. We declined in the Fifty-fifth Congress to attempt impossible legislation upon this subject. In the present Congress the situation is very different. We are now in a position of power, coupled with corresponding responsibility in both branches of the legislative body and at the White House. We are now in a position to perform our agreements. The time for talk has passed by, and the hour for action has arrived.

A legislative milestone should now be erected to mark the progress of national thought.

This bill will serve that purpose. With its provisions upon the statute books, any President must obey the law until it is repealed, and no mere Executive order could then overturn the standard of commercial value.

The sound-money Democrats, who aided us by their votes and influence in 1896 and 1898, will see by our action that the party with which they have been temporarily associated is worthy of their permanent support.

In 1900 the attempt to overthrow the legislative settlement of this question will be resented by every business interest in the United States, and labor will insist on keeping good the standard of wages, too. One more contest must be fought out upon this issue.

With our position fortified by the enactment of law, the attempt of our opponents to overturn existing conditions will be displeasing alike to the wage-earner, the farmer, and the business man.

Even after the lapse of so short a time as has passed since 1896 it is hard to recall the desperate conditions that surrounded our people at that time. Under the threat of free silver, and under the actual existence of the Wilson-Bryan law, business was paralyzed and the free-silver orators were demonstrating that cheap money was the only cure for the financial ailment of the nation.

Thousands of workmen who had been thrown out of employment by the Wilson-Bryan law and by the attack upon our monetary standard rallied around Mr. Bryan and, deceived by his plausible words, skipped over twenty-three years of time and charged the existing calamity to something that the Republican party had done in 1873. Napoleon's maxim for success was, "Audacity! Audacity!!"

The cool audacity of the Populistic-Democratic fusion of 1896 swept thousands of lifelong Republicans off their feet, but the campaign of education that followed brought the business interests of the country into line, and the workmen took their second thought, and the victory of 1896 came, followed by its gratifying results.

It would seem that in the light of past events the silver question ought not to be fought over again. But our opponents require plenty of time to catch up in the procession. Mr. Bryan and most of his supporters now eulogize Lincoln. Even a good word for Garfield and Blaine may occasionally be heard from them, but all this takes time. Usually their greatest difficulty is found in fully comprehending the death of an issue.

That splendid old Democrat, Andrew Jackson, fought the battle of New Orleans on January 8, 1815. His victory was of the type that has made Dewey famous in modern times and Joshua in ancient days. Twenty-six hundred of Jackson's enemies bit the dust, and only 13 Americans were killed and wounded. It was, indeed, a notable deed, one that did honor to the American arms, and we all join in sounding the praise of Old Hickory.

But you will recall that this battle was fought before the days of Atlantic cables, and the treaty of peace was signed at Ghent fifteen days before the fight, and the slaughter was, indeed, an unnecessary one. That was in the old days, when sailing ships, with their woven wings, slowly carried the message of peace across the deep. The gallant Jackson got so much and such well-deserved glory out of this victory that the party that now claims to represent his principles emulates his example and continues to fight its battles after the war is over, when all questions in dispute ought to be forever set at rest.

Merritt and Dewey stormed Manila after the protocol, but the cable had been cut, and they, like Jackson, did not know that the war was ended.

But the result of 1896 is known to all men, and there is no excuse of ignorance to justify fighting anew the battle of the standards in 1900.

Colonel Bryan has again sounded the tocsin of 1896. But there must be proper adjuncts to justify a renewal of this contest. In 1896, surrounded with the wreckage of 1893, 1894, and 1895, he pointed to 1873 as the belated cause of it all and made one of the most notable Presidential campaigns in our history.

Free silver was then the financial Keely motor by which wealth, like power, was to be produced by vibrations of sound.

But in 1899 it takes a bold man to attempt to form the lines again for such a contest.

The smoke of the battle of 1896 has cleared away, and the peaceful smoke of the factory and the forge now again rises and floats over the scene.

It is hard to look with becoming seriousness upon the proposition of our opponents to renew the contest upon the issues of the Chicago platform.

That platform is what Dickens would call "the dearest and buriedest" of all the things of this world.

In 1896 we had an abundance of prophecies upon which to draw. Evil, and that continually, was the foreboding of our opponents, if the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 and consequent silver standard were not adopted.

We were told that the "bryanide of silver" was our only remedy for the ills which all knew to exist. We were assured that the gold standard would result in widespread bankruptcy and ruin, just as in 1878 we were assured that the resumption of specie payments would lead to universal financial calamity.

In 1896, as in 1878, our opponents' evil predictions were not justified by the event.

Many Republicans were swept off their feet in 1896 by the word "gold" in the St. Louis platform. Thousands of them went over to the other side; and without the purchase of votes, but by appealing to the judgment of men in the Democratic party, they came over and not only made good the loss, but aided to cast that half million of majority which has been rewarded by the prosperity which you now enjoy. No man has risen in his place in this House to say that his district is not prosperous. How would that have been but a few years ago, when this silver campaign was going on? On every hand the cohorts of calamity would have appeared and would have borne witness to hard times. The South is rejoicing in prosperity, and I am glad to see it. The price of cotton has gone up along with other products, and as I see my friend from Texas rising to interrupt me, I will ask him if they are not having good times down in Texas?

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Iowa to be a frank man, and I desire to ask him a question and trust that he will answer that question frankly. Do you say that the prosperity now in the country is due to the fact that the Republican party is controlling the destinies of this country?

Mr. LACEY. It is due to two causes.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The Republican party and the God of the universe?

Mr. LACEY. To both. The God of the universe works through terrestrial things. The Republican party is one of those things through which He has worked prosperity in this country. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] My friend would say when the price of cotton was down that the cheapness was due to the Republican party, and now when cotton rises he says the Almighty did it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. As the gentleman from Iowa has just mentioned the fact that the price of cotton has risen, does he not know, and does not every man know, that the price of cotton has advanced somewhat this year because the crop is supposed to be short from 25 to 40 per cent as compared with the production of last year?

Mr. LACEY. Now, I am inclined to think that my friend is

suggesting only one of the reasons. A few years ago the gentlemen on the other side, if the price of cotton was down, said that was because they did not have free silver; that it could never rise under a gold standard. Now, when cotton rises without free silver, they attribute it to something else.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LACEY. What is the number of bales raised this year?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not know; no man knows.

Mr. LACEY. Has there been any marked decline in the production?

Several MEMBERS. Oh, yes.

Mr. LACEY. My friends on the other side attribute it to a short crop. A few years ago, when the price was low, they ignored the question of the size of the crop and referred all their misfortunes to the crime of 1873.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that cotton is lower now than it was in 1896?

Mr. LACEY. I am not sure of that. What is it selling at now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. About 7½ cents a pound.

Mr. LACEY. It is selling for more than it did a year or two ago.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Will the gentleman from Iowa allow me one question more?

Mr. LACEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The gentleman has attributed the present prosperity to the Republican party. In 1897 wheat sold for a dollar a bushel, and in 1899 at 65 cents a bushel. How do you reconcile that?

Mr. LACEY. I do not reconcile it at all. No political party can make a fixity of prices. I am talking about the general situation of the country. Wheat will go up and wheat will go down, cotton will go up and cotton will go down, whether the Democrats are in power or the Republicans are in power; but a condition of general prosperity and confidence following upon a change of policy involving great industrial and financial issues is worthy of recognition even upon the part of those who opposed the change. Distrust growing out of unwise laws and the threat of still more unwise laws was removed by the election of 1896.

Let us be glad of the result, and as far as possible provide by law against a recurrence of the condition from which we have happily emerged.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to answer the question which he asked a moment ago?

Mr. LACEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I understood the gentleman to inquire if there had been any material decline in the yield of cotton this year. It is estimated that the decrease in the yield is not less than 2,600,000 bales, which will account for the very moderate increase in value. I want to say that cotton to-day is selling at unremunerative figures in the great State of Texas. It is bringing 3½ cents a pound less than what was thought to be a remunerative price.

Mr. LACEY. The increase in the cotton product, I think, has been largely due to free labor in the South, and the decline in price has been due largely to the great increase in its production. It is the greatest product of the South, and it is now joining in the general advance. I rejoice at it, and regret that the gentlemen who were so ready to blame the decline in price upon Republican policies are now unwilling to attribute their improved conditions to what seems to us to be so evident.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me for a question?

Mr. LACEY. I can not now; my time is getting limited. The enactment of this law, Mr. Chairman, will not change the standard of value. We have declared in favor of sound money in the past; we have never attempted to write into the statute law an explicit declaration as to what sound money is. Sound money is that which you can convert into the standard of the world.

No more prosperous Treasury report has ever been exhibited in the history of the United States than at the present time. With \$1,043,128,288 cash on hand and a net balance of \$286,216,439, and with revenues exceeding the current expenses of the Government, notwithstanding the fact that we have just passed out of one war and have nearly concluded another, with all of this immense mass of revenue at our disposal, I say what more remarkable record has been written in the history of the world than is shown by the Treasury report of to-day?

A few years ago we were discussing in this House a bill to extend the Union Pacific and the Central Pacific railroad bonds at 2 per cent for one hundred years, in the hope that thereby we might receive something of the amount due to the Government from these roads. To-day the last dollar of the Union Pacific indebtedness of \$36,000,000 has been paid, and payments are rapidly being made on the Central Pacific, and the entire amount of all of this indebtedness about which we felt so much doubt and uncertainty a few years ago will soon be paid in hard cash into the Treasury.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, redeems the pledges of the Republican

party made to the people in the past and clarifies the political atmosphere for the year 1900. It is true that Nebraska has gone Populistic—Democratic, if you please. It is true, however, that in other parts of the country the policy of the old party of sound money has received the sanction and the approval of the people at the polls.

A MEMBER. How did Ohio go?

Mr. LACEY (continuing). And on yesterday the city of Boston, almost continuously Democratic for so many years back, has retaken its place in the old fold.

Mr. GAINES. And defeated a Gold Democrat for mayor.

Mr. LACEY. Now, the gentleman from Tennessee has sought to interrupt me. He lives in the State of Tennessee?

Mr. GAINES. Certainly. And the expenditure of \$262,000,000 to carry on the war created an enforced demand for certain commodities in the South.

Mr. LACEY. Then the gentleman from Tennessee is willing to admit the suggestion that there is "prosperity in spots?" [Laughter.]

Mr. GAINES. Undoubtedly, because you sent there and bought everything in the world which was necessary to carry on the war.

Mr. LACEY. Let me ask the gentleman in what part of the State does he live?

Mr. GAINES. In the blue-grass region of Tennessee, where the Democrats believe in the Constitution of the United States, and believe in the issue of gold and silver currency, and are unwilling to demonetize either. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LACEY. Well, are you not doing pretty well, under the circumstances?

Mr. GAINES. Yes, we are; but not owing to Republican legislation.

Mr. LACEY. My friend thinks that his part of the country is doing well, but the people there want to do better. Let me recall the old epitaph on the tombstone of one who tried experiments in life. It read, "I was well, but wanted to be better. I took physic; now I am here." [Laughter and applause.] Now, you want to be better.

Mr. GAINES. We will give you more "physic" in 1900.

Mr. LACEY. In 1892 the people, like the Israelites of old, grew tired of quails and wanted to go back to the leeks and garlic of Egypt.

And the people that year tried the experiment of voting the Democratic party back into power, believing that Grover Cleveland, with his sound-money ideas, would be able to hold them in check. But the first thing that was done when they took possession was to begin that crusade upon our standard of value which paralyzed the industries of this country, and from which we were not relieved until the people in 1896 resolved to return again to the successful policy of the past.

The Republicans have urged two policies as necessary to the national welfare. One was protection, giving employment to the American people. The other was sound money and a gold standard, to pay for that employment with the best money in the world. With these two principles sustained at the polls we have seen a change come. We have seen a change that is as wide as the country, as broad as the land itself, and even my friend from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], radical as he always is, hesitated a while to state which kind of a spot he lives in.

Mr. GAINES. The good spots are mighty scarce, I want to say, and the longer your party keeps in power the scarcer they will get. I do not go where anything is wrong, and hence I am against your policy and your party. I stand on the side of right, here and everywhere.

Mr. LACEY. I always admire the judicial severity of my friend's comments upon any question. A few years ago he criticized us for the hard times, and now that the blue-grass region of Tennessee enjoys good times he admits it, but says he wants them to be better. They will not improve by lowering the standard of money. He is easy to please when one party is in power, and it is impossible to satisfy him when another party is in. But my friend has simply wandered off after this silver fetiche. It is remarkable how that has captured the imagination of the people in the Southern States.

And yet, gentlemen, you have to abandon the East, the business interests and the manufacturing interests of the whole country in order to gratify that sentiment. Localities that have been heretofore strongly Democratic could only be carried now by declaring against the policy of that party to-day. I have heard but little said about the ratio of 16 to 1 upon the other side. I am not sure even that my friend from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] is still in favor of the sacred ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I am, and so is my party.

Mr. LACEY. You are still for it?

Mr. GAINES. Congress fixed the ratio and we have the right to make it, and you have supported that ratio time and time again and so has your party.

Mr. LACEY. We have declared in favor of the present ratio



many times, but we have declared also in favor of maintaining all the money that is coined at a parity with gold. This side of the House has endeavored to aid the silver producer. Silver is an American product, and we have gone almost to the verge of business destruction in our efforts to do something for that metal. We have bought nearly sixteen thousand tons of silver under the Bland-Allison law and under the Sherman law in the vain effort to stem the tide and to bring back once more the old parity between silver and gold at a ratio substantially that which had previously been in use.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LACEY. Yes, I yield to what is left of the Populist party from Kansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. RIDGELY. The gentleman says that his party is pledged to maintain the silver dollar at a parity with the gold dollar. I ask him if he takes the position that the only way in which it is possible for this nation to do that is to make the silver dollars redeemable in gold dollars at the will of the holders?

Mr. LACEY. They must either be redeemable directly or indirectly. We have maintained the parity heretofore by an indirect redemption. That which can be converted into gold will be as good as gold. We have maintained the parity of the silver dollar and of the silver certificate with gold by the fact that you can convert the same into gold, and without that it will be utterly impossible.

Mr. RIDGELY. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. LACEY. My time is almost up, and I can not yield.

Mr. RIDGELY. This question bears directly on the first one.

Mr. LACEY. Well, I will yield once more to the gentleman.

Mr. RIDGELY. Does this bill provide directly for the redemption of silver dollars with gold dollars?

Mr. LACEY. It does not.

Mr. RIDGELY. Indirectly, then?

Mr. LACEY. The law heretofore has provided indirectly for substantially the same thing for years. We have long since provided directly for the redemption of half dollars, dimes, and quarters, and the various small coin.

This bill provides for indirect redemption of the dollar and direct redemption, if necessary to maintain it at a parity with gold, and still leaves its legal-tender qualities. By limiting the number of silver dollars we have been able to maintain them in circulation at a parity with gold.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we coined 18,000,000 of these silver dollars, which is 10,000,000 more than had been coined in the eighty-five years prior to "the crime of 1873."

Now, before I close I want to call the attention of gentlemen on the other side to a Democratic platform of a few years ago, on which they well-nigh carried the country. It reads:

We denounce the failure, for all these eleven years of peace, to make good the promise of the legal-tender notes, which are a changing standard of value in the hands of the people, and the nonpayment of which is a disregard of the plighted faith of the nation.

That is the Democratic platform of a few years ago. To-day, when we are providing practically for the redemption of the greenbacks, our friends say that it should not be done. They throw their hands up in horror, and they say that the thing that they said in this platform ought to have been done years ago ought not to be done now. But let us see the further inconsistency of Democratic platforms:

We denounce the improvidence—

That is, of the Republican party—

which in eleven years of peace have taken from the people in Federal taxes thirteen times the whole amount of the legal-tender notes \* \* \* and made no provision for resumption.

And then they wind up by saying:

And as such hindrance we denounce the resumption clause of the act of 1875, and we here demand its repeal.

Those gentlemen, after denouncing us for not resuming specie payment, then demanded the repeal of the law which provides for the specie payment of those notes, and they demanded its repeal on the ground that it would be a hindrance to specie payment. They were in favor of resumption, but opposed to fixing a day. They were like that very great candidate for the Presidency on the platform I have just read, Mr. Tilden. He was in favor of getting married, but opposed to fixing the day, and died a bachelor.

You agree with us already in some things. I believe in your hearts you agree with us upon this money question. I am not here to speak of the Democracy like my friend from Missouri spoke of us. He assumed that everything we do on this side we do from some depraved or immoral purpose. I do not so regard the Democratic party.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LACEY. I can not yield to the gentleman, as my time is about to expire.

Mr. COX. From what platform were you reading?

Mr. LACEY. From the platform of 1876. I believe there are good men on that side of the Chamber.

Mr. COX. Of course there are.

Mr. LACEY. I think you all are, and I do not believe you want our country destroyed. I do not believe even my friend from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] thinks gentlemen on this side of the House want their country ruined or are willing to buy Democrats with money or intimidate them by force. That is talk for one of the "spots" in Missouri for the campaign of 1900. We all desire to do what is best for our common country. We have had experience and the example of what followed from 1896 down to the present time. Do you dare strike down that which you are enjoying? I do not believe you will dare to make a campaign on free silver. You may talk about it bravely now, but when you come to meet your happy, prosperous, and contented people you will not again discuss the propositions involved in the Chicago platform of 1896. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to first call attention to the provisions of this bill:

First. You, the majority, propose by legal enactment to establish the single gold standard.

Second. You make every bond or interest-bearing obligation payable in gold.

Third. You make United States notes (greenbacks) redeemable in gold and prevent their being again paid out except for gold.

Fourth. You make the Treasury notes issued under the law of 1890 and paid out for silver bullion payable in gold.

Fifth. You make all other debts, public and private, which now exist or that shall be contracted payable in gold.

Sixth. You make a division of issue and redemption into which you dump \$760,000,000 for redemption purposes.

Seventh. You compel the Secretary of the Treasury to keep \$50,000,000 additional in the general fund.

Eighth. You authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds, payable principal and interest in gold, to enable him to keep this \$810,000,000 shut up in the Treasury.

Ninth. You make silver exchangeable for gold (redeemable).

Tenth. You authorize the Secretary to coin the silver seigniorage into small money, but you require him to cancel and destroy an equal amount of Treasury notes.

Eleventh. You give power to the Secretary to name the size of the Treasury note bills.

Twelfth. You make it obligatory that silver certificates shall only be issued in one, two, and five dollar bills, destroying silver's power to be used except in small transactions.

Thirteenth. You permit national banks to issue the par value of their bonds, and you reduce their taxes.

Fourteenth. You permit national banks to organize in villages with \$25,000 capital, which will have the effect to destroy private banks.

Mr. Chairman, the financial notions and demands of the moneyed class have nearly all been incorporated in the bill before us. The majority have, as near as they dared, followed the demands of the Indianapolis monetary convention. Briefly stated, this bill proposes to enact into law the payment of the entire bonded indebtedness of the Government, principal and interest, in gold, the permanent retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes issued under the law of July, 1890, by redeeming them in gold, the redemption of silver with gold when demanded, and the final substitution of national-bank paper for every kind of paper money now in circulation. In other words, the scheme is to make gold the money of final payment for everything and to permit corporations to issue and control the entire paper circulation.

As the representative of a brave, enlightened, honest people I protest against this scheme. I believe it to be un-American, unbusinesslike, unconstitutional, and hurtful to the wealth producers of our country. It means the degradation of the silver money we now have and pledges the money world that we will coin no more. It means the ultimate destruction of one of the constitutional coins of our Government. It means appreciation in the purchasing power of gold and the lowering of prices for the products of labor. It means the contraction or expansion of the paper currency at the will and pleasure of the national banking corporations and consequent paralysis of the business men of small means—the farmer, miner, and mechanic.

It means the weeding out of the middle classes, the bone and sinew of free government, and leaving us two classes, the very poor and the very rich. It means, as I read it, the enslavement of the farmer, miner, country merchant, small banker, mechanic, and day laborer to the money power. This last brings a sneer to the face of the defender, advocate, and apologist of this class, and we are asked, Who and what is the money power?

It is a combination of great bankers and bond owners of Europe and the United States who are neither American, English, French, Belgian, nor German in their real allegiance, but must be regarded as a law unto themselves and a separate power gradually but steadily strengthening their remorseless grip upon the destiny of governments. It is that power that permitted the

Turks to murder Armenians, that made terms of peace between Greece and Turkey so as to preserve the solvency of Turkish bonds, that is dismembering China—

that has forced this republican Government, in violation of every sentiment of liberty, humanity, and Christianity, to go into world politics, spit on our great past, and deny liberty to a struggling people, and through it all has carried its blood-stained banner of per cent of profit without regard to the claims of justice or the cause of liberty and right.

For twenty-five years there has been slowly but surely developed a determined and unrelenting purpose on the part of the holders of our bonds in Europe and the United States, and of capitalists who control the national banks, to make the bonds of this Government payable in gold, to circumscribe the legal-tender power of silver, and to destroy every kind of paper currency except that of national banks.

In spite of assertion to the contrary, this bill is intended to and will contract the currency, and history teaches that a contraction of capital invariably produces adverse and distressing times, while an abundance of money creates prosperity. But you insist that the payment of bonds and redemption of paper in silver would not be honest, because silver is far below gold. Who is to blame for the price of silver? The men who are demanding the present legislation. You stopped the coinage of silver in 1873. You only permitted a crippled coinage under the law of 1878. You again killed coinage of silver by the law of July, 1890.

Every Administration for more than twenty-five years has tried to destroy the virility of silver. The oft-told tale has been repeated in this debate that the Secretary can not get silver to circulate. The general stock of silver coined amounts to \$482,622,376. The statement of the Treasury Department on December 1, 1899, was that there was on that day in circulation in silver dollars \$76,233,454, and of silver certificates \$394,292,800, or a total of \$472,525,250, nearly the whole amount of silver ever coined. But we are told that there has been such an unexampled yield of silver during the last twenty-five years that a tremendous fall in its value has been forced upon the commercial world and has no reference to its not being coined.

Mr. Chairman, this old worm-eaten chestnut has been made to do duty in every debate on the financial question for more than twenty years. In the debate in this House in the Fifty-fifth Congress on the Teller resolutions, it was dragged from its hiding place and paraded as the crowning reason why we should not return to coinage of silver. But the facts do not bear gentlemen out in this contention. The total product of gold and silver from the mines of the United States, 1873 to 1897, inclusive, is, gold, \$970,751,327; silver, coinage value, \$1,299,000,000.

In that same period the world's production of gold was \$3,160,000,000 and of silver \$3,281,000,000, coinage value, and the gold production has wonderfully increased since then. From 1801 to 1850 the total product of gold and silver in the world in each hundred dollars' worth of coin was of gold, 36.7, and of silver, 63.3. I pass over the period when Californian and Australian gold discoveries made it so plentiful.

From 1874 to 1896 it was 48 per cent of gold and 52 per cent of silver. Is there any unexampled overproduction of silver in these figures? Gentlemen can satisfy themselves of the truth of these figures by looking at the reports of the Director of the Mint from year to year, and silver has not had a friendly Director of the Mint since I have mixed in politics.

You propose by this bill to make \$346,681,016 of United States notes (greenbacks), \$89,026,280 of Treasury notes, 482,622,376 silver dollars, and \$1,037,049,690 of United States bonds payable in gold—a grand total of \$1,955,379,362 made to depend on the ever-changing home of gold and \$918,329,672 to be mere token money, the whole amount to depend on the good will of the gold gamblers of the world.

You have not been quite bold enough to declare outright for demonetization of silver and the cancellation of greenbacks, but your bill does propose to have the Treasury exchange gold for silver and to redeem the greenbacks and Treasury notes in gold, which means that every dollar so redeemed will pass out of circulation for all time if you continue in control of the Government. This bill proposes to shut up in the Treasury, in the division of issue and redemption, at one fell swoop, about \$760,000,000, and \$50,000,000 more must be kept in the general fund. Of this, \$260,000,000 must be in gold coin. This will inevitably contract the circulating medium.

And in section 4 of this bill you extend the glad hand to the bondocrats by authorizing the Secretary to issue United States bonds at his own sweet will. You tear down all barriers that have heretofore protected the plain people against the demands of the holders of idle capital, who want to escape taxation by investing in nontaxable bonds. It appears at first glance that the majority intended to expand our money a little by coining the silver seigniorage into subsidiary coin, but they carefully look after that

by declaring that a like amount of Treasury notes shall be canceled and not reissued.

Again, the bill before us strikes a deadly blow at all forms of paper currency issued by the Government by giving authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe what sized bills of United States notes and Treasury notes shall be issued, and by declaring that silver certificates shall hereafter only be issued in bills of one, two, and five dollars. The meaning of all this is made plain by the reading of sections 8, 9, 10, and 11 of this bill, which absolutely and without reserve turn over the supreme control of the paper currency of the United States to the national banks.

For seventy years the "money power" has worked and waited, toiled and planned, for the "glad day" which this bill promises. The day is upon us for which Nicholas Biddle and his clan toiled and schemed, prayed and bulldozed, begged and demanded—the control of our monetary system by national banks. You of the majority hope that the banks will buy bonds of the Government and fill the vacant places of silver, greenbacks, and Treasury notes with national-bank paper and expand the currency to meet the demands of trade. You will find that a "hope long deferred," which will "make your heart sick."

I stand with the Democratic party, and with the Populists as well, in never-ending opposition to granting further power to national banks. We find here and there a man who affiliates with the Democracy in favor of such banks and who is willing to see their power augmented. But when you do find such a man he is either uninformed as to the history of our party or he is willing to forego party principles for the sake of gain to himself or his friends. Thomas Jefferson is one of the world's immortals.

Here and there, as we read the history and biography of the centuries, we find a man of marvelous qualities standing out in advance of his fellows. Among them all no finite man outranks Jefferson. As an exponent of human liberty, of individual rights, of government by the people, he is the Colossus of the ages. The honest, the faithful, the natural Democrat goes to his teachings for inspiration to acts of integrity. The Declaration of Independence and his first inaugural address are examples of his wondrous faith in the plain people, and his whole life lessons were in the direction of giving every man an equal opportunity.

The keen foresight with which he had been gifted enabled him to see the dangers of a currency which was controlled by the greed of corporate wealth, and his knowledge of the Constitution, his intense desire to protect our country, impelled him to say:

That Congress has no power to charter a United States bank; that such an institution is one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our Republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated "money power" and above the laws and will of the people.

[Applause.]

Having faith in the immaculate democracy of the founder of our party, another great exemplar of American democracy, Andrew Jackson, destroyed the old national bank of the thirties. No less than eight times has the party in national convention indorsed the theory of Jefferson and the action of Jackson. It is a cardinal principle of our party that the Federal Government should not surrender its sovereignty and farm out to corporations the making and control of our paper currency. We are opposed to it because we find no warrant in the Constitution for the Government surrendering its own sovereignty to corporations made up of private individuals. Some vigilant champion of gold and national banks may demand of us why, if we believe what we preach, we do not carry the questions to the courts and have settlement.

Alas, Mr. Chairman, we have learned by bitter experience that he who pleads for the plain people on these great questions rarely reaches the ear of the courts. The power that is to make gold the unit of value and that demands that corporations shall make and control the paper currency has had much to do with making the personnel of the courts. The recent decision of the highest court of our country on the income tax teaches us that judicial precedents and constitutional guaranties cut no large figure these latter days.

We oppose national banks because their charters are special privileges not given other classes of citizens. It is now proposed to enlarge the power of the national banks by issuing to them their full 100 per cent of their bonds and to reduce the taxes on them. Retire the greenbacks and Treasury notes as is suggested, and this will give the control of the currency issue into the hands of the national banks, with power to expand or contract the issue at will. This is a surrender of sovereignty to corporate interests which has been damaging to the interests of the common people in the past; that has helped to unsettle values and brought disaster to business of all kinds.

Let it not be forgotten that in 1881, when Congress attempted to reduce the interest on bonds, these banks retired in one day without notice \$18,000,000 of their currency. It is too much power to give to corporations. In this connection I may be pardoned for quoting from one who had some character and standing



among the public men of sixty years ago. In a speech in the United States Senate in 1831, this language was used by a Democratic Senator, referring to the United States bank:

The Government itself ceases to be independent, it ceases to be safe, when the national currency is at the will of a company. The Government can undertake no great enterprise, neither of war or peace, without the consent and cooperation of that company; it can not count its revenues for six months ahead without referring to the action of that company—its friendship or its enmity, its concurrence or opposition—to see how far that company will permit money to be plentiful or make it scarce; how far it will let the moneyed system go on regularly or throw it into disorder; how far it will suit the interests or policy of that company to create a tempest or to suffer a calm in the moneyed ocean.

The people are not safe when a company has such power. The temptation is too great, the opportunity too easy, to put up and put down prices; to make and break fortunes; to bring the whole community upon its knees to the Neptunes who preside over the flux and reflux of paper. All property is at their mercy. The price of real estate, of every growing crop, of every staple article, is at their command. Stocks are their playthings, their gambling theater, on which they gamble daily with as little secrecy and as little morality and far more mischief to fortunes than common gamblers carry on their operations. It tends to aggravate the inequalities of fortunes, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, to multiply nabobs and paupers, and to deepen and widen the gulf which separates Dives and Lazarus.

If there was aught of truth in this picture, made nearly seventy years ago, when we had one United States Bank, how much more potent must be the influence of thousands of national banks which we now have and which are held together as a great trust "by the cohesive power of public and private plunder." As their charters expire, they should be compelled to go out of business as national banks, instead of us enlarging their powers and becoming subject to their baleful influence. Gentlemen on the other side take party credit for the better times in the country. You are persistently following the commands of your former leader, Mr. Blaine, to "claim everything."

The marvelous production of gold in the world during these years, a great deal of which came from our mines, the large demand for our meats and bread in Europe, together with the fact that our manufacturers have gone into the markets of the world with their wares and have successfully competed with foreigners, has given us a mighty balance of trade which, after paying our interest charges abroad, has left us some hundreds of millions more money than we had three years ago. It proves our contention that "more money" makes better prices. But you can not expect this to continue always. One extra large foreign crop will glut our home market, the balance of trade will be against us, gold will flow from us, and under the provisions of this bill we will be bound hand and foot, with every debt made or to be made payable in gold.

Mr. Chairman, who demands this legislation? How many raisers of wheat, corn, cattle, cotton, hogs, tobacco, and fruit appeared before your partisan committee to ask that this proposed bill become the law? How many private bankers, country merchants, miners of coal, lead, and zinc came before you and pleaded for it? How many of the millions of Americans who earn their bread by honest labor have asked you to pay the bonds in gold and cancel Treasury notes and strike down silver? How great was the throng of old Federal soldiers who saved the Union that have begged you to impound and destroy the greenbacks?

Who besides the money changers demand the retirement of the greenbacks? What small country banker or merchant demands it? Who among the millions of farmers have asked it? What great army of laborers want greenbacks redeemed in gold or, in fact, redeemed at all? It is a safe, a sound, a stable currency, and, besides, it was issued by our Government in the exercise of its constitutional sovereign power. It paid the soldiers who fought for and saved the Union. This money bought the bonds which by law are now to be payable in gold. I assert that there is no general demand among the people for the present redemption of greenbacks, but there is a general opposition to their being redeemed in gold and permanently retired.

I was trained and educated to believe that the only legal-tender money authorized by the Constitution was silver and gold, but a Supreme Court dominated by your party declared that Congress had the right to make paper money a legal tender as well. Therefore, with that authority given Congress, I insist that the sovereignty of the Government should be exercised when we need paper money, and not given over to national banks.

When the leaders of gold monometallism bore down the young Ajax from Nebraska, with threats, predictions, prophecies, with unlimited money, with desertions from our party, and with soothing promises of "international bimetalism," they thought the battle over and the "silver craze" forever killed. But they may learn from their own platform of 1892 that "the American people from tradition and interest favor bimetalism." We have seen the commission sent to treat with foreign countries "backcapped" from the Treasury and by the President when he sent in his recommendation to Congress on July 24, 1897.

The people now see clearly that they were buncoed in 1896 with false promises, and now, feeling bold, the Administration, by its pliant Congress, dares to proclaim its purpose to "more firmly

establish the gold standard." We welcome the gage of battle. We believe this compact minority will come back to the Fifty-seventh Congress a compact majority and will so demean itself as to be a triumphant party on the Democratic platform of 1896. [Loud applause on Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Fox] is recognized for twenty-five minutes.

Mr. FOX. Mr. Chairman, the financial problems of a great Government like this are by many considered too abstruse and complex for ordinary mortals to grasp. It may be so, but anybody who can tell "a hawk from a handsaw" can see the dishonor and infamy in this bill.

Section 1 of the bill makes the gold dollar the standard unit of value.

Section 2 provides:

That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money, shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in that section.

According to the recent annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, there are now outstanding—

United States notes, or greenbacks.....	\$346,681,016
Treasury notes, 1890.....	93,518,280
Silver certificates.....	406,085,504
Interest-bearing debt.....	1,046,048,850

The greenbacks and Treasury notes are, under the law and by the express terms of the contract, payable either in gold or silver, at the option of the Government. The silver certificates are mere certificates of deposit, and payable only in silver.

In supporting this measure, which makes all these obligations payable in gold, gentlemen on the other side repudiate that provision of their platform of 1896 which declared in favor of bimetalism. They even have the effrontery to confess in this debate, what we always knew, that the plank in that platform declaring for the double standard by international agreement was and is a humbug. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] admits that he was humbugged and declares with emphasis that he will be humbugged no longer.

But this is not all. Gentlemen have a right to change their minds. More eminent gentlemen, or at least gentlemen in more eminent positions, have changed their minds quite as suddenly. The gentlemen who are sent here as the representatives and agents of the people, who are the real debtors who owe all these outstanding obligations, have no right to sit here as the agents of the creditors of the people and repudiate their contracts by striking down half the money of final redemption, thereby making money scarcer and dearer and the terms harder.

Let it be remembered that the people and not the Government are the real debtors. The Government has nothing of its own. Not a cent goes into the United States Treasury except from the pockets of the people through taxation. The Government is simply the agent of the people and negotiated these loans and issued these promises to pay for the people. The holders of these obligations are really the creditors, not of the Government, but of the people. Congress is supposed to sit here as the representatives of the people and not of their creditors; but those who vote for this bill ignominiously desert the people who elected them and sent them here as their representatives, and go over to the creditors of the people, and as their agents and acting under their orders, repudiate their most sacred contracts.

Section 2 of this bill is rank repudiation.

Mr. LINNEY. I should call it extortion.

Mr. FOX. It is absolute repudiation. My friend says it is extortion. I say it is just as much repudiation to require the people to pay more than the contract stipulates as it is to compel the creditor to take less. It is just as dishonest for the creditors to demand more as it is for the debtor to pay less.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It repudiates the contract.

Mr. FOX. It does repudiate the contract. All these obligations are contracts, Mr. Chairman; every one of them. Every promise to pay and every interest-bearing bond is a contract, the holders being the creditors on the one side, and the people being the debtors on the other side; and these contracts may be repudiated by the creditor as well as by the debtor. Whenever a creditor brings about a condition of things which makes it harder for the debtor to pay these debts, it is repudiation.

Whenever he changes the contract so as to enable him to demand more or dearer money, it is just as much repudiation as it is for the debtor to refuse to pay. If the honor of the nation demands that good faith shall be kept with its creditors, still higher and more sacred is the obligation to keep faith with the people, through whose hard toil all the money is raised to pay these creditors. To do less is infamous. It is worse; it is treason.

This section, in so far as it is constitutional and can be made operative in the courts, completely destroys the legal-tender quality of greenbacks and Treasury notes by making all private as



well as public debts payable in gold. Nobody will want this money if it will not pay debts, and this provision will, as it was intended to, hasten the retirement of all the paper money, as provided in section 4.

The crowning infamy of this bill is the provision in section 4 for the absolute redemption in gold and retirement of all greenbacks and Treasury notes, to the amount of \$440,000,000, at the will of the holders, and the redemption in gold and the retirement of \$400,000,000 silver certificates and 57,000,000 silver dollars at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, thus retiring from circulation \$900,000,000 of the people's money.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. FOX. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. You said a while ago that these bonds were payable in coin?

Mr. FOX. They are payable either in gold or silver.

Mr. GAINES. Is it not a fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, in the decision given in 7 Wallace, page 26, held that they were payable in coin?

Mr. FOX. It has never been disputed. I understand that it is the very purpose of this bill to change the contract. They are now payable in the coin of the realm, which means either gold or silver. It has been so held by the Supreme Court and by resolutions of both Houses of Congress. It has never been denied by anybody.

Mr. GAINES. Let me read a part of the decision.

Mr. FOX. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but my time is limited.

Mr. Chairman, we have had in this country many distinguished financiers from Alexander Hamilton down to the present day, but it has remained for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], the distinguished author of this bill, to discover for the first time in the history of government, here or elsewhere, that you can strike down and cancel and destroy \$900,000,000 of the currency of the country and not decrease the volume of that currency.

When asked the question if it would not decrease the circulation to that amount to redeem \$500,000,000 of silver certificates and silver dollars in gold, he replied that it would not, because the Treasury would release the same amount of gold, which would go into the circulation in place of the silver and silver certificates that were taken into the Treasury. A most astounding proposition, Mr. Chairman! The gentleman seems to think that the United States Treasury is an inexhaustible gold mine, from which the Government may take freely without cost and supply any deficiency in the volume of money.

He forgets that the Government is a pauper and can not get a dollar except by taxation or by the issue and sale of bonds. It all comes from the pockets of the people. He forgets that his own bill provides for the sale of bonds at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, whenever it becomes necessary to purchase gold with which to take up this silver and redeem these greenbacks and United States Treasury notes. Where is this gold to come from, Mr. Chairman? It will be purchased from the banks and the people and taken out of circulation, and the circulation will be decreased to that extent. And when the gold is paid out in the redemption of paper currency and silver, they will in turn be taken out of circulation, thus reducing the volume of the currency by \$900,000,000.

It is true the bill provides that "the notes and certificates so redeemed or exchanged shall be held as a part of the redemption fund," but it also provides that "they shall not be withdrawn or disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged."

And this means that they are to be perpetually impounded, and might as well be canceled; for who will return gold for this paper currency? No provision whatever is made for the disposition of silver taken in exchange for gold. It is safe to assume that the country will never see it again.

To-day, when our commerce and trade are expanding and there is an unprecedented demand for money, it is a startling proposition to decrease the volume of currency, as is proposed in this bill, by \$900,000,000. The quantitative theory of money has been much discussed in this debate and in every debate on the money question, but recent events have conclusively demonstrated that we have not money enough now. The Secretary of the Treasury, a few weeks ago, in order to relieve a stress in the money market, saw proper to pay a year in advance all interest on United States bonds and to purchase \$25,000,000 of bonds at the market price. In their annual reports just made the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasurer of the United States distinctly recognize the quantitative theory of money. The Treasurer in his report says:

It is fair to point out that the Treasury, in this as in previous seasons, has striven to the utmost to meet the demands for currency for moving the crops and for general business. It has exhausted all its resources, and these ought not to be increased by more Government issues. The vast inflow of gold into circulation has been an unmixed blessing and has helped out every industrial and financial interest. This is a legitimate and permanent contribution to our money. It is likely to continue and to grow. Beyond

such increase in gold the national banks must solve the problem of adding to the volume of currency.

Referring to the recent stress in the money market, the Secretary of the Treasury in his report says:

Interest, or, more truly speaking, the bank's charge for exchanging its credit against private credit, rose from 2½, 3, and 4 per cent to 10, 15, 25, and 40 per cent. The elements of the currency which bank credits furnished was contracted within a period of nine weeks to the extent of \$84,000,000. In common parlance, deposits were reduced to that extent. Put in the shortest form: In order to supply the interior with the use of a medium of exchange for a few weeks, to the amount of \$23,000,000, havoc was wrought in the regular on-going of our commercial life.

But you say it is expected that under the enlarged privileges given to national banks by this bill they will supply the deficiency by a larger issue of bank notes. You stand on the recommendation of the Treasurer, which I have just quoted, that the "national banks must solve the problem of adding to the volume of currency." You have no assurance that they will do this. But suppose they do? The issuance of legal-tender money is a function of the Government. It has been so declared by the Supreme Court. It is a constitutional prerogative and duty. Why abdicate that prerogative and turn it over to private corporations?

Last summer, in his tour over the United States, the President of the United States frequently boasted that we had a safe, sound currency, every dollar of which is as good as every other dollar. Why change? Why give the banks a monopoly of issuing money, thus forming the most gigantic trust of the age, a money trust, that will give a few corporations absolute control of the currency of the country? Of course, gold will not circulate. It, being the only money of final redemption, will all be locked up in the banks, and bank notes will be the only money in circulation, and its volume will be entirely in control of the banks.

Certainly bank notes are not safer than United States notes. Behind the greenbacks are 70,000,000 of people and the unlimited resources of this great country, with the taxing power of Congress to fill the Treasury with money of final redemption. It is a curious thing that it is insisted by the capitalists of the country that there should always be sufficient gold in the Treasury to redeem outstanding obligations when presented, and yet we have the present distinguished Secretary of the Treasury for authority that banks rarely pay any debts they owe in money, but pay them in their own promises to pay. In his recent annual report he says:

It is a popular delusion that the bank deals in money. Money is an incident in its dealings—an important incident, no doubt—but, truly speaking, an incident only. The bank deals in credits. For a consideration, varying according to time, place, and circumstances, it gives to the people with whom it deals its own debt obligations in exchange for the debt obligations of its dealers and customers. The obligations of the bank thus created are generally evidenced by a credit upon its books to the dealer, who has the right to draw upon it by his checks or drafts and as his convenience may be served.

The constant interchange of credits between the bank and its dealers, with the enormous volume of checks and drafts passing between buyer and seller, constitutes in the broadest sense the currency of the country. It is these instruments which trade uses in much the larger part of all its operations. Money—real money, gold or silver—plays but a small part in the multitudinous exchanges.

He further says:

It is impossible for anyone to name a good reason why the indebtedness of the banker in the field of exchanges should not be expressed as freely in his notes of hand of convenient size as in one consolidated entry to the credit of his dealer upon his books of account. It is precisely at this point that difficulty, embarrassment, and loss are occasioned. What would be a natural economy and effective operation is, by the inhibition and restriction of law, now made impossible. In a state of freedom the extraordinary wants of the country at harvest time would be largely, if not wholly, met by the conversion of bank balances not available for these general purposes into bank notes or paper money.

Referring to the fact that great masses of money had to be sent out recently into the country to move the crops and to meet the demands of the great industrial movement in the country, he says:

If the New York banks could have issued their notes in the form of paper money, they would have furnished them and thus discharged the credits standing upon their books, and this would have entirely satisfied interior and Western needs. In that case there would have been no expansion of credit. By so much as notes were issued by so much book credits would have been canceled. The bank statement would have been expressed in different form with no material change in fact.

Two important deductions may be made from these extracts:

First. There is a real demand for more instead of less money.

Second. The banks are not satisfied with the United States notes, with gold and silver in the Treasury for their redemption. They are not willing for an increase of this currency. They want to use their own promises to pay, and keep all the real money in their vaults. They complain because they had to send so much money into the country.

It is a fact that there is more money in actual circulation in the country to-day than ever before since the war, and it is due to this fact, that the country is perhaps more prosperous than ever before. It is the amount of money in circulation that makes prosperity, rather than the volume of money. Money locked up, that does not circulate, contributes nothing to the prosperity of the country.



Mr. Chairman, it is a dangerous policy to surrender to the banks the control of the money of the country. Those who control the currency of the country and dictate its financial policy can control the business and government of the country. They can raise or depress prices. They can create a bounteous plenty or a ruinous panic. They can make money scarce or abundant. They can dictate the wages of labor. They can elect governors, Congressmen, legislators, and judges. This bill creates the greatest of all trusts and makes possible all trusts.

In a recent magazine article Bishop Potter, of New York, said:

In the great industrial and financial combinations which are the special feature of our day it must be admitted that it is the gain of the few and not the equities of the many which are chiefly kept in view.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the utterance of a politician appealing to the prejudices of the masses. Nor was it spoken by a toiler who was blinded and maddened by the hard conditions of his life. It is the candid admission of a gentleman who preaches, not in country meetinghouses or in the slums of the city, but in palatial cathedrals to the richest congregations on earth. It is the truth.

I would excite no prejudice against capital. Large fortunes and even combinations of large fortunes are necessary to carry on the great enterprises of the world. But they should keep their hands off of government. They have no business to control legislation, the administration of the laws, or the financial policy of government. Bishop Potter is right. Human nature is selfish.

Bankers are no worse and no better than the balance of mankind, and in their great financial and business operations they think not of the "equities of the many," but are looking solely to their own gain; and I want to warn you now that you commit the greatest crime of the closing century when you rob the people of their dearest constitutional prerogative and surrender to the banks the right to control the currency and dictate the financial policy of the country.

While capital should be protected, it is not the only sacred thing in the country. We must have some regard for the muscle that toils, the back that bends under its heavy burden, and the brain that grows weary with unremitting labor. "The man with the hoe" is as much entitled to consideration as the man with the bonds.

Mr. Chairman, my friends on this side of the Chamber say that the people will call you to account in the next Presidential election. I do not think so. They would if they were free; but they will be shackled hand and foot. The laborer in the mines and factories will be at your mercy. You will control the money of the country, and therefore control labor and wages. With your hand on the throat of the laborer, he dare not thwart your wishes. He is absolutely at your mercy. You can crucify him, and will do it if it is necessary. You will buy everybody that can be bought and intimidate everything that can be bulldozed.

What will the end be? As sure as God reigns, right will finally triumph. Many close students of history say that every great step forward in the progress of the world is made through bloodshed and revolution. Is it not possible for this cup to pass from us? For the sake of humanity and the Carpenter's Son, who died for humanity, I appeal to you gentlemen who represent the wealth of the country to avert this great calamity. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, although I am as strong an advocate of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 as any member upon this floor, I can not see from the provisions in this bill that the questions of bimetalism and free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, or any other ratio, are involved. As I understand it, it is simply a proposition to change the monetary conditions as they exist in the United States to-day. The questions of bimetalism, the free coinage of both gold and silver, are not involved, except what is the difference between them and the single gold standard. This bill proposes to do that which no party has ever dared to say in its national platform.

While I appreciate the fact that the Republican platform of 1896 said that it favored the gold standard unless bimetalism could be obtained through international agreement, yet we all know that the solemn pledge of the Republican party was not as expressed in this bill. I desire, before I begin in the main what I shall have to say, to show how the Republican party upon this floor has departed from the pledges and promises as made by the candidate of their party, President McKinley, in his letter of acceptance in 1896. This is what he said, and when I have read it I desire to call the attention of the gentlemen on the other side to the pledges of the President of the United States in regard to the silver and paper money in this country.

This is in part the letter of acceptance of President McKinley:

It is not proposed by the Republican party to take from the circulating medium of the country any of the silver that we now have. On the contrary, it is proposed to keep all of the silver money now in circulation on a parity with gold, maintaining the pledge of the Government that all of it shall be equal to gold. This has been the unbroken policy of the Republican party since 1878. It is inaugurating no new policy. It will keep in circulation and as good as gold all of the silver and paper money which are now included in the circulation of the country.

That was the written pledge of Candidate McKinley in connection with the platform of his party, and you pledged through him, when you asked the votes of the people of the United States in 1896, that not only the silver dollar but all paper money in the United States should be kept in circulation.

We have the solemn pledge of your candidate, to which I have just referred. How is it with regard to the pending bill? Will any gentleman on the other side of the House stand up and deny that any of the provisions of the bill complies with the declaration of your President? On the contrary, we are told by gentlemen on that side of the House that at a given hour on Monday next the House is to pass this bill, the effect of which is that when the greenbacks are taken to the Treasury and redeemed in gold they will never be reissued or taken from the Treasury unless gold is presented and demand made for their exchange.

Dare any gentleman on that side of the House stand up and say that that is not withdrawing the greenbacks from circulation and reducing the currency of the people to that extent? Can any of you do it? I pause for an answer. Is there any man on that side of the House who dares to stand up and risk his reputation in denial of this proposition?

What else do we find? That the Treasury notes, which under the Sherman Act were issued for the purchase of silver bullion, are to be retired in like manner as the greenbacks. In section 3 of the Sherman Act of 1890 is the following language:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall each month coin 2,000,000 ounces of silver bullion, purchased under the provisions of this act, into standard silver dollars, until the 1st day of July, 1891, and after that time he shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for.

From this it will be seen the purpose of said act was that these Treasury notes should be redeemed in standard silver dollars; but this purpose was ignored by the Administrations of Harrison, Cleveland, and McKinley, and they have persistently been redeemed in gold, helping to make what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] has called the "endless chain."

The inquiry I put to the gentleman who has charge of the bill now before the committee, Mr. OVERSTREET, of Indiana, and the colloquy arising thereupon, which I adopt as a part of my remarks, explains itself:

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. In reference to the silver dollars, when they are taken to the Treasury and redeemed in gold, what is to become of them after they have been received by the Treasury? Are they to be paid out again or not?

Mr. OVERSTREET. There are two alternatives. The first is, they may be returned to trade upon the presentation of gold for their exchange, or they may be transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury from the redemption fund to the fiscal fund and used in the discharge of Government expenses.

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Then if they are paid out in due course of trade and transferred to this fund that the gentleman speaks of, do they not then become an endless chain in themselves, the same as you say the greenbacks and Treasury notes do?

Mr. OVERSTREET. No, sir; for the following reason—

Mr. PIERCE of Tennessee. Will the gentleman answer that? If they are paid out in the due course of trade, can they not be taken back and gold demanded, and then go the round again for another endless chain, like the one the gentleman has talked of in reference to greenbacks and Treasury notes? I would like the gentleman to make that clear.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman's question. I may say that I think I have answered it very conclusively in the argument I have prepared, but in order to deal with entire fairness with the gentleman I will answer his question now. Under the present law an endless chain is created, because the greenback is reissued immediately and may again seek its way to the Treasury for a second redemption. That is stopped by the proposition which I have just elaborated in my argument. Under the proposed law the silver dollar, if exchanged for gold, would be returned to trade upon presentation of gold for another exchange of the silver, or it may be returned from one fund (the redemption fund) to another (the fiscal fund) by the Secretary of the Treasury. Just at that point is to be found the reason why an endless chain of silver dollars can not occur. It is the Secretary of the Treasury who has that option and right to transfer the silver dollar and pay it out, and it only goes out in the payment of the expenses of the Government.

What was his reply? He said that when the silver dollars are exchanged for gold they will go into the redemption fund; that they can not be reissued unless by an order of the Secretary of the Treasury transferring them to the general fund.

In section 3 of this bill I find the following:

SEC. 3. That there be established in the Treasury Department, as a part of the office of the Treasurer of the United States, a division to be designated and known as the division of issue and redemption, to which shall be assigned, under such regulation as the Secretary of the Treasury may approve, all records and accounts relating to the issue, redemption, and exchange, as herein provided, of the several kinds of United States money. There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States, and taken up on the books of said division as a redemption fund, the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, and the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890; and an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount, both of United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890, outstanding. The gold and silver coins and bullion transferred from the general fund in the Treasury, as herein provided, shall be increased or diminished, as the case may be, in accordance with the provisions of this act and in no other way.



From which it will be seen all the silver dollars and silver bullion in the "general fund," as designated by this bill, are transferred to the "redemption fund," never again to reach the channels of trade unless the Secretary of the Treasury, by special order, transfers them to the general fund to be paid out upon the expenses of the Government. And this, Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted this Republican Administration will never do. For has not the President, Mr. McKinley, in his message to Congress, recommended the impounding of the greenbacks and Treasury notes to stop what the Republicans and gold-standard advocates call the "endless chain?" So, if you are honest in your contention to stop the endless chain, the silver dollars must be as effectually impounded as the greenbacks and Treasury notes.

To-day there are in the Treasury of the United States, in round numbers, 400,000,000 of silver dollars, represented by outstanding silver certificates, less \$6,000,000 of silver certificates in the Treasury; standard silver dollars of 1890, in round numbers, \$7,000,000. The total amount of standard silver dollars, in round numbers, coined to date is 490,000,000, leaving between seventy-five or eighty millions of silver dollars in circulation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point the thought presents itself, What, under this bill, will become of the \$394,000,000 of outstanding silver certificates? A reference to the bill shows they are to receive the same fate as the standard silver dollars, or they will become an endless chain, and of course you gentlemen on that side have provided in this bill against any such contingency.

In section 4, page 4, from line 6 to line 19, inclusive, is the following, to wit:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all time the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government; and if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may at his discretion exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. The notes and certificates so redeemed or exchanged shall be held in and constitute a part of said redemption fund and shall not be withdrawn therefrom nor disbursed except in exchange for an equivalent amount of the coin in which said notes or certificates were redeemed or exchanged, except as hereinbefore in this section provided.

We see that a knock-out blow has been provided for the silver certificates. In order to do what this bill calls "maintaining the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States," the Secretary of the Treasury may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. When silver certificates are taken to the Treasury and gold demanded, they must be paid in that money or the gold advocates will cry out that the parity of our moneys is not preserved and the credit of the Government is in peril; so into the redemption fund the silver certificates must go to keep company with the silver dollar.

By a little addition we see that when the purposes of this bill are carried out, the currency of the country will be contracted to the extent of the greenbacks, Treasury notes, and silver dollars—in amount exceeding \$800,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, is there any truth in the contention of the advocates of the gold standard that if the Secretary of the Treasury exercised the right of the Government to pay the greenbacks and Treasury notes in silver—they being payable in coin at the option of the Treasurer—this would in any way affect the parity of our money or the credit of our Government? I assert here that it would not. We have before us the example of the French Government, with a population of less than 38,000,000 people, who has in her financial system 900,000,000 silver 5-franc pieces (or dollars), a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, and which, with gold in nearly equal amounts, constitutes the reserve of the Bank of France. The notes issued by the bank, like our greenbacks and Treasury notes, are payable in standard coin. The bank to-day, as it has done since 1873, pays either gold or silver coin in redemption of its notes at its option, and has never surrendered to the holder of its notes this right. And whenever an effort is made to trench upon the gold part of the reserve of the Bank of France the bank pays those who present her notes 95 per cent in silver and 5 per cent in gold.

Mr. Chairman, for fear that some Republican member may be doubtful upon this subject I will give good Republican authority. During the extra session of the Fifty-third Congress, called by Grover Cleveland, Mr. Hendrix, a banker, gold-advocate Democrat, member of this House from the State of New York, was discussing the evil results to the Government by the so-called endless chain, by its having to redeem the greenbacks and Treasury notes in gold, and if it refused its credit would be ruined, when a distinguished Republican member interrupted him and denied that if the Secretary of the Treasury exercised his option, instead of surrendering it to the holder of the greenbacks or Treasury notes, and paid in silver dollars, that this act would affect the credit of our Government or the value of our money, and cited the example of the Bank of France that I have just mentioned above, and this gentleman is the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. HEPBURN, of Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, if John G. Carlisle, while Secretary of the Treasury, had refused to pay out gold for the greenbacks and Treasury notes at the demands of the "gold gamblers," and had exercised the option which the law gave him to pay in either gold or silver dollars and had paid in silver, the burden of two hundred and sixty millions of bonded debt which he issued would not now be fastened upon the taxpayers of this country; and if President McKinley had made his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Gage, exercise this option in favor of the people instead of surrendering it to these same gamblers, it would not have been necessary for him to place an additional two hundred millions of bonded debt upon the country.

What member upon this floor, who has any regard for the truth, will contend that if ex-Secretary Carlisle or Secretary Gage had refused to pay gold for the greenbacks and Treasury notes when presented for redemption, but had paid silver dollars, that either our credit or money, at home or abroad, would in the least have been affected? Can not this, the most powerful nation in the world, with only four hundred and ninety millions in silver dollars and not less than seventy-five millions of population, do what the Bank of France is doing every day, and maintain the parity of value of all our money?

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana has told us that the reason the standard silver dollar is worth 100 cents in gold is because, under the parity clause of the law, there is a gold dollar behind every silver dollar. I tell the gentleman that the first time the "parity clause" ever appeared in the statutes of the United States was in the Sherman act of 1890, and I challenge him, or any member on that side, to mention a time when a standard silver dollar was ever worth less than one hundred cents in gold, and for thirty-six years was worth from 1 to 3 cents more than a gold dollar, and I tell him that, in all the past history of the Treasury of this Government not one standard silver dollar has been redeemed in gold. Even Cleveland's Administration did not dare do this, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] told us in his speech that Grover Cleveland was the archenemy of silver. Yes; he was.

I agree with the gentleman. No man, not even excepting the discarded statesman from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, has been a more bitter enemy of the white metal than Grover Cleveland. He perverted the principles of his party and prostituted, with the gift of offices, men high in the councils of his party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I agree with you that Grover Cleveland was the archenemy of the Democratic party [applause on the Democratic side], for he came near wrecking it; but the people wrested his control from him and cast out the men who had followed him, and, so far as I am concerned, if they want to come back into the Democratic party let them come back and take their medicine and be Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, section 1 of this bill provides that the standard unit of value shall be the gold dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, or 23.22 grains of pure gold, being the one-tenth part of the eagle.

Section 2 of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section. Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

Thus we see, if this bill becomes a law, all the obligations of the Government, past and future, all the private debts of our people, past or future, are to be paid in gold.

Mr. Chairman, every bond of the Government, including the two hundred and sixty millions issued during Cleveland's Administration and the two hundred millions issued by this Administration, are payable in standard silver and gold dollars, and have stamped upon each bond, "payable in standard coin of the weight and value of the act of July 14, 1870," and to-day the four hundred and eighty-two millions of standard silver dollars are a legal tender for all debts, public and private.

Section 4 of this bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury the authority—

to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of the said (gold) reserve fund, bonds of the United States bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year.

This section of the bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury unlimited power to issue gold bonds.

By sections 8 and 9 of this bill the national banks are authorized to issue notes to the par value of these bonds.

Section 10 removes the tax on national bank notes and puts a tax of one-fifth of 1 per cent upon their franchises, measured by their capital stock, undivided surplus, and profits.



Section 11 is as follows:

SEC. 11. That section 5138 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5138. No association shall be organized with a capital of less than \$100,000, except that banks with a capital of not less than \$50,000 may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 6,000 inhabitants, and except that banks with a capital of not less than \$25,000 may, with the sanction of the Secretary of the Treasury, be organized in any place the population of which does not exceed 2,000 inhabitants. No association shall be organized in a city the population of which exceeds 50,000 persons with a capital of less than \$200,000."

From which we see that banks with not less than \$50,000 capital, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may be formed in places which do not exceed 6,000 in population, and banks with not less than \$25,000 capital, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may be formed in places where the population does not exceed 2,000. Under this section the Secretary of the Treasury, if he so desires, can punish a community by refusing to grant banking privileges, a power no Secretary should have.

When this bill becomes a law what will be its effect upon the people? It establishes the single gold standard; retires all the greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver dollars, and silver certificates; gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power to place upon the people a perpetual debt, and makes them the prey of the gold trust and the national banks. The Republican party in this House and in the Senate, we are told, will pass this bill with all its aggravated evils; gentlemen of that side boast that when in caucus considering it not a single Republican voted against it. You turn your backs upon your records, which so far have been in opposition to every provision of this bill, and the only excuse you give is that you have changed your minds, that you are a progressive party, and that we upon this side of the House are, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] puts it, "not up to date." The proudest boast on this side is that we still worship the eternal principles in the interest of mankind as enunciated and taught by Jefferson, Jackson, and the fathers of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You are doing now what John Sherman years ago warned you not to do. On page 533 of Sherman's Autobiography you can read:

I think that America by deciding in favor of the double valuation would not only save the world at large from an abyss and prevent the accomplishment of a stupid general crime whose authors humanity would some day learn to curse, but that she would advance her own interests more than may be supposed possible.

On page 531 of the same book he uttered these memorable words:

These two metals, gold and silver, have traveled side by side from the beginning of time. The records of human history do not go back to a time when they did not move together. They have varied in value, sometimes one and sometimes the other being higher, but they have gone on, gold the money of the rich, silver the money of the poor, the one to measure acquired wealth, the other to measure the daily necessities of life.

You are doing now what William McKinley, speaking at Toledo, Ohio, on the 12th day of February, 1891, warned you not to do. He said:

You are setting up "gold, the money of the rich," and you are destroying "silver, the money of the poor;" you are destroying one of our precious metals, one of our own products, destroying silver and enhancing the price of gold. You are determined to contract the circulating medium, limit the volume of money among the people, "make money scarce and therefore dear."

When this bill becomes law you will have "increased the value of money" and will have "diminished the value of everything else." You are determined you will make "money the master everywhere, everything else the servant."

I warn you that this evil brood which you are about to turn loose upon the people will before long return to plague you, and its multiplied evils upon the people will bring them to the realization that their only hope of relief is in the success of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] has told us, in his usual impressive way, that immediately succeeding the election of Cleveland by the Democratic party in 1893, "Confidence fled and depression and hard times were felt by all the industrial interests of the country." I admit this was true, but these results were not caused by Cleveland attempting to carry out and enforce Democratic principles. The daily press of New York and of the Eastern cities, through the Associated Press, told how the Cleveland Administration, in connection with the great metropolitan bankers of New York, Boston, Chicago, and the "solid communities" of the East, combined to bring about the hard times which cursed this country during all Cleveland's Administration.

In the Washington Post of the 28th of April, 1893, and every other Eastern daily that received the Associated Press dispatches, there appeared the following account of Secretary Carlisle's conference, Mr. Cleveland at that time being in New York with the New York bankers:

WASHINGTON, Friday, April 23, 1893.

Carlisle meets bankers. No issue of bonds unless all other expedients fail. A New York conference. The Secretary frankly enlightens prominent financiers as to the policy of the Government and states that nothing will be

left undone to secure the repeal of the Sherman law when Congress assembles. Result of conference.

NEW YORK, April 27.

Secretary Carlisle decided this morning to have a talk with the New York bankers. Late on Wednesday evening, after his arrival from Washington, he conferred with Assistant Treasurer Jordan and ex-Assistant Treasurer Charles J. Canda. As a result the Secretary this morning suggested that he meet the bank presidents and private bankers at 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The postponement of the naval review because of the storm caused some delay, as Secretary Carlisle accompanied President Cleveland on the *Dolphin*. The Secretary landed with the Presidential party at the foot of Ninety-sixth street, and was there met by the Columbian reception committee, including President J. Edward Simmons, of the Fourth National Bank. The Secretary and Mr. Simmons were driven to the home of President George Williams, of the Chemical Bank, and chairman of the Clearing House Association, at No. 34 West Fifty-eighth street.

The conference between the Secretary and the bank presidents lasted somewhat over an hour. There was the utmost good feeling displayed and the Secretary said he was there to make a frank, free, and open statement of what he believed to be the financial policy of the Government.

As the Secretary outlined the policy of the Government, it was shown nothing would be done that in any way would retard or check the determination of the Cleveland Administration concerning the repeal of the Sherman law. The Secretary went over the currency laws of the country and said that they were in bad shape and needed revision. He said the revision would start with the Sherman law. There is a determination also to show the miners of silver the evil effects of the Sherman law in their fortunes.

President Cleveland's advisers have told him that the only way to induce the Western and Southwestern Senators and Congressmen to consent to a repeal of this Sherman law is to demonstrate to their constituents that they are losing money every day that this law is in operation. The missionary work in that direction has been started by a number of the bankers in the solid communities of the East. They are daily refusing credits to the South, Southwest, and West.

The Chicago bankers, it was said, are carrying out the same line of policy. Secretary Carlisle, in his talk with the bankers, made his stand very clear. It is to be heroic treatment all the way through.

The bank presidents, replying to Secretary Carlisle, cordially informed him that they would be ready at all times to cooperate with him in the successful administration of the financial policy of the Government. Everybody shook hands and there was harmony all around.

Here we have President Cleveland and his Secretary of the Treasury, on the 27th day of April, 1893, less than two months after his inauguration, in conference with the great millionaire bankers of New York, devising "ways and means" to bring on a financial panic in the United States. How? By "daily refusing credits to the South, Southwest, and West" and the Chicago bankers "carrying out the same line of policy," and every member upon the floor knows this policy was adopted by the banking corporations, great and small, throughout the United States. "Secretary Carlisle, in his talk with the bankers, made his stand very clear." "It is to be heroic treatment all the way through." "Everybody shook hands, and there was harmony all round."

Mr. Chairman, was there ever a more infamous compact against the interest, well-being, and happiness of our people? The great Republican and gold-standard press of the country joined in the hue and cry that the silver bullion purchase and coinage clause of the Sherman Act of 1890 was the cause of the want of confidence in the country. I have already met and shown the fallacy of this contention in the policy of the Bank of France.

In furtherance of this evil compact many of the great tariff-protected manufacturing corporations began to reduce the wages of their employees, and many of these establishments closed their doors for months at a time, throwing out of employment thousands of men, and brought want and misery to hundred of thousands of people.

The smaller banks of the country pursued the same policy, forced in their loans, refused credit to their former customers, and wrecked the fortunes of thousands of honest, deserving men, and brought their families to actual want. In order that we might have, as these corporations claimed, "sound money" and "an honest" dollar, Cleveland and Carlisle, with their Republican allies, were doing that which in 1891 William McKinley had denounced as "destroying one of our precious metals, one of our great products, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold," limiting "the volume of money among the people," "making money scarce and therefore dear," "increasing the value of money and decreasing the value of everything else," "making money the master and everything else the servant."

The gentleman from Ohio has also told us that when the Republican party again came into power by the election of President McKinley in 1896, confidence was restored, wages of the employees in the manufactories began and have continued to be increased, and that these things were due to the success of the Republican party.

Mr. Chairman, who are the recipients of the prosperity that the gentleman so much boasts of? I assert here that the average wages of the employees in the tariff-protected manufacturing industries are not as high to-day as they were on the 1st day of January, 1893, in the face of the fact that the manufacturers have put up the price of their products in the past twelve months from 100 to 200 per cent and in some instances 300 per cent.

Take iron, nails, fencing wire, barbed and woven wire, etc., over 300 per cent; every article that the laborers and farmers have to buy enormously increased in price; coal, wall paper, agricultural implements, furniture, food products, rubber goods, queen's ware,



glass—in fact, every article controlled by these trusts, almost too innumerable to mention, have been arbitrarily increased in price by these corporate trusts to pay dividends on fictitious capital, as ex-Senator Ingalls says, "By methods that make larceny respectable."

Mr. Chairman, I ask gentlemen on that side, Why is it that there has not been a corresponding rise in the prices of the products of the farm? The reason is easily given. These trust combinations of corporate wealth meet and fix the price of their manufactured products, and the farmers and laborers must do without them or pay the trust prices. So they meet and fix the price of what the farmers have to sell, and they must take it or their products go unsold.

Unless the history of the financial legislation of the past reverses itself, the adoption of the single gold standard by this country and the striking down of our silver money, greenbacks, and Treasury notes will result most disastrously to the people of the United States. England destroyed silver in 1816, and its effects, as given by the great English historian, Alison, I quote:

The effects of this extraordinary piece of legislation were soon apparent. The industry of the nation was speedily congealed, as a flowing stream is by the severity of an arctic winter. The alarm became as universal and widespread as confidence and activity had recently been. The country bankers, who had advanced largely on the stocks of goods imported, refused to continue their support to their customers, and they were forced to bring their stocks into market. Prices in consequence fell rapidly, that of cotton, in particular, sank in three months to half its former level. \* \* \* The effects of this sudden and prodigious contraction of the currency were soon apparent, and they rendered the next three years a period of ceaseless distress and suffering in the British Islands. \* \* \* The effect upon prices was not less immediate or appalling. They declined in general within six months to half their former amount and remained at that low level for the next three years. Distress was universal in the latter months of 1819, and that distrust and discouragement were felt in all branches of industry which are at once the forerunner and cause of disaster.

I need scarcely recur to the demonetization of silver and the suspension of the free coinage of silver in 1873-74 by the United States and Germany, and the consequent contraction of the standard money of the world, and the financial panic in the United States for a period of five years, until the Bland Act of 1878 was passed, restoring the full legal-tender quality of silver dollars and providing for the coinage of \$2,000,000 worth of silver bullion into standard dollars per month. The effect of this legislation was an expansion of the money of the country, followed by rising prices in every industry of the United States; again, in 1890, upon the passage of the Sherman Act, which added four millions of Treasury notes to the circulating medium by the purchase of silver bullion. The effect of this act is described by President Harrison in the following language (message to Congress, December, 1890):

It is gratifying to know that the increased circulation secured by the act has exerted, and will continue to exert, a most beneficial influence upon business and general values.

Admitting that a few of the products of our farmers are higher than a few years ago—wheat and corn are lower now in price than at this time last year—does this prove that the election of Mr. McKinley brought about these results? Did the success of the Republican party make a short cotton crop in the South in 1899? Did it make bounteous crops in one section and short ones in another? Did it produce the famines in India and some parts of Russia? Did it make the gold output rise from \$33,000,000 in the United States in 1892 to \$64,000,000 in 1898, and in the world from \$138,000,000 in 1892 to \$287,463,000 in 1898?

Mr. Chairman, had it not been for this enormous increase in gold enlarging the volume of standard money, who can doubt the disastrous financial results that would have irresistibly overtaken this country? The world's production of gold shows that these large yields only last for a few years, and when this large output has ceased, as it surely will, the evils of this bill will convince the Republican party that it has "courted fate" once too often. Allison, from whom I have already quoted, wrote of the results of the discoveries of gold and silver in the '40s in America and Australia, as follows:

The annual supply of gold and silver for the use of the globe was by these discoveries suddenly increased from an average of 10,000,000 pounds to one of 35,000,000 pounds. The era of a contracted currency and consequent low prices and general misery, interrupted by passing gleams of prosperity, was at an end. Prices rose rapidly and rose steadily; wages advanced in a similar proportion; exports and imports enormously increased, while crime and misery as rapidly diminished. Wheat rose from 40 shillings to 55 shillings and 60 shillings; but the wages of labor advanced in nearly as great a proportion; they were found to be about 30 per cent higher on an average than they had been five years before. In Ireland the change was still greater, and probably unequaled in so short a time in the annals of history. Wages of country labor rose from 4 pence a day to 1 shilling 6 pence or 2 shillings; convicted crime sank nearly half, and the increased growth of cereal crops under the genial influences of these advanced prices was for some years as rapid as its previous decline since 1846 had been. At the same time decisive evidence was afforded that all this sudden burst of prosperity was the result of the expanded currency, and by no means of free trade, in the fact that it did not appear till the gold discoveries came into operation, and then it was fully as great in the protected as in the free-trade States.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes a law the Republican party will have carried out its contract with the millionaire bankers and corporations—the price they paid, giving their millions to secure

the election of William McKinley, President of the United States, with the further condition that they are to contribute again to the Republican campaign fund of 1900.

When this bill becomes a law, these are the evils that will be fastened on the people: The single gold standard, and all debts, public and private, now payable in any lawful money of the United States, gold, silver, greenbacks, and Treasury notes, made redeemable alone in gold; the contraction of the currency \$8,000,000; authority given the Secretary of the Treasury to issue gold bonds in an unlimited amount, fastening upon the people a perpetual interest-bearing debt as a basis for the national banks; the placing the people of the United States in the ruthless clutches of the gold trust and the national banks by giving to the banks the authority to issue their bills as the only paper money of the country, making them the rulers of the people and the masters of the price of labor and the fruits of labor. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the gold standard by the progressive nations of the earth is inevitable. No arbitrary act or conventional arrangement leads to this result. It is a feature of that evolution which is characteristic of the age. We have made the mistake of ascribing too much importance to legislative enactments for the demonetization of silver, and have given too little attention to the working of those underlying forces and principles whose behest legislators and finance ministers must obey. It is not a matter of perversity of legislators or conspiracy of financiers; it is the logic of events.

In bringing about this condition three great central facts are prominent. First, the necessity in this present era for selecting for the operations of trade and industry the simplest and most convenient instruments. That means that we will select the lighter metal rather than the heavier, or other qualities giving equal advantages, the one which has the greatest value with the least weight. Second, the impracticability of bimetallicism as a principle. Third, the great growth in gold production in the last fifty years, which has made possible the adoption of the changes promoted by the first two facts.

First, in regard to the selection of the simplest instruments, historically speaking, diverse commodities have been selected and abandoned for use as money. Tobacco and a great variety of articles which I need not name have been used, but the evolution has been to select metals, and then among metals the lighter. Iron gave place to copper, copper to silver, and by that same rule silver must give place to gold. In the year 1896 I carried about with me a copper coin of Sweden of 1732 for \$2. That coin weighed 4 pounds and 3½ ounces. It was abandoned for the lighter metal, just as the farmer abandons the clumsy old wagon with the wooden hub for the more convenient and lighter vehicle. Bimetallicism has also proven impossible with modern commercial progress. The concurrent use of two metals at a ratio of 16 to 1 or 15½ to 1, or any other ratio, with modern development is impossible.

I will concede that for nearly two hundred years—from 1637 to 1874—these metals ran together at approximately the same ratio, with a maximum relative value for silver of 14.14 to 1 in 1760 and a minimum relative value of 16.25 to 1 in 1813. I will concede the very considerable influence which the use of a metal as money has in increasing its value; but conditions have radically changed. Among the factors which have caused the change are the following:

First. The larger proportion of the precious metals used for the arts and the larger transactions in gold and silver as independent commodities. Formerly the whole production of both gold and silver was eagerly sought for monetary use. This was particularly true of the first half of this century, when trade was increasing rapidly but the quantity of gold and silver was not.

Second. The larger use of metallic money for international exchanges and its lesser use for local circulation. A prominent use of metallic money is for the settling of balances between countries.

Paper money in a greater degree is used as a substitute in ordinary transactions. Then there is another influence—the great increase in the production of gold and silver in recent years, the increased production of gold beginning before that of silver. Formerly the annual product or even the product of a decade was an insignificant share of the accumulated stock, so that the production from year to year exercised but little influence upon the relative value of gold and silver.

This brings us to the consideration of the third fact named—the great increase in the production of gold in the last fifty years or more. According to the best estimates, the total quantity of gold mined from the discovery of America to and including 1850, a period of more than three hundred and fifty years, was \$3,314,000,000. In the twenty-five years from 1851 to 1875, inclusive, the total quantity mined was \$3,317,000,000, almost exactly the same amount.

We can confidently predict also that in the twenty-five years from 1876 to 1900, inclusive, the total production will exceed \$3,500,000,000. This increase has made possible the adoption of the single standard. These comparative figures will be even more



emphatic when we notice that the production of gold in 1898, \$287,000,000 (Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1899, page 17), was more than one-half as much as for the whole of the sixteenth century; nearly one-half as much as for the seventeenth century, almost one-fourth as much as for the eighteenth century, and very nearly as much as for the first thirty years of the nineteenth century.

A pamphlet was published by Dr. Suess, of Vienna, about 1877, in which he maintained that the fields available for gold production were nearly exhausted and thereafter the supply of gold must decline. This pamphlet was republished as a Senate document and has afforded a basis for many of the arguments in favor of the remonetization of silver. His forecast has proven to be entirely wrong.

Improvements in engineering and machinery, and more especially in chemical processes, together with the discovery of new fields in South Africa and the northwesterly portion of this continent, have greatly increased the gold supply. A steady increase began in the year 1891. There is no present prospect that this added annual supply will be slackened, though it may be temporarily diminished by the present disturbances in South Africa. The prospect of an increase is so well established that it is safe to make calculations upon the present and prospective increase as a basis for action in coinage laws.

In the year 1898 the value of gold mined was more than the total value of both gold and silver mined in any year preceding the year 1891, valued at the coinage ratio of 16 to 1, and more than the total quantity of both metals, valued at the commercial ratio in any year preceding 1894, in which year the commercial value of both gold and silver mined was almost exactly equal to the gold mined in 1898.

Nothing but a marked decline in the production of gold would afford any justification for a reopening of this question of the coinage of silver as legal-tender money. Should such a situation arise, it will then be time for agitation in favor of a change of regulations.

One feature of the situation, it must be admitted, has given a great deal of justification for the arguments in favor of a larger use of silver as money—that is, the diminished quantity of gold mined from 1871 to 1890 as compared with the preceding twenty years. Had it not been for the increased quantity mined since 1891 the question would assume an entirely different aspect from that which it presents to-day. A charge of inconsistency can not be justly made against those who argued for the remonetization of silver during that period or until the increased production of gold became a settled fact, because existing conditions were radically different.

Notwithstanding the very general adoption of the gold standard by the more civilized nations during the last quarter of a century, silver has been coined on a very large scale. During the twenty-five years ending in 1897 the total quantity of silver money coined was \$3,210,000,000. The total stock of silver money in existence at the expiration of the period named was \$3,977,000,000. After making due allowance for recoinage it is evident that the greater share of the silver money now in existence has been coined since the demonetization act of 1873.

So it has not been an abandonment of the coinage of silver which has caused it to go down. It has rather been other forces more potent which we must recognize. How useless is it, then, to talk about being friendly to silver. Silver is a commodity; gold is a commodity. Each must take the value given to it in the markets of the world.

A great deal has been said in this discussion about basic or primary money. What is basic or primary money? It is money which as a commodity has intrinsic value equal to the amount that it carries on its face.

The silver dollar is not basic money. We have three kinds of money or currency in this country: First, gold money, which has intrinsic value; second, the credit or paper money, which has no intrinsic value; third, the silver money, partaking of the nature of each of the other kinds, which has intrinsic value to the extent of 45 cents and rests upon the credit of the Government to the extent of 55 cents.

Primary money is that which is not confined in its circulation to any special location, which does not depend upon the protecting influence of any Government, but that which, by reason of its intrinsic value, is available all over the globe in exchanges between countries. Under this test what is the comparison between gold and the silver dollar? The gold dollar, if I may personify it, comes to the mint and says, "Here I am. I need no stamp of king or emperor to give me value; I am worth 100 cents. Cast me into the crucible and melt me in the fiercest flame, and when I have gone through that process I am worth 100 cents." The silver dollar says, "Here I am; 45 cents. Put the dollar stamp upon me; put on me that sacred motto 'In God we trust,' and set me in circulation; and avoid that profane motto, 'The devil take the hindmost.'" [Laughter.]

I appeal to Democrats on this subject. The Democratic party in the days of Jefferson and Jackson was a hard-money party. In speaking of conditions in President Jackson's time Michel Chevalier, a French economist, who spent some years in this country, said:

Gold is called Jackson money. The national mint has been set to work with extraordinary activity to strike off gold pieces, half eagles and quarter eagles. The chief journals, in the interest of General Jackson's party, pay all their workmen with gold; the warm friends of Administration keep nothing but gold in their pockets; and whenever you see a man with coin in his pocket you may be sure he is a Jackson man. Lately the President went to his country house of Hermitage, in Tennessee; all along the road he expended nothing but gold; the Globe, his acknowledged organ, took especial care to let it be known to the public; and at a great banquet which the inhabitants of Nashville gave to him he drank as a toast, "Gold and silver, the only representatives of wealth recognized by the Constitution."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman from Ohio mean to say that General Jackson ever advocated in any manner a single gold standard or the demonetization of silver?

Mr. BURTON. Not at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (continuing). What the gentleman really means, then, is that General Jackson advocated a legislative ratio which would insure the circulation of gold coin throughout the United States.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Is it not a fact that the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Ingham, favored a single silver standard at that time in his reports?

Mr. BURTON. I think not.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is an absolute fact. A single silver standard was advocated by him.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman from Texas may be right in regard to that. What I am now seeking to emphasize is the fact that President Jackson insisted upon money which had intrinsic value, and would tolerate no other.

One of the arguments most persistently urged in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver has been the quantitative theory of money, or the theory that prices rise and fall with the increase or decrease of the amount of money in circulation. A quotation has been made from Mr. John Stuart Mill in favor of this theory. On this subject I wish to quote another passage from Mr. Mill. He says:

The proposition respecting the dependence of general prices upon the quantity of money in circulation must be understood as applying only to a state of things in which money is the exclusive instrument of exchange, and actually passes from hand to hand at every purchase, credit in any of its shapes being unknown. When credit comes into play as a means of purchasing, distinct from money in hand, the connection between prices and the amount of the circulating medium is much less direct and intimate, and such connection as does exist no longer admits of so simple a mode of expression.

Mr. Tooke, the author of a standard work on prices, also says in this connection:

There is not, so far as I have been able to discover, any single commodity in the whole range of articles embraced in the most extensive list of prices the variations of which do not admit of being distinctly accounted for by circumstances peculiar to it. \* \* \* Circumstances do frequently operate with such force as to reduce prices in the face of an expanding currency and to advance prices when the currency is diminishing. In point of fact, the expansion is frequently rather an effort than a cause of enhanced prices.

I read also from Adam Smith on the Wealth of Nations, wherein he uses this language:

Upon every account, therefore, the attention of government never was so unnecessarily employed as when directed to watch over the preservation or increase of the quantity of money in any country.

No complaint, however, is more common than that of a scarcity of money. Money, like wine, must always be scarce with those who have neither wherewithal to buy it nor credit to borrow it. Those who have either will seldom be in want either of the money or of the wine which they have occasion for. This complaint, however, of the scarcity of money is not always confined to improvident spendthrifts. It is sometimes general through a whole mercantile town and the country in its neighborhood. Overtrading is the common cause of it. Sober men whose projects have been disproportioned to their capitals are as likely to have neither wherewithal to buy money nor credit to borrow it as prodigals whose expense has been disproportioned to their revenue. Before their projects can be brought to bear their stock is gone and their credit with it. They run about everywhere to borrow money, and everybody tells them that they have none to lend.

What is the correct theory as to the circulation of money among nations? Every nation obtains that share of the world's money—that is, money which has intrinsic value—which its trade and wealth demand. The different nations of the earth in this respect have been compared to reservoirs connected by a system of pipes. If one nation has more than its share, the level lowers for the benefit of another. If any nation attempts to put money into circulation, paper money, fiat money, or that which is half fiat money and half actual money, beyond its share, what is the result?

Prices rise in that country and a period of inflation and speculation begins. Exports decrease and imports increase. They do not ship abroad as they did before, but they buy from abroad; and I wish to call attention to a fact that I should like to hear explained: If prosperity depends upon the quantity of money in circulation, why is it that in 1837, a year of panic, we had the largest volume of money and the largest volume per capita up to that time? Why is it that in 1857, another year of panic, we had the

largest volume and, with the exception of one year, 1854, the largest amount per capita?

Why is it that again in 1873, the next year of panic, the quantity per capita was quite at the maximum? Why is it that in 1893 and prior thereto, when we had an abundant currency and were issuing silver certificates of an amount equal to the value of four and a half million ounces of silver a month, gold was being exported in enormous quantities? It was because we had a vicious currency system. Part of our metallic money had intrinsic value; part did not. The better form of money went abroad and the worse remained at home, a fruitful parent of speculation.

What is the explanation of the great increase of money since 1897? Not that more has been issued, but because of the change in the balance of trade and the impetus given to the commerce and industry of the country. This brought money at home into circulation and caused the import of large quantities of gold from abroad. Increased prosperity and confidence have been the moving factors to produce this result. If you had put the cart before the horse and issued a large volume of money, it would have been absorbed in speculative enterprises and withdrawn when those enterprises failed; but instead of that policy the Government has maintained the gold standard, and McKinley's election gave the assurance that it would be permanently maintained.

Then there came a revival of industry. It is useless to suppose that we can gain prosperity by opening up the mints to a debased coin or issuing paper money in larger quantities. We might be here all night with the best presses and issue millions of dollars of paper money, and yet the world would not be any wealthier than it was before; but if we were to use our skill in the manufacture of something that is useful, that met a demand, it would add something to the wealth of the world.

One thing is essential, not only to the prosperity of this country, but to its standing among nations. We can not remain out of line with these nations which have taken a stand for the single gold standard. Prior to 1896 nearly all advanced nations adopted it. Since then the drift has been entirely in the same direction. Russia, the most isolated of all the civilized countries, tried the experiment of a debased currency and failed, and recently adopted the gold standard. Peru, where the chief piled up the silver to the top of a room as his ransom, has abandoned the silver standard and adopted the gold standard. Far-off Japan, the most progressive of all the nations of the Orient, has adopted the gold standard.

Even Mexico, the country which would naturally longest adhere to the silver standard, has been compelled to recognize the current of events. It has funded its debt of more than a hundred millions of dollars, and what has it done? Though its mints have been at work for three centuries and a half and have coined over three billions of silver dollars, a large share of which has gone to the Orient, it has decided that those bonds shall be made payable in gold coin. Can all this occur without the necessity on our part of keeping abreast with the times and basing our currency upon a rock which shall stand? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have two criticisms to make upon this bill. It would seem better to confine the issuing of notes of \$5 and less to the silver certificates issued against silver in the Treasury and not allow the issuance by national banks of notes of a less denomination than \$10. The total quantity of silver dollars represented by silver certificates of various denominations on the 30th of June last was, in round numbers, \$406,000,000. The total quantity outstanding of notes of \$5 or less was, of greenbacks, silver, bullion certificates, and silver approximately \$302,000,000; of national bank notes, \$74,000,000; in all, \$376,000,000.

Everyone must realize that the problem in our monetary system will be to make use of the silver coinage in such a way as to prevent disturbance or an undue strain upon the gold reserve. From these figures it appears that the aggregate of notes of \$5 and less, including national bank notes, is thirty millions less than the total quantity of silver certificates depending upon silver dollars. Why not restrict five-dollar notes absolutely to these silver certificates? There is every prospect that they would afford an ample supply of smaller bills, and at the same time would solve this perplexing problem of utilizing a large quantity of silver money not having full intrinsic value.

A second criticism: It would seem to be an improvement to provide more definitely that the national bank shall redeem their bills in gold. Each national bank must now provide a redemption fund of 5 per cent of its bank bills outstanding. Why not provide that this redemption fund shall be in gold and that at some central agency they shall redeem their bills, when presented, in gold? In case of a large demand upon the Treasury for gold in exchange for Government currency the pressure might be so great as to cause embarrassment. This embarrassment would be greatly relieved if the national banks share with the Treasury the burden of providing gold. Under present conditions it may not seem probable that this would occur, but our monetary system should provide for all possible contingencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, the argument on this bill is largely an argument after the fact. The people of the United States on the day of the last national election entered into their election booths, after hearing the arguments on both sides and reviewing the evidence, and returned the Republican party to power. By that verdict they pronounced against the clipping of coin by legislative enactment and in favor of a dollar true to name and true to the value stamped upon it, and that will not shrink on exposure to salt water in crossing the ocean. This bill simply enters judgment on the verdict of the people.

This bill declares that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar. This is a legal declaration of a historic fact.

In the act of April 2, 1792, passed pursuant to Hamilton's report, in which he and Jefferson agreed, the word "unit" was employed as the equivalent of "dollar."

The value of this unit was to be measured both in gold and silver. The dollar was therefore neither exclusively a gold nor a silver dollar, but was a dollar into which gold might be made and a dollar into which silver might be made.

Gentlemen have talked through at least two campaigns about going back to the silver dollar of their ancestors and at times have worked themselves and their audiences into a state of feeling over the antique. But the dollar of their ancestors was no more silver than gold.

It was then, as now, a well-known law of coinage that with unlimited coinage of both metals at a fixed ratio the metal worth more at the mint than elsewhere would go to the mint and be coined, and the metal worth less at the mint than elsewhere would stay away. This is the so-called Gresham law, which takes its name from Thomas Gresham, once master of the mint under Queen Elizabeth.

It is perfectly apparent that I would be foolish to pay my debt of \$10 in gold if with \$5 in gold I can buy silver bullion, have it coined into \$10, discharge my debt of \$10, and have \$5 in gold left.

Hence it is clear that silver under a mint ratio whereby it is given a value which it does not commercially possess will go to the mint and be coined and that gold will stay away.

Under such conditions it is clear that there can be no bimetallism, but only monometallism; that is, there can be no circulation of both metals as money side by side, but the cheaper metal will fill the channels of trade.

#### FORTY YEARS OF THEORY, BUT NO BIMETALLISM.

In April, 1790, Congress had referred certain matters relating to the establishment of a mint to Alexander Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, and in January, 1791, he submitted a report advocating the dollar as the unit and recommending the ratio of coinage at 15 to 1. In this report Jefferson, then Secretary of State, concurred.

Pursuant to such recommendation Congress passed the law of 1792, section 11 of which provided—

That the proportional value of gold to silver in all coins which shall by law be current as money within the United States shall be as 15 to 1.

In fixing this ratio it was intended to make the mint ratio conform to the then commercial ratio. It was not then supposed that by any mere paper enactment any single nation could compel silver and gold to go yoked in any arbitrary ratio.

However, soon after the passage of the act of 1792 silver became comparatively cheaper than gold, so that by 1809 1 pound of gold was worth in the market 16½ pounds of silver. Gold therefore became a commodity and was shipped abroad to pay for imported goods.

The comparative cheapness of silver stimulated its coinage, and it superseded gold as a circulating medium.

Nor did silver dollars remain long in circulation, but went to Mexico and the West Indies in exchange at par for Spanish dollars, which were about 3 grains heavier than our own. Their dollars were brought to our mints and recoined for reexchange for the 3 grains of profit involved until the further coinage of our silver dollars was stopped, May 1, 1806, by order of Thomas Jefferson, then President.

At that time there had been coined 1,439,457 silver dollars.

No more silver dollars were coined until 1836.

Under the ratio of 15 to 1 gold had gradually been expelled from circulation, and the coinage of silver having been prohibited under the order of Thomas Jefferson, worn, fractional Spanish money, supplemented by bank notes, furnished most of the circulation.

By 1830, as appears from a report of a committee of Congress appointed to consider the condition of the currency, the mint had coined since its establishment in 1794, in all, about \$37,000,000, of which about four-fifths had been exported, leaving only seven or eight millions in the United States.

This was the net result of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 15 to 1 for about forty years.

During that time there had never been bimetallism for a day, although theoretically it had been provided for.



## THEORETICAL BIMETALLISM AGAIN A FAILURE.

By the acts of 1834 and 1837 Congress provided for the coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1, but again the legal ratio did not conform to the commercial ratio. This time gold was overvalued at the mint and went to the mint to be coined, while silver was attracted to Europe by a French ratio, which declared that it took only 15½ ounces of silver to be worth an ounce of gold, while the United States had declared that it took 16 ounces.

The acts of 1834 and 1837 in effect demonetized silver. This was done under the Administrations of Jackson and Van Buren.

Then, too, up to 1853, in the Administration of Mr. Pierce, silver subsidiary coin, viz, half dimes, dimes, quarters, and halves, which had theretofore been made proportional to the weight of the silver dollar and had been full legal tender, was reduced in bullion and limited as legal tender to the amount of \$5.

This was because subsidiary silver was worth more than 16 to 1 and was rapidly finding its way from mint to melting pot.

From 1834 down to the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 the country was on a gold basis, without coinage on Government account, except during the period of our civil war, when we were on a green-back basis and cheap paper drove both silver and gold out of circulation and went down at times to 38 cents on a dollar.

During that period there was never bimetalism for a day, although theoretically it had been provided for, except that the subsidiary silver provided for by the law of 1853 did circulate with gold.

The gentlemen on the other side in advocating the ratio of 16 to 1 call themselves bimetalists, but they are not entitled to be so called. The only practical bimetalism in our financial history has been wrought out by the Republican party under a gold standard, and history makes it clear that the free coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 would result only in a silver monometallism of fluctuating and reduced value, whereby a fluctuating half dollar would be called a dollar, whereby the purchasing power of a day's work would be reduced, the pensions of soldiers and widows would be cut in two, the value of existing life-insurance policies would be reduced to the injury of widows and orphans, whereby savings deposits and loan investments would be repaid in clipped dollars, and executors and administrators might file their final accounts and be discharged on payment of depreciated money and thereby legally defraud their wards and trust states.

It is difficult to believe that any reading, thinking man can sincerely advocate the free coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 as a means of obtaining bimetalism.

Indeed, sir, the theory that silver and gold would circulate together if free coined at 16 to 1 is only theory, with no historic precedent to sustain it, and which the mere wisdom and experience of the past have long ago refuted.

Since, under the operation of the Gresham law, silver drove gold out of circulation under the law of 1792; since gold drove silver out of circulation under the law of 1834; since cheap paper drove both gold and silver out, and since the so-called Gresham law is only common sense, which operates though not invoked, what possible assurance can gentlemen on the other side have that we would be exempt from its operation now?

## HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

Shakespeare makes Jack Cade promise Dick the butcher, Best the tanner, Smith the weaver, and his other followers that seven half-penny loaves should be sold for a penny; that the three-hooped pot should have ten hoops; that all lands should be held in common; that the educated and wealthy should be degraded, poverty abolished, and that all lawyers should be killed.

Speaking of one William Lowndes, who lived in the reign of William III, Macaulay says:

He seriously believed, incredible as it may seem, that if the ounce of silver were divided into seven shillings instead of five, foreign nations would sell us wines and their silks for a smaller number of ounces.

He had a considerable following, composed partly of dull men who really believed what he told them and partly of shrewd men who were perfectly willing to be authorized to pay a hundred pounds with eighty.

Of our own condition in 1786 McMaster says that there were those who thought that a state could, by merely calling a bundle of old rags a hundred thousand pounds, really add £100,000 to the wealth of the community.

So there are men now who believe that our Government can by calling half a dollar a dollar add to our national wealth. It is singular how history repeats itself. There are still those who propose to make a half equal to a whole; to regulate value by legislation; to compel 7 half-penny loaves to be sold for a penny; that lands ought to be held in common, and that the man with a dollar ahead ought to be disciplined.

Every age renews the problem and every generation breeds its demagogues to operate upon the passions and prejudices of their cotemporaries.

## THE STANDARD.

This bill provides that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the gold dollar.

The term "gold standard" has been much misunderstood and much misrepresented.

By it it is not intended to say that all money shall be made of gold, and it does not control the amount of money in use and circulation. This is one of the hallucinations, like that that 16 to 1 means bimetalism, which has been vociferously encouraged.

Nothing is absolutely fixed, settled, and determined; nothing is changeless.

The Pyramids are slowly crumbling.

But gold has become by common consent of the business world a standard of value because it fluctuates less than other metals.

The word "standard" means something definite, fixed, settled, and established. Obviously there can not be two standards, either of length, of weight, of value, or of any other thing.

By this bill, as by existing law, the gold dollar is the standard of value.

By this standard we buy and sell and borrow and loan, make contracts and make wills.

Around it all our complex business transactions, big and little, are carried on day by day.

It measures the market in which wheat, pork, stocks and bonds, and every commodity grown and produced are bought and sold.

If I enter into a contract to-day to pay you \$1 or \$1,000 one year from date or ten years from date, you want to know and I want to know that I am to repay you just what I promise to pay you; and with a fixed standard you know and I know; but if your standard bobs up and down from day to day like a cork on the wave, fluctuating in the markets of the world, subject to the caprice of public confidence, the element of chance enters into every transaction and trade is demoralized.

A safe standard is not only the unchanging measure of all transactions, but is the solid bottom on which business confidence is built.

If there is anything in our system of Government that ought to be built upon a sure foundation, it is our system of finance, especially now that we are increasing our territorial limits and including under the scope of our control more multifarious conditions.

Soon after the fall of Santiago Cuban merchants refused to take our silver dollars at their face value, insisting that they were worth only the silver composing them. They had not yet learned, perhaps, that the United States stands pledged to maintain its silver dollars at the value stamped upon them, or perhaps they had learned that there were those in the United States who were bending every energy to bring about a condition where these same dollars would be worth only the silver composing them and preferred to take no chances, just as the Philippine insurrectionists have learned that there is a party in this country who are seeking to cripple our Government in its efforts to restore order there and establish a stable government.

We are extending our power. The Nicaragua Canal will be dug. Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines, strung together by a Pacific cable, will be stepping-stones for the advancement of American trade and American ideas and American liberty westward. Mr. Seward's prediction that the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast region beyond will become the chief theater of events is rapidly being fulfilled.

Wherever our flag goes up, there our standard ought to be sure and steadfast.

## CONFIDENCE MAKES BUSINESS—BUSINESS MAKES PROSPERITY.

Our financial system—

In the language of William McKinley—

needs some revision; our money is all good now, but its value must not further be threatened. It should all be put upon an enduring basis not subject to easy attack nor its stability to doubt or dispute.

Our financial system needs strengthening, not weakening.

When our credit is rendered doubtful our whole system is affected.

We have now a per capita circulation of over \$26, but the per capita circulation is not the chief index of business.

Ninety per cent of the business of this country is done by checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and other instruments of credit.

It is only the smaller transactions in which cash is used.

Any uncertainty as to standard tends to contract the circulation of money; and money driven to cover by panic and hidden away in fear builds up no enterprises and furnishes no employment to labor.

He who establishes order and confidence multiplies money in circulation.

He who foments disorder produces a famine in money. Hence it will be remembered that in the period from 1893 to 1897 banks were unsuccessfully offering 4 and 5 per cent on deposits to lure money out of hiding, while under this Administration banks are burdened with deposits without interest.

One man takes another man's note because he believes in his honesty and ability to pay.

The people take a nation's bonds and notes because they believe in the nation's honesty and ability to pay and redeem them.

Honesty makes confidence, confidence makes business, and business makes prosperity.

Under a sound money policy we passed into a state of actual war with scarcely a ripple in financial circles; but no one at home or abroad would have been willing to lend to our Government with the knowledge that the loan would be repaid in 40-cent dollars.

The plain people the country over took our bonds and asked for more; some of them did more—they gave their sons; some of them did more—they gave their lives.

Every man who bought a bond testified his confidence in our Government, and no man who holds a bond will vote to have his Government repay him at 40 cents on the dollar.

On the 8th day of May, 1898, a resolution was introduced in this House appropriating \$50,000,000 for national defense, and every man—North, South, East, and West, Republican, Democrat, and Populist—voted "aye;" but that appropriation would not have been impressive at 40 cents on the dollar.

Public confidence, on which the whole superstructure of commerce stands, would have been demoralized at the first approach of war, and disastrous panic would have followed where instead prevails national solvency and national pride.

#### DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COINAGE ON GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ACCOUNT.

This bill provides that all bonds now or hereafter existing, all United States notes and Treasury notes of July 14, 1890, and all obligations, public and private, shall be payable in the gold coin defined therein and in conformity with the standard established therein.

There is a wide difference between this bill and the resolution of January, 1898, by which it was declared that all bonds of the United States are payable in silver dollars coined at the ratio of 16 to 1.

By that resolution it was proposed to take silver then standing temporarily at the ratio of 33 to 1 with gold, coin it into dollars arbitrarily and without limit at the ratio of 16 to 1, and pay debts with the money so created.

That was the so-called Teller resolution, and it was voted down at the ratio of 183 to 133.

There are at least two sides to every question—a right side and a wrong side—and as a rule the right people get on the right side and the wrong people get on the wrong side.

Our silver dollars are sustained at parity with gold by coinage on Government account because by coinage on Government account the Government may limit the output of silver dollars within its powers of redemption and because behind every dollar stands the promise and pledge of this great nation to maintain silver and gold at parity with each other at the present legal ratio or such ratio as may be provided by law.

For illustration, if I am the owner of 40 acres of land over and above debts, liabilities, and exemptions worth \$2,000, my promissory notes up to \$1,000 or \$1,500 would be considered good because behind my notes would be property of the value of \$2,000 liable to levy and sale; but if I increase my indebtedness my credit would begin to be scrutinized and my notes if taken at all would be taken at a discount.

To make the illustration more complete, suppose I should set up in my house a press capable of printing my promissory note at every turn of the wheel and allow everybody to turn the wheel and take my notes away, it is obvious that my notes could have no value beyond the material composing them.

The object of coining money is simply to certify the weight and fineness of the piece.

Individuals may not coin money, but if they might, and I might allow to be stamped at my house silver promises to pay instead of paper at every turn of the wheel and allow everybody to turn the wheel, it is equally obvious that my silver promises would be worth only the intrinsic value of the silver composing them.

If the policy of coinage on Government account were swept away and a policy of free and unlimited coinage on private account were inaugurated, the Government would be absolved from obligation to keep and maintain gold and silver at parity, and both metals would thereafter stand, rise, or fall according to their intrinsic bullion value. If your grocer should advertise to pay 25 cents a dozen for eggs, eggs being worth on the market 10 cents a dozen, eggs would be worth 25 cents a dozen in that vicinity so long as your grocer remained solvent and continued to pay the price.

So long as Mr. Leiter was able to pay \$1.50 a bushel for wheat, wheat was worth \$1.50 a bushel. But if your grocer should simply say: "Gentlemen, we have exceptional facilities for counting eggs; bring on your eggs and we will count them for you free of charge," this could have no possible effect on the value of eggs; or if Mr. Leiter had said: "Gentlemen, we have exceptional facilities for weighing wheat; bring on your wheat and we will weigh

it for you free of charge," this could have had no effect on the value of wheat.

Under free and unlimited coinage the Government buys no eggs. It simply certifies that there are 12 in a dozen. It buys no wheat. It simply certifies that there are 60 pounds in a bushel.

It buys no bullion. It simply says to the owners of bullion: "Bring on your bullion, gentlemen, and we will stamp it into coin for you free of charge, and will certify that each dollar contains 412½ grains of standard silver, but we do not guarantee its value, and are under no obligations to maintain its value."

And when so stamped the coin would not belong to the Government, nor to you, nor to me, and we could not get a dollar of it without work or value received; but it would belong to the mining corporation or the man who brought the bullion to the mint.

The man or the corporation whose bullion had been so coined could then take his dollars so coined and pay off his past-due debts at 40 cents on the dollar, or whatever the bullion composing the silver coin was worth in the market, and could pay his laboring man at 40 cents on the dollar until they refuse to work longer unless their pay was raised as measured in such money.

But the laboring man could compel no one to receive these dollars at 100 cents in current trade.

The merchant would simply say, "This dollar is worth the bullion it contains—no more. For it we will give you 40 cents' worth of sugar, coffee, tea, or clothes."

Besides this the merchant would be obliged to charge something for holding in his till over night a coin of fluctuating value.

I am on record as having said, and I reaffirm the proposition, that a free, open mint is only a place run by the Government where bullion goes into the hopper bullion and comes out coin; and if a free, open mint can pull the price of silver up to parity with gold, then a free, open thrashing machine can raise the price of wheat, and a free, open sawmill can raise the price of basswood up to rosewood or mahogany.

If the touch of the Government stamp can create value, why waste silver and why coin at 16 to 1? Why not coin at 8 to 1 or 1 to 1, or why not stamp paper? Why longer permit poverty, since by mere act of Congress the distinction between the tramp and the millionaire can be obliterated?

The most iniquitous thing about the so-called free-silver contention is that it proposes that sovereign government shall take a metal of depreciated and fluctuating value, stamp it into money, and by its sovereign power make it legal tender for all debts, public and private, pay its own debts at 40 cents on the dollar, or whatever the bullion value of the metal may be, and make it legal for its citizens to do so. If any man should fail to do so under such law, he would be more honest than his government advised him to be.

Fortunately, sir, I have no fear that this proposition, so earnestly and so persistently advocated, will prevail either in Congress or at the polls.

In the language of William McKinley:

The United States has never repudiated a national obligation either to its creditors or to humanity. It will not now begin to do either. It never struck a blow, except for civilization, and it never struck its colors.

The bill further provides for the coinage of bullion purchased under the act of July 14, 1890, into subsidiary coins, takes off the fifty-million limit of the aggregate amount of subsidiary silver and fractional currency that may be coined, and provides for the cancellation of Treasury notes issued on the cost of such bullion. Thereby our subsidiary and fractional currency will be increased, and we shall be able in a measure to guard against loss on bullion purchased in a falling market under the law of 1890. It provides permanently for the recoinage of worn and uncurrent coins, so that our circulation shall suffer no loss thereby.

It provides for an increase of silver certificates of small denomination to meet the demands of a vastly increasing business.

Pursuant to the recommendations of four Presidents and five Secretaries of the Treasury, it amends existing law so as to permit the issue of bank certificates to the par value of the bonds deposited for their security.

#### THE END OF THE ENDLESS CHAIN.

It puts an end to the "endless chain." The resumption act of 1875 directed the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and provide for the redemption of United States notes in "coin" on and after January 1, 1879, and for that purpose he was authorized to use any surplus in the Treasury and to sell bonds as provided in the re-funding act of 1890.

From the bonds sold pursuant to this authorization \$96,000,000 were realized, since known as the "gold reserve." This reserve has not been authorized by law, but has been established by usage.

Such usage is legalized by this bill by a provision that a reserve of gold coin and bullion equal to one-fourth of outstanding United States notes and Treasury notes shall be transferred to the division of issue and redemption.

At present one statute requires the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem legal-tender notes in coin on presentation, and another



requires him to pay them out again that they may return again for redemption again. This is the so-called "endless chain." This bill makes it impossible for any future syndicate to sell gold into our Treasury and pump it out again at will by providing that redeemed notes and certificates shall not be paid out again except in exchange for their equivalent in the coin in which they were redeemed.

This can result in no contraction of the currency, because while notes are being so held their equivalent in coin is in circulation.

Besides, the very fact that a run on the "gold reserve" is fully provided against will prevent such run.

It will be the old story over again of the man who did not want his money if he could have it, but if he could not have it he wanted it bad.

Such runs are not likely under a Republican Administration, but in time of prosperity and safety it is best to guard against contingencies.

#### THE USES OF DISCIPLINE.

In His inscrutable wisdom, the Omnipotent Ruler of the destinies of men and nations permits lapses and reactions in human history.

Prof. John Fiske has lately elaborated a cheering argument to the effect that the existence of evil in the world is so that man as a free moral agent may choose between good and evil; that if the world were wholly good, each man would be a good automaton, with no power or volition to select other than good, and therefore without merit for such selection; that, given the power of selection, he may at last present a character formed from buffeting with evil—rugged, worthy, and appreciative. [Applause.]

So nations, in the fullness of time, in the evolution of events, by experiment, by reverses, and by experience, evolve a national character.

On such hypothesis the office and functions of the opposition on the other side of this Chamber and that which it represents is explainable.

#### PROSPERITY.

We got down to the intrinsic bullion value of our national morality in the last election. We preserved our national self-respect and the respect of the world.

We have been successful ever since, and we have thereby demonstrated the truth of Washington's declaration in his Farewell Address, that honesty is the best policy for men and nations.

Our war bonds have been taken everywhere by our patriotic people, whose purchase is a pledge of their devotion to our common country.

The gentlemen on the other side urged free trade because they said the price was increased to the consumer by precisely the amount of the duty exacted, and things were too high.

In illogical conjunction with this demand, they urged free silver because they said more money would make higher prices, and prices were too low.

They sympathized with the laboring man because they said he was paying too much for his bread, and wept on the neck of the farmer because he was not getting enough for his wheat out of which the laboring man's bread was made.

They affirmed that wheat and silver were going down hill together, joint victims of the same inexorable law; then wheat went up and silver went down.

To certain minds it is evident that it is immaterial whether their major and their minor premises lead to a logical conclusion if their major premises make votes and their minor premises other votes.

They declared that there could be no prosperity which did not result from the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1; and here we are in the midst of an unprecedented prosperity, so great, so ample, so all pervading as to smother denial. Gentlemen, why put back the clock while the sun goes on.

Your talk about "bogus prosperity" is as worthless as the wind and rain tattered fragments of one of your last campaign posters. When gentlemen say they stand where they did three years ago, that tells the whole story so far as they are concerned. The country has moved on.

We are buying less and selling more than ever before.

We are conquering, winning, and annexing the markets of the world, and the more there is sold abroad the more there is made at home, and the more there is made at home the more labor employed at home, and the more labor employed at home the more wages paid at home.

And yet to certain minds prosperity is but a false pretense.

"ALL THINGS ARE YELLOW TO THE JAUNDICED EYE."

Crops may be large, but the more we raise the more trouble it is to harvest them; besides, is it not clear that there would be more if we could call a half bushel a bushel?

Prices may be large, but is it not evident that they would be larger if we could call 50 cents a dollar?

We are paying our debts, public and private, but we could pay them faster at 40 cents on the dollar.

Our whole condition is improved. Men are making money, and many men are getting rich, but some are poor, and is it not obvious that everybody ought to be prevented from getting a living in order that some may be prevented from getting rich?

Our export business is increasing enormously, but that brings no cheer, because is it not obvious that when we have traded all our products for gold, stocks, and bonds, we shall have nothing to eat but gold, stocks, and bonds and people will starve until they have only strength enough left to curse McKinley for restoring prosperity and then perish by millions?

And then while the earth swings carelessly through eternal space and "the sun climbs up and on and over," above the dumb despair of our prosperous destruction will be heard the growls of the trust monster crunching the bones of its emaciated victims.

To avert this awful cataclysm we are advised to vote for free trade because things are too high; to vote for free silver because things are too low; to come home from the Philippines; to give up the task Providence has set for us; to bring back our flag trailing in retreat from duty and proclaim ourselves forever incompetent.

This is a government of majorities, but if such things are done they will never be done by a Republican majority—never.

From the eminence which a century of growth, development, and expansion has builded the nation stands to-day with uplifted brow facing the dawn of a new century, whose years, let us hope, in God's providence, shall be shining steps in the upward march of the greatest nation on earth to grander and more glorious achievement. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is with a feeling of hesitation and somewhat of timidity that I will not endeavor to conceal that I rise at this time to speak for a moment only on the pending measure. I am not moved to this action by the egotistic belief that I can add anything to what has been said in support of this great measure by the Republican members on this side of the House.

I have marched under the banner of the single gold standard so long and championed that cause when it was despised and renounced by all political parties alike that I can not refrain from raising my voice for an instant in gratification in the hour of the triumph of that policy in this Hall.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] was on yesterday arraigning the members on this side of the House for what he chose to call their change of front and for fear they were not carrying out the wish of their constituents in voting for this bill. It will not be necessary for me to spend any of the few brief moments of my time in trying to square my record on the financial question. In the year of 1888, when I first spoke on the financial question, I said—and that speech was printed and given currency against me—that I believed the free coinage of silver was a delusion and a snare; a thing that had the sound of fabulous wealth, but in reality contained the essence of poverty; and that a double standard of value was as impossible as a double and different standard of length or a double and different standard of time. From that day to this I have never wavered or faltered in my belief, or the expression of it, upon this proposition.

And as to the second proposition, whether, in recording my vote in favor of the single gold standard, I will be reflecting the views of my constituents, I would say the gentleman need give himself no uneasiness upon that point, for the reason that the Republicans of the State of Washington wrote the word "gold" in the platform of that State long before it ever appeared in the Republican national platform. And when I was indorsed for the nomination for Congress and asked to express my views upon the declarations to be placed in the platform, I said:

I do not assume to speak for my party or my State at this time, nor to in any way foreshadow the declarations of my party on any subject. But if I were asked to write a platform for my party in this year of 1898—a year rich in glorious memories and heroic deeds—I would write away up at the top a ringing declaration in favor of sound money, and when I said sound money I would say gold standard, and say it without stuttering.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

And that is what we wrote in the platform, and then the good Republicans of my State, one and all, buckled on their armor and faced a hostile majority of 14,000 votes in a State that casts but 80,000 votes. Two years before the free-silver forces had carried it by almost 14,000 majority, and the Republicans of my State, assisted by many loyal Democrats, reversed that majority in 1898 and wrote 3,000 majority in favor of sound money and national honor. And when I cast my vote upon this question it will reflect the unbiased and intelligent sentiment of my State.

There would be no greater inconsistency to me in hearing a man talk of biyardism, biquartism, or bibushelism than to hear any one discourse on the beauties of bimetalism in the sense of using both metals as a standard. I admit that both metals can and will be used in common, and each will be a measure of value,



but one metal only can or will ever be the standard at any one time.

Having come honestly to this conclusion, I have not been occupying my time, like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND], in looking about me to see whether I had reached a popular belief. The one feature of this question that has chiefly agitated my mind was not whether I had reached a popular conclusion, but whether I had reached a right conclusion.

Speaking for myself alone, I had rather go down to the bottomless ocean of irretrievable political disaster battling for an immortal principle than to ride into the haven of political safety under the flag of repudiation and at the expense of the honor of my country! [Applause.]

In 1892, under the Republican Administration of President Harrison, the American people were so busy making money that they did not have time to think. They voted a Democratic Administration into power, and then they had plenty of time to think! [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] They had little else to do during the next four years except to think; and while they were thinking and starving, and starving and thinking, they made up their minds that what they wanted was a high protective tariff and a sound-money circulation.

In 1892 they preached a crusade against all the industries of the land and whispered into the willing ear of the deluded voter that he was not really prosperous, but under the law which they proposed to give him he would be. In an unhappy hour for American labor they placed their trust in that party, and it tore down the barrier of protection, closed the workshop and the factory, threw American labor out of employment, and turned American men and women into the streets to wander, idle, hopeless, and hungry. By the enactment of that free-trade law they robbed the laborer of his employment on the one hand, and robbed the farmer and the producer of their customer on the other; and then, when they had reduced both to beggary by their false economic theories, they turned around in the next breath and told both that the trouble was not with the industrial system, but with the financial system. Told the American people that all at once they were being crushed by our financial system; the same financial system under which for twenty-three years immediately prior to that time the American people had enjoyed the greatest prosperity that ever blessed mankind from the day that Noah left the ark! I remember, and every member on this floor remembers, the pitiful condition of affairs in this country in 1894 and 1895—the condition that was everywhere apparent to the human eye. In fact, you did not have to see it; if you were similarly situated with me, you could feel it! [Laughter.]

In the year of 1896 the Democratic party found itself standing in the midst of a country with its industries paralyzed, its people hopeless and desperate. Did the Democratic party in that campaign attempt to justify the economic free-trade measure which had brought about this condition of affairs? It did not. It immediately turned its back upon all its promises of the past, refused to discuss the free-trade question, but immediately furnished the American voter with a brand-new soap bubble, filled with Nebraska wind, and asked them to chase that off over another financial and industrial precipice. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

We are surrounded in this country to-day by a prosperity that is as general and as genuine as the all-prevailing air, and gentlemen on the other side will make no serviceable political capital by endeavoring to make out that prosperity is not with us. The prosperity of the busy mill, the bustling factory, and the roaring forge are everywhere in evidence. What a contrast to the dark days of 1894 and 1895. One of the most eminent men it has been my fortune to know was a psychologist, a student of the human mind. That gentleman once said to me that one of the most difficult traits of the human mind to develop was that of remembrance. He said that first came idleness, then came poverty, then came want, then came starvation, then came despair, and then came remembrance. [Applause on the Republican side.] During the four long, long years that intervened between 1892 and 1896 the American people passed through all the different stages of that psychological proposition until they at last arrived at the stage of remembrance. [Laughter.] It will prove a difficult task for the gentlemen on the other side to figure out of American mind and memory the recollection of those dark days.

The gentleman from Missouri went far back into history in his remarks; in fact, beyond all recorded history into the gray dawn of the universe, when "the morning stars sang together." I wish at this time in my remarks to allude to a time greatly anterior to even that remote period. I wish at this time to go so far back into the misty past that no single Democrat on this floor has ever been able to recall the time. The period I allude to is the year of 1896 A. D. [Laughter.]

In the midst of your prophecies and predictions of to-day I wish to impress upon the American memory, with all the emphasis that this time and occasion will permit, that you also made prophecies

and predictions in the year of 1896. Everything you at that time said was going to happen failed to happen. Everything you said would not happen did happen. Do you know what I would be doing if I stood in your place to-day? I would be keeping still. Yes, I would be keeping still in six different languages and praying to a just and merciful God that the American people might forget the promises and prophecies that I made two years ago. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

I desire now for a moment to refer to a little financial history. I presumed when I began listening to this debate that the gentlemen on the other side were attempting to make votes. Perhaps I am wrong in my impression on that point; but if I am right in that impression, I will now give you a life-sized opportunity to make one vote, and make it right now. There are a few points in this financial problem that I have never yet been able to get any gentlemen of your political faith to answer. My failure in that regard heretofore may be accounted for because I have lived away out in the boundless West, far from the throne of grace and the mighty reservoirs of distilled financial wisdom. But now, standing here in the midst of the brightest men of the silver party, I have a perfect right to ask that out of the accumulated store of your wisdom you shed a little light on one or two of the cloudy spots in my poor mind.

I desire to ask one question in regard to this famous theory of 16 to 1; and if there is any living human being on that side of the House within the sound of my voice who will give me an answer to this one question, and your answer when given is true, and likewise is consistent with your theory of free coinage at 16 to 1, I hereby promise, in the presence of this august assembly, to vote against the pending measure and for the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1. That is fair, isn't it?

In the first place, let me briefly recite a little financial history. The Republican party is contending that the ratio between silver and gold was merely a commercial problem and that the relative values of the metals was not and could not be regulated by law. The free-coinage advocates have always insisted that it was not a commercial problem, but was regulated by law, and that whenever we open our mints to the free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1, this legal enactment will at once make the gold and silver dollars coined under that law of the same value; that each will be equal to the other in value because the law makes them so.

Well, we had the free coinage of gold and silver in this country all the time from 1792 until 1834—the absolute free coinage of both metals all the time at the fixed legal ratio of 15 parts of silver to 1 part of gold.

Now comes the question: If it is the law which regulates the value of these coins under a free-coinage system, what was it that caused the purchasing power of the gold dollar to rise above the purchasing power of the silver dollar between those two dates? What made them separate? [A long pause, but no reply.] My Democratic friends, you are now "up against the real thing!" [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have asked that question a number of times, and I have always received the same answer which I received just now! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I have always observed when I hear a Democrat discussing the free-coinage question he will start out at the beginning and move along down the line very logically until he gets right square up to the sticking point, and then he will spread his wings in the form of a beautiful oratorical metaphor and soar away up into the air and come down gracefully on the other side—and proceed! It has been the frequent observation of this peculiarity that has led me to try and get the organized Democracy of this country "up against the real thing."

I desire to press this question home upon the conscience and the intelligence of this House and the American people. If the law did not regulate the value of the two coins in the days when we had free coinage, what right has any man to say that the law will be powerful enough when reenacted to produce the result which it failed to produce when it was on the statute book before? That law was passed establishing the ratio at 15 to 1 when 15 to 1 was the commercial ratio. Then after the law was passed the purchasing power of the two coins separated; they separated not by reason of the law, but in spite of it. Some free-silver advocate may say that the two coins only separated in purchasing power about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents. They separated by exactly the amount represented by the difference in the bullion value of the two metals at that time.

Another beautiful and falacious theory that I desire at this time to puncture is the statement that has been continually made on this floor and elsewhere, that under a free-coinage system if one of the coins rises in value a trifle above the other, that this difference in value will immediately transfer the demand to the cheaper coin, and this increased demand will immediately raise the value of the cheaper coin to a parity with the dearer. That is a beautiful theory, and it is frequently illustrated with a drawing



showing two tanks of water joined by a connecting pipe which always insures an exact level of the water in both tanks. It is insisted that if the bulk of silver on the one side and the bulk of gold on the other are joined by a connecting pipe, to wit, a free-coinage law at a fixed ratio, this law will operate like the connecting pipe and keep the value of both metals at the exact relative value recognized by the legal ratio. It is all very well for the Democratic members of this House to stand up before the American people and tell them what is going to happen in the future, but what I want you to do is to explain to them here and now why the thing you say is going to happen under a free-coinage system in the future did not happen under a free-coinage system in the past.

I reiterate that for forty years under a free-coinage system of 15 to 1 the gold dollar was always above the value of the silver dollar. Where was that theoretical increased demand of yours that was going to raise the value of the cheaper coin? Why did it not operate and get in its work between the years of 1792 and 1834?

That law proved powerless to hold the two coins equal in value when their value was at an equality at the time the law was enacted. Yes, more than this, throughout forty years of our financial history that law failed to establish an equality of value between the two coins, and this at a time when the two coins were only separated in value by a cent and a quarter. Now, then, my free-coinage prophets, will you please tell me what ground you have for the belief that that same law which has proved powerless to raise one coin in value by a cent and a quarter in forty years is now going in a single day to establish an equality between the same two coins when they are separated in value by a difference of 53 cents? Why do you not answer that?

Mr. Chairman, as was said by a much wiser man than I in days gone by, "I have no lamp to guide my feet save that of experience." If I stand on the shore of a lake and throw 99 rocks in and they all sink, when I poise the hundredth rock to cast it out above the shimmering surface of that lake I have an established and well-grounded right to prophesy that that one is going to sink too. My Democratic friends, what right have you to prophesy that that one is going to float?

They tell us that they have faith that the equality of the two dollars will be thus established under free coinage at 16 to 1. Faith is a human attribute that I greatly admire and commend if it is founded on anything, but this particular kind of faith must be a sample of that faith which is said to have moved mountains.

I defy any member of this body, or any man on earth, to point out to me a single instance in the financial history of the world where any free-coinage coin ever floated at a purchasing power greater than the bullion value of the metal that was in it, or where the free-coinage privilege being given to it ever raised its bullion value or value as a coin after being minted.

And yet the free-coinage advocates on this floor are standing on the shore of time and looking backward into the six thousand years of the world's recorded financial history and are flying boldly into the very face of every financial fact and monetary precedent established during all that time by all the nations of the earth, and are to-day boldly affirming that the laws of finance, which are as universal as the laws of gravitation, are all going to be suspended and cease to operate because, forsooth, the Democratic party of the United States has written a financial falsehood in its platform. [Applause.]

In the discussion of the financial question many men insist in commencing the argument at the wrong end of the subject. It is business activity that creates and causes the circulation of money, and not the creation of money that causes business activity. And the men who begin the discussion of this question at the other end are simply arguing from effect back to cause, and not from cause forward to effect. And to that other class of financiers who are continually drawing comparisons between the amount of money in existence in this country and what they are pleased to term "the indebtedness of the country" I have to say that no light can be shed on the financial question by any such comparison. If A owes B \$10, B owes C a similar amount, and C owes B a similar sum, one ten-dollar bill passed around the circuit will destroy the entire \$30 of indebtedness, and—mirabile dictu—the ten-dollar bill will still be left, and it can continue to circulate and pay debts or buy commodities.

The exact function of a dollar is the point in this question which so many participants in this debate seem to continually overlook. When you pay a debt with a dollar, that destroys the debt; but the dollar is left. Like the old gourd at the spring around which I played in childhood—everyone who came along took a drink out of it; but they didn't eat the gourd. That continued to remain and served as the modest utensil that assisted in quenching the thirst of the thousands of weary pilgrims who followed that way. I claim that there can be no exact ratio fixed between either the amount of debts in a country and the amount of money in exist-

ence in that country; or the amount of business done in a country and the amount of money in existence in that country. If money exists in a country and is buried in the earth or driven into hiding by the just financial fears of mankind, that money for the time being performs no commercial function and does no man any good. It is the amount of money in circulation and the rapidity with which it circulates that is the index of any nation's prosperity.

The amount of money in existence in the United States to-day shows no great proportionate increase over the money in existence in the dark days of 1893, when we were cursed with a financial panic. The marked difference between these two periods of time is caused by the fact that the money of the United States, in response to a business revival and a just sense of financial security, has come forth from hiding, and is to-day filling to the brim all the varied channels of trade and industry. The nimble American dollar is to-day chasing itself around the circle of varied human employment, too lucrative to go abroad and too honest to go into hiding. [Applause.] That, in my humble judgment, is the most potential factor in American prosperity to-day.

One of the great war cries of the famous campaign of 1896 was that we needed an increased amount of money per capita. I heard that statement reiterated on every stump throughout that entire campaign; but, Mr. Chairman, the American people have come to understand from actual experience that they are not so much interested in the amount of money in this country per capita as they are interested in the amount of money per pocket! [Laughter and applause.]

In the campaign of 1896 I contended that the relative value of gold and silver and all other commodities was regulated by the universal law of supply and demand. I especially urged at that time, the price of grain being low, that this was the result of that law of supply and demand. This proposition of mine at that time was frantically and hysterically denied by every free-coinage advocate. They all said, in substance, that prices were no longer regulated by the law of supply and demand, but by the monopoly and control of the money of the world; and that it was impossible for prices to rise, because there was not money enough in existence to permit them to rise, and they never would rise until the volume of money was increased.

Just after they had thoroughly demonstrated to the American people the utter impossibility of the rise in the price of commodities without the free coinage of silver, many commodities, and particularly wheat, rose enormously. And immediately every free-silver claqueur on earth commenced to yell, "Famine in India!" "Shortage in Russia!" "Crop failure abroad!" and to say these were the reasons for the rise in the price of wheat.

Mr. Chairman, I know they are not right in this contention, because the shortage abroad and the crop failure elsewhere have to do with the law of supply and demand, and that is the very law the operation of which they were denying two years ago, and now you are very busy affirming what you denied two years ago! [Applause on the Republican side.]

The other day I met one of the gentlemen whose personality ornaments the other side of the House and he admitted to me in a mournful sort of way that one or two commodities had risen since the Republican party had gone into power. That is right, my friend; when the Republican party went into power several things rose; wheat rose, pork rose, beef rose, land rose, labor rose, humanity rose, the flag of the nation rose, everything from one end of this nation to the other rose except the Democratic party, and you bet your life that has been going downhill. [Laughter and applause.]

There is a great deal of difference, Mr. Chairman, between theory and fact. It is an easy thing to theorize, but it is a difficult thing to create. Any fool can prophesy, but it takes genius to create and brains to execute. I sometimes think the greatest party on earth to theorize is the Democratic party. I know that the Republican party is the greatest party witnessed in all history to produce results.

I recall one little incident that illustrates very aptly the exact difference between theory and fact. Out in my State there once resided a very eminent gentleman who was learned in the law and skilled in the sciences. During one of his vacations he made a voyage from Tacoma to San Francisco. When the ship passed out of sight of land the captain took the reckoning in order to correctly locate the ship on the chart. My friend was very much interested, and having studied geometry and higher mathematics, he asked the captain if on to-morrow he might be permitted to locate the ship; all of which the captain readily granted, and at the same time explained to him how it was done, to wit, by pointing one angle of the instrument at the sun, the other at the horizon, measuring the intervening angle, and taking the time of day, and from these given and ascertained points to figure out by a mathematical calculation the latitude and longitude, which point could then be located on the chart.

My friend was intensely interested. On the next day he got out



the instrument and proceeded to locate the ship. He pointed one angle at the sun, the other at the horizon, measured the intervening angle, took the time of day, and then proceeded to figure it out. And when he finally ascertained the exact latitude and longitude of the ship he took his pencil and on the chart ran down one of the meridians and across one of the parallels to the point of intersection and then proudly remarked: "There she is, Cap; right there." Then he stopped to look at the point on the chart where he had located the ship, and, bless your innocent hearts, he had her located 700 miles in the middle of the mountains of Idaho. [Great laughter and applause.] And then he turned and looked all about him, and on every side, as far as the human eye could reach, he beheld the blue and beautiful waves of God's boundless ocean. That was the almighty and undeniable fact, that all the figuring and theorizing on earth could not refute. And you, my friends [turning to the Democratic side], theorized the people of the United States into a condition of opulence and plenty, but unimpeachable history has recorded the fact to be that you left them stranded on the financial rocks and commercial shoals 700 miles from the shore of prosperity. [Great applause.]

A number of the advocates of free coinage in this debate have said that their desire for free coinage was based upon a desire to "get back to the money of the Constitution." The first time I heard the expression "the money of the Constitution" used in connection with a free-silver argument I did not remember any provision in the Constitution in favor of free silver, and it occurred to me that possibly I had never read the Constitution. So I went home and took the document down, carefully blew the dust off of it, and proceeded to read it. And when I had finished I came to the conclusion that it was the other fellow who had not read the Constitution.

I hold in my hand now the Constitution of the United States. I deny that it provides for free coinage of silver at 16 to 1; I deny that it provides for the free coinage of silver; I deny that it provides for the coinage by the Government of silver at all in any way, shape, or manner. There are just two provisions of the Constitution that refer to the coining and issuance of money; no more. Section 8 of the United States Constitution provides that "Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." That provision means that Congress shall have power to coin money and fix the relative value of different coins in accordance with the different bullion value contained in each. That clause of the Constitution does not mean that Congress has power to coin a copper wash boiler into twenty-dollar gold pieces.

The other provision of the Constitution regarding money, the one most frequently referred to, is section 9, the one immediately following. The clause of this section to which I refer reads as follows: "No State shall \* \* \* make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts." Every student of the Constitution knows that that instrument contains two great divisions. One portion of the Constitution defines and limits the powers and duties of the whole United States; the other division defines and limits the powers and duties of the separate States. The last provision, which says, "No State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts," is a provision that limits the powers of the separate States and does not define a duty of the General Government. And when the instrument says that the separate States shall not do a certain thing, this is not equivalent to saying that the Government shall do that particular thing. When the law forbids the doing of a certain thing on the one hand, it does not necessarily command the performance of the opposite of that thing on the other. For instance, the law of the land says that "no man shall have more than one wife." But it does not say that every man in the United States shall have a wife. [Laughter.]

If there was builded here to-day a bright and shining pyramid of silver dollars, whose base was as broad as the known earth and whose glittering top towered amidst the eternal stars, neither you nor I nor any other man could get a single dollar of it without giving up a dollar's worth of labor to get it. Then when they destroyed by false economic theories and hostile legislation the industries of the land, they robbed the American laboring man of the only avenue through which he could secure a single dollar. Then they immediately began to prate to him about relieving his distress by the coinage of more dollars—which he would have no opportunity to get.

In all this endless talk on the beauties of 16 to 1 I have as yet failed to hear a single statesman advance a single sound argument or detail a reasonable theory as to how this money is to be placed in circulation when it is once coined. Employment comes to a man first, and then money as a payment for that employment. The acquisition of money follows, but does not precede, the employment.

As I have witnessed the progress of this financial debate I have seen the advocates of the free and unlimited coinage of silver driven from one position to another until with common action they seem to have sought refuge behind and planted their case

upon the enormous production of gold in this country in the last two years. Every time the statement is made that the economic and financial measures of the Republican party have been the potential causes of the now abundant prosperity it is a sufficient answer for them to aver that the production of gold is a matter not controlled by any party (which is true), and that this enormous production of gold in the past two years is alone responsible for the return of prosperity.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury which came to my desk only a few moments ago, which letter I now propose to read:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1899.

SIR: Replying to your inquiry of even date, I herewith inclose you a table showing the total production of gold in the United States for the years 1891 to 1898, inclusive:

1891	\$33,175,000
1892	33,060,000
1893	35,955,000
1894	39,500,000
1895	46,610,000
1896	53,088,000
1897	57,333,000
1898	64,463,000

Respectfully, yours,

LYMAN J. GAGE,  
Secretary of the Treasury.

HON. FRANCIS W. CUSHMAN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

That table shows that there was an increase or decrease in the production of gold in the United States during those years, as follows:

In the year 1892, a decrease of	\$175,000
In the year 1893, an increase of	2,935,000
In the year 1894, an increase of	3,545,000
In the year 1895, an increase of	7,110,000
In the year 1896, an increase of	6,478,000
In the year 1897, an increase of	4,275,000
In the year 1898, an increase of	7,100,000

Cast your eye on those figures, my Democratic friends, and then charge, if you can, that it was the great production of gold in 1897 and 1898 that brought prosperity to this country. There has been an increase in the production of gold in the United States during all the years enumerated above, but that production was not proportionately greater in the years of 1897 and 1898 than it was in 1895 and 1896, while the greatest increase in production made in any of these years was in the year 1895, when the panic was on and every business concern in the United States was embarrassed and every workman in the nation was starving.

Now, the point upon which I desire information is this: If it is the greatly increasing production of gold in this country that has brought this change, and an increase in that production of \$7,100,000 in the year 1898 has been sufficient to bring about all this marvelous change for the better that you say now exists, why did not the increase in that production in the year 1895, which was the greatest increase of any single year, to wit, \$7,110,000, bring prosperity to this land in the year of our Lord 1895? [Applause.]

It will do very well for you to talk to the men from the East about the mighty production of gold in Alaska—and, by the way, I am glad to state on this floor that those reports have not been exaggerated—but I live in the city of Tacoma, on Puget Sound, the very gateway of the Alaskan country, and I know that months and months before the newspapers had even announced the marvelous discoveries of gold in Alaska and long before any of that gold had gone into circulation that Bradstreet's and Dun's commercial agencies had reported a wonderful advance in financial and business activity, and even the Democratic papers of the country generally had conceded that times were much improved.

I welcome to the American people, to all parties alike, without distinction, all the increased prosperity which may have been brought to them by the discovery of gold in Alaska. But as long as I am on this floor I am going to deny the right of the Democratic party to allege that prosperity, like a seer or a fortune teller, gazed into the unwritten future and ascertained that gold was going to be discovered in Alaska, and returned in anticipation of the event. Mr. Chairman, the discovery of gold in Alaska was an incident (a happy one, I admit), but it was an incident which accidentally followed the return of prosperity and was not a potential and controlling cause which preceded it.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] who preceded me in this debate made a touching and appropriate reference to the message of cheer that went forth to the laboring men of this nation "from the little vine-clad porch at Canton."

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DE ARMOND] has attempted to brush aside with a contemptuous sneer that sentiment which he could not meet in argument. Sneer about it all you will, my Democratic friend, the mighty and unassailable fact still remains recorded in 80,000,000 grateful and patriotic hearts that there did go forth from that "little vine-clad porch" to the waiting ears of the millions of his idle and helpless countrymen a message that was sweeter to their ears than the chimes of angelus. The American



people to-day recognize their benefactor. It was he who put employment to their hands, bread into their mouths, hope into their hearts, and set the nation's flag forever in the sky. [Applause.]

I lived out in Nebraska a number of years ago, and I am acquainted with the gentleman whose name is breathed with so much reverence on the other side of the House—William Jennings Bryan. I know him. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I know him as well as if I had been through him with a lantern! [Loud laughter on the Republican side.] It has been my fortune to hear the gentleman on several occasions. In the campaign I now refer to I heard the gentleman make one speech on the financial question—and survived it. [Laughter.]

The gentleman was ornamenting the rear end of a freight train at that particular time. That was the campaign in which we had two men running for the Presidency, one of them running around over the country on the tail end of a freight train in a fruitless endeavor to find the American voters, and the other one sitting at home like a statesman and a patriot while the American voter was making a successful effort to find him. [Applause.]

The gentleman at that time, in discussing the financial question, said: "We are going to give you the free coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, because the gold dollar now buys too much. We are going to bring down the price of the gold dollar to the point where the silver dollar now is." And everybody threw up their hats. Then he walked over to the other side of the platform and said: "We are going to give you the free coinage of silver; and when we have the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1, that will lift the value of the silver dollar up to the point where the gold dollar now is." [Laughter.] And everybody threw up their hats again. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

The same speech, Mr. Chairman, from the same platform and to the same audience. On the one side he told them that free coinage would drag down the value of the gold dollar to the value which the silver dollar then had, and on the other side he told them that free coinage would lift up the value of the silver dollar to the value which the gold dollar then possessed. And the truth of the whole matter is that the trouble with the immortal William Jennings Bryan, and with most of you gentlemen on the other side, is that in your arguments you are so crooked you can not walk around the block without meeting yourselves on the other side! [Prolonged laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] who has just concluded his remarks made a clever Republican stump speech, not entirely applicable, however, to the question under discussion, but apropos of the story he told I think I can say in this regard that if he took his political bearings at the present time he would find that he was "700 miles" and more out of his latitude. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, in discussing this bill I desire to protest with all the emphasis in my power against its hasty and precipitate consideration. The bill is being rushed through as a strict Republican party measure. The rights of the Democratic minority have been infringed. The fact is, this bill—a most important and momentous one—has never been referred to a committee of this House. It was carefully prepared last summer by a few Republicans, assisted, no doubt, by able representatives of the money power and the national banks. No one on this side of the House had an opportunity to see the bill, to consider it, or to discuss it before it was introduced, the first day of this session, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET]. The unparliamentary procedure pursued by the Republican party in the consideration of this important legislation is in violation of all legislative rules and every precedent of a deliberative assembly. Under the rule adopted this bill can not be amended or perfected. It must pass just as it is, and passed within a week. Why this unseemly haste?

The Republican party has made this bill a party question. You made it a caucus measure, and under the spur of king caucus you hold your members in line to vote for it, and under the party lash you intend to pass it because you have the physical power to do so. For one, I am glad it is a Republican party bill, and that at last you have thrown off the mask of political hypocrisy on the financial question and stand before the people of this country in your true colors.

Many of the gentlemen on the other side, I am informed, never read this bill and never saw it until it was introduced, and I have no doubt that if you now expressed your honest opinions and your sincere convictions about it many of you would be against the bill, and instead of voting for it you would openly denounce the many vicious provisions it contains. Every one of you, however, must vote for it because it is a part of the programme and a part of the policy of the Republican party.

The leaders of your party demand its passage, and in order to prevent you from acting according to your convictions and for the best interests of your constituents they have made it a party measure and will pass it under the rule of the party caucus. For these reasons alone no Democrat should vote for it.

You are going to pass this bill, not because it is a good bill or a proper measure, but because the money power to-day behind the Republican party demands the enactment of this legislation. It is the final consummation of the contract made in the campaign of 1896 between Mark Hanna, representing the Republican party, and the national banks. It is the carrying into effect of the last and the most villainous act in the great political drama of the last national campaign. By this act the Republican party surrenders unconditionally to the sordid greed of the money power.

Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely opposed to the passage of this iniquitous bill and shall vote against it. It is one of the most vicious political measures ever attempted to be passed through Congress. The bill commits the Government unalterably by law to the single gold standard and makes all obligations, public and private, payable in gold. It strikes out the word "coin" in all Government bonds, which means gold or silver, inserts in its place the word "gold," and in addition thereto it authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bonds *ad infinitum* whenever he pleases and makes the bonds payable in gold. The bill violates the obligations of the contract between the Government and the bondholder and provides that the finances of a mighty people shall be turned over to the national banks of the country and gives them the right at will to expand or contract the currency.

The bill does much more, but very briefly these are its most sweeping, vicious, and objectionable features. It is the most startling and the most daring departure from time-honored and well-fixed financial principles ever made in our history, and the result will be as disastrous as it is far-reaching. I say to you and to the Republican party that if this measure is enacted into law it reverses our financial system, repudiates the platforms of both parties, and revolutionizes the monetary methods of the whole country.

In order, sir, to show how the Republican party has changed its attitude on the financial question, let me quote the financial plank from the Republican national platform of 1888. It says:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

In the national Republican platform of 1893 you say:

The American people from tradition and interest favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of gold and silver as money.

What a difference between the Republican party now and then!

And, again, in the national Republican platform of 1896 you say substantially that you favor free coinage by international agreement, which you pledge yourselves to promote. Let me ask if you are doing that now?

What a change from those professions to this treacherous act of perfidy!

Let us see how William McKinley, the Republican President of the United States, has progressed on the money question.

In 1878, as a member of Congress, he voted for the Stanley Matthews resolution in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and declaring in favor of the payment of all bonds, principle and interest, in gold or silver at the option of the Government.

On the 24th of June, 1890, in a speech in this House, before William McKinley saw the light of the money power and experienced a change of heart, he said:

I am for the largest use of silver in the currency of the country. I would not dishonor it; I would give it equal credit and honor with gold. I would make no discrimination. I would utilize both metals as money and discredit neither. I want the double standard.

Why is he opposed to it now? Let him answer! The record speaks for itself, and on that record we appeal to the people for judgment from President McKinley in the White House, the agent of the money trust, to William McKinley, a candidate for reelection in the great contest next year. The people understand this question; they know what is going on; they will answer next year.

William McKinley in the last election did not stand on a gold-standard platform, but on a bimetallic platform to be brought about by international agreement. You promised the people to get rid of the gold standard. You then pretended to favor international bimetalism. In that campaign the gold-standard candidate for the Presidency only polled about 134,000 votes. But now you throw off the disguise and declare unequivocally against bimetalism, independently or by international agreement, and for the single gold standard. Up to the present time the Republican party and its leading thinkers and speakers have always been in favor of bimetalism and against monometallism.

Against my friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] I appeal to the RECORD, and I quote James A. Garfield, who said, in his inaugural address, March 4, 1881:

By the experience of commercial nations in all ages it has been found that gold and silver afford the only safe foundation for a monetary system.

Against my friend from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], who has charge of this bill, I quote that stalwart Republican, James G. Blaine, who said:

I believe gold and silver to be the money of the Constitution—indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which that great



organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress has, therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no more power to demonetize either than to demonetize both.—*James G. Blaine in the Senate, February 7, 1878; Congressional Record, volume 7, part 1, page 820.*

Against my friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], whose specious plea for the gold standard will deceive no impartial student of the facts, I quote from the great expounder of the Constitution, Daniel Webster, who said in the Senate December 21, 1836:

I am certainly of opinion, then, that gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard, or to displace this.

Against my friend and colleague from New York [Mr. DRIGGS], whose speech I attentively listened to, I cite that sterling Democrat, Thomas A. Hendricks, who said:

That gold and silver are the real standard of value is a cherished Democratic sentiment, not now or hereafter to be abandoned.

And President Andrew Jackson, who said to the American people in his farewell address:

My humble efforts have not been spared during my administration of the Government to restore the constitutional currency of gold and silver; and something, I trust, has been done toward the accomplishment of this most desirable object.

And grand old Allen G. Thurman, who eloquently told the story in the Senate on the 6th day of February, 1878, when he said:

Has there ever been, so far as we know, a more prosperous country than were the United States from 1789 to 1861? Did any nation ever exceed the progress we made in population, wealth, education, refinement, and the general well-being of the people in those seventy-two years? And yet during all that period we had bimetalism, for we gave no preference to gold over silver or silver over gold.—*CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 7, Part I, page 787.*

And to all my Republican friends who must vote for this bill, no matter what they honestly think of it, listen while I read to you again from a speech of James G. Blaine, delivered in the Senate February 7, 1878:

I believe the struggle now going on in this country and in other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in the end throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value, and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property.—*Congressional Record, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, volume 7, Part I, page 821.*

Can anyone here get up and honestly deny that statement?

The position you gentlemen occupy on this question before the people of the country to-day is, indeed, an unenviable one. Why do you stultify yourselves? What has compelled you to go back on your record? What power, what influence, has compelled you to change front on this great question, affecting as it does all the people of the land? I will tell you. It is the money power, the bondholders and their agents, the trusts, the syndicates, and the plutocrats. They favor the passage of this bill. They are in favor of changing the terms of the contract so that they shall hold the option instead of the Government. They would commit treason against the Government in order to gain a monetary advantage.

The Republican party to-day is the mere agent of the money trust and in every department of the Government carries out its wishes and registers and records its decrees.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again what I have always said and which I strenuously maintain, that I am now, always have been, and always will be a sound-money Democrat. I stand to-day on the financial question just where I have always stood and just where I always expect to stand—for hard money, for gold and silver as the ultimate money of redemption, freely and independently coined at a ratio to be fixed and determined by Congress. I believe now, as I always have done, in the sound money of the Constitution, and I take my stand on the side of all the leading Democrats of our party from Thomas Jefferson, its illustrious founder, to Andrew Jackson, from Wright and Marcy, from Seymour and Tilden down to the present time. We stand, sir, where they stood—on the safe and the sound side—for bimetalism.

When we became members of this House we took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution, and everyone here knows that the fundamental law of the land provides for gold and silver, the money of the fathers and of all our glorious past.

I am an old-fashioned Democrat. I believe in the fundamental principles of the Democratic party. I believe in sticking to your party. I am no bolter. I stand squarely on the Chicago platform, and I have no apologies to offer for my support of William J. Bryan, or for my loyalty to the principles enunciated in that magnificent document. In my judgment it is the best platform the Democratic party ever adopted, and notwithstanding all you have said against it, I believe the day is not far distant when every principle enunciated in it will be enacted into law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I know that some of my colleagues from the State

of New York differ with me on the financial question. I have no controversy with them except that of honest opinion. They claim the right to their convictions on this question as much as I claim the right to mine. I concede to them what I claim for myself, the right to hold and express my honest and sincere opinion on the greatest question to-day in American politics. They think I am mistaken; I think they are. It is an honest difference—that is all. Time will tell who is right. Let me say to my friend from New York [Mr. LEVY] that I am a Jeffersonian Democrat and stand to-day on the financial question just where Thomas Jefferson stood when he agreed with Alexander Hamilton and said "that the unit of value must stand on both metals." I know my friend favors the single gold standard, and he knows I favor the unit resting on the double standard of Jefferson and Hamilton. "There is no safety for the national finances," said that grand old Democrat, Thomas H. Benton, "but in the constitutional medium of gold and silver."

Sir, the history of all the past teaches in unmistakable terms that gold and silver at a fixed ratio was the basis for the currency of the world. I am neither a gold monometallist nor a silver monometallist. I am a bimetalist. I believe in both gold and silver, and I would not destroy or demonetize either. Both precious metals should be admitted to the mints of the country and freely coined, not for the Government, but for and on account of the depositor. Herein is the distinction and the substance of the whole matter. The act you do to-day will not destroy silver as a part of the money of the world, but will only be an additional incentive to every true friend of humanity to work harder and more earnestly for the free and unlimited coinage of both precious metals. There will be no sure, no lasting, and no permanent prosperity until it is done.

Make no mistake, gentlemen. The passage of this bill will not settle the controversy, but will only define more certainly the issue, make it more clear, and bring about more quickly its ultimate triumph. No great question is ever settled until it is settled right. Bimetalism, sir, is a living issue, and will be of paramount importance to mankind as long as civilization uses money for trade and commerce. Gold never was the friend of liberty. It never fought a battle for humanity. No people in a great crisis ever found it a faithful ally. It has been the agent of every panic, the minister of despair, the advocate of calamity, and the high priest of cruelty, misery, and woe. I am against the gold standard. If it comes by means of this bill, it will only come as a curse to rob us, to plague us, and to enslave us. In time it will have to go. The passage of this bill simplifies the fight.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill does much more than firmly commit the Government by law to the single gold-standard policy of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. All our Government obligations are now payable in "coin," and the word "coin" is written in every bond. When these bonds were sold it was understood and agreed by law that they should be redeemed, at the option of the Government, in either gold or silver. This bill strikes out the word "coin" in all our bonded indebtedness and writes in its place the magic word "gold." It is well known and can not be denied that this will greatly enhance the value of all outstanding bonds and put millions and millions of dollars of unjust profit in the pockets of the bondholders. It is an admitted fact that if "gold" had originally been put in the bonds they would have brought a much higher price.

You remember the special message President Cleveland sent to this House in which he asked us to do this very thing. You refused—every one of you. The amount of bonds issued at that time, I believe, was only \$62,400,000, and yet Mr. Cleveland said they would bring sixteen millions more if the word "gold" was substituted for "coin." You refused to do that at that time, but now you intend to write the word "gold" in all the bonds outstanding against the Government, and strike out the word "coin." You are going to change the terms of the contract in favor of the creditor and against the debtor; you make a new contract for the benefit of the bondholder.

You say you are in favor of honest money, but you know this is dishonest money. It is a fraudulent transaction in the interest of the bondholders against the people and an outrage on the taxpayers of the country. When you do this you make the debtor pay more than he agreed to pay when the debt was contracted. By virtue of law you make a gift—a dishonest gift—of millions and millions of dollars to the bondholders, foreign and domestic, of the Republic. I protest against this injustice. I cry out with all the vehemence of my nature against this outrage on the people. I am opposed to any law that robs the many for the benefit of the few, and especially so when it is done under the subtle cloak of national honor and the euphonious phraseology of "honest money." If you are in favor of "honest money," why do you do this dishonest thing?

We denounce your action and warn you that the people will never submit to such a surrender of their rights. We will pay the bondholders the same money they paid the Government for



the bonds. No denunciation of the money power will deter us from doing our duty. As John Sherman once said:

The bondholder can only demand the kind of money he paid, as stipulated in the bond, and he is a repudiator and extortioner to demand more valuable money than he gave.

We stand by the terms of the contract. That is all the Democratic party wants to do, and it will resist with all its power any effort on the part of the Republican party to do anything contrary. On this question the Democratic party stands on the side of the people and demands absolute fair play for the debtor as well as exact justice for the creditor. The Republican party has taken its stand on the side of the money lender and the bondholder.

If your political policies were as honest as your professions, you would oppose the passage of this bill and refuse to commit this unpardonable crime on the toilers of this country. I am in favor of living up to the letter of our national obligations and maintaining them inviolate according to their spirit. I believe in carrying out the contract as it was made, doing no injustice to the bondholder, no injury to the taxpayer, favoring neither the creditor nor the debtor. The law of the land now is the act of 1878, and reads as follows:

That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government of the United States, in silver dollars of the coinage of the United States.

That is a Republican law, and William McKinley, then a member of Congress, voted for it.

Let me say to my colleagues from New York and to other members on this side of the House who believe in the single gold standard that in my judgment you violate no promise to your constituents expressed or implied if you vote against this iniquitous measure. The Republican party now tells us, and the President and the Secretary of the Treasury reiterate it, that the country is on the gold standard. If that is so, then why enact this bill? Is it because you fear defeat next year? Is it because you think William J. Bryan is going to be the next President of the United States and you want to tie his hands? Or is it because you want to surrender the Government now and for all future time to the money power?

If this bill did no more than simply enact the gold standard, I can understand how some of my colleagues who believe in that standard could support it, but it goes much further. It enacts legislation in many respects a thousand times worse, and that will, in my opinion, ultimately cause more woe, more poverty, more distress, and more misery than any other act in all our history. Every Democrat should be opposed to the sweeping banking privileges contained in this bill.

A Democratic Representative who favors the gold standard can honestly and I believe consistently vote against this bill without straining a conviction or violating an obligation to his constituents. Every Democrat should also vote against the bill because it gives the Secretary of the Treasury the power to issue bonds without let or hindrance—a very dangerous power to delegate to one man. Congress should not abdicate its constitutional powers. We, the representatives of the people, should not lodge in the discretion of any man the right to mortgage future generations.

Remember, my gold-standard Democratic friends, the Republicans compel you to vote for this bill just as they have prepared it; gold standard, unlimited bonds, contracted currency, national-bank government, and all. If they were fair and honest about it, do you not think they would give you a chance to offer a substitute, or to at least amend it to meet your approval and to conform to the wishes of a great majority of your constituents? They do not need your votes. It is their bill—their party bill—and they will pass it no matter what you do. I believe the misguided Democrat who listens to the siren song of the money changers and votes for this bill will live to regret it.

My friends, one of the worst features, to my mind, of this bill is that part of it which consummates the alleged bargain made by MARK HANNA with the national bankers of Wall street during the campaign of 1896. They aided the Republicans then, and now they receive their share of the spoils. For three years the Republicans have waited and hesitated to pass this abomination, fearing the wrath of an outraged and indignant people. But another national campaign is near at hand. You need their help again, and in order to get it you abjectly and unconditionally surrender to the money power and turn the finances of a great Government over to the national banks. This bill delivers the goods bargained for. It is awful to contemplate, and the result can not be overestimated.

The powers this bill gives the national banks are far-reaching and most dangerous. It turns over to them the finances of the people—the lifeblood of trade and commerce—and gives them the right to contract or expand the currency at will. This right should never be surrendered by the Government. I say to you, and time will demonstrate it, that if you give the control of the money supply to the national banks they will soon absorb the wealth of the people and own the Government.

It is an enormous power; a power that can cause panic or prosperity, happiness or misery, to thousands and millions of people. I say it is too great a power to be given to any corporation, and if once given and set in motion for selfish ends and for sordid motives will be a fruitful source of woe and bankruptcy to hundreds and to thousands of our fellow-citizens. The audacity of this feature of the bill shows to what length the Republican party is now willing to go. Ten years ago this measure in my opinion would not receive 10 votes in this House.

Sir, you talk against trusts. This bill creates the greatest trust the world has ever seen—a national-bank trust, controlling the finances of a mighty people. Pass this measure, and the banks will be supreme. They will act in accord for a common purpose and be one great gigantic trust, octopus-like, with tentacles reaching all over and to every part of the land, holding, squeezing, and controlling every other trust, every other industry, and all the people. This bill marks a long stride in the gradual progress of the money power to enslave the industrial masses of the country.

If you enact this legislation, the banks will ere long own, control, and run the Government. It gives them the power to help or destroy, to make or to unmake. They can raise or lower the price of stocks and staple commodities whenever it is to their interest to do so. They can cause the stock market to go up or to go down and make for themselves or their beneficiaries fortunes out of helpless people and the unsuspecting public. They will have at their mercy the producers and the products of the land. They can boom stocks to the highest point, withdraw their support and send them tumbling down. They can mortgage every home, destroy competition, regulate prices, paralyze industry, stagnate commerce, and enslave toiling humanity.

In my opinion the secret motive for the passage of this bill is to confer these sweeping and unlimited powers on the national banks. It has been said that the national banking act is the greatest scheme ever invented by the ingenuity of man to rob his fellow-man. If that is not true now, this bill will make it so.

My friends on this side of the Chamber, I appeal to you in the name of justice, in the cause of humanity, and for the best interests of Democracy to vote against this iniquitous scheme of the Republican party. Every friend of the people, every sincere patriot should vote against this bill. Let us all stand together and present a united front to this assault of the money power to enslave the industrial masses.

To-day, in the face of what is going on, every earnest, every honest, and every loyal Democrat should stand firm against the encroachments, on the rights of the people, of the national banks. They menace our Republic to-day and jeopardize the perpetuity of our free institutions. They are against the people, and their powers should be curtailed instead of extended. Jackson waged the most bitter and relentless war of his life against the United States Bank and finally destroyed that gigantic monopoly. If he had not, it would have destroyed the Republic. One of the greatest acts of his life was the veto of the bill extending the charter of that bank trust. In the light of what is going on now that veto message should be read by every citizen in our land.

This is a Republican bill and the Republican party stands sponsor for it. If it should become a law, it would give the monopoly of issuing money to the national banks, and hence the right to expand or contract the currency of the people whenever it suited their convenience. No corporation should have this power to make or destroy. It would deprive the Government of one of its greatest attributes of sovereignty and give to the national banks the right to paralyze, at their own will, every industry in the country. It is the most daring attempt the banks have ever made by law to seize one of the greatest weapons for good or evil known to civilized man. For the Government to surrender this prerogative and delegate away this power would be a crime against every citizen in this land and work woe and misery to millions yet unborn.

I am opposed to the Government delegating away its powers to the national banks. The Democratic party should vigorously oppose conferring any additional powers on or granting any greater privileges to the national banks. In my judgment they already possess entirely too much power. They are doing precisely to-day, only to a greater extent, what the United States Bank did in the days of Andrew Jackson. The right to coin and issue money is one of the greatest prerogatives of the Republic and one of the highest attributes of its sovereignty. It should not be delegated, transferred, assigned, or set over to any national bank, to any trust, or to any monopoly. As Democrats we should resist the encroachments of national banks on the liberties of the people with the same zeal and the same courage that Andrew Jackson in his day resisted the audacious claims of the United States Bank. And when the national banks impudently declare that the Government should go out of the banking business, we should answer that the banks should and must go out of the governing business.

In Jackson's day there was only one Nick Biddle. To-day there is a Nick Biddle in every national bank in the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have ten minutes more.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest that if that is done it will disarrange the entire programme on that side.

Mr. SULZER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, if I remember rightly, challenged any man on this side of the Chamber to repeat a single statement made in a Democratic campaign speech of 1896 that was still true, other than the opening remark, "Ladies and gentlemen." As long as he leveled that challenge at the leaders only I did not feel that it was necessary for me to reply; but when the gentleman challenged the members of this side from the highest to the very lowest in the ranks, I felt that in the concluding words he had about gotten my range and that his shells were falling in my neighborhood.

I had the pleasure of reading the campaign speech of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, delivered in the city where I reside, in 1896, and it was a very good campaign speech from the Republican standpoint; and when I read it, Mr. Chairman, and saw that he claimed, as Republican orators always do, that every good thing that ever came to the United States came from the Republican party—that it was the Republican party that caused the rain to fall and the grass to grow; that it was under the beneficent influence of that party the sun shone and the grain brought forth a hundredfold—I said in my campaign speech the next day that I thought his was the boldest effort to traffic in the power of the Almighty since Simon, the sorcerer, tried to buy from St. Peter the gift of the Holy Ghost. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

After listening to the arguments of gentlemen on that side of the Chamber on the question now before us, I submit to the gentleman from Ohio that statement will bear the test of time. If I rightly understood the gentleman from Iowa this morning, when we have a big crop at home and there is famine abroad and we get good prices for the crop, it is the Republican party that gives both the crop and the price, but when we have a small crop and get a good price because of the reduced amount of the crop, then it is the Lord that cuts down the crop and the Republican party that puts up the price.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that sort of argument needs no refutation; nor do I care to go into any general discussion of the question of finance. I think there is some truth in the statement that the people of the country are not caring very much for financial discussion; not because they have less interest in the subject, but because they are fully informed upon it and have made up their minds how they are going to vote.

There are, however, some features of this bill to which I desire to call the attention of the House, because I believe it bears embodied in it a more serious menace to the business interests of this country than was ever contained in the wildest scheme of finance yet presented to the people. After establishing the gold standard and practically making every debt, public and private, payable in gold, you proceed then, in order to make the gold more valuable, to lock up in a public pound, created in a department of the Treasury, every vagrant dollar that dares trespass in any way on the sacred territory of the gold reserve.

I hardly think my good friend from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] is entirely frank in his statement of that proposition; for when pushed to the question as to whether this money so redeemed was to be reissued, except a gold dollar was substituted for it, if I rightly understood him, he said that the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion could exchange one fund for another; it could be transferred from the redemption fund to the fiscal fund and used in the discharge of Government expenses. I submit that the terms of the bill provide that the Secretary of the Treasury may exchange any money so redeemed for one purpose, and only one, and that is for the purpose of maintaining the gold reserve in the Treasury.

He can exchange this fund only as he can issue bonds and sell them; and if he can only exchange them in order to maintain the gold reserve, then I ask the gentleman from Indiana how and in what other way could he exchange them except by an exchange of greenbacks, Treasury notes, or silver certificates for the gold itself? I submit to you that under the terms of this measure whenever a dollar, however redeemed, has got into that division of issue and redemption, it never can go out again except a gold dollar comes into that pound, giving bond for the good behavior of that dollar so reissued. That is the fact. Now, what is the result of it? If this bill is enacted into law, we have a right to believe that the logical and natural consequences will follow.

Gentlemen say that money will not be redeemed; that no one will desire or attempt to redeem our present currency, whether it

be silver certificates, Treasury notes, greenbacks, or silver dollars. If this bill is passed, the means by which they can be redeemed is furnished, the bankers get the power to compel redemption, and in the very same bill they are given a motive for the retirement and locking up of this money. You propose to substitute the national-bank currency for the currency now in existence, thus supplying the very strongest motive the national banks could have to lock up all other currency except their own, in order that their currency may be more valuable, and in order that no paper currency may be outstanding in the business world as a rival of their own.

How does it lie in your mouths, when you pass a measure proposing to lock up this currency and put into the hands of a powerful class both the right and the motive to lock it up—how does it lie in your mouths to say that that will not be done? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in the ordinary and usual course followed by these men we will find in a few years a larger part of the United States notes and the Treasury notes and the silver certificates and the silver dollars locked up in the division of issue and redemption, and what will we have to take their place? Let us see. I do not remember the figures of the gentleman from Indiana, but I have the figures taken from the last report of the Treasurer of the United States applicable to conditions existing June 30, 1899.

There were outstanding then something over \$310,000,000 of United States notes, commonly known as greenbacks, \$92,000,000 of Treasury notes, \$401,000,000 of silver certificates, and about \$80,000,000, as given by the gentleman from Indiana, of silver dollars. When this redemption takes place, we will have locked up over \$875,000,000 of currency, for which you tell us there will be in circulation an equal amount of gold taking its place. How did we get that gold? By selling \$875,000,000 of bonds, on which we are to pay every year more than \$26,000,000 of interest in order to get money to substitute for what you admit is now the currency of the country, meeting all the business needs, providing every use and function of money.

But of course it will not be done at once. If it were possible to bring to the door of the Treasury every silver certificate, every silver dollar, every greenback, and every Treasury note to-morrow, and to exchange them for gold, and place in the hands of the men now holding them the equivalent in gold, there would be no security that within five years from this date 50 per cent of that amount of gold would still be within the territorial limits of the United States. Gold is the one money that is cosmopolitan. It is the one that has no local habitation, no fixed place of abode. We settle with Europe a trade balance in our favor, and the banks of the country are full of gold. We pay the trade balance, and our gold eagles are winging their way to other lands. England raises the price of exchange, Russia desires to fill her war chests, and the gold of the United States is promptly drawn out and flies across the ocean in every vessel.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] has said that there are no balances to be paid when the Republican party is in power. He has said that we export gold only when we pay trade balances abroad, but that the trade is always in our favor when the Republican party is in power. I hold here the review of the foreign commerce of the United States, as published by the Bureau of Statistics, and I notice that from 1866 to 1876, every year a Republican year, there was but one year in all that time when the balance of trade was in our favor.

I wish to call the gentleman's attention also to the figures on the question as to whether gold is only exported to pay balances of trade. I find that in 1876 the balance of trade was more than \$79,000,000 in our favor, and we exported \$23,000,000 of gold. I find in 1884 the balance of trade was \$72,000,000 in our favor, and we exported \$18,000,000 in gold. In 1886 the balance of trade was \$44,000,000 in our favor, and we exported \$22,000,000 in gold. In 1891, another good Republican year, the balance of trade was \$39,000,000 in our favor, and we exported \$68,000,000 of gold.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Will the gentleman state the importations of gold for those years?

Mr. COWHERD. I am stating the excess of exportation over importation. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Let me say that in 1896, a Democratic year, and I offer this to show that the questions of importation and exportation of gold, as well as the balance of trade, are not affected by a question of Democratic or Republican office holding.

In 1896 the balance of trade was \$102,000,000 in our favor, and the excess of exportation over importation of gold was \$78,000,000. So I say that if you could make this exchange to-morrow there would be no security that in five years from this date 50 per cent of the gold so paid out would remain within the territorial limits of the United States. But it will not be done that way. Every man knows the way in which it will be done is this: The banker wishes to pay a balance in London. The merchant wishes to pay for a bill of goods in Germany. The broker can sell gold to advantage in Europe. They come to the vaults of the Treasury with five, ten, or fifty million dollars of greenbacks, Treasury notes, or



silver certificates, and the Treasurer takes the currency and pays them the gold.

The currency is locked up in the public pound, and the gold is promptly shipped to a foreign country. By that means the circulating medium of the United States is reduced by the amount of every dollar so exported and so exchanged, and this will go on year after year, just as necessity demands or just as exportation is profitable, until there is locked up in the vaults of the Treasury a large proportion of what is now the circulating medium of the country, and gold, instead of being out to take its place among the people, has been exported to pay foreign debts and balances. But gentlemen say that if we do not have the gold we will have instead of it a national banking currency.

I submit to you, gentlemen, that there is no security that you will have a national-bank currency under the provisions of this bill. Nor is there any justification for this great Government of the United States saying to the people it will surrender to any particular person or any combination of individuals or corporations the first and greatest power of a government and its most important function—the issuing and the coining of money. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Dangerous as it would be to surrender this great power to the banks, thus creating a money trust in addition to those now preying upon the people, and more powerful than all combined, yet even this would be less hurtful than the contraction your bill makes both possible and probable. For how under it can we be assured that even bank notes will be issued to take the place of the currency withdrawn? The bonds sold may never find their way into the hands of the banker.

When the bonds issued under the war revenue bill were sold it was the boast of the Administration that they had gone not into the hands of the national banker, but into the hands of the investor; that people of moderate means largely consumed the issue, and that the Government had so regulated its sale that they might go into such hands. If we should issue a half billion dollars in Government bonds, what is to prevent the great estates of the country taking at least half of that amount and holding them simply for the purpose of investment? But even should the bonds be bought by the banks, there is nothing to compel their use as a basis for the issuing of currency.

Bankers and brokers, like other men, will use the law, and legitimately use it, if the law is open to such use, to their advantage. If it rests in the hands of the holders of these bonds to contract the currency by their will, then what is to prevent them locking the bonds up in the vaults, secure in their investment and in the interest to be drawn on them, contracting the currency until ruin and disaster have swept over the business interests of the United States, and then bringing forth the bonds, issue currency upon them to the full face value, and with the money so issued buy for a song the property whose value was destroyed by the very contraction of the currency thus brought about?

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this in the end would be the logical result and workings of the bill now before the House, and believing, as I said, that it is more dangerous to the commercial and business interests of the United States than the wildest scheme of finance ever devised or seriously offered to the American people, I shall surely vote against the measure.

Mr. OTEY. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the danger of permitting any coquetting with Republicans, and yet I will vote for this bill, provided you strike out all after the words "Be it enacted," etc., and substitute the words "the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to open at once the mints of this country to the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the existing ratio of 16 to 1," and then add a resolution to suppress the explosions of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] and curtail the expansion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. [Applause.]

Taking them in reverse order, let me say that the eloquence of the gentleman from Iowa always rivets my attention and commands my admiration. I find much to commend in his gestures. [Applause and laughter.] He has expanded from the respectable white dollar, to be seen in every mart, to a disreputable mulatto standard, to coin which is a penitentiary offense. [Great laughter and applause.]

His eloquence on expansion reminds me of an old man in my town who was called on to explain "expansion." Mounting a goods box, he said: "This great Republican bird has plumed its wings and soared aloft and taken a view of this little world, and then lit, with one foot on the Asiatic shore, the other on the golden walls of California; has flopped its tail in the Arctic Ocean and pecked Filipinos off of the island of Luzon." [Laughter and uproarious applause.]

Mr. Chairman, a bird with such a stride must split somewhere or lose its footing on the one shore or the other. [Laughter and applause.] My genial friend, for I esteem him highly, is not certain "where he is at," has been, or whither he is going, and he answers queries like a man at the county court starting to leave.

He bridled his horse and put on the saddle. He put the saddle on hind part before. A bystander said, "Mister, you've got that saddle on wrong end foremost." He looked at the meddler and said to him, "How do you know, sir, which way I'm going." [Great laughter and continued applause.]

As for my friend from Ohio—I call him friend because he is so friendly in his disposition generally—he has again exploded, and he has deposited his explosive prosperity all over this country on 25-cent corn, 20-cent oats, and the farm products generally, and the other farming interests—a kind of nervous prosperity. He reminds me of a stammerer, who, seeing a man with a parrot, walked up to him and said: "Sa-a-y, m-is-is-te-ter, ca-ca-can tha-tha-tha—that p-p-p-parrot taw-taw-tawk pros-pros-prosperity?" "Well," says the man, "if he couldn't talk better than you I'd kill him." [Laughter and uproarious applause, long and continued.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, no one would suppose that we had a great financial measure before us, judging by the remarks of the two distinguished gentlemen, but that we were again in the campaign of 1896.

Before I have anything to say on the pending bill, let me remind them and this House of a few salient points respecting that great campaign.

The white people of this country are composed of the German, Swede, Irish, Jew, Italian, and Anglo-Saxon. They are Caucasian—all Americans. The Anglo-Saxon predominates, and this race in this country is increasing with more certainty and with more rapidity than any other race on earth.

It is not subject to the causes (or has not hitherto been) which check the growth of races elsewhere, such as war, famine, and pestilence. Its inventive genius has lessened the devastation and destruction of war. Commerce, reenforced by steam and electricity and our own natural resources, has made famine impossible, and medical science has minimized pestilence and disease.

We are the largest part of this great race, and in another century no people will rival the American people, if we but tempt not Providence too far.

This country is to be the great home of the white race, the principal seat of his power, the center of his life and influence. Our nation in what comprises wealth, viz, lands, mines, timber, horses, cattle, sheep, hogs, merchandise, railroads, etc., stands ahead of the world. Mulhall places our wealth at \$82,000,000,000, the United Kingdom coming next with \$59,000,000,000.

The English have grown great by attending to and interfering with the business of others, while we have outstripped her by attending to our own business.

Where does the intelligence, the cultivation, the genius, the industry, the integrity of character, the tenacity of purpose, and the bone and sinew reside? I say, in the white man of the United States.

You admit this, Mr. Chairman; and now, for the benefit of the statistician from Ohio, I desire to call his attention to the fact that William Jennings Bryan, whom he belittles, and whom the gentleman from Iowa ridicules, received just a little over 1,000,000 more of the votes of these great people than did William McKinley.

Yea, the Chicago platform received the approval of 1,000,000 more of these white citizens than did your St. Louis platform.

And I am slow to believe that the people of this country who think for themselves will run away with their sound judgment in the glamor of a little "cheap John" prosperity cry from the gentleman and join in the slogan of the other side of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill and shall vote against it.

First. Because its banking feature is a delusion and a snare; one not demanded by the country, and one which was originated for the benefit of the few to the injury of the many.

Second. Because I believe the gold standard in this country is iniquitous, contrary to the Constitution of our country, and certain to curtail the circulating medium of the country and hence certain to bring misery and suffering to the masses of the laboring people, especially to the conservative farming element of this land.

I am not opposed to banks, sir. They are as necessary as railroads. They are beneficial to communities. They should be encouraged. A nation of enlightened and advanced ideas can not do without them. The limited time at my disposal does not admit of a lengthy discussion of this feature of the measure, and yet to do so briefly would be to leave it undone.

I may advert, however, to a few of the effects of the workings under this bill should it become a law unamended. It is proposed to make national banks the only source of issue. It might be well to recall the fact that the greatest bank that ever existed was the Bank of Venice, which lived for three hundred years and never issued a note. In making the national bank the only source of issue you not only deprive the Government of the sovereign right to issue money, but you destroy \$346,000,000 of the legal-tender money familiarly known as the greenback and the \$150,000,000

Treasury notes, all money which our people love. The Government surrenders its prerogative, which no sovereign can relinquish with safety.

Banks of discount and deposit are blessings to a community. Where are the thousands of State banks which to-day can not issue a note? Where are the thousands of bankers who can not issue a note? We are told that the note holder is made secure. True; but was not the holder of a greenback, of a Treasury note, of a silver certificate, of a silver dollar secure?

The national bank deposits a Government bond as security for the note holder. Is not the note of an individual banker as secure when a deposit is made for the security of the note holder of the individual banker; and if so, why should not an individual banker be entitled to \$100,000 of currency if he deposits \$100,000 United States bonds as an association of gentlemen when they deposit \$100,000 United States bonds?

Indeed, sir, if a poor widow and a frugal farmer have each a \$1,000 United States bond, and the one is pinched with poverty and wants money, and the other needs money with which to replenish his stock, why, tell me, should not both be permitted to deposit these bonds with the United States Treasury and receive currency—greenbacks, if you please—and be thus favored, as well as an association of business men?

His bonds are as good as the bonds of an association. The note holder of neither can lose.

And do not banking associations fail as often as individual bankers?

I notice that the Comptroller's report shows that since 1865 387 national banks alone have failed.

That is not quite 1 a month for thirty-four years, or 11 every twelve months during thirty-four years.

It is a well-known fact that no such number of private or individual bankers failed in the same period.

It is true that 17 of these 387 were found solvent and were permitted to resume business. The claims proved against the remaining 370 amounted to \$127,002,895, an average of about \$350,000 each, all of which, even if eventually paid in dividends—which was not the case—crippled individuals and associations, widows, and orphans irretrievably. But it was never all paid, for a deficiency of \$44,000,000 existed; 236 of the 370 had been wound up, 134 still undergoing the process of being wound up.

So we are led to inquire, Is this great concession to associations in banking desirable? Do the existing institutions invite or invoke it? Will it inure to the benefit of their customers? Will it inure to their own benefit?

In the nature of things this bill must of necessity contract the circulating medium. Let us suppose that it is determined to start a national bank in a town, the capital stock to be \$150,000. The whole circulating medium in the town is \$150,000; \$150,000 is paid in on the capital stock.

The bank proposes to issue \$100,000 currency. By reason of the gold-standard enactment into law United States bonds have risen to 50 per cent premium. The bank pays \$150,000 for United States bonds, deposits them with the Treasury, and gets \$100,000 circulating notes. The circulating medium is reduced to \$100,000, or 33½ per cent, in this little town by the operation. It has \$100,000 national-bank notes, now its only circulation, whereas before it had \$150,000. The stockholder, it is true, will get 4 per cent on its bonds, equal to \$4,000, and say 6 per cent on its circulation, equal to \$6,000, a total of \$10,000, while 6 per cent on the \$150,000 alone would have yielded only \$9,000. But would this be a beneficence to the people of that community? is the question.

I remember well when United States bonds reached the point that circulation was so little profitable that banks with \$1,000,000 capital issued only \$45,000 currency, no more than a national bank of \$100,000 issued. Now, we all remember that when President Cleveland issued his last, the \$62,400,000, bonds, he sent a message to Congress requesting Congress to have the word "gold" inserted, stating that if this were done he could get \$16,000,000 more for the issue, an increase of 25 per cent. Congress refused by a majority vote on both sides of this House. This bill proposes to insert the word "gold" in all past, present, and future United States bonds.

If the word "gold," inserted when Mr. Cleveland suggested it, would have increased the selling price of bonds 25 per cent, will not the passage of this bill have a like effect on all the bonds now unpaid?

If so, can banks afford either to purchase bonds at 25 per cent advance over present prices, or to hold those they have with 25 per cent dead capital, in order to issue currency even at the face value?

If banks find that they can not afford to issue circulation, of course they will not do so, and hence banks with over \$150,000 capital will issue only \$50,000, and banks under to an amount one-fourth of the amount of their capital, and we will have bank circulation to an amount of about \$95,000,000, all told, a contraction which would of necessity bring to the point of failure many customers of the banks.

Do all banks demand this law? Let us see what other banking interests there are in this country and compare their standing:

There are 3,583 national banks in the country.

There are 6,349 other banks in the country.

United States bonds owned by national banks.....	\$346,114,413
United States bonds owned by other banks.....	173,973,738
Other bonds owned by national banks.....	305,428,927
Other bonds owned by other banks.....	1,353,621,422
Surplus and profits of national banks.....	342,321,752
Surplus and profits of other banks.....	418,798,087
Deposits of national banks.....	2,523,157,509
Deposits of other banks.....	4,246,500,852

National banks are banks of issue.

Other banks are banks of discount and deposit only.

But the system of taxation may be an inducement to banks to invoke the passage of the bill, for the Comptroller, as shown by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT], demonstrates that the burden of taxation will be less.

But however advocates of banking systems may want banks of issue, however profitable it may be, is it for the best interest of our people for the Government, to surrender to them that which is claimed to be a good and profitable thing for them, and yet deprive itself or the people of the same benefit?

If good for the corporation, then why not good for the Government?

The gentleman from Minnesota, to whom I always listen with great pleasure, a gentleman whose courtesy in debate is equaled only by the force with which he presents his views—I refer to the Hon. Mr. McCLEARY—said that credit was an easier method of settlement than cash; that the vehicle of credit was the note; that if he owed a man \$100, what law, said he, should forbid him to give his note if the creditor would accept it?

So if two, three, or more owed a debt, who was there or what law ought to step in and forbid the three joining in a note and giving it? And so, analyzing further, he said the issue of a national bank was nothing but the association loaning its credit.

Now, I quote him from memory and while I have not his exact words I state in effect what he said.

I would like to ask him—but he is not in his seat—why, if your proposition is sound, and I believe it is, should not State banks be allowed to issue their notes, too, for the same reason given by you? You will not say because the United States must protect the citizens of a State from wild-cat money; you stultify your own proposition if you do. You know that State banks can and would be organized, with all the light before us, that would issue as good money as any national bank could issue. You know that the national-bank system is modeled after the banks of Louisiana as they existed before the war.

But you also know that were you to permit such an amendment to this bill that it would break the backbone of the gold trust and the agency of the monster would be powerless.

Banking ought to be free. No more impediment should be placed in its path than in the unobstructed course of the merchant, the artisan the professional man.

By one stroke of the pen after next Monday William McKinley will destroy not only the money of the Constitution, but the money made constitutionally a legal tender by the edict of the Supreme Court.

Talk of endless chain. There never can be a more complete one than the one forged by this bill. Even standard silver dollars are made redeemable in a standard the coinage of which is to-day under our laws a felony.

There is no gold dollar known to our laws of coinage.

That banks are a benefit to us no one can deny. That I make no war on them is my purpose not to conceal. That they should have every encouragement and that the law should be so framed that humble individuals in the smallest villages should have the mantle of such benefits thrown over them by the agency of their own people in such associations as they may deem proper, regulated by wholesome laws, I contend is right. But to organize a giant monopoly by the Government farming out its financial prerogative to a few giant institutions in a few of the large cities of this country is not only a dangerous experiment but one the exercise of whose power will shake the very foundation of our Republic. But even this power dwindles into insignificance when we contemplate the misery in store for the millions of our people when once the inexorable gold standard is fixed on us. No country in the world has ever had such a drastic measure as the one contained in this bill, and the only hope is that the people will rise up and demand its obliteration.

Who is to suffer from the gold standard? Is it right that the bonds of the United States, the debts of the people, should be by legislation increased in value 25 per cent at one fell swoop? Is it honest? Is it just? Can such things be?

Here lies old Thirty-three per cent.  
The more he got the more he lent;  
The more he lent the more he craved.  
Good Lord, can such a soul be saved?



So it will be said of the Republican Congress of 1899-1900.

The honorable gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY], whose speech in reply to the Hon. Charles A. Towne in the Fifty-fourth Congress was an effort worthy of his high standing, and came nearer answering the incomparable argument of his great colleague than any speech on the Republican side in that splendid debate, is lacking, I think, in candor when he attempts to show that Thomas Jefferson was in favor of the gold standard because, as he claims, he stopped the coinage of the silver dollar.

He says not a single silver dollar was coined from 1805 to—his speech has not yet been put in print—a certain time, say 1834. I think I quote him correctly.

Now, to illustrate the want of frankness of the foremost advocate of the gold standard on the Republican side, I want to say that the Bible says "there is no God," and I announce a truth indisputable as far as it goes, just as his assertion is true, thus limited.

But how uncandid do I appear when called to task and I say I omitted the context and should have said, "The fool in his heart hath said, 'There is no God.'"

Now, I asked him was it not a fact that there never was a single gold dollar coined till 1849? He admitted this was true.

The inevitable inference from his assertion was that no legal-tender silver was issued from 1805 to 1834. The inevitable inference followed from my question was that no legal-tender gold was issued till 1849. Both statements left out, "The fool in his heart hath said," etc.

Now, what are the facts? That from 1805 up to 1853 all the silver coined was legal tender, but it did not happen to be in dollar pieces; and all the gold coined up to the same time was legal tender, but did not happen to be in dollar pieces. And up to 1873 as much legal-tender silver had been coined as legal-tender gold.

I deny that Jefferson stopped the coinage of legal-tender silver, and my friend knows that he did not.

But, Mr. Chairman, I pass on. Who are to be affected by this great wrong? We are living in an age of mortgages. Why should the plow and the hoe be emblems of poverty? My answer is mortgages. Why should the laboring man bow to the whim of the plutocrat? Because of mortgages. Why should the mechanic build the great edifice and live in a hut? He is mortgaged. Why should the artisan build the carriages and go afoot? He is mortgaged. Why should the miner delve in the mines and unearth the coal while his children shiver in the cold? He is mortgaged. Why should the machinist erect the electric light and go to bed with a kerosene lamp? He is mortgaged. Why should the builder construct the splendid organs and church edifices and go to an humble meeting house? He is mortgaged. The pick of the railroad laborer, the tools of the carpenter, the engine, the cars, the carriages, the horses, the farm, the cabin, and the huts are mortgaged. Will the gold standard help them? The palace and incomes of the princes only are free.

The latest statistics that I can find show, in the United States:

Number of farms mortgaged.....	4,747,078
Amount borrowed.....	\$4,896,771,112
Number of acres so mortgaged.....	581,054,962
On lots, number of mortgages.....	4,770,669
Amount borrowed.....	\$7,198,106,681
Number of lots so mortgaged.....	8,027,031
The total acreage of farm lands.....	623,218,619

This does not include railroad mortgages, as you will see, nor other semipublic mortgages, as I may term them.

These will no doubt double the mortgages referred to.

Now, while our friends are boasting of prosperity I wish to invite their attention to the fact that whatever there may be of it, it is all on borrowed money. For we are told that we have some \$2,000,000,000 in circulating medium in this country. Even if true, which I neither believe nor admit, it is every dollar borrowed. Not only do we owe it as a nation, but wipe out all national, State, and corporation indebtedness, and we have standing against farm lands alone double the amount of the alleged circulating medium, and, including mortgages on other lands, five times the amount.

What does this mean? Does it not mean that the time is coming when the Klondike and our own mines will fail to supply our wants measured by gold? And does it not mean that our mountains, swelling almost to bursting with the white metal, must and will be utilized?

What if we have \$400,000,000 more gold now than we had in 1896? What if this did produce prosperity?

Has not the Democratic party always contended for volume of money? Has it not always (and was not that its slogan in 1896) demanded more money? Has not the Republican party always claimed that there was a sufficiency and that low prices were an evidence of prosperity—an evidence of sound finance? And yet now do they not claim that more money has produced more prosperity?

What if \$385,000,000 additional gold has produced some pros-

perity? Would not an addition in three years of \$150,000,000 of silver dollars only have added to this prosperity?

The leaves of memory served to make a mournful rustling in the dark ways of Republican finance.

The Republican leaders, the great men in the ranks, have repudiated all such measures as this bill. Mr. McKinley did it when a member of Congress. He did it when he accepted the nomination on the St. Louis platform. He did it when he sent a commission to Europe to secure international agreement.

There must be awful memories as the light of bygone days flashed from the graves of your great men. "Take heed to yourselves, my Republican friends, that your hearts be not deceived and go turn aside and serve other gods and worship them."

In the language of Ezekiel, "I have given you up to the delusions of your own heart and justly left you to your own blindness that you shall not discern your own self-deceivings."

You are perpetrating a wrong on your country that is now without remedy. It will be corrected in time, and that in the no distant future.

But I am one whom you have not deceived. I began my service in Congress by sounding the danger signal, and I have kept it up without intermission; and now that this bill marks the climax of Republican treachery to the people of this country, I may feel at least some satisfaction in having attempted to avert this disaster.

In 1895 I published the following circular and sent it out to our people. Thousands of them were returned to me, and the signatures to them were numbered by thousands. And there is no surprise in my State at the exhibition of deception on the part of the Republican party as evidenced by this bill:

The undersigned, deprecating the combination of the money power of this country and England with the Republican party to enforce the single gold standard and to further contract the currency, believing that we voice the sentiments of the Democratic party of the great West and South, hereby declare:

- I. That we demand the free coinage of silver at the existing ratio of 16 to 1.
- II. We oppose the efforts of this combination—
  1. To retire the \$347,000,000 legal-tender notes (greenbacks).
  2. To retire the \$152,000,000 Treasury notes (issued under the Sherman bill).
  3. To issue in their stead \$500,000,000 gold interest-bearing bonds, as an additional and unnecessary burden on our already overburdened taxpayers, and especially iniquitous as against the best interests of the agricultural industry of our country.
  4. To destroy the existing volume of silver money by restricting it to a mere subsidiary or token money, stripped of its legal-tender functions.
- III. That this combination conceals its determination to contract the currency by retiring \$500,000,000 greenbacks and Treasury notes, in which, if successful, then to retire the \$400,000,000 silver dollars and to prevent any further increase of currency by a continuance of the 10 per cent tax on State banks, thus leaving the country with gold and national-bank notes as "the money of the realm" and the only circulating media; and we believe that the success of such action will cause a further reduction in prices and wages, prove disastrous to our industrial interests, and precipitate another panic like of which this country has never experienced.

The currency or House bill No. 1 completes the crimes charged in this indictment. In 1895 I believed it was the purpose of the Republican party to do just what this bill provides; so I then predicted and so it is decreed.

No amendments will be permitted. It must go through just as a solid shot. Examine the bill. Compare it with this circular, and it will be seen that the bill provides, virtually in the language of this circular, that "gold and national-bank notes are to be the only money of the realm," and that bonds are to be issued, principal and interest payable in gold! gold!! gold!!!

But again, is this country ready for contraction of the currency? Can even the Republicans stand this? We know that plutocrats are their masters and trusts are their protégés; that expansion is their allurements and imperialism their poem. But what of contraction? To take out of circulation \$346,000,000 of greenbacks, money that all people want and that the Supreme Court said was good as the best; to retire the Treasury notes, \$157,000,000; redeem the silver dollars, \$500,000,000.

Is the country ready for this? They will recall that there were twenty Presidents, beginning with George Washington, down to Grover Cleveland, every one of whom was opposed to the single gold standard. They will recall that not a single illustrious man that this country has produced has advocated the single gold standard. There was not one of them who did not believe in bimetallism and the free coinage of gold and silver; not one who did not conform to our Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof and that no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender.

Not one who did not believe that the "power to tax was the power to destroy," and hence opposed to discrimination in favor of gigantic trusts and corporations, of which the gold trust (now to be inaugurated in the beginning of the twentieth century) is the most gigantic and dangerous of all. Not one of them who was not the friend of him who follows the plow and hoes the hill, and ever endeavored to lift him up and not press him down.

You tell us of prosperity. Where is it? Do you find it in the humble home? Your eyes are fixed, not on the hut, but on the palace; not on the laboring man, but on the banker; not on the

pinched and careworn face of the toiling mother, with her hungry children, but on the queens of society and the gifts of royalty.

A war was thrust upon us. Armies had to be fed; armies had to be transported and clothed. Speculation became rife. The great trusts took charge of William McKinley, body and soul, and of the Government. Idle labor was employed. Money hitherto locked up was turned loose. The great cotton fields of the South, the grain of the farmers of the West, the products of the fields were put in motion, and the agricultural exports brought in a golden harvest of trade balance—\$385,000,000 added to our money. Spindles had to be started, furnaces went into blast, iron advanced. More money was the mainspring that started the wheels of industry. Then sporadic prosperity ensued.

Is it "fait accompli" for all time? God grant that it is. But must it be said that the cruel monster war accomplished that which thirty years of profound peace and abundant harvest failed to accomplish? Must we resort to war to produce prosperity when peaceable means are always within our grasp, if we use those means which a kind Providence has given us? God forbid. Must we measure the flow of human blood by dollars and cents? Are you prepared to be Anglicised? Is all this simply to be an ally of England? It tends that way, Mr. Chairman.

Is our great farming interest to be sacrificed to the greed of conquest? Where is England's boasted agricultural interest of 1800? Where the thrift of her farmer of 1816, when the gold standard was fastened partially on her people?

"Gone where the woodbine twineth," in the language of a New York banker.

With the Romans agriculture was the fundamental idea. A tract of land was allotted to each citizen. Senator Curias said:

I am not counted a good citizen, but rather a dangerous one to the State, because I can not content myself with 5 acres of land.

Cato, distinguished orator, general, and statesman, was loudly commended for having written a book on farming. The senate ordered the 28 books on agriculture of Mago to be translated into Latin for the use of the Roman farmers; and so in other nations of the world the farmers' interest was considered and protected, and yet in the Congress of the United States he is forgotten, neglected—aye, despised. The business man of the bank counter, the industrial head of the trust, is honored and worshiped. The superstructure must be erected, while the foundation is neglected. Can such an edifice stand? It is not the per capita of circulation that tells the tale of the needs of a nation, but it is the proportion of circulation to wealth. And we must note the distinction between wealth and money.

What matters it about circulation in a country barren of wealth? The per capita of \$100 would matter little with no wealth to move. On the other hand, what matters wealth without an abundant medium of exchange?

We find from Mulhall that our wealth is \$82,000,000,000. On this basis we have in this most progressive and the wealthiest of all nations \$1 of circulation to \$40 of wealth; in France, \$20; in England, \$15.

Now, let us suppose our circulation was distributed. Here is a farmer whose farm is worth \$10,000. This is his wealth—his proportion of the \$82,000,000,000. What would his proportion of the circulation be?

If \$40 wealth gives \$1 circulation, how much ought \$10,000 be entitled to? Two hundred and fifty dollars to run a farm worth \$10,000. He must make a start, and he must borrow. If the circulating medium was \$1 for every \$20 of wealth, he could borrow \$500 with as much ease and at the same cost as he could \$250 when wealth was 40 to 1. If the circulation was one dollar for every ten of wealth, he could borrow \$1,000 as easily as he could \$250 under existing conditions. Four billion dollars of circulation to-day would about put us on a par with France. If we had \$5,000,000,000, we should be about on a par with England. And when we remember that our circulation is congested in the cities and manufacturing districts, how much more unjust to the farmer is our contraction of the currency.

If the bill goes into effect our circulating medium will be only \$1 to every \$80 of wealth, and the pinching will be renewed.

The people of this great country are to silently submit to such nefarious schemes to advance the interests of trusts, Mr. Chairman, and there is a death struggle going on. Trusts will conquer the people, and their manhood will be assassinated and their liberties will be gone, or the people will kill and conquer the trusts. Which will it be? It is for the intelligent, industrious, and courageous white American citizen to say at the ballot box. Which will they choose?

Why should we model after England? Why should we not, without waiting for precedent, not only command the gold but the silver of our country to do duty? We can pay with commodities every demand from foreign countries.

We have 70,000,000 people; 3,600,000 square miles of territory

on which the sun never sets, for as it rises in Maine its golden rays are just dying out in the twilight of Alaska.

Our trade between the States is greater than the whole foreign trade of Great Britain. And this is free trade, too; and we need all the silver as well as gold of our own mines to continue our development and trade, yet in their infancy. Texas, at the one extreme, the largest of our States, an empire in itself, would make 212 States the size of Rhode Island, the smallest of our Commonwealths.

Rhode Island wants the single gold standard. Texas wants bi-metalism. In the Senate Rhode Island neutralizes the vote of this great empire of the South, within whose confines the New England borough might be lost beyond the hope of discovery.

The cotton of the South, the grain of the West, furnish the balance of trade that gives the trade balance, the gold, on which the alleged prosperity so generally diffused is based.

Yet these great producers of the South and West appeal in vain for the money guaranteed them by the Constitution, while New England and the trusts hold the conscience of the imperial power of a once free Republic and decree Gold! Gold!! Gold!!!

Every man, woman, and child in the world could settle in Texas and have each a lot 50 by 100 feet and not be crowded as much as New York City, and she can raise all the food products and cotton needed in the world.

We have about as many miles of railroads as the rest of the world combined, one of which alone transfers more tonnage annually than all the ships of England.

The tracks of our railroads, if laid parallel, would encircle the world seven times, and trains run over them every year traverse a distance four times the distance from our earth to the moon.

One-fourth of our area is still in virgin forests, and our annual cut of lumber, if measured in dollars, is more than all the gold, silver, coal, iron, copper, lead, and zinc mined in the United States, and yet we are ahead in mining. From 194,000 acres of coal lands we produce one-third of all the world's output.

The product of 1898 would have taken a bin to hold it which would have measured 10 feet by 45 from New York to San Francisco.

We have 75,000 to 80,000 post-offices—double that of any other nation—and of the 9,000,000,000 letters the United States mails carry one-half. Our farming interest is ahead of that of all nations; it is one-fifth of our national wealth, and yet stifled by financial legislation.

Our boast has been that the classes in other nations rule the masses; that in other nations the peasant is the slave of the landlord; the mechanic and laborer are the tools of the taskmaster; that both are shut out from aspirations. No future lies before them but dependence or want.

But that here—

My country, 'tis of thee,  
Sweet land of liberty,  
Of thee I sing.

Take care, Mr. Chairman, lest this bill causes a revulsion to—

My country, 'tis of thee,  
Land of plutocracy,  
Of thee I moan.

The last words of Washington were, "It is well." Of Napoleon, "Tête d'armée."

The one dying in the light of liberty achieved for his people, beloved and honored, the first in the hearts of his countrymen, the exponent of a free and prosperous people and happy in the confidence of their giant strength and confident of that growth of power that was to astonish an admiring world and jealous of the glorious name of American.

The other on his lonely rock of St. Helena, sighing for his freedom; a caged lion, feared by friends and despised by foes.

A desolator desolate,  
A victor overthrown;  
The arbiter of others' fate  
A suppliant for his own.

And like your party, Mr. Chairman, which this bill dooms to destruction, as the torch at Moscow doomed his brilliant career, he thought not of the millions of desolate homes, of sighing widows and weeping orphans, but only of the army, his instrument of power and tyranny; but dies recalling the fact that there was an element that had spoken and destroyed him.

But where is he, the modern, mightier far,  
Who, born no king, made monarchs draw his car;

Whose game was empires, and whose stakes were thrones?  
Whose table earth—whose dice were human bones?

But I have faith in the American people. I do not believe that they will indorse this measure. It may be that Providence, in its inscrutable wisdom has started the Republican party on this path that it may accomplish its own undoing, and in the language of Isaiah I would say as he said to the king:

Let not Hezekiah deceive you; for he shall not be able to deliver you.

[Applause.]



I present here as part of my remarks the admirable bill of the Hon. W. C. ADAMSON, of Georgia.

A bill to provide a uniform and stable currency for the United States of America.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the lawful currency of the United States of America shall consist of such standard silver dollars as have been or may hereafter be coined, and such gold coins of any denomination as have been coined (since July 31, 1834), or may hereafter be coined at the mints of the United States; such fractional subsidiary coin of silver, nickel, or copper as has been emitted or may hereinafter be provided by law; such legal-tender United States notes, called greenbacks, as have been or may hereafter be issued; the Treasury notes issued under the law of July 4, 1890, and coin certificates as hereinafter provided. All of said forms of currency, except the subsidiary coin, shall be full and absolute legal tender for all debts and dues, public or private, without exception or reservation and regardless of contract, stipulations, or efforts to evade. Of the subsidiary currency the copper coin shall be legal tender at its nominal value to the amount of 25 cents, the nickel coin to the amount of \$1, and the silver to the amount of \$10.

SEC. 2. That the standard of value shall be the dollar of silver and its multiple of gold (eagles or \$10, half eagles or \$5, and double eagles or \$20) at the present legal ratio and of the weight and fineness now provided by law, which coins, and no others, shall be coined and issued from the mints of the United States for any persons who may deposit at the mints for coinage on private account either gold or silver bullion, all of which shall be received when offered in lots of not less than \$100 in value, and coined without charge for mintage, the silver into dollars and the gold into their multiples, all of which coin shall have and bear such devices and inscriptions as are now provided by law for such coins, and the coins shall be delivered to the depositor of the bullion from which they were coined.

SEC. 3. That any person depositing at any mint either gold or silver bullion for coinage may, as soon as it can be assayed and its value ascertained, receive certificates of deposit for so many dollars of coin as the bullion would make when coined. For this purpose there shall be kept at the mint a supply of coin certificates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury. When the bullion for which certificates are issued is coined, the coin shall be covered into the Treasury. Any person depositing at the Treasury any number of dollars of either gold or silver coin in amounts exceeding \$1 shall receive from the Treasurer like coin certificates for as many dollars as are deposited. There shall never be issued a certificate for gold or silver as such, but all of such coin certificates used at the mints and the Treasury shall be of the same form and expressly for coin, and shall be redeemable in coin on demand at the Treasury when presented in sums not less than \$100.

SEC. 4. That the fractional subsidiary coin now authorized by law shall be manufactured on Government account from bullion and metal purchased at its market price, paid for with legal-tender coin or Treasury notes. The amount of fractional currency shall be increased until \$200,000,000 shall have been emitted, up to which amount it shall be kept in circulation among the people by using it to the amount of its legal-tender limit in every payment and disbursement made by the Government; which fractional currency may at any time be exchanged at the Treasury, in sums not less than \$100, for legal-tender coin or Treasury notes.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and issue in denominations of \$5 and multiples thereof legal-tender Treasury notes of the United States, commonly called greenbacks, which, like those heretofore issued, shall be convertible on demand at the Treasury into legal-tender coin, and shall keep such Treasury notes in circulation to the amount, including those now in circulation, of \$500,000,000 by paying them out upon all dues and disbursements of the Government. No more than \$500,000,000 of such Treasury notes shall be in circulation at one time, and whenever the amount outstanding is below that sum they shall be paid out in all disbursements by the Treasurer.

SEC. 6. That all obligations of the United States, whether bonds, Treasury notes, or coin certificates, when presented for payment shall, as now provided by law for all existing liabilities except gold certificates, be payable at the option of the Government in any legal-tender coin in the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall so exercise that option as to pay out the coin of that metal which is more plentiful in the Treasury and more easy and likely to flow in and remain plentiful.

SEC. 7. That section 3412 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, edition of 1878, is hereby repealed, and it shall not hereafter be lawful for the Government in any wise to participate in, control, or assume responsibility for the issue or redemption of circulating notes of any bank; nor shall any bank of issue, State or Federal, be required to pay any tax to the United States Government upon notes issued and paid out, whether its own or those of other banks.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, as rapidly as possible, cause to be coined at the mints of the United States into standard silver dollars all the silver bullion in his custody, both corpus and seigniorage, cover the coined dollars into the Treasury, and to pay them out when coin is needed to redeem any paper of the Government payable in coin.

SEC. 9. That it having been heretofore "declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money," and "to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, to be secured through international agreement or safeguards of legislation," and that "the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetalism," the Congress now redeems those pledges by this enactment, which provides all the safeguards of legislation necessary to secure the desired end. All other nations which desire to do so are at liberty to adopt the same system, with the assurance that fluctuation in the values of the two metals can not be prevented by discriminating legislation against either, but that permanent stability can be assured only by according the two metals the same legislative consideration and reestablishing that equality of condition which allows the people, in making their payments, the unrestricted use of either or both. To this righteous and honest course the United States of America will adhere in future, regardless of the machinations of speculators or the policies of other nations.

SEC. 10. That all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act or any part thereof are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, before I touch upon the merits of this bill, I feel it my duty, having been a member of the Fifty-fifth Congress, to give to the members, especially the new members, of this House and the people who are to suffer by it, some of the history of this proposed legislation in the Fifty-fifth Congress. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that in 1897 we were called here in extra session a few days after we were elected, about March the 15th, and that the Speaker of this Republican House refused to

appoint any committees except those he wanted, the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Ways and Means. You will remember further that all through this session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, though it sat here from the 15th of March until the last of July, all it did was to pass the unfortunate Dingley bill, which perpetuated a deficit in the Treasury which had been inherited from the bond-producing McKinley bill under the Administration of President Harrison.

You will remember that from day to day, after the passage of that bill in this House, the Democratic party urged the Republican majority and the Speaker of this House to appoint the committees in order that we might proceed in due course to the investigation of the important questions proposed for legislation by both Democrats and Republicans. The Speaker was upheld in his reckless and revolutionary assumption of power. No other business was permitted. The House met daily only to adjourn, and then, growing tired of this useless frivolity, the Republicans adjourned it for four days at a time, which was unquestionably in contravention of the Constitution, as was then abundantly shown. At last the President ended this unprecedented folly by sending in, just ninety minutes before the hour for final adjournment, a message recommending the passage of a currency bill, and it was immediately passed without having been referred to any committee and without the slightest deliberation or discussion. I have before me that message. He recommended for passage the Indianapolis gold-standard bill, designed to rivet more permanently upon the statute books the gold standard, and that too while the Wolcott monetary commission was in Europe, at the President's instance, trying to induce other nations to help us drop the gold standard. The President said:

A notable assembly of business men, with delegates from 29 States and Territories, was held at Indianapolis in January of this year. The financial situation commanded their earnest attention, and after two days' session the convention recommended to Congress the appointment of a monetary commission. I commend this report to the consideration of Congress.

The report, thus indorsed and commended by the President, said in part:

This conference declares that it has become necessary that a consistent, straightforward, and deliberately planned monetary system shall be inaugurated, the fundamental basis of which shall be, first, that the present gold standard should be maintained.

Notwithstanding this measure involved the determination of an issue of most transcendent importance, the President advised Congress to give it no thought or consideration, well knowing that within the few minutes left to it before adjournment it could not do so, urging its immediate passage thus:

This subject should receive the attention of Congress at this special session. It ought not to be postponed until the regular session.

If the President was working in good faith for international bimetalism, he should never have sent, as long as he was so laboring, this message to Congress. Not content with that, he appealed for immediate legislation thereon. It must seem to any fair-minded man that it is a plain case of duplicity and bad faith on the part of the President.

In addition to this, he appointed Mr. Gage, an ultra gold monometallist, Secretary of the Treasury, who indorsed personally and officially the gold plans of the Indianapolis convention, which in turn were indorsed and recommended by the President, as I have shown, to Congress for immediate action. Here was a complete surrender by the President to Mr. Gage's gold monometallic plans, and very naturally it destroyed all practical hopes of success of the Wolcott International Bimetallic Commission then at work in Europe. We are not surprised that Senator WOLCOTT in his speech in the Senate took to task Mr. Secretary Gage, and I shall expect him now to be equally as painstaking in condemning the President for following in the steps of Mr. Gage in urging the passage of the bill we are now considering. Senator WOLCOTT said in the Senate:

Here, Mr. President, I should naturally end this account of our negotiations, negotiations which are still pending and undetermined. The extraordinary statements, however, lately made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and which, unexplained, must seriously affect the future of any further attempts toward securing international action, require some reference at this time.

When Congress convened on the 6th of last month the President, in his reference to the subject of international bimetalism, spoke earnestly and anxiously of his desire to see an international bimetallic agreement consummated. His assurances gave renewed hope to bimetallics all over the country, and seemed final and conclusive answer to those who had claimed that the President was not in earnest in his efforts toward international bimetalism. For myself, I needed no such proof. I had again and again been made to know how genuine was the President's devotion to this settlement of the vexed question. Within a fortnight after this, with no event meanwhile which would change existing conditions, the Secretary of the Treasury, in support of a bill which he has prepared respecting the currency, said as follows to a committee of Congress:

"The objects I have in mind in the series of provisions offered by me are four in number:

"1. To commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard, remove, so far as possible, all doubts and fears on that point, and thus strengthen the credit of the United States both at home and abroad."

The two statements are utterly at variance and contradictory to each other. They can not be reconciled. This is not the proper occasion to analyze the bill of the Secretary. It will reach limbo long before it reaches the



Senate. He proposes to capitalize the premium on our bonds sold recently and to make of them, with others to be issued, a security definitely payable in gold.

The Secretary forgets that only a few months ago, when the country was in dire distress, we were compelled to pay \$9,000,000 for the privilege of keeping the word "gold" out of some of these very bonds. He ought not to forget, for the bank of which he was president, it was said, got some of the bonds and received some of the proceeds of that deplorable transaction. But I do not intend to discuss the bill which the President's message specifically does not indorse, and it is premature to criticize the Secretary's Republicanism, for his advent into the party and the Cabinet were practically contemporaneous. We must accept the situation.

In my opinion, the great majority of the members of the Republican party are bimetalists, and the fact that they are misrepresented by a Cabinet officer is not pleasing, but it is endurable. The selection of the members of his official household is the President's own affair, and so long as he stands upon the question of bimetalism where he has ever stood there is no serious ground for apprehension. But even in the inconceivable event that the Chief Magistrate of this people should, in the exercise of his judgment, determine to countenance the final fastening upon this country of the burdens of the gold standard, I trust we may still warrant for faith and hope in the pledges of the party and the wisdom of its counsels.

We will cross our bridges when we come to them. The time when this country will submit to the final imposition of gold monometallism is far away. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the ability of this country to maintain alone the parity between silver and gold, there is no question that the concurrence of other nations would help and not hinder the cause of bimetalism in the United States, and efforts to secure it ought to receive the cordial support of every citizen who is opposed to gold monometallism.

Senator WOLCOTT at that time undertook, as you see, to defend the President as a friend in good faith of international bimetalism, but he will now see that the President was even then, as now, as much in the mud as Mr. Secretary Gage was and is now in the mire.

The bill we are now considering is the outgrowth of a Republican caucus, a caucus which was so very intelligent and learned as to be able to pass on, digest, and adjudge in one night's session that this, above all others, is the proper bill to be enacted into law. Of course it must have been submitted to the President and approved by him, and will finally receive his approval as President.

It can not truthfully be said that this is a continuation of the existing gold standard, and the President can not hide behind that plea, for it makes all our public obligations (now payable in gold or silver, or both, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury) payable in gold and gold only, and that, too, by law, the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury being abrogated entirely.

And more, this bill further demonetizes all of our other legal-tender silver coins. It says in effect they are not and shall not be tender money in payment of our past, present, or future public obligations. They may remain as they are, tender in the payment of the plain man's obligation, but they are not good enough for the bondholder, who must be paid in gold and gold only. This bill debases and discredits our silver and paper tenders, which of course tends to destroy their usefulness to a very great extent. This bill, then, does not and can not perpetuate the "existing gold standard," but extends and makes it apply, and by law, to each and all of our public obligations, which has never been the law heretofore. But I shall later on allude to this view of the bill.

The currency bill of 1897, sent by the President to that extra session of the Fifty-fifth Congress just ninety minutes before the adjournment for the session, was, by the edict of the Speaker and a willing Republican majority, passed by the House without examination then and there, and went to a Democratic Senate, where it sleeps.

During the last session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures and the Committee on Banking and Currency, dominated by the Republican party, being unable to agree upon a currency bill among themselves, were unable to report one here that they could even debate decently without falling out among themselves and denouncing each other here on the floor of the House to such an extent that one of the bills which they brought in here was sent back to the committee.

So divided were they upon the proposition of riveting the gold standard upon the country that the chairman of the Republican caucus, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] took it upon himself to appoint a committee of Republicans only, who should sit through the summer at Atlantic City and prepare a bill. But not one of the members of that committee was a member of either the Committee on Banking and Currency or the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the Fifty-fifth Congress. It was charged here on this floor, March 3, 1899, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Walker, a Republican and member of the Fifty-fifth Congress, whose speech I hold in my hand, and it is a notorious fact, that not a member of those two committees of the House was appointed a member of the committee which was to prepare this bill. It is "reported" by a committee of Republicans, not a committee of the House, to a committee of the Republican caucus.

Mr. Walker in his speech quotes the action of the caucus as given in the Post and Star, the latter being an Administration paper. The facts then given by Mr. Walker are undisputed even by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who was present and heard Mr. Walker's speech. I will insert in the RECORD that

portion most pertinent which Mr. Walker read in the presence of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], reading only the explanation the gentleman from Ohio made of this unprecedented practice:

[Washington Post, February 3, 1899.]

A CAUCUS ON FINANCE—STRONG SHOWING FOR MONETARY LEGISLATION IN HOUSE—TO NAME A COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN.

General HENDERSON made a strong speech in support of the plan embodied in his resolution, and pointed out the advantage of having this important subject committed to a body serving both in this Congress and the next, and representing the various sections of the country, and, as far as possible, its diverse business and economic interests.

CANNON IN DOUBTFUL MOOD.

Mr. CANNON said he did not think any financial legislation could be carried through until after the next Presidential election.

Representative PAYNE said it would permit careful consideration of the question during the coming months, and the preparation of such a well-matured plan as would commend itself on all hands.

Resolved, That a committee of eleven members of the present House of Representatives, who are members of the Fifty-sixth Congress, shall be appointed by the chairman of this caucus for the purpose of considering monetary legislation and submitting their recommendations to a Republican caucus at the first session of the Fifty-sixth Congress, with authority to confer with a like committee from the Senate. Adopted.

[Washington Evening Star, February 13, 1899.]

FOR CURRENCY REVISION—REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE SELECTED BY REPRESENTATIVE GROSVENOR.

Representative GROSVENOR, of Ohio, chairman of the Republican caucus, has announced the appointment of the following Republicans of the House as members of the committee provided by the resolution of the Republican caucus on currency legislation: Representatives HENDERSON, of Iowa; PAYNE, New York; DALZELL, Pennsylvania; KERR, Ohio; HAWLEY, Texas; LOVERING, Massachusetts; OVERSTREET, Indiana; CURTIS, Kansas; LOUD, California; BANCROCK, Wisconsin, and MORRIS, Minnesota.

It will be observed that no member of the Banking and Currency Committee or the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee is put upon this committee. Referring to this fact, Representative GROSVENOR said:

"I made the appointments in that way after full and free conference with most of the members of the committees and with prominent members of the House. It must not be for a moment understood that the omission of members of these committees from the caucus committee was intended to in any wise reflect upon the distinguished gentlemen who compose these two great committees, and, on the contrary, the idea prevailed that inasmuch as any bill or bills which might be agreed upon by the Republican caucus would have to go to one or both of these committees for their final action and report, it would be unwise to ask these gentlemen to make any decision or take sides in any way upon any dispute of policy or detail, and it was deemed wisest and best that the committees should remain wholly independent and noncommittal as to the details of the report, and be free to act independently, with the final judgment of each member uninfluenced and unaffected by the action of the caucus committee. In this way we will ultimately have the opinion of the caucus committee of 11 members of the House and of such committees as the Senate may see fit to provide, and then the deliberate judgment of the proper committee of the House."

I charge that the gentleman from Ohio, the leader and representative of the President on the floor of this House, promised to report his Atlantic City offspring not to the House, but to the "proper committee of the House," and I charge that he has broken his promise not only to his party but to the people at large. The members of the Fifty-sixth Congress are deprived by this action of "the deliberate judgment of a proper committee of this House on this bill." It was the first bill introduced in the House and is "No. 1" on the Calendar. It was never "reported" by any committee of this House. Briefly put, the history of this bill outside of the House, before the House had any jurisdiction of it whatever, is about as follows:

This caucus committee of the Fifty-fifth Congress, all Republicans—named by the caucus chairman, Mr. GROSVENOR—last summer repaired to Atlantic City for the consideration of this vital and fundamental legislation that reaches down into the pockets of every taxpayer of the land and conserves the private welfare of the bondholder—the running mate of the Republican party. After due consideration they swallowed their past records in behalf of bimetalism and the Constitution, washing their hands of "gold and silver;" and after "due consideration," before breakfast, "Resolved, That the hungry and naked bondholder must be clothed and fed as never before. We will say this time gold, gold, much fine gold, must be writ by the heavy hand of the law in the face of his bond of the past, the present, and the future. The people be damned. The bondholders put us in power and we must stick by them."

And they are like a band of brothers. The secretary of the national Republican committee of 1896, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. OVERSTREET, the friend of Wall street, brings their bill to this House—not to a committee of the House—introduces it; the Rules Committee fix a time—"twelve hours on a side"—for debate by 357 members of this House, and then it is to, as it will, "pass the House without the deliberate judgment of the proper committee of the House," but only the "judgment" of a dumb, driven Republican caucus. Such is the history, so far, of this bill, which later, as law, is to draw the lifeblood of the nation that the bondholder and money ghouls may feast.

I desire now to call your attention in a brief way to the attempts which have previously been made to force "gold" bonds upon the American people.

Congress, in an effort to strengthen our public credit by an act entitled "An act relating to the public debt," endeavored to make



our "public indebtedness" payable in gold, just as it tried to do by this bill, but the amendment was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 8 to 34, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Cole, Davis, Henderson, Morton, Pomeroy, Robertson, Ross, Spencer—8.

NAYS—Messrs. Anthony, Cattell, Conkling, Conness, Corbett, Cragin, Dixon, Edmunds, Ferry, Fessenden, Frelinghuysen, Grimes, Harlan, Harris, Howard, McDonald, Morgan, Morrill of Maine, Morrill of Vermont, Nye, Osborn, Patterson of New Hampshire, Sawyer, Sherman, Stewart, Sumner, Thayer, Tipton, Wade, Warner, Welch, Willey, Williams, Wilson—34.

We are not surprised at this, as it is a fact our war bonds "sold for 60 cents on an average."

Later, in 1869, Congress passed an act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," making our "public indebtedness" payable in coin, which, in the language of the Supreme Court, means the gold and silver dollar, the option belonging to the Government to pay in either or both coins.

Senator Edmunds voted against making our bonds payable in gold only in 1869, but reversed himself in 1878 and offered an amendment in the Senate making our bonds by law payable in gold only; but properly his measure was defeated by a vote of 18 to 44.

The amendment read as follows:

That all the bonds of the United States issued or authorized to be issued under the said acts of Congress hereinbefore recited are payable, principal and interest, in gold coin or its equivalent; and that any other payment, without the consent of the creditor, would be in violation of the public faith and in derogation of his rights.

Those voting "yea" were:

Anthony, Barnum, Bayard, Burnside, Christiancy, Conkling, Dawes, Eaton, Edmunds, Hamlin, Kernan, McPherson, Mitchell, Morrill, Randolph, Rollins, Sargent, Wadleigh.

Those voting "nay" were:

ALLISON, ARMSTRONG, Bailey of Tennessee, Beck, Booth, Bruce, Cameron of Pennsylvania, Cameron of Wisconsin, Chaffee, Coke, Conover, Davis of Illinois, Davis of West Virginia, Dennis, Dorsey, Eustis, Ferry, Gordon, Grover, Hereford, Hill, Howe, Johnston, Jones of Florida, JONES of Nevada, Kirkwood, McCreery, McDonald, McMillin, Matthews, Maxey, Merrimon, MORGAN, Oglesby, Paddock, Plumb, Saunders, Spencer, TELLER, Thurman, Voorhees, Wallace, Windom, Withers.

Absent 14:

Blaine, Butler, COCKRELL, Garland, Harris, HOAR, Ingalls, Kellogg, Lamar, Patterson, Ransom, Saulsbury, Sharon, Whyte.—*Record*, page 558, volume 27.

The second effort—a foul conspiracy—to force the payment of these war bonds in gold only was made by stopping the coinage of the old silver dollar in 1873 and by stripping the existing silver dollars of their full legal-tender quality in the revised statute of 1874. A panic followed and the people recoiled. They rose in their wrath and demanded a remonetization of silver for their general welfare and to pay these bonds. The people succeeded in partial remonetization in 1878 by passing the Bland-Allison law, for general purposes and to resume specie payment, while a few days before the Stanley Matthews (now known as the Teller) resolution was passed, declaring that it was just, legal, and proper and not in derogation of good faith with our creditors to remonetize and pay these bonds in the old silver dollar. These measures were all passed through the efforts of the Democratic party, and the Bland-Allison law over the veto of President Hayes, who contended that it was the agreement and right, legal, and just to pay these war bonds in gold only.

Again, on February 14, 1895, President Cleveland's plan of issuing bonds payable in gold only, by law, met with disastrous defeat in this House by a vote of 120 yeas to 167 nays. We find the following members of the present House, Republicans, who bitterly opposed and voted against gold bonds then who now favor and will vote for this bill, to wit: BROMWELL, CANNON, COOPER, CURTIS, DOLLIVER, FLETCHER, GRIFFIN, GROSVENOR, GROW, HENDERSON (the Speaker), HOPKINS, HITT, HEPBURN, HULL, LACEY, LOUD, MARSH, McCLEARY, MERCER, TAWNEY, VAN VOORHIS.

On that eventful day the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, said:

I believe in preserving the national faith. I believe that every obligation of this Government, under well-settled law as construed for almost two decades by all Administrations, and as it is to be enforced by virtue of an honest sentiment of an honest people, is payable, at the option of the holder, in gold or its equivalent.

I stop to say, in 1876 he said:

Our bonds were payable in silver or gold at the option of the Government.

He continued:

Coin means gold in the Government obligations at the holder's option. The country has so understood it; and the world so understands it to-day. \* \* \* Bear with me a minute while I state briefly my reasons for voting against this bill. I am not going into ancient history. Let us go into modern history—last month and this month.

He then proceeded in his usual powerful way to condemn President Cleveland for proposing this gold-bond measure, and continued:

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, if the President in good faith put in this reserve, in ten days gold bonds were authorized specifically by Congress—if it was done—it made them no better. Did he do it in good faith? No. Why, then, was it put in? To muddy the waters and to deceive the country, while the

favorite syndicates go away with the ten millions of dishonorable profit. [Applause on the Republican side.]

His time was extended and he finished his speech in a way that is extremely appropriate for every patriotic member of this House to close his. He said:

Now, with all these facts standing around, I say it in sorrow that I can not look with pride on the performance of the Executive of the nation. I say further that if it were a Republican Secretary of the Treasury that had made this contract this Democratic House in my judgment would have impeached him. Yet these gentlemen say our credit is gone. Why, right here I have a telegram, received this morning, that the 4 per cents due in 1907, payable in coin, command in the markets of the world a premium of 104 to-day—now—at this moment. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This same class of bonds sold December 5, 1899, at 112½.

This same question was up for consideration in this House on July 13, 1876, when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois took the very opposite position and said that our obligations were payable legally, equitably, and morally in the standard silver dollar, and cited as conclusive proof, which it was, an opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States (7 Wallace, page 26), all our bond-issuing statutes pertinent, and the report of the Treasurer, and wound up his argument in this language:

#### THE LAW AND JUSTICE.

The nature of the obligation resting upon the Government under these acts is tersely set forth in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress, as follows:

"But the purpose and meaning of the acts in question are not left open for forensic discussion, having been authoritatively settled by the unanimous opinion of the highest judicial tribunal known to our Constitution. As soon after the termination of the war as 1868 it was argued before the Supreme Court that the legal-tender notes of the United States were issued as money, a substitute for metallic currency, and that, having been made legal tender in payment of all debts, including (with certain exceptions) the Government's own, of course, when presented for payment, if similar notes, being legal tender, were offered in exchange for them, the debt would be discharged by a delivery of new notes of the same kind, and so on ad infinitum. To this argument the court replied:

"Apart from the quality of legal tender impressed upon them by acts of Congress, of which we now say nothing, their circulation as currency depends upon the extent to which they are received in payment, on the quantity in circulation, and on the credit given to the promises they bear. In other respects they resemble the bank notes formerly issued as currency.

#### SUPREME COURT.

"But, on the other hand, it is equally clear that these notes are obligations of the United States. Their name imports obligation. Every one of them expresses upon its face an engagement of the nation to pay the bearer a certain sum. The dollar note is an engagement to pay a dollar, and the dollar intended is the coin dollar of the United States—a certain quantity in weight and fineness of gold or silver, authenticated as such by the stamp of the Government."

This authoritative declaration of the Supreme Court defines clearly and precisely the meaning and intent of Congress in the acts which authorized the issue, and should be accepted as conclusive of the obligation and duty of the Government to provide for the payment in specie of all such issues.

Nor is this all. Subsequent to this decision, and for the purpose of putting a quietus upon the mischievous discussion of the subject, Congress, on the 18th day of March, 1890, declared by public act that "the United States solemnly pledges its faith to make provision at the earliest practicable period for the redemption of the United States notes in coin." (7 Wall., page 26; Chase, C. J.)

#### MR. CANNON'S OPINION.

I have referred to these acts of Congress and the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States for the reason that on the part of certain gentlemen upon this floor and a great many throughout the country there appears to be a misapprehension as to what the contract is between the Government on the one hand and its creditors upon the other; and from the above references to the law, as well as a careful examination of the text of the different acts, I am prepared to state— (7 Wall., page 26; Chase, C. J.)

#### LAW AND CONTRACT.

First. That there is not one dollar of the indebtedness of the United States, interest bearing or noninterest bearing, bond or greenback, but what the Government has the right, legal, equitable, and moral, under the contract to pay in coin, and that coin is gold or the standard silver dollar of the fineness and weight provided by law at the time the indebtedness was made.

Second. It further appears that the faith of the Government is pledged to collect duties on imports in coin (either gold or silver, or both) for the payment of interest upon the public debt.

Third. That the faith of the Government is pledged, until the redemption of the greenbacks, never to issue more than \$400,000,000 of the same.

Having shown the right under the contract to pay our debt in gold and silver, or either, let us inquire briefly as to the policy of paying our debts in silver as well as in gold.

He had already said:

#### THE BOND CONTRACT.

Mr. Speaker, I have very great respect for the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Garfield], and also many gentlemen on the other side of the House who oppose the legislation spoken of, but I do not agree with him in denouncing the proposition to remonetize silver and paying our debts with it as swindling, and his stigmatizing silver with the term "cheap and nasty."

Sir, it has with gold been used as money for ages past, and will be, in my opinion, for ages to come. It is in common with gold the money of the Constitution, and whether it has grown less valuable or gold has grown more valuable is not the question. By the letter and spirit of the contract we have the right to pay every dollar of the indebtedness of the United States in standard silver dollars weighing 412½ grains, nine-tenths of it fine silver and one-tenth of it alloy, as well as in gold, and I should like to know what right the gentleman has to denounce as swindling a proposition to do what we contracted to do. I suppose if gold were cheaper than silver, then the gentleman would say it is swindling to pay in gold.

If the gentleman owed me \$10,000, and by the contract had the option to pay it either in gold dollars or silver dollars, and had to be industrious and economize to pay either, does he claim that it would be swindling to pay me in silver dollars because they were the cheapest?

If the gentleman did business in that way on his private account, before six months had elapsed any court would appoint a conservator to take charge of his property and manage his estate.

This distinguished statesman declared silver was not "cheap" and "nasty," but that it was the money of the Constitution, and good enough for anybody, and that to remonetize the white metal we could more easily pay our bonds and that free coinage would bring about a parity. He said:

**FREE COINAGE WILL CAUSE A PARITY.**

Now, then, let us remonetize silver. There is, as before shown, about as much silver in value in the world as there is gold. The result will be that silver, as compared with gold, will grow more valuable; gold, as compared with silver, will grow less valuable, and they will meet, each traveling half-way, at about the value of the greenback; and thus we would have silver at par with gold, gold at par with silver, and the greenback at par with gold and silver.

**WE SHOULD REMONETIZE SILVER.**

But the objection is made that the United States may remonetize silver, and that Germany and the other nations will not. In answer, I say so much the greater necessity for the United States remonetizing silver; that is the only way we can get even, for by adopting the gold standard only they have made the dollar more valuable than it was when they bought our bonds and loaned us their capital; and silver ceasing to be used as money, silver coin is thrown upon the market, and has depreciated as compared with gold. Now, if we remonetize silver that will create a demand for it here, and it will flow into this country in exchange for our products, and we will in turn use it in paying our debts in common with gold as between each other, and in paying the \$50,000,000 to \$70,000,000 of annual interest upon our foreign debt.

He also decapitated the "theorist," the "politician," the "speculator," and the gold lover generally in the following very lucid and comprehensive, patriotic language:

But I want to say to the other side of the House that one-tenth part of the time given to the maturity and consideration of this measure that is used in the effort to make capital for the fall campaign will suffice to perfect the details and pass the bill.

There is another reason why this legislation should be had at once. It would settle the money question permanently. If there is any one thing more than another that paralyzes business it is the power Congress has, with our unsettled condition of finance, to tinker with the currency; it sets the theorist, the politician, and the speculator to work proposing all manner of schemes to better our condition, nine-tenths of which are purely impracticable or thoroughly selfish; the producer and the trader are kept in a state of feverish excitement, doubtful as to what bad results may follow from unwise legislation.

**THE WAY OUT.**

There is but one way out of it: Restore the money of the Constitution by remonetizing silver; give the Government and each individual the chance to comply with its or his contract; nothing more and nothing less. Then the laws governing demand and supply will regulate the money and the credit of the country as they regulate the production of corn and wheat; and under the operation of that primal law imposed upon man by the Creator, "By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," each individual, under stable laws and stable money, will work out his own salvation, and as a people we enter upon a secure and stable era of prosperity.

We here see that the opinion of this distinguished son of Illinois has changed, but I ask him if the Constitution has been changed? If the Supreme Court has reversed the 7th Wallace case? If the word "coin" means gold only? If silver is too "cheap" and "nasty" to pay the bondholder?

Mr. Chairman, a man's opinions may change, but the Constitution and the authorities the gentleman cited have not been changed or reversed, and I am at a loss to know how the gentleman from Illinois reconciles his two opposing positions, based as they are upon constitutional grounds, and that, too, when the credit of the Government is as good, if not better, than ever before; we have no "run" on the Treasury as in 1895, when he voted against gold bonds and said that if the Secretary of the Treasury in 1895 had not been a Democrat the then Democratic House would have impeached him for insisting on gold bonds.

Now, I ask him what he thinks on the question of impeachment of our present officials, who, backed by the bondholder, demand the passage of this infamous bill? We will not assume the high privilege, Mr. Chairman, of impeaching them now; we will leave to the unterrified, unbent, and unbought people of this great country that pleasing task when their tribunal sits in November, 1900. But, Mr. Chairman, this noble son of Illinois had to aid him in 1895 the eloquent, the ever-present, powerful, and distinguished son of Ohio, Mr. GROSVENOR, in opposing this gold issue of 1895. In a speech in this House, found at page 2185, volume 27, of the Fifty-third Congress, third session, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] said:

One of the main stipulations is that it is to be paid in gold because it is better than coin. Why better than coin? \* \* \*

He then demonstrated that it was not, and continued:

And when you have steered away from the landmarks of the Republican party, and the Democratic party, too, since the war, you have started in to begin the destruction of bimetalism as perfectly as if every silver dollar upon the earth were destroyed. [Loud applause.] We stand here as Republicans, pledged in our national resolutions to maintain the parity between the two metals. [Applause.] We come here and are asked by a bribe of sixteen and a half million dollars, payable in thirty years, to make the discrimination between the gold bonds and the coin bonds. Fellow Republicans, let me read to you our platform, the declarations of our principles upon which we have marched both to victory and defeat.

In 1888 we said: "The Republican party is in favor of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver."

In 1892 we said: "The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and sil-

ver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal." \* \* \*

These are the declarations of our party, and those are the principles of the Republicans of the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, for one, faithful to these platform declarations, I will not vote for this measure. [Loud applause.] I believe that it is fraught with dishonor and not with honor. I believe that the people of the United States, when they look beyond the mere temporary expressions of this Presidential message, will stand by the men who in this storm have stood by the people and against this combination of European financiers. They will stand by the men who have stood faithful to the principles and the landmarks of their party. [Renewed applause.] No man will stand longer or fight harder for the Government than I will; but I will not permit the prostitution of the powers of this Government to the building up of one interest in this country or in any other country to the destruction and overthrow of all the interests of the people of this country. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The distinguished speaker had already cited at length the gold contract proposed, etc., and said:

Our answer, Mr. Speaker, to all this ought to be that we will not do it. For the first time in the history of this country we are to put the word "gold" in our long-time bonds, and we do it for the purpose, with the stipulation that there is a difference of three-fourths of 1 per cent between "gold" and "coin." That means something. This syndicate does not offer \$16,500,000 for nothing. This syndicate does not understand that one bond is as good as another. It means more than that they will make a difference of sixteen and a half millions of dollars in the cost to the Government of these two loans.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], who in the same debate opposed gold bonds, but who now favors this bill, said:

And I want to call his [Mr. PAYNE of New York] attention to the fact that he proposes in his rescue, or attempt at rescue, the change of the whole policy of his party, to go back upon all the declarations of his party, and to institute a new method, a new policy, and call for new following.

There has never been a day since this party of his has been in existence that it has not contended for the equal status of gold and silver in the United States. [Applause.] If there is one proposition more certainly impressed upon the minds of the Republicans than another it is that we will as a party, by all means within our power, see to it that these two metals have equal potency in this land.

Here is a new departure. I am told that the Secretary of the Treasury, in his interview yesterday with a committee of this House, admitted that if this bond was issued, if this country now enters upon a policy of gold bond, no other kind of bonds would probably ever be known in its entire history. Are we ready for that? [Cries of "No! No!"]

He then read the Democrats' and Republicans' platforms on the gold and silver question and commented on the last lines of the Republican plank about—

the maintenance of the parity of the two metals, and the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, shall at all times be equal—

And with great force said:

Equal, and here we are called upon now to declare that this dollar of ours, this silver dollar of ours, has not the same debt-paying power that a gold dollar has. I affirm, notwithstanding the language of the gentleman [Mr. PAYNE] who stood here a few moments ago where I stand now, and said that our indebtedness was payable in gold alone, I say not so. [Loud applause.]

There is no obligation of the United States save gold certificates that may not honestly be paid in silver dollars [applause], and every creditor of the United States knew the fact when he permitted himself to become a creditor of the Government.—Record, volume 27, part 3, Fifty-third Congress, page 2198.

He says that in 1895, and in 1899 he speaks for gold bonds now and hereafter.

Mind you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cleveland wanted to "issue" bonds and make them payable by law in gold only, which by doing he contended we would save \$16,500,000, a certain syndicate making the proposition to take all these bonds. This House bill No. 1 proposes to make our bonds already issued and those hereafter issued and all our public obligations, past and future, payable by law in gold. Now, I ask, What syndicate is behind House bill No. 1? How much will the bond owners make without turning their hands, if this bill becomes a law, on their existing bond holdings? Millions untold! We give them almost an incalculable sum without a single recompense on the bonds already issued, while a similar profit will follow on obligations issued hereafter under this bill. I hope a calculation is possible in the near future showing how much the bondholders will make by this measure, and that, too, as stated, without raising their hands.

The last effort at gold bonds that I recall was in the Fifty-fourth Congress, when an effort was made in some Territorial obligations, then payable in lawful money, to make them payable in gold only. On a rising vote the proposition was overwhelmingly defeated, both parties voting in the main against it.

The Hon. Edwards Pierpont, in a letter to the New York Times of April 14, 1884, said not one of our bonds had any proviso for their payment in gold only. He said:

There is not an outstanding bond, coupon, or greenback issued by the United States which may not be lawfully paid in silver. Not one of them on its face or back, or in the statute authorizing the issue, or in declaration, or in resolution of Congress, has any proviso that they shall be paid in gold. And the act of February 28, 1878, directing the coinage of silver dollars, declared that such dollars shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote with great pleasure against this bill. I am a bimetalist. I believe in the free coinage of both gold



and silver at a legal ratio in full-tender coin. I believe that bimetalism is the policy and the law of the Constitution, and being founded in the Constitution it can not be repealed by any statute we may pass. The Constitution can not be repealed by statute. Gold and silver are admittedly the money of the Constitution. No unselfish, enlightened man disputes this. Therefore I contend that Congress has no power to stop the coinage of silver or gold, and that if it has the power to stop either, it can stop both, and thus deprive the people of the money of the Constitution, as well as the States, counties, and cities of our land, who do and must necessarily make and pay debts in performing their respective functions.

If the States, as they have, have the right to make both "gold and silver tender in the payment of debts" without the intervention of the United States, what right has Congress, though having the exclusive right to coin money and regulate its value, to stop the coinage of gold and silver, or either, thus directly prohibiting the States from using gold and silver or either in the payment of their debts? No such right or power was granted to Congress.

Indeed, the States, under the Confederation, and therefore before the Constitution, had the right to coin the money of our colonial and Revolutionary fathers, and when the Constitution was formed they reserved to themselves, the States, expressly in the Constitution the right to make, and therefore the right to have, gold and silver full legal tender, simply surrendering to the Congress the power and right to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." Previous to the Confederation, as a colonial inheritance, anterior to the Constitution, as now, I contend, the people had and always reserved to themselves as their own personal and collective right the privilege—nay, more the right—to take their money metal, gold and silver, to the public mint and have it made into money whenever they chose to so do. They fought for and wrested from Mother England this right. It came with our independence more than a century ago. It is theirs, and it does not belong to the Congress nor the States, and never did, to shut up the mints and shut off the people from the high privilege of taking their money metal at will to the mints for coinage.

There are three terms in the Constitution that refer to money. They are "gold and silver," "money," and "dollars," and appear in the following form, to wit:

The Congress shall have the power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coins.

No State shall coin money, make anything but gold and silver tender in the payment of debts.

By amendment to the Constitution, Article VII, it is ordained:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.

The term "money" was used, as shown by Elliott's Debates, in framing the Constitution, as synonymous with "gold and silver." They meant then one and the same thing. The term "gold and silver" was settled upon at the same time, as shown by Elliott's Debates, after grave and many discussions. The word "and" is clearly conjunctive and not disjunctive. Unsuccessful efforts were made during these debates, as they show, to insert the word "or" where "and" now appears, but finally abandoned, and the conjunctive word "and" was used to fasten the two metals together in the Constitution, as they now read—gold and silver—there to remain until amended, and not to be disjoined by a statute, State or national. Bimetalism is therefore a part of and embedded in the Constitution. The money unit is there in the same way. It rests on both metals.

And Mr. Hamilton, in his report on the Mint, quotes the Constitution as I have, except amendment 7, and upon that, as well as a wise policy, fixed the money unit on "both metals," which Mr. Jefferson approved and all of our Presidents down to the crime of 1873, when gold only was made the money unit, which is being perpetuated in the present measure. In support of these contentions I take pleasure and pride in citing the speeches of some of the greatest statesmen we ever produced—Hamilton, Jefferson, Webster, Gallatin, Hunter, Jackson, Garland, John Randolph Tucker, Morgan, Beck, Pierrepont, Thurman, Coke, Maxey, Isham G. Harris, Vest, Cockrell, and, strange to say, President Hayes. President Hayes, in his fourth annual message, 1890, said:

The Constitution in express terms recognizes both gold and silver as the only legal-tender money. To banish either of these metals from our currency is to narrow and limit the circulating medium of exchange, to the disparagement of important interests.

President Hayes saw the error of his veto message in 1878, and before his time expired we find him thus speaking and urging Congress to perpetuate the coinage of the silver dollar, so prosperous had our country become under the influence of the Bland-Allison law, which he had vetoed.

Mr. Blaine, in a speech on February 7, 1878, said:

First, I believe gold and silver coin to be the money of the Constitution—indeed, the money of the American people anterior to the Constitution, which that great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare that either metal should not be money. Congress has therefore, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold; no power to demonetize either any

more than to demonetize both. In this statement I am but repeating the weighty dictum of the first constitutional lawyers. "I am certainly of opinion," said Mr. Webster, "that gold and silver, at rates fixed by Congress, constitute the legal standard of value in this country and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace this standard." Few persons can be found, I apprehend, who will maintain that Congress possesses the power to demonetize both gold and silver, or that Congress could be justified in prohibiting the coinage of both; and yet in logic and legal construction it would be difficult to show where and why the power of Congress over silver is greater than over gold, greater over either than over the two. If, therefore, silver has been demonetized, I am in favor of re-monetizing it. If its coinage has been prohibited, I am in favor of ordering it to be resumed. If it has been restricted, I am in favor of having it enlarged.

On the money unit Mr. Blaine said:

I believe the struggle now going on in this country and other countries for a single gold standard would, if successful, produce widespread disaster in the end throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver as money and establishing gold as the sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect on all forms of property except those investments which yield a fixed return in money. These would be enormously enhanced in value and would gain a disproportionate and unfair advantage over every other species of property. If, as the most reliable statistics affirm, there are nearly seven thousand millions of coin or bullion in the world, not very equally divided between gold and silver, it is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and utterly disastrous to tens of thousands. Alexander Hamilton, in his able and invaluable report in 1791 on the establishment of a mint, declared that "to annul the use of either gold or silver as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of the benefits of a full circulation with the evils of a scanty circulation." I take no risks in saying that the benefits of a full circulation and the evils of a scanty circulation are both immeasurably greater to-day than they were when Mr. Hamilton uttered these weighty words, always provided that the circulation is one of actual money and not of depreciated promises to pay.

In the report from which I have already quoted Mr. Hamilton argues at length in favor of a double standard, and all the subsequent experience of well-nigh 90 years has brought out no clearer statement of the whole case nor developed a more complete comprehension of this subtle and difficult subject. "On the whole," says Mr. Hamilton, "it seems most advisable not to attach the unit exclusively to either of the metals, because this can not be done effectually without destroying the office and character of one of them as money and reducing it to the situation of mere merchandise." And then Mr. Hamilton wisely concludes that this reduction of either of the metals to mere merchandise (I again quote his exact words) "would probably be a greater evil than occasional variations in the unit from the fluctuations in the relative value of the metals, especially if care be taken to regulate the proportion between them with an eye to their average commercial value." I do not think that this country, holding so vast a proportion of the world's supply of silver in its mountains and its mines, can afford to reduce the metal to the "situation of mere merchandise." If silver ceases to be used as money in Europe and America, the great mines of the Pacific slope will be closed and dead. Mining enterprises of the gigantic scale existing in this country can not be carried on to provide backs for looking-glasses and to manufacture cream pitchers and sugar bowls. A vast source of wealth to this entire country is destroyed the moment silver is permanently disused as money. It is for us to check that tendency and bring the continent of Europe back to the full recognition of the value of the metal as a medium of exchange.

Mr. Blaine, as did the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, found the money unit is fixed on both metals by and in the Constitution.

The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, took the same position of Mr. Blaine, citing the same authorities, Hamilton and Jefferson, in his speech in 1876, and said in addition:

And let me here say that we have just as much right under our contract to call silver the unit or standard of value and par and to say that the greenback is above par by 11 per cent and gold above par by 24 per cent as advocates of the gold standard have to claim that gold should be the unit or standard of value and that greenbacks are below par and that silver is below par.

Now, sir, we all remember that a few days ago the distinguished gentleman [Mr. CANNON] said to my colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON] that he was living in the present, and not living with "the ghouls in the graveyards." I want to know if the distinguished gentleman has placed the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, which in 1876 he stood by, in the grave with the money ghouls? I want to know if he has placed the Constitution of his country in the grave with the money ghouls? He said that under the Constitution and under our laws and under the common law gold and silver were full legal tender when coined by our Government, and in concluding his speech he said all would be well if we restored silver to its time-honored place. [Applause.]

Entertaining, Mr. Chairman, these views, based, as they are, upon the wise policy of bimetalism as set forth in the Constitution, which I am sworn to support, I must vote against this bill. It is contrary to the Constitution and its principles and the welfare of the people, and is framed and driven through this House by the bondholders, who would desecrate these sacred principles to fill their pockets with money poured into our coffers by the taxpayers of their country, who are soon to groan under its heavy burdens. This bill perpetuates gold as the money unit. It perpetuates the single gold standard. It perpetuates and intensifies the further demonetization of the old silver dollar. It demonetizes, debases, and restricts the money uses of silver, and casts suspicion over all our other moneys. It puts the bondholder and his rights above the masses and their rights. It bleeds the plain people for the aristocratic bondholder. It is a plutocratic measure throughout.

The express policy of this Government on finance is to keep our two money coins on a parity, and so determined are our people on this that Congress has expressed this policy in an old and now existing statute that is the law of the land. This bill does make



inevitably a disparity between the two coins by the mighty hand of the law. It disarranges that parity between the two coins our statutes were enacted to maintain. The bill is, therefore, contrary to public policy as expressed in our statute law and at the ballot box. I oppose the bill for that reason and for turning the people, very largely, over to the national banks for their paper money. You know the banks can let out and call in their bank issues, and by doing so can make or break the surrounding communities and States. Andrew Jackson successfully opposed such a menace to the public welfare. He was right then, and the principle is right now.

Make our bonds payable in gold only, and at once the bondholder loses all interest, if he has any, in the silver bullion or silver coin. He becomes silver's enemy at once. Why? Because his bond, once payable, can no longer be paid, in silver coin, but is payable in gold only. He would rather bear than bull the price of silver, because it would increase the price of gold, make his gold dollar worth that much more of silver.

He would further divorce the price of the two coins, the very thing the Government is pledged to maintain and encourage. Continue our bonds as coin bonds, and we continue the selfish interest of the bondholder with our efforts to maintain the parity of the two coins. Again, make our obligations payable in gold only, and we make the owner thereof the personal and political enemy of domestic bimetalism and international bimetalism, because in such event silver would become the equal in fact of gold—that is, meet each other halfway, and thus reach what we call a parity.

You can see at once that gold bonds will become the stumbling-block in our endeavors to maintain the established policy of our Government, expressed by existing statutes, of maintaining the parity of the two coins and to the achievement of bimetalism, which the people want. This bill, when law, intervenes and cuts off all hope of any such arrangement, in the face of the fact that the Bryan and McKinley vote combined in 1896 favored international bimetalism if it could be had, while in addition the Bryan vote was for bimetalism without waiting for the consent of any nation.

This law is the straw that breaks the camel's back. But bimetalism by and through the Republican party is now an abandoned policy, and this measure is conclusive proof of the fact. We must look to the Democratic party, that ever has been and ever will be, so long as it remains true to its past history, the friend of the masses in truth, for that bimetalism with which our forefathers were familiar, planted by them in the Constitution.

Again, this bill, making all of our past, present, and future public obligations payable in gold only, creates, I contend, unnecessarily an increased demand and call for our gold coin and gold metal, and thus the immense increase in our gold production will be gobbled up in paying off these gold obligations, thereby necessarily turning this large gold increase from the everyday channels of trade and commerce into Wall street and the stock jobbers' recesses.

In this way the good effects of our increased amounts of gold money are reduced and fall short of the happy effect that would follow if we continued the payment of our bonds and public obligations in coin, gold and silver, or either, and in the discretion not of the payee but payor, as at law, and as it should be and was until the Republican party gave the option to select the money of payment to the payee.

Much has been said in the House about prosperity. When war was declared against Spain the Dingley tariff was proving a failure as a revenue producer. The issue of bonds to pay the necessary expenses of the Government were almost in sight when war was declared. A war tariff was imposed on our people, and everything in sight, except a few rich concerns that were able to control legislation, was taxed.

The Government then sent its purchasing agents throughout this country and said to the owners of any war paraphernalia, "What is your price? We want your property to carry on this war." The owner set his own price, and the Government paid it, spot cash. In this way not only large sums of money were scattered throughout the country, but large prices were given, as we all know—some outrageously exorbitant. This increased demand and sudden dissemination of money throughout the country started the wheels of many a closed manufactory and caused the sale of many products that had been lying on the shelf for a long time.

There is a difference, Mr. Chairman, in saying to a party, "How much will you take for your property?" and paying at once the price demanded, and a property owner going out and looking for a purchaser and begging some one to buy at any price. Again, war was declared and the President called for over 200,000 volunteers. They were, and must have been, able-bodied and, in the main, fine business men. They were swept into the camps of the country and detained there for a long time. Their places had to be and were filled by those left behind, who were idle and had been for months, if not years. In this way idle labor was

absorbed and increased wages demanded and received, for urgent orders were had, war orders, that had to be filled in a certain time.

The result was that in places prosperity and an increase of wages followed. I hope it may continue, but I doubt it. This prosperity is a war prosperity. We had the same thing north of the Ohio River during the civil war thirty years ago. Labor, as you all remember, became so scarce that Congress appropriated several millions of dollars and sent agents to Europe to encourage foreign labor to come to the United States, and succeeded. Here is a case where history is repeating itself, except we had enough idle labor at home to do our work. I hope this prosperity has come and come to stay, but I doubt it. What I want, Mr. Chairman, is general prosperity, a prosperity for everybody, and one that will come and stay.

I desire here briefly and hurriedly to reply to some statements made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], who led off in a set speech.

First. "That the Spanish mill dollar was never coined in America"—but it was coined in foreign countries and brought to America in immense amounts, and served our colonial and Revolutionary fathers faithfully and for many years.

Second. "That the act of January 18, 1837, changed the ratio from 1 to 16 to 1 to 15.988 by again modifying the quantity of metal in the coin." This statement is misleading. The amount of fine silver in the old silver dollar was never changed, while the amount of fine gold in the gold coins was reduced twice—1834 and 1837.

Third. The coinage act of February 21, 1853, did not discontinue the double standard nor the free coinage of the old silver dollar or the gold coins. It simply reduced the amount of fine silver in the half-dollar, quarter, dime and half-dime, and limited their tender of the coinage thereunder—for what? To prevent their exportation, while the Government assumed the right to buy bullion and coin these small coins to increase their coinage and secure a much-needed small change. The half-dollar, quarter, and dime coined up to the act of 1853, amounting to \$85,436,376, were and remained full legal tender up to the act of 1874. In none, no, not one, of our coinage laws, up to April 1, 1873, was standard silver demonetized. Free coinage of the gold and silver dollars and eagles was cautiously guarded and continued down to 1873. Even the trade dollar was given the right of free coinage.

Fourth. The gold standard begun with us April 1, 1873, when the coinage act of February 12, 1873, took effect. Previous to this date the people could take either or both their gold or silver untrammelled to our mint and have it coined in the full legal-tender money. It is false that we were previous to 1873 on a gold standard. These facts can not be successfully disputed, though often smeared over by the gold advocates and the truth ignorantly, if not corruptly, perverted to mislead a confiding public. I quote again, in conclusive proof of my contention, from the very high authority on any subject in this House, from the speech of the honorable Representative from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, in this House July 13, 1876. This he said:

And, strange to say, the United States being the debtor nation, having the right to pay that debt in gold and silver of a certain fineness, with her vast mineral wealth, especially of silver, that is being developed by the labor, pluck, and energy of the Americans, under the lead of science and experience, has unwittingly assented to the demonetization of silver. This legislation was had in the Forty-second Congress, February 12, 1873, by a bill to regulate the mints of the United States, and practically abolished silver as money by failing to provide for the coinage of the silver dollar.

It was not discussed, as shown by the RECORD, and neither members of Congress nor the people understood the scope of the legislation. The result is that gold has become the only standard by which values are measured, silver ceasing to be used as money, and gold as compared with silver has become more valuable, and silver as compared with gold has become less valuable, so that if we actually pay in gold, not having the privilege to pay silver, we have decreased our ability to pay by at least from 20 to 30 per cent; in other words, we decrease our ability to pay by the amount of silver we have to pay with, it no longer being available to us to pay in the discharge of our indebtedness the same as gold. \* \* \*

He then quotes from a leading Republican official, as follows:

Dr. Linderman, Director of the Mint, fully understood this, for in his report for the year 1873, page 21, he says:

"The gradual adoption of the gold standard and consequent demonetization of silver will, of course, be followed by an increase in the value of gold, or, what is the same thing, a decrease in the price of articles measured by it. Indeed, it is quite certain that this effect is already perceptible in some portions of Europe."

I may add that Dr. Linderman, in his book, *Money and Legal Tender*, at page 44, says:

The declaration in the coinage act of 1873 that the gold dollar was thereafter the unit of value, and the omission of the silver dollar from the coins to be struck under the provisions of that act, placed the United States upon the single gold standard.

This is clear and explicit.

Again, up to at least 1857 we had the foreign silver coins full tender in immense quantities, and the \$77,015,348.50 half dollars, quarters, dimes, and half dimes coined before 1853, that were full tender up to 1874, and the old silver dollar was still open to free coinage.



The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. OVERSTREET, in his speech of Monday, says:

Prior to 1873, when the gold standard was adopted, there had been issued by the Government only 8,031,238 silver dollars.

Here he admits the advent of the gold standard was in 1873, but is unfair enough to state that we coined only 8,031,238 silver dollars, which is clearly misleading, and at most a half truth, for, in addition to that number of silver-dollar pieces, we coined before the act of 1853, in half dollars, dimes, and half dimes, \$77,015,348.50 which was full legal tender, as much so as the silver or gold dollar.

The amount of these small coins and their full-tender quality is overlooked by the gold advocates, and hence this reference. The following official letter is given, which is self-explanatory:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,  
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1899.

SIR: As requested by you, I append herewith a statement of the coinage of fractional silver (excluding 3-cent pieces) from 1792 to June 1, 1853, and the coinage of silver dollars from 1792 to February 12, 1873.

Coinage of fractional silver—1792 to June 1, 1853.

Half dollars.....	\$36,492,644.50
Quarter dollars.....	4,606,595.50
Dimes.....	4,016,731.10
Half dimes.....	1,899,377.40

Total.....	77,015,348.50
Silver dollars, 1792 to February 12, 1873.....	8,031,238.00

85,046,586.50

Respectfully,

GEO. E. ROBERTS,  
Director of the Mint.

HON. J. W. GAINES,  
House of Representatives.

We then had current legal-tender silver coin before 1873, \$85,046,586.50 and oceans of foreign full-tender silver coins, which well served the people and bondholder alike.

In 1806 the old dollar coinage was suspended by Mr. Jefferson, but the legal right remained to coin it nevertheless, and in addition, on April 20, 1806, ten days previous to this order of suspension, May 1, 1806, President Jefferson approved a bill making foreign gold and silver coins full legal tender in the payment of debts, which more than took the place of the suspended silver-dollar coinage and supplied every want of the people.

At no time did Jefferson suspend the coinage of standard silver money. On the contrary, in the order suspending the old dollar coinage he continued the free coinage and urged the coinage in large amounts of the half-dollar, quarter, dime, and half-dime, which, as I have stated, were full legal tender in the payment of all debts, public and private. It is a foul aspersion upon Jefferson's patriotic deeds and his democratic acts to say that he thus abused the bimetallic principles planted in the Constitution, which he helped to write, as well as the first mint report, in which he said to Mr. Hamilton:

I return you the report on the mint. I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals.

And yet by this bill the fraud of 1873, which put the unit on one metal, gold, must be perpetuated, and all our public obligations, past and future, are to be paid in gold only. Here is the language of the order suspending the old dollar coinage, found in the Secretary of State's office in 1878:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, May 1, 1806.  
ROBERT PATTERSON, esq.,  
Director of the Mint.

SIR: In consequence of a representation from the directors of the Bank of the United States that considerable purchases have been made of dollars coined at the mint for the purpose of exporting them, and as it is probable further purchases and exportations will be made, the President directs that all silver to be coined at the mint shall be of small denominations, so that the value of the largest pieces shall not exceed half a dollar.

I am, sir, etc.,

JAMES MADISON.

President Jefferson did this:

First. Twenty days before (April 20, 1806) he stopped the dollar coinage (May 1, 1806) he created a substitute entirely acceptable by making foreign silver full tender for all debts, the Spanish milled dollar being already a full tender.

Second. He stopped the silver dollar coinage thereafter to prevent its exportation and to encourage and give place to the increased coinage of the full-tender small silver coins to supply change much needed.

Third. The free coinage in increased quantities of full legal-tender silver coins was continued and they were coined in larger amounts.

Fourth. He perpetuated the bimetallic double standard of the Constitution, because the half dollar, quarter, dime, and half dime were full legal tender and left open to free coinage.

Fifth. He continued the money unit on both metals and the full tender quality to all old silver dollars and foreign silver coin.

Mr. OVERSTREET says:

The debates in Congress just prior to the passage of the act of February 21, 1853, clearly marked the change of sentiment against the further effort to maintain a double standard.

This I deny, because, first, the double standard was perpetuated;

second, the increased use of silver was provided for; third, the free coinage of gold and silver was continued; and, in addition to that, Senator R. M. T. Hunter, of Virginia, as chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, denounced the adoption of either one of the metals alone as ruinous to the welfare of the people. He declared:

The mischief would be great indeed if all the world were to adopt but one of the precious metals as the standard of value. To adopt gold alone would diminish the specie currency more than one-half; and the reduction the other way, should silver be taken as the only standard, would be large enough to prove highly disastrous to the human race.

Again, Mr. Sanford, of New York, by a report made to the Senate in the Twenty-first Congress, amongst other things, said:

The necessity of occasional adjustments is a small inconvenience when compared with the great inconvenience of using only one of the metals, and such has been the experience of mankind.

Strange, indeed, must be that policy which can tolerate 500 different kinds of paper money and can not tolerate both gold and silver.

The Constitution of the United States evidently contemplates that the money of this country shall be gold and silver. Our system of money, established in 1792, fully adopts the principle that it is expedient to coin and use both metals as money, and such has always been the opinion of the people of the United States.

Albert Gallatin, banker, financier, and statesman, favored the double standard and, in speaking of England demonetizing silver, said:

Even if the precedent were good, it could not be conveniently adopted by the United States. To the exclusion of silver there are great objections. The American dollar, or 37½ grains of pure silver, is the unit of money and standard of value on which all public and private contracts are founded.

Again, Mr. OVERSTREET says, in speaking of the Bland-Allison Act.

With all the ills which this measure (act of 1878) brought upon the country, it was far to be preferred to an absolute free-coinage bill.

Mr. Chairman, I deny there were any ill effects from that law. Prosperity throughout this gold-standard-cursed land came, and promptly, to the humble and exalted, the sweeter and the bondholder, the States and the Federal Government. And I challenge the gentlemen to show a single message or Thanksgiving proclamation of President Hayes that does not support my declaration. We accumulated over four hundred and seventy millions of gold in the Treasury. Our coin bonds were sought for. The rate of interest was reduced. The Treasury was overflowing. Resumption was made easy. The public credit was good, and better than ever before, and President Hayes stated the facts and figures supporting it in his messages.

The Bland-Allison Act was passed over the veto of President Hayes, who wanted our "public indebtedness" paid in gold. In his veto message, as in his former messages, he said in effect that to remonetize silver would destroy the business of the country and to pay our bonds with silver dollars was "an act of bad faith." In vetoing the Bland-Allison law President Hayes said:

The right to pay duties in silver or in certificates for silver deposits will, when they are issued in sufficient amounts to circulate, put an end to the receipt of revenue in gold, and thus compel the payment of silver for both the principal and interest of the public debt. One billion one hundred and forty-three million four hundred and ninety-three thousand four hundred dollars of the bonded debt now outstanding was issued prior to February, 1873, when the silver dollar was unknown in circulation in this country and was only a convenient form of silver bullion for exportation; \$583,440,350 of the funded debt has been issued since February, 1873, when gold alone was the coin for which the bonds were sold, and gold alone was the coin in which both parties to the contract understood that the bonds would be paid. The sum of \$225,000,000 of these bonds has been sold during my Administration for gold coin.

In the face of the fact that this \$1,143,493,400 of bonds were issued prior to 1873, when the old silver dollar was unknown in circulation, but still open to free coinage and a full tender, yet they were all coin bonds, not gold bonds only, or silver bonds only, but coin bonds. In the face of the fact that \$583,440,350 of the funded debt was issued since 1873, and before the Bland-Allison law was passed and when the silver-dollar coinage was stopped, still they were coin bonds, not gold only or silver only, but coin bonds, and payable in gold and silver, or both, or some of each. And in the face of the further fact that \$225,000,000 of these bonds were sold after 1873, as President Hayes said, for gold coin, they, too, were made coin bonds, not gold only or silver only, but coin bonds. Now, it would have been easy for Congress, particularly from 1873 to 1878, to have said, by law, as you are now trying to say, that these bonds were payable alone in gold; in fact, making the bond payable on its face in gold; but it did not. And why not? Because the Government rightfully reserved to itself the alternative which the term "coin" gave—that is, to pay in either coin, or both, whichever was easiest, cheapest, and best to be paid at the time.

But now this alternative is being surrendered, so that the Government will be compelled to pay in gold only, regardless of whether it has gold on hand at the time of payment or not. More bonds will be issued and sold for gold, with which to keep up these endless gold payments and satiate the money ghouls' "run" on his country's Treasury.

In the face of the prophecies that dire destruction would follow to the business of the country if silver was remonetized, we find

President Hayes, on the 30th of October, 1878, in his Thanksgiving proclamation, saying:

Exuberant harvests, productive mines, ample crops of the staples of trade and manufactures have enriched the country. The resources thus furnished to our reviving industry and expanding commerce are hastening the day when discords and distresses through the length and breadth of the land will, under the continued favor of Providence, have given way to confidence and energy and assured prosperity.

President Hayes, in his last annual message, December 6, 1880, says:

The condition of the financial affairs of the Government, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, is very satisfactory. It is believed that the present financial situation of the United States, whether considered with respect to trade, currency, credit, growing wealth, or the extent and variety of our resources, is more favorable than that of any other country of our time, and has never been surpassed by that of any country at any period of its history. All our industries are thriving. The rate of interest is low. New railroads are being constructed. A vast immigration is increasing our population, capital, and labor. New enterprises in great number are in progress, and our commercial relations with other countries are improving.

He further says:

The continuance of specie payments has not been interrupted or endangered since the date of resumption. It has contributed greatly to the revival of business and to our remarkable prosperity. The fears that preceded and accompanied resumption have proved groundless. No considerable amount of United States notes have been presented for redemption, while very large sums of gold bullion, both domestic and imported, are taken to the mints and exchanged for coin or notes. The increase of coin and bullion in the United States since January 1, 1879, is estimated at \$227,399,423.

December 7, 1878, in his annual message, President Hayes says:

We are at peace with all other nations. Our public credit has greatly improved, and is now perhaps stronger than ever before. Abundant harvests have rewarded the labors of those who till the soil, our manufacturing industries are reviving, and it is believed that general prosperity, which has been so long anxiously looked for, is at last within our reach.

In this same message President Hayes says by its terms—that is, by the act of February 25, 1862—

the public debt should have been reduced between 1862 and the close of the last fiscal year, June, 1878, \$518,361,806.23; the actual reduction of the ascertained debt in that period has been \$720,644,729.61, being in excess of the reduction required by the sinking-fund act, \$202,282,923.33.

The amount of the public debt, less cash in the Treasury, November 1, 1878, was \$2,024,200,063.18, a reduction since the same date of the last year of \$23,150,617.39.

In the face of this happy result of the remonetization the President adds this:

The progress made during the last year in refunding the public debt at lower rates of interest is very gratifying. The amount of 4 per cent bonds sold during the present year, prior to November 23, 1878, is \$1,270,900, and 6 per cent bonds, commonly known as five-twenties, to an equal amount have been or will be reduced as calls mature.

The President stated that the gold coinage for the last fiscal year was \$52,798,980, and the silver dollars coined under the act of February 28, 1878, to the 23d of November, amounted to \$19,814,550. He then continues:

With views unchanged in regard to the act under which the coinage of silver proceeds, it has been the purpose of the Secretary faithfully to execute the law and to afford a fair trial to the measure.

And we see the happy results of a faithful execution of the law. He then continues:

In the present financial condition of the country I am persuaded that the welfare of legitimate business and industry of every description will be best promoted by abstaining from all attempts to make radical changes in the existing financial legislation.

On the 3d of November, 1879, President Hayes, in his Thanksgiving proclamation, said:

At no recurrence of the season which the devout habit of a religious people has made the occasion for giving thanks to Almighty God and humbly invoking His continued favor has the material prosperity enjoyed by our whole country been more conspicuous, more manifold, or more universal.

Again, on December 1, 1879, the President begins his message at a period, as he said—

calling for mutual congratulation and grateful acknowledgment to the Giver of all good for the large and unusual measure of national prosperity which we now enjoy. The most interesting events which have occurred in our public affairs since my last annual message to Congress are connected with the financial operations of the Government, directly affecting the business interests of the country. I congratulate Congress on the successful execution of the resumption act. At the time fixed, and in the manner contemplated by law, United States notes began to be redeemed in coin.

Since the 1st of January last they have been promptly redeemed on presentation, and in all business transactions, public and private, in all parts of the country, they are received and paid out as the equivalent of coin. The demand upon the Treasury for gold and silver in exchange for United States notes has been comparatively small, and the voluntary deposit of coin and bullion in exchange for notes has been very large. The excess of the precious metals deposited or exchanged for United States notes over the amount of United States notes redeemed is about \$40,000,000.

The resumption of specie payments has been followed by a very great revival of business. With a currency equivalent in value to the money of the commercial world, we are enabled to enter upon an equal competition with other nations in trade and production.

Further on in his message the President says:

Since the resumption of specie payments there has also been a marked and gratifying improvement of the public credit. The bonds of the Government bearing only 4 per cent interest have been sold at or above par sufficient in amount to pay off all of the national debt which was redeemable under present laws. The amount of interest saved annually by the process of refunding the debt since March 1, 1877, is \$14,297,177. The bonds sold were largely in small sums, and the number of our citizens now holding the public securities is much greater than ever before.

The amount of the national debt which matures within less than two years is \$792,121,700, of which \$500,000,000 bears interest at the rate of 5 per cent, and the balance is in bonds bearing 6 per cent interest. It is believed that this part of the public debt can be refunded by the issue of 4 per cent bonds, and, by the reduction of interest which will thus be effected, about \$11,000,000 can be annually saved to the Treasury. To secure this important reduction of interest to be paid by the United States further legislation is required, which, it is hoped, will be provided by Congress during its present session. The coinage of gold by the mints of the United States during the last fiscal year was \$40,986,912. The coinage of silver dollars since the passage of the act for that purpose up to November 1, 1879, was \$45,000,850, of which \$12,700,344 have been issued from the Treasury and are now in circulation and \$32,300,506 are still in the possession of the Government.

President Hayes, in his Thanksgiving proclamation of November 1, 1880, says:

At no period in their history since the United States became a nation has this people had so abundant and so universal reasons for joy and gratitude at the favor of Almighty God or been subject to so profound an obligation to give thanks for His loving-kindness and humbly to implore His continued care and protection. Health, wealth, and prosperity throughout all our borders; peace, honor, and friendship with all the world; firm and faithful adherence by the great body of our population to the principles of liberty and justice which have made our greatness as a nation, and the wise institutions and strong frame of government and society which will perpetuate it—for all these let the thanks of a happy and united people as with one voice ascend in devout homage to the Giver of All Good.

If such a condition of our public credit and condition of the people as President Hayes states existed throughout his term of four years is to be called a period of "ills," I am at a loss to know what a prosperous era is.

#### APPENDIX.

*Money question reviewed by Percy Kinnaid, of the Nashville bar—1897.*

The cupidity and rascality of certain classes in this country since its first settlement have brought evil and disaster upon the people and tended to overthrow and change the theory and form of our Government. On the other hand, the practical wisdom of the people, as expressed in experiments of the Government, has demonstrated what is the correct method of issuing money. Each has, at different periods, had their turn in issuing money, and though the first-named class, with bank notes, has always succeeded in entailing loss and disaster upon the people and it has been imperative for the Government to issue Treasury notes to repair this loss and save the property of the people, the Government has grown none the wiser.

Notwithstanding the number of times the Government has been forced to issue Treasury notes to protect the people from serious loss and to preserve its very existence, and which has demonstrated that the sole motive for so issuing money was to subserve in the highest degree the interest of the people by accommodating them in the easy exchange of their products, so soon as this has been accomplished bank notes have invariably returned and driven the Treasury notes out of circulation. The sole motive for the issue of money should be to accommodate in the highest degree the exchange of products among the people.

Whenever money has been issued for this purpose alone and made a legal tender or solvent of debts, both public and private, it has invariably served the interests of the entire people with the highest efficiency until it received the blow of hostile legislation of those who desired to substitute their bank notes in the place of the Treasury notes.

Whenever money has professedly been issued to accommodate the people in making their exchanges, and has only been made a legal tender in part, viz, for public, not private, debts, the friends of bank notes have always refused to receive it and in some instances have influenced the Government not to receive it, and thus forced it to a discount, and then demanded its retirement and the issue of bank notes. If it is conceded, as it must be, that the basic idea and dominant motive for the issue of money at all is the purpose to accommodate the people in making the exchange of their products, then certainly it should never be lost sight of or departed from in the formation of a financial system.

As civilization expands the country enlarges, population increases, and exchanges become intricate and on a magnitude that forces the abandonment of cash transactions. We are compelled to realize that this condition of affairs has to be met and provided for.

This is a natural and advantageous growth in the affairs of humanity that everyone should welcome and encourage with voice and hand, but not if it is at the expense of any portion of the people from the abuses of governmental legislation.

If a people can grow into the development above described with advantage to themselves, the country, and to humanity, it is well and good; but if this growth is at the expense of the many and enriches the few, creating distinctive and noxious class interests, threatening to the peace of society, it were well to discover the cause and remedy it before revolution, as it will, cures or makes worse the evil.

It may truthfully be said that the growth of the issue of money in a country is the growth of its civilization and that in this sense "moral growth is real growth; moral decay is real decay." Applying this thought, if a correct one, to the civilization of this country, and the inclination is strong to examine into the growth of our financial system and ascertain wherein and in what particulars it has taken on the excrescences that engendered all the corruption of that enhanced class interest which has grown so bold and shameless in its determination to keep what it has appropriated.

It is easily seen that under an advanced civilization the exchange of products that could not possibly be made by barter and trade could easily be made with a legal-tender currency. It is also easily seen that as population increased and the diversity of occupations enlarged the growth of cities would project the completion of large contracts into the future and create the debtor and creditor classes. Under this condition there was cash payments and future payments to be made in cash or credit. In both these instances actual cash payments were made. As the number of people increased and exchange of products became more intricate notes, bills, and drafts were used, but final settlements were made with the actual use of legal-tender money.

Finally there came a time in the transactions of this country, as is the case with all countries of advanced civilization and great power, when the magnitude of exchange made it a physical impossibility to transact business in the expectation or with the idea of making settlements with the actual use of legal-tender money. The only way in which business of this magnitude could be carried on at all was by a system of "bookkeeping" that had grown up in keeping an intelligent record of the manifold and almost incomprehensible variations of the daily, monthly, and yearly transactions which were taking place in the different parts of the country, and in some cases throughout the world, or wherever man went in his propensity to trade.



This system of "bookkeeping" is called the "credit system," as contradistinguished from all other methods of making exchanges, and should never be confused with credit.

The distinction between the "credit system" and all other modes of making exchanges and payments for same commences at that point where the settlement of balances and the liquidation of accounts in legal-tender money is an annoyance and undue expense in the actual handling of legal-tender money.

Just here lies the error of our present financial system. Notwithstanding the magnitude of many business interests in every State in the Union, and especially in the East and the more immediate Western States, has long been such that it is ridiculous to think of them handling legal-tender money in their business, except in the limited use that may be made to pay current expense, and that their business is conducted necessarily by the "credit system," or the "bookkeeping" theory, yet in contemplation of law all that vast and almost inconceivable volume of exchange of products is payable finally in legal-tender money.

Consequently whenever the ringleaders in this country or in Europe want to, for holy or unholy purpose, they make the demand for cash payments and precipitate a catastrophe that the Government is unable to ward off, even if the public officials attitudinizing as servants of the people were not the agents and tools of the ringleaders.

The growth of the business of this country has long since reached such proportions in many lines that the individual is completely barred.

It has been given over to chartered companies, and as it increased, the possibilities under our financial system and legislation are such that trusts and combines are naturally entered into with a purpose of complete absorption of that business.

The individual is thus driven from one field of employment to another and is fast becoming so restricted in his opportunities that he is being rapidly reduced to the condition of a wage slave more intolerable than that of chattel slavery. If the business of the country in many instances has grown to such proportions that it is ridiculous to think of their payments and settlements being made in the actual use of legal-tender money, and the use of such plebeian methods are not even contemplated in their business affairs, why should it not be separated from and made independent of a system that is the lifeblood of the business of the people?

They laugh and jeer at the idea that it makes any difference whether there is much or little money in circulation, claiming that only 4 per cent of the volume of all business is carried on by money, and the balance, 96 per cent, by the "credit system."

They deride the idea that if the volume of money is reduced it makes any difference, claiming that if you give much for it, either in labor or products, it will reimburse you when you part with it for the equivalent of what it cost you.

They claim that they have little or no use for money, because the bulk of their transactions are carried on by the "credit system," and that there is plenty of money to carry on the cash transactions, which are only 4 per cent of the volume of business.

If this is so and they do not need and do not use actual cash in their business, which is 96 per cent of the volume of all business, it is a false policy to leave the system so that at any time they want to they can demand the payment of this 96 per cent of the volume of all business in actual legal-tender money, and thereby precipitate a financial catastrophe that they call an object lesson.

The only way to disarm them and take this powerful engine of oppression from their use is to separate the "credit system" from cash and credits.

This would leave both systems to be used by those who used the "credit system," and secure cash and credit to the actual users of money, undisturbed by the rascality and manipulation of those who use the "credit system." But so long as the people can be cajoled into maintaining the present system that fleaves the money class the enjoyment of the "credit system," and in addition the right and power to formulate, control, and direct the money system, with the added power, at any hour, to demand the payment of all their vast business and indebtedness in actual legal-tender money, the conversion of the property and products of the people will go forward until in the near future they will be the masters and the people serfs.

This separation of the "credit system" from the system wherein there is actual use of money, and taking away from the "credit system" the right to demand legal-tender money, whenever cupidity may incline, has been done in the history of the race (notably in the Bank of Venice), and can and will be done again when statesmen and not the mere politicians are at the helm. Not satisfied with this control and domination over the volume of business and the method and manner of payments, they demand the right to issue their bank notes in the place of the greenbacks and the silver dollars, and they deny the right of the Government to issue money direct to the people.

This right to issue bank notes is maintained to-day by the threat to demand payment in legal-tender money of the vast indebtedness due them, and whenever and at such times as Congress attempts to pass contrary legislation, the call for payment in legal tender in vast amounts is made, precipitating in embryo a catastrophe that is termed an object lesson, and which is relieved so soon as Congress has been deterred from acting in the interest of the people. There was one of these object lessons in 1893, when it was decided to force Congress to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman law and cease the coining of silver, and there will be another and more serious one this year in the attempt that will be made to induce Congress to retire the greenbacks and silver dollars and pass a banking law. To determine how this will be of advantage, and why it is regarded as so necessary, can be best shown by a cursory examination of the history and growth of the issues of money in this country.

It is unnecessary to consider the first two hundred and fifty years of our financial experiments, except to state that it consisted of all forms of barter and the use of the most primitive kinds of money; that as the country gradually took on the forms and assumed the manners of a higher civilization, it enlarged its purchases from Europe. This required the use on the part of the colonist of the same money that was current in Europe, and the demands for the metals became imperative.

This demand for metal money first affected Massachusetts, because of its higher advancement in civilization, and in 1649 that State, in order that it might secure the needed coins, demonetized beads that had been legal tender.

So great was the necessity at that time for metal money that the people of that State were glad of an opportunity to open up business relations with the buccaneers of the Spanish main.

This association of the much-lauded Puritan with the buccaneers of the Spanish main to secure a full supply of metal money did not secure enough for foreign use and local purposes, and in 1690 they were compelled to issue \$35,000 of paper money. This was forced upon the State after the return of an unsuccessful expedition against the French in Canada.

The soldiers had come back without any spoils of war, were in a miserable condition, and so clamorous for their pay that this paper money had to be issued. It was made redeemable in any stock at any time that might be in the treasury, and for twenty years it circulated at par until it was redeemed. In 1708 Massachusetts made a second issue of \$75,000 of paper money that was made a legal tender for private debt.

In 1716, \$750,000 more of paper money was authorized to be issued on real-estate security for ten years at 5 per cent interest.

In 1720, \$250,000 more was issued.

During this time South Carolina, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maryland, Delaware, and some of the other colonies under similar pressure for money for local need that the metals might be used in foreign trade had also issued paper money, and in most instances it was made a legal tender.

The Bank of England was organized in 1691, and in 1723 it suspended payment.

In its preparation and effort to resume the coin of the American colonies was needed and it was drawn across the ocean in the same peremptory manner that the East has drawn the coin out of the South and West since 1893 to keep their banks from suspending.

All the coin left Pennsylvania, though the colony passed laws raising its value. It was therefore forced in 1723 to issue treasury notes to supply the demand for local currency, and the notes were made a legal tender and redeemable only in payment of taxes. In 1740, notwithstanding the previous issues, the necessity for additional money was such that the colony of Massachusetts endeavored to secure more currency by establishing a land bank. It was denied this right by the governor of the colony, who claimed that it was unlawful and pernicious, contrary to the act of Parliament, and to his instructions.

The people of Massachusetts were beginning to feel the iron hand of the financiers of England, and in their extremity they laid aside their Puritan principles, called to their aid the characteristics of their buccaneering ancestors, and in 1745 made a predatory incursion upon the French and captured Lewisburg, on Cape Breton, which they despoiled.

The British Parliament so highly approved this exhibition of their buccaneering propensities dominating the heretical puritanic convictions that it ransomed Lewisburg from the colony, paying therefor a large sum of silver and copper.

Thereupon the colony of Massachusetts (that had received but small assistance from the other colonies), with the greater share of this ransom money, announced the intention of paying off her paper money and going to a sound-money basis.

This action of Massachusetts had the effect of drawing a large part of the trade of the other colonies to its market, and consequently was calculated to depreciate the value of the paper issues of the other colonies.

It was most disastrous to New Hampshire and Rhode Island on account of their proximity.

This loss of their trade checked their progress, lessened the demand for the use of their paper money, deprived them of the specie that it would have brought them, and the natural consequence was that the value of specie increased and their paper money was forced to a discount.

This was Massachusetts' first taste of the blood of humanity, drawn by financial buccaneering, and not with the buccaneer's sword and its attendant dangers, and was so much more in consonance with their professed puritanical principles that they have followed it every since.

The people realized fully the advantage that had accrued to them and the colony from the ransom money of the despoiled city and the use they had made of it at the expense of their sister colonies, and indifferent then as now and as they have ever been to the wail of suffering humanity, if it was caused by schemes that advance their prosperity and increase their wealth, does anyone doubt that they began secretly to influence the financiers of the Bank of England that the colonies ought not to be allowed to issue paper money?

From the use and enjoyment of a full supply of legal-tender paper money from 1690 to 1745, and then the capture, despoilment, and sale of a city, assisted by the method in which they used their ill-gotten gains at the expense of their sister colonists, the people of Massachusetts succeeded in clearing up their sterile and rocky lands and were far advanced on the road to material prosperity and riches.

Appreciating, as they must, the disadvantages they had suffered from and labored under so long in their trade relations with England and the necessity there was for them to secure sufficient metal money at any and all cost to carry on trade at home and abroad, and fully realizing that a full supply of legal-tender paper money for local use was the main cause of their success, it would naturally be supposed that solicitude for the younger, weaker, and struggling colonies would have prompted them to take no action that would injure or be detrimental to their sister colonies.

On the contrary, however, they at once proceeded to use the specie they had received for looting a city to go to a sound-money basis, conscious of the fact that in so doing they were applying to the other colonies similar impositions to those England had so inhumanly applied to them. From that time to this at first Massachusetts, and subsequently the East, has preyed and fattened off of the South and the West as it came into existence.

Going to a specie basis and the consequent despoilment of the other colonies of a large portion of their trade inured so much to the benefit of Massachusetts that by 1773 that colony had paid off all its paper money and debts and was on a specie basis.

The effect upon the other colonies was that their trade had decreased, their debts had increased, their paper money was at a discount, and they had to borrow from the people of Massachusetts.

This had been caused to a great extent by an act of Parliament in 1751, prohibiting the colonies from issuing paper money.

This prohibitive act seems to have had only the effect intended, that of depreciating the value of paper money and increasing the trade of specie-paying Massachusetts, for it appears that Virginia first issued paper money in 1755, notwithstanding the act.

This failure on the part of the colonies to obey the act of 1751, as Massachusetts was doing in gradually retiring her paper issues because it was to her interest, caused the British Board of Trade, in 1764, to object to the use of legal-tender paper money by the colonies, on the ground that "every medium of exchange should have an intrinsic value, which paper had not."

The British Board of Trade, the financiers of the Bank of England, and the people of Massachusetts finally succeeded, and in 1773 Parliament passed an act that took away from the colonies their representative money, commanded that no more paper money should be issued and that they should cease to be a legal tender, and demanded payment of taxes in silver.

This contraction of the currency paralyzed all the industries of the people. "Ruin seized upon these once flourishing colonies; the most severe distress was brought home to every human and family; discontent was urged on to desperation, till at last 'human nature,' as Dr. Johnson phrases it, 'arose and asserted its rights.'" Thomas Pownall, M. P., of England, who had acted as governor and commander in chief of all the provinces, in a book written by him in 1763, says in regard to this colonial system of money: "In a country under such circumstances money lent to settlers creates money. Paper money thus lent upon interest will create gold and silver principal, while the interest becomes a revenue that pays the charges of the government. This currency is the true Pactolean stream which converts all into gold that is washed by it."

The desperation caused by this destruction of the colonial currency, and which contracted the volume of currency to such an extent that all enterprise perished, and the realization that the colonists would soon lose all their possessions and virtually become serfs of the English money lenders, brought on the Revolution. The English owners of gold and silver, in the folly of their mad avarice and the false assumption that if Massachusetts could go to a specie basis the other colonies could also, made the Revolution a certainty by the



following act of Parliament passed in 1775, viz: "That all promissory or other notes, bills of exchange, or drafts, or undertakings in writing, being negotiable or transferable, for the payment of any sum or sums of money less than the sum of 20 shillings in the whole, \* \* \* shall be, and the same are hereby, declared to be absolutely void and of no effect."

Two years after this was followed by an act extending these provisions to all sums under £5. This was going to a hard-money basis with a vengeance.

The poor man was denied the right to make any trade to be paid in the future, but was forced to pay in cash in all transactions under \$5 at first, and subsequently in all transactions under \$25. This was too much for Massachusetts even. A sound-money basis of her own selection—and that was a good scheme for her people, although at the expense of her sister colonies—was well enough, but when she realized that all the transactions of her people under \$5 must be in cash, and appreciated that a specie basis of that kind was detrimental to her interests, they were keen for the fighting to commence.

Therefore, when the English officials demanded of the people of Massachusetts the stamp tax upon the tea in specie, after they had made the use of specie a necessity in all local trades under \$5, they realized, in the scarcity of specie, that English greed had outwitted them, and that they were going to be deprived of all the gains they had hoped to make off of their sister colonies in going to a specie basis.

Thoroughly enraged that English greed should gather the inhuman profits they were willing to take from the other colonists, their inherited buccaneering courage backed up their Puritan ideas of independence and freedom, and they threw the tea into the sea, declaring undying war to the tyrants.

Ostensibly the people of Massachusetts fought for independence and freedom from love of liberty and patriotism, but it was the freedom and liberty to despoil the other colonies it fought for, unrestrained and without fear of English interference.

This is clearly evidenced in the influence of that colony as to the manner of the issuance of paper money to fight the war of the Revolution; in the action of its delegates in framing the financial part of the Constitution; in the action of her public men in and out of Congress ever since in all financial legislation, and in the attitude of its people at the present time, demanding bank notes and the gold basis.

In preparing for the war the act of June 25, 1775, passed by the provisional government authorized the issue of \$2,000,000 in notes that read as follows:

"This note entitles the bearer to receive — Spanish milled dollars, or the value thereof in gold or silver, according to the resolution of the 10th of May, 1775."

Entering actively upon preparation for war with Great Britain because the acts of Parliament in 1773 and 1774 had forced them to a specie basis when, according to the best estimate, the colonies only had five millions of gold and silver, they are guilty of the fatal error of issuing six millions in notes redeemable in gold and silver.

In their ignorance of finances, or from ulterior motives of some powerful and sinister influence, their first issue of money inflicts upon the people the very grievance that was driving them to war with Great Britain. This manner of issuing notes was not the Pennsylvania method inaugurated by Franklin and of which Thomas Pownall thought so favorably.

It was not the method of the colonies that made the notes a legal tender for all debts, public and private, and made them redeemable in taxes.

It was not the method which provides and arranges for a safe, full, and acceptable money for local uses and makes it possible to have all the gold and silver for trade with foreign nations that Massachusetts had availed itself of from 1690 to 1773.

But it was the buccaneering policy of Massachusetts glossed over with hypocritical Puritan professions of patriotism and love of liberty that she thought had been fastened upon her sister colonists at the time she went to a sound-money basis. They were not made a legal tender in payment of public or private dues. After the war was over her delegates were instrumental in having the power denied to the States and withheld from Congress of emitting bills of credit or paper money and giving to Congress only the right to coin gold and silver.

The result of this has been that whenever money was needed banks have been given the right to issue notes, and the country has through all its history been afflicted with their worthless issues.

Whenever new territory was settled and money was needed, as Massachusetts did in her early days, instead of being able to do as Massachusetts did for such a while and so advantageously, they have been forced to borrow from Massachusetts and the East, until the East in this manner has absorbed nearly all the surplus wealth of the South and West. Her public men were instrumental in demonetizing silver and repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, with the purpose of enhancing the value of the debt due Massachusetts that was forced upon the people of the South and West in being forced to borrow money of her people.

Her public men and people to-day are active and vociferous in demanding the retirement of the greenbacks, the withdrawal from circulation of all silver dollars, and the adoption of the gold standard in order that a banking law may be passed, so that they can issue their notes in the place of the greenbacks and the silver dollar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I find an interview in the Washington Post this morning that purports to have been had with Mr. W. J. Bryan, now at Austin, Tex., on the subject of the bill before the House, and he closes the interview as follows:

It should certainly never be permitted to pass the House, because it is not in the interest of Democracy.

I have heard the criticism made by the gentleman who has taken his seat as to the manner in which this bill is before us. It seems to me it would be higher statesmanship on the part of gentlemen on the other side to discuss the effect of this bill on the country rather than its effect either upon the Republican or Democratic party. I propose to attempt to discuss it in that way. The discussion on my part will necessarily be a dry one, and I ask the considerate attention of the House for a while.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One moment—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HILL. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman read an interview, and I think inadvertently. As I read it, Mr. Bryan said it was because it was not in the interest of the people.

Mr. HILL. This interview says because it is not in the interest of Democracy.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman from Connecticut read the whole interview?

Mr. HILL. I have practically. I shall have to ask not to be interrupted, because my time will not allow me to complete my remarks.

Webster's Dictionary gives several definitions of the word "standard;" one, "That which is established as a rule or model by respectable authority, by custom, or by general consent;" another, with relation to coinage, "The proportion of weight of fine metal and alloy established by authority."

Our coinage law uses it in the latter sense only, and as such it is applied to the quality or fineness of both gold and silver alike, declaring "that the standard for both gold and silver coins shall be such that of 1,000 parts by weight 900 shall be pure metal and 100 of alloy." But it adds "that the one-dollar piece, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains of gold, shall be the unit of value."

The law of 1878 provides for the coinage of a silver dollar of the weight of 412½ grains troy of standard silver, but it nowhere makes this another unit or measure of value.

By common usage in the political discussions of the past three years the word "standard" has been applied to the metal and not to the fineness or quality of the metal, and, singularly enough, in the title of the bill under consideration, as well as in the Senate bill, the word is used with its broader meaning, referring to the basis of our financial system, and then in the first section of both bills in a restricted or specific sense, describing a peculiar characteristic of that basis and defining certain conditions which shall pertain to it.

I think it is this double use of the term standard rather than any ambiguity of the law itself which has caused doubt to exist in the minds of so many of our people as to the legal status of the measure of value in this country.

There is no question whatever that under the law since 1873 the only standard unit of value here has been, and is now, the gold dollar, consisting of 25.8 grains of standard gold or 23.22 grains of pure gold, and the fact that a silver dollar is a legal tender under certain conditions does not make it another standard unit of value any more than it makes a dollar greenback possessing larger legal-tender qualities a standard unit of value also.

Both of these are only means of payment or commercial tools, but both must be measured by the established unit of gold.

The purpose of this bill is not to fix another unit, or, using the common acceptance of the term, to establish another standard, but rather, at the demand of the people of the country, to recognize and emphasize the one we have and provide some way by which all of our currency and our whole commercial system shall be put and kept in accord with it.

That gold has been the touchstone, as it were, by which all other things have been tested from the earliest recorded times needs no argument now, and that as civilization has advanced to higher planes gold has by its inherent qualities demonstrated its superiority to everything else as a medium of exchange is beyond dispute.

The only question remaining is whether it now exists in quantities sufficient to be the only medium of exchange throughout the world, for if all forms of money are made exchangeable for it at the will of the holder it thus becomes the universal solvent.

This was disputed in this country three years ago, and even now the arguments then advanced are oozing out at intervals to sustain a dying cause; but while the controversy has been going on the miner's pick and dynamite have solved the problem, and to-day 89 per cent of all international trade is settled by the use of gold.

The question now is, Is there enough for us; and if so, how can we best use it as our medium of exchange in our domestic trade?

I do not use the word "enough" as in any way connected with the quantitative theory of money, for I do not accept that theory; but I mean enough, together with the other instruments of trade, to conveniently provide for the necessities of to-day.

Six years ago our silver friends said that gold and silver both were needed as redemption money, and the commercial value of the world's product of both was then \$280,055,900.

In 1898 the product of gold alone was \$287,428,600, and in the past six years, from 1893 to 1898, \$1,267,271,100 have been added to the world's constantly accumulating supply of an imperishable money metal.

I have often thought that our timid bimetallic friends believed, or acted as if they did, that the crop of gold, like the world's food supply, was wholly consumed each year, instead of accumulating as it has through all the ages; but the proof is clear and plain that the great bulk of gold produced goes into and remains in money use.

The known, visible holdings of gold in the banks and treasuries of twenty-two countries of Europe increased from 1893 to 1898, inclusive, \$603,323,711.

Of this increase they lost in 1898 \$190,025,073, but it was almost wholly from the Russian Imperial Bank and treasury, and was, in the process of gold resumption, distributed among the Russian



people. But Mr. De Witte, the Russian minister of finance, says in his annual report that "there has been an actual increase in the general amount of gold in the country during the year 1898."

Assuming that this is correct, and adding the known increase to the stock of gold in the United States for six years prior to the 1st of July, 1899, which was \$365,800,699, and we have accounted in these countries alone for \$969,124,410 increased money supply out of the world's product of a little over twelve hundred millions in these six years.

But why weary the members of this House with dry statistics to prove that which even the casual observer of the world's progress now admits—namely, that the gold supply is rapidly approaching, if it has not already reached, the point where it meets the necessities and convenience of the world?

How is it in the United States?

In 1873 the per capita stock of money was \$21.36, being \$3.24 of gold, 15 cents of silver, and \$17.97 of paper. On December 1, 1899, it consisted of \$1,018,133,208 in gold, or \$13.25 per capita; \$644,491,755 in silver, or \$8.38 per capita; \$590,523,084 in paper, counting no certificates or Treasury notes, or a per capita of \$7.68; making a total of \$2,253,148,047, or a per capita of \$29.31, of which 45 per cent is gold and 55 per cent is silver and paper, which we propose by exchangeability to make and keep as good as gold.

This is the task which we have undertaken, and it is a tremendous one.

That its greatness may be more clearly understood, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that, according to the latest statistics which I have, in 1897 the monetary stock of Great Britain consisted of 72 per cent of gold and 28 per cent of silver and paper; of France, 58 per cent of gold and 42 per cent of silver and paper; of Germany, 66 per cent of gold and 34 per cent of silver and paper.

Since adopting the gold standard, Germany has reduced her per capita of silver from \$7.47 to \$4.07, in 1897, and now she is about to recoin the greater part of her legal-tender silver into subsidiary coin.

She has found her burden, though small compared with ours, too great for her to carry. When the bullion in the Treasury is all coined, as is now being done under the law, we shall have \$601,239,276 of legal-tender silver.

In the presence of this distinguished company of financiers, for we can all be thus classified this week, I hesitate even to offer a suggestion; but is it not a serious question whether, in time of panic, or with the balance of trade running strongly against us, or with a deficit in our Treasury, we can maintain gold redemption and exchangeability of gold with silver, unless some permanent disposition of the greenbacks is made and more rigid methods provided for holding our excessive volume of silver in circulation as change money among the people?

I shall vote for this bill with great pleasure, for, even as it is, it is far in advance of any former step taken by this House, and gives great promise for the future; but the country is calling for mandatory provisions where this bill allows discretion, and is demanding that the question of the maintenance of parity shall be so definitely settled now that it will require the united action of the Executive and both Houses of Congress ever to disturb or break it.

In September last I was present at the annual meeting of the American Bankers' Association at Cleveland, an organization representing a very large proportion of the State banks, trust companies, and national banks of the country and attended by more than a thousand delegates, representing nearly every State and Territory. This resolution was passed unanimously:

*Resolved*, That the bankers of the United States most earnestly recommend that the Congress of the United States at its next session enact a law to establish more firmly and unequivocally the gold standard in this country by providing that the gold dollar, which under the existing law is the unit of value, shall be the standard and measure of all values in the United States; that all obligations of the Government and all paper money, including the circulating notes of national banks, shall be redeemed in gold coin, and the legal-tender notes of the United States, when paid into the Treasury, shall not be reissued except upon the deposit of an equivalent amount of gold coin.

Mark the language. The banks themselves demand that their own notes shall be redeemable in gold, and that Government notes once coming in for redemption or paid in in the ordinary course of business shall not be reissued except upon the deposit of an equivalent amount of gold coin, making practically gold certificates of every one of them.

This done, and your silver given the whole field of change money by the limit of \$10 placed upon circulating notes, your endless chain would be broken, and bond issues would be unnecessary if a Republican Administration and excess revenues continued for another four years.

Oh, that the timidity of the legislator might give place to the courage and confidence of the people of this land!

Nevertheless I rejoice in voting for this bill, for it makes every obligation for the payment of money an obligation to pay gold or its equivalent, and that puts the poor man's wage and the bondholder's coupon upon an equal footing.

It writes upon the face of every life-insurance policy and across the cover of every savings-bank book "Payable in gold."

While it means lower interest rates on mortgages and bonds, it means larger dividends on stocks, for every currency obligation will be gold, and the accumulated capital of the Old World will be drawn to the fixed investments of the New, so that the money now locked up in waterworks, sewers, completed railroad construction, and public works of all kinds where the necessity for employing labor is exhausted can be transmuted into live capital for new construction and further development and the employment of the home capital at greater profit in untried risks.

It will open up new mines, build more ships, dig more canals, and do more than any other one thing to render permanent the prosperity which abounds to-day.

A few months ago I received a letter from a gentleman in Connecticut, from which I wish to quote as touching this point:

The people are constantly calling for more money, but at the same time some of them are doing their utmost quite effectually to lessen the volume, as may be seen from the following facts: Early in September in London I asked one of the largest dealers in money in the world why England did not take all of the stocks in the market of such character as St. Paul preferred, New York Central, New York and New Haven, and those of other first-class roads that would net more than 4 per cent interest, instead of investing in European securities that pay less than 3 per cent. His reply was, "Because they are currency obligations, and Europe is still in doubt whether the basis of the currency of the United States is to be gold or silver. The London market is destitute of American railway shares of an investment character. They have all been sold and sent home, and had I an order to buy them I should be obliged to fill it in New York."

The day I left Liverpool for home one of the finance committee of the Liverpool, London, and Globe Insurance Company, a gentleman who knows this country well, told me it was useless to suggest in committee a larger investment in American securities, "because of the danger of silver legislation; remove that danger and hundreds—yes, thousands—of millions of European money would come like a flood for investment."

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, section 2 of this bill removes that danger by declaring that every obligation for the payment of money shall be discharged with gold or its equivalent, and I do not propose to quibble now over the details of sections 3 and 4, for behind this declaration will stand the majesty, the honor, and the conscience of 75,000,000 of people, who will demand under all political changes that the spirit as well as the letter of the law shall be enforced.

In dropping further consideration of this topic and passing to the banking features of the bill, may I not express the hope that the same unanimity of opinion that characterized the committee which had the honor of compiling this bill may, after more extended deliberation and before its final enactment into law, prompt them to eliminate all discretionary provisions and make the exchangeability of all forms of money at the will of the holder absolute, unequivocal, and mandatory, for I believe that the unquestioned maintenance of parity will irresistibly drive every Secretary who administers this law in good faith to precisely that course of action.

The pending bill, so far as it relates to banking, touches three subjects: First, increased circulation; second, taxation; third, minimum limit of capitalization.

During the past four years, whenever any proposition relating to national banks has come up for action in this House, I have noticed the remarkable unanimity which has characterized the unvarying opposition of the Democratic membership, and have wondered whether this antagonism was toward all banks or only to the national system.

In the attempt to solve the doubt I have briefly noted the declarations of that party in its national platforms since 1836 relating to banking and currency. They are as follows:

Platform of 1836:

We declare unqualified hostility to bank notes and paper money as a circulating medium, because gold and silver are the only safe and constitutional currency.

Platform of 1840:

*Resolved*, That Congress has no power to charter a United States bank.

Platform of 1844: Resolution of 1840 reaffirmed.

Platform of 1848: No expression.

Platform of 1852:

*Resolved*, That Congress has no power to charter a national bank, etc.

Platform of 1856: Same resolution reaffirmed.

Platform of 1860: Same resolution reaffirmed.

Platform of 1864: No resolution.

Platform of 1868:

One currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the officeholder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder.

Platform of 1872:

The public credit must be sacredly maintained, and we denounce repudiation in every form and guise. A speedy return to specie payment is demanded alike by the highest considerations of commercial morality and honest government.

Platform of 1876:

As such hindrance we denounce the resumption clause of the act of 1875, and we here demand its repeal.

## Platform of 1880:

Honest money (the strict maintenance of the public faith), consisting of gold and silver and paper, convertible into coin on demand.

## Platform of 1884:

We believe in honest money, the gold and silver coin of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss.

## Platform of 1888: No currency resolution.

## Platform of 1892:

We recommend that the prohibitory 10 per cent tax on State bank issues be repealed.

## Platform of 1896:

Congress alone has the power to coin and issue money. We therefore demand that the power to issue notes to circulate as money be taken from the national banks and that all paper money shall be issued directly by the Treasury Department.

The only conclusion that I can draw from these declarations is that in its early youth the Democratic party was opposed to any form of paper money, and especially to bank-note issues.

In middle life and vigorous manhood it fell in love with State banks and note issues without limit or supervision, and now in its old age and declining years it demands that all paper money shall be issued directly by the Treasury Department, with no provision for payment except that it shall be receivable for public dues.

Is it not true in this, as in another historic case, that "the last state of that man is worse than the first?"

I have no authority to speak for anyone but myself, but my belief is that the only safe currency system for this country, or indeed for any country, is gold for its legal tender, a subsidiary coinage of silver for change money, and bank-note issues for commercial instruments; and all such notes should be issued by banks under the direct supervision and control of the General Government, and under such provisions of safety, either by the deposit of bonds or other guaranties, that there can be no possibility of loss to the holders thereof.

A government can not put money into circulation except in payment of debts already contracted, and when it pays with notes it has no returning stream of assets with which to meet them, for, while it often borrows, it never lends.

It can impose taxes, but can not adjust the time of payment to meet its notes, for, if they circulate as money, they must be on demand.

With a bank it is not so. It lends its credit in exchange for that of others, and for every dollar note that it puts out, at the time it does so it receives another back on which it expects to realize either on demand or at a fixed date in the future.

Again, the issue of notes by a government in payment of its debts has no relation to the business necessities of the people or the needs of trade, but a bank can only issue notes legitimately in response to commercial demands.

And yet we count a Government note as money, and in the statement of the condition of the United States Treasury, which the members of this House receive each day, millions of them are classed as cash on hand and counted as a part of the available cash balance, when, as a matter of fact, for every one put out a new obligation is at once created.

The absurdity of the whole thing is shown by the fact that a national bank is forbidden by law from counting its own notes as cash on hand, notwithstanding it has previously deposited with the Government its own bonds as security for their payment.

But the question here is, Shall a national bank be permitted to issue circulation within the limit of its capital to par of the bonds deposited as security?

The proposition is a plain one.

It is simply this: Will the United States accept its own bond of \$100 as good security for \$100 or only for \$90?

Think for a moment what this means.

By the exercise of its taxing power, this Government says to its own people, "You shall not organize banks and issue notes unless you do it under the national banking system, and if you do it under that system you shall buy the bonds of the United States Government to a certain amount."

"We will not take less than \$100 for a single bond, but when you have bought it we refuse to accept it as collateral security for more than \$90."

What would be thought of an individual who had another in his power and made such a proposition as that to him?

I fancy that Shylock in his palmy days never dreamed of such a bargain, even when the mosquitoes of Venice were singing him to sleep on the banks of the Grand Canal.

It would seem as though the simple statement of the proposition would be the best demonstration of its utter absurdity, and yet for thirty-five years this has been the effect of this law, and for all that time it has locked up millions of dollars of margin and premium that under any business treatment of the case would have been active working capital and used in developing the industrial and commercial resources of this nation.

Almost as much as the entire monetary stock of Canada and

Mexico combined is lying idle here because this great Government still clings to the idea that its own bond is not absolutely safe for what it sells at.

It may not be known to all that the national-bank law, as originally drawn, February 25, 1863, provided for issuing circulation—equal in amount to 90 per cent of the current market value of the United States bonds, but not exceeding the par value thereof, if bearing interest at 6 per cent, or of equivalent United States bonds bearing a less rate of interest, but limited by the capital stock.

This provision remained in force until the act of June 3, 1864, which limited the issue of notes based on bonds bearing not less than 5 per cent interest to "not exceeding 90 per cent of the amount of said bonds at the par value thereof," and with this act began a series of attempts to fetter and control the banking capital of this country, every one of which has been a complete and total failure and most of which have been repealed.

Complaint is made to-day that the national-bank system does not measure up to the financial requirements of the times; that its note issues are insufficient and nonelastic; that it locks up capital instead of sending it out free and unencumbered to do its beneficent work, and in some respects the charge is true; but this is not due to the system itself, but rather to the miserable and senseless restrictions that have been placed upon it, which during all these years have held it as in a vise.

Twice it has come to the rescue of his nation—first, when it made a market for our bonds and supplied the means to carry on the war, and, second, when it made resumption possible, and gratitude alone should prompt at least a recognition of its usefulness.

In 1864 the limit of circulation was fixed at three hundred millions, when at that very time there were eighty-six millions of capital in the national and four hundred and five millions in the State bank system.

The minimum limit of capital stock was fixed and still remains at \$50,000, and in 1865 the privilege of issuing notes was graded from 90 per cent down to 60 per cent, according to the capital of a bank.

This same year an attempt was made to distribute arbitrarily circulation among the States and Territories, which was about as effective in its results as the seed distribution was last year upon the crops of 1899.

In 1870 the amount was increased to three hundred and fifty-four millions and a redistribution attempted on the basis of the census of that year, and the limit for any one bank was fixed at \$500,000.

Taxes were laid on deposits and circulation, and reserves of 15 per cent and 25 per cent ordered to be held against both.

Most of these restrictions proved to be total failures, and in 1875 the separate and aggregate limit and the provisions for the distribution were repealed, and now the only limit of capitalization of a bank is the necessities of commerce, and of circulation 90 per cent of capital stock. The reserve against circulation has been removed and the tax taken from deposits, and should be from circulation, for there is no more reason for taxing money than there is for taxing air and water, for money is the life-blood of trade and commerce.

In 1892 another turn of the screw was made and laws were passed making it impossible to issue and withdraw notes at will, with the result that when the pinch came in 1893 and a currency famine made excessive calls for notes it took months to supply the demand, and then the trouble was over and months more passed by before withdrawals could be made.

Is it surprising that a system so hampered and tied down should not in every case respond to the business wants of this great nation?

Is it not a greater wonder that it has survived at all? And it would not if it had not possessed elements of vitality and strength that made it indestructible.

In 1882 Comptroller John Jay Knox advised an increase of circulation to 95 per cent of the market value of the bonds he'd, and every Comptroller, Republican and Democratic, from that day to this has repeated the recommendation in a more or less modified form.

In my judgment, the wise course would be to permit an issue of notes to the market value of the bonds, for behind this is the first lien upon all of the assets of the bank, and the liability of the stockholder added, so that no possible loss could ever come to a bill holder if such a plan were adopted.

But this bill provides for an issue to par only, and its probable immediate effect would be to add about twenty millions of national-bank notes to the currency of the country.

Furthermore, by giving a possibility of a slight profit on circulation, it may stimulate the taking out of circulation by banks which now have none, and may encourage the organization of small banks in the West and South.

We have more banks in New England now than we need.

As the law now stands the profit on note issues based on a 4 per cent bond of 1907 is less than one-third of 1 per cent, but that result is only obtained by having all money loaned all of the time and all at 6 per cent, which in actual experience is utterly



impossible, and the probabilities are that very few banks can to-day show any profit on circulation.

The best proof of this is that in New York City alone there is a note issue of but seventeen millions against forty-nine millions of capital, and in the whole country there are four hundred and thirteen millions of unused privilege.

The special benefit to be derived from this change in the law seems to me to be the impetus it will give to the organization of small banks in the newer sections of the country.

✓ The average capitalization as I found it a year or two ago under the national banking system was \$178,000; under State laws, \$88,000, and of private banks, \$31,000.

Reduce the limit of possible capital to \$25,000, give circulation to par of the bonds, withdraw all taxes from it, and I have no doubt but that large numbers of State and private banks will reorganize under the national system with results that would be exceedingly beneficial in many ways.

When I last examined this subject 66 per cent of our population resided in communities of less than 4,000 inhabitants.

By the last census there were 2,810 towns of from 1,000 to 4,000 people.

The national-bank system would give to them not only lower rates of interest but larger capital, and, what is of more importance, far greater security for deposits than most private banks can offer.

Protected by Government supervision and control, the capital of other States would flow in for investment where it would never be sent to be subject to State legislation or individual management.

Three years ago the report of the Comptroller showed that of the 525 banks in Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, one-third of the capital was contributed by Eastern stockholders. Of the 144 banks in Dakota, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, and Arizona, one-half was from the same source; and of the 410 banks in the South, one-sixth was from the North and East.

It is utterly impossible that this could be, except under the national system.

But not only would this bring in the capital of nonresidents, but it would develop a habit of depositing in banks the money which is now carried in the pocket and kept in the home in those sections where such facilities are not afforded, and every dollar so placed at once becomes an addition to the loanable funds of the community.

Such a system would soon become a splendid contribution to the business of the larger banks in the reserve cities and would furnish exchange between different points at far less cost than now.

Unite with these national banks in the small towns of the West and South the mutual savings-bank system of New England under the same management and without additional cost, as our laws permit, until the aggregate of deposits reaches half a million dollars, and the best feature of New England life will be transplanted to those sections of our country where now the use of pennies is unknown.

Such a community will soon become self-developing and self-reliant.

I refer with pardonable pride to the results of a system grown up from such beginnings in my own State.

The population of Connecticut is 746,258, and its savings-bank depositors number 375,810, with an average deposit of \$435.01 each and the splendid total of \$163,482,498.52. Match it in this Union if you can. This is where our 54,000 majority came from in 1896. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Last year 52,589 accounts were opened and 43,443 closed, and in ordinary years following up each closed account may be found a separate cottage built, a home furnished, or a child educated, and back of the open account—a guaranty against days of adversity or times of sorrow and a constant incentive to industry—economy and thrift, the virtues which are worth far more to a State or nation than mines of gold and silver or untold millions of legal-tender paper notes, which we sometimes call money.

It may be inferred from what I have said that I am in favor of the organization of small banks, and so I am, if nothing better can be had, but I would greatly prefer the branch-bank system.

It is a popular idea that, by the reduction of the minimum of capital to \$25,000 in small towns, banking facilities will be provided in communities where there are not deposits or business enough to justify a larger capital.

Of course those are agricultural communities.

Instead of less than one-third of 1 per cent profit on circulation under the present law, assume, under the provisions of this bill, that in 6 per cent localities 1 per cent could be made.

It needs no argument to show that at any reasonable rate of interest on \$25,000 it is impossible to maintain an independent organization, provide the management and equipment for a national bank, and return a reasonable profit to the investor.

It follows, therefore, that deposits must be added to a consider-

able amount or very heavy rates for discounts charged to even meet expenses, and where such rates of interest can be charged and are paid it is more profitable to loan capital direct than to invest it in low-interest bonds, bought at a high premium, on which to issue circulation.

Hence, in such communities the private banker has full sway and makes his own terms for loans, and will continue to have control until, by a system of branch banking, agencies for large and strong institutions are permitted to come into competition with him.

Deposits of at least double the amount of capital will be necessary to maintain an independent existence.

There is another fact which should be considered with reference to this feature of the bill.

The strength of a bank is its capital.

The deposit is a liability.

While deposits provide loanable funds, less the reserve required, the margin of safety to the depositor is in the precise proportion which capital bears to deposits.

A bank with \$100,000 of deposits and \$50,000 capital is twice as safe as one with the same deposits and \$25,000 capital.

We are apt to look at the enormous deposits of some of our city banks and think how great and strong they are, but the prudent depositor will turn to the capital account and judge of the margin of safety to himself.

I would suggest to the gentleman in charge of this bill whether it might not be well to provide, at the organization of these small banks, for a compulsory increase of capital when a certain amount of deposits is reached.

Four years ago I came here a believer in the small independent bank, and I prefer it now to none at all; but the experience of every commercial nation except ours has demonstrated the wisdom and economy of the branch system.

It needs no argument to show that a large bank in a market town or commercial city and a hundred agencies established among country stores or with branch offices in small communities, and all connected by telephone or telegraph with the parent office, can do business far more economically, and hence serve these communities far more effectively, than a hundred independent organizations.

There is no more reason for objecting to it than there would be in passing a law forbidding a manufacturer establishing offices and salesrooms for his product in any number of cities in the country or anywhere else where he could find a market for his goods.

Any individual can go into any State and loan money, and if he can get credit he can borrow. Why should not five men associated together as a national banking association and under Government supervision and frequent inspection be allowed to do the same thing?

The claim here is that the country would be drained of money and the cities would be clogged; but the experience of other nations shows that by the branch-bank system the parent bank would receive money where it was not needed and interest rates were low and distribute it where it was wanted and interest rates were high, and, like the irrigating plants of the West, carry life and health and strength by a hundred little channels to what would otherwise be dry and thirsty ground.

As it is now, the country banks, with their city reserves and system of rediscounts, are practically branches of the banks in the reserve cities, but the business is done at greatly increased cost, and the country customer pays the bill.

Branches in other countries are the commercial drummers of their banking systems.

One of the conditions on which the charter of the Bank of France was recently renewed was that it should agree to establish a branch in each political division of the country.

Here we put our banks in a strait-jacket and wonder why money is so cheap in some places and dear in others.

I do not believe that the branch system would equalize rates in all parts of the country, for there are many important factors in that problem, but it would very materially help to improve present conditions.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of taxation is the important one, for it is upon the final decision of this question that the fate of the national system rests.

Contrary to the common thought upon the subject, I believe that the exercise of the power of note issue is a duty which a bank owes to the community rather than a privilege to the bank itself, and so believing, it seems to me to be absurd to tax it. A bank note is equivalent to the bank's check on its own redemption fund.

Taxes should be laid on property, and a bank note or a check is not property, but only a convenient instrument for the transfer of property.

As a war measure, a stamp tax on checks or anything else is justifiable.

On principle, there is no excuse for it.

One set of men organized a grocery firm, another a bank. Each should pay a tax on their investment.

In the first case this is represented by the average stock on hand, plus average accounts due them, minus average accounts owing and notes outstanding.

The bank should also pay on its investment, which can only be represented by capital, surplus, and undivided profits.

But exactly here is the trouble with our national system.

The strongest competitor which the national bank has to-day is the trust company, organized under our State laws, with liberal privileges and all banking powers except that of note issue, and with practically unlimited power of maintaining branches anywhere in the world.

The taxes of the trust company are paid by the company.

It pays no national tax, and the stockholders pay no local tax on the shares which they own.

When the company is assessed locally under the national law, it can and does claim exemption from local taxation to the extent of its holdings in Government bonds.

With the national bank it is not so.

Its national tax is specifically on circulation.

Its local tax is on the shares of its stockholders, and as the bank, not the individual stockholders, owns the bonds held, no exemption can be claimed for the individual tax.

It makes no difference whether the stockholder pays his own tax or whether the bank pays it for all; the result is the same.

To anywhere nearly equalize the two, no tax whatever should be charged by the Government, but the actual cost of issuing the notes and maintaining the redemption bureau should be assessed pro rata upon the banks taking out circulation.

Even then the trust company and State banks would have a great advantage in local taxation.

The only remedy that I can see, and possibly the only salvation for the system, is to exempt the shares of national banks from all taxation, and to permit the investment in national banks to be taxed locally, as all other investments are, and paid by the banks themselves, with the same right as a trust company to plead exemption on Government bonds.

I am satisfied that the plan proposed here is much more just than the present 1 per cent tax on circulation, for under the present system the large city banks which do not take out circulation contribute nothing to the support of the Government, and have not since they succeeded in having the tax taken off from deposits.

If, instead of driving them out of the national system, it brings them to using their great influence toward securing a more equitable distribution of the burden between the city and country banks and the trust company, all will be well.

In closing, I beg the pardon of the House for having thus gone into the dry details of this measure.

I am a believer in a national banking system, not necessarily as it is now, but a system always under the watchful supervision and careful inspection of the National Government.

I am utterly opposed to the old State banks, with 45 different charter powers and 45 different kinds of note issues.

We are a great people, rich now beyond the dreams of our fathers and growing richer every day.

In many lines of industry we already lead the world.

Under the stimulus of protection other triumphs are awaiting us.

The sea is ours to conquer, if we will, and American genius will yet prove itself equal to the task.

But the dominant power of the globe will always be the one which controls the financial exchanges of the world.

Gentlemen, the victory will never come to us while our currency and banking system continues to be the sport of politics and the plaything of demagogues.

The one supreme purpose of this bill is to lay in standard gold a solid foundation upon which another Republican Congress may erect the splendid superstructure of a national-banking system, reorganized and improved, ready and fit to contest with the Bank of England for the financial supremacy of the world.

The bill is worthy of the affirmative vote of every lover of his country and every believer in her future greatness. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ADJOURNMENT FOR HOLIDAYS.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, December 20, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, January 3, 1900.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PAYNE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a recess be taken to-morrow in order that we may join with the President and Senate in paying proper tribute to the memory of George Washington and that we take the vote on Tuesday instead of Monday. I ask unanimous consent that the order may be made to that effect.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the House adjourn over to-morrow for the purpose of paying tribute to the memory of George Washington and that the vote on this bill be postponed from Monday until Tuesday next.

Mr. DALZELL. At the same hour on Tuesday?

Mr. OVERSTREET. I want to inquire if that would interfere with the vote on Monday?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am willing that Monday shall be substituted for Saturday for the five-minute debate, and then the vote be taken immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Has it not been the experience of the gentleman from Tennessee through to-day that with the night sessions and the additional hour in the morning three days will be sufficient time for the remaining debate, without carrying the vote over for another day?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not think so.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think it will be better to take the vote on Monday. I have no objection to the other part of the request.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Everybody who wishes can go to the celebration, and the debate can go on in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. OVERSTREET. It will be in Committee of the Whole and no other business can be done.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the House, out of respect to the memory of the first President of the United States, ought to adjourn over.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if Washington were alive to-day he would stay here in the House, if he was a member of it, and finish the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

#### UNVEILING THE STATUE OF DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SULZER. I suppose this is read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a committee consisting of three members from the Senate and five members from the House of Representatives be appointed to make arrangements for the reception and unveiling, on January 18, 1900, of the statue of Daniel Webster presented to the United States by Mr. Stilson Hutchins and erected on Massachusetts avenue, in the city of Washington.*

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we have just refused to suspend our business out of respect for the memory of the most illustrious American, we ought not to be asked now to suspend our rules to honor a less illustrious one. To-morrow marks the 100th anniversary of the death of the first President of the United States—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas object?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will designate to act as Speaker this evening the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. GAMBLE.

The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the Speaker declared the House, in pursuance of its previous order, in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GAMBLE.

#### THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House for the session this evening the House will now resolve itself into



Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. HEPBURN, will please take the chair.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill H. R. No. 1—the financial bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is now engaged in the discussion of one of the most important subjects of legislation that has occupied its attention in the later history of our country. Important it is, for the powers are here to fasten the gold standard upon our people. The design is clearly expressed in this bill to retire from circulation the greenbacks, "the people's money," and to clothe the national banks with the power to issue paper money in lieu of the Government greenbacks, and to make all United States bonds and obligations of the Government redeemable in gold instead of in "coin."

This plan is but the beginning of that policy the successive step in which will be the destruction of silver as money, save as subsidiary coin.

The Reed rules, ever elastic, always powerful, fashions the mode of procedure by which this infamy is perpetrated upon the country. The Rules Committee, the imperial progeny of the rules themselves, the representative of the greatest autocratic power that ever fastened itself upon a republic, is the agency through which the work is accomplished.

Without committee consideration, indeed without committees being appointed to consider, this measure is presented, important and far-reaching to all our people, and a rule is fixed for debate in this body which accords to each member of the minority here less than five minutes, on the average, for discussion, though this bill comprehends within its scope a change of the entire banking and financial concerns of the country.

In the usual and orderly procedure questions of such vitality and importance have taken weeks for deliberation, have gone to committee composed of members of both political parties, been there considered, and received in this House on reports of such committee.

But now all safeguards are set aside by the rules and by the Rules Committee to speedily pass this measure at the behest of the special interests.

Upon the first day of our assembling here this Congress, with one-third of the membership of the House not members of the former Congress, you saw fastened upon you, with no opportunity for debate and amendment, and before the committees were appointed, this code of rules which bind you down like slaves so long as they are continued.

You heard stated here by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] that a reason for their adoption thus was that they had been the rules of the former Congress; but he did not then state, what you yourself do know, Mr. Chairman, and what every member of that Congress knows, that they were passed the first day of the Fifty-fifth Congress, without committee consideration, under the operation of the previous question, without the opportunity for a half minute's debate, and with no opportunity for amendments. The reason stated by the gentleman, when the facts are known, becomes a most cogent one, does it not, new members of the House, for you to thus shackle yourselves, as you of the majority did, in supporting them by your vote on that day?

The time I have will not permit a discussion of the great questions of money and finance, but I shall content myself in the few moments I have with offering some observations which, under the operation of the previous question, I was denied making on the day the whilom Rules Committee refused to have a discussion of the rules, and which can be so appropriately made at this time, as every power of the rules has been invoked here to force this measure upon the House and upon the country.

The disfranchisement of constituencies under the mode of legislation enforced by the Reed rules, which for years have czarized this body, is not a new subject of complaint either on this or on the Republican side of the House.

Our fathers established for us a republican form of government, and with it transmitted to us the House of Representatives, republican in form it has remained, but how changed in fact.

For years the most popular branch of the American Congress has been governed with a rod of iron, under the sanction of iron rules. These rules were enforced by a Speaker of the House once, and his name will go thundering down through all ages as a ruler of great sapience, a man of iron nerve, iron will, while his colleagues on this floor were buried, as were the rights and appeals of their constituencies, in a grave of oblivion, unheard of and unknown, save as they are recorded in the roll calls of the House, for they were vouchsafed the right to vote. This was not a survival of the fittest, but a triumph of the powerful.

History records that we have a republican form of government, but the evidence of it is not found in the House of Representatives. Scourged in conscience and in action, with party fealty making cowards of you all, you members of the majority, who were members then, and your constituencies were disfranchised, while this body existed only as a relic of a proud and historic form of people's government, intended by our fathers to have been transmitted to their posterity.

Read the proof in the earlier and later history of our country, in the earlier and later records of the House; read it, gentlemen, honor bright, read it in your own hearts and minds and in your consciences, you who had the power in this Congress to change those rules if you had had the courage.

Under these rules and practices in the last Congress more time was given for the discussion of the smallest appropriation than could be had to discuss the great questions of currency and finance; more time given to discuss whether a member used or intended to use the word "many" or "most" in debate than was given to discuss the great questions of international law; more time given in opposition to the President's civil-service laws than was accorded for the discussion of the great questions of national taxation.

The Committee on Rules, with its great choking coils like huge anacondas intertangling and stifling legislation, disfranchising free men and Americans, is a fitting background for a picture of the throne.

The Rules Committee is all powerful; such rules as these are drastic; but withal, they seem to be flexible enough in their enforcement to well serve party ends and private purposes. Not only are such rules subject to great criticism and complaint, but the peculiar and eccentric enforcement of them is still more subject to criticism and complaint. Such a power of facility and expedience is found within them that they can be and have been used to thwart not only the will of the American people, but the Senate of the United States expressing that will.

Under those rules, in the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, when the people of the country and their Representatives in Congress wanted to pass a measure for Cuba, the magic powers of the rules were invoked to suppress and dishearten; when the Senators of all political parties—Republican, Populist, and Democratic—passed a joint resolution for Cuba, it came to the most numerous branch of the American Congress, and there, under the mysterious influence of the Reed rules, it went to sleep in the catacombs of the House. On the other hand, when it was desired by the power that was to pass a measure, it was rushed through the House by a meteor process, without discussion and debate, as was shown by the monetary-commission bill, passed in the dying hour of the special session of the preceding Congress.

Under these rules the objection of a single member last session of Congress prevented the passage of a law to stop the importation of Chinese and coolie laborers, under contract, into the Hawaiian Islands, and thousands have in the meantime been brought, practically as slaves, to those islands of recent acquisition.

If this is not proof of monarchy, show me the one-man power more potent than this.

I need not say that a single man, a single power and influence, dominated this House. It is true that one man under these rules can govern and control it; all others are subjected to his sweet will, and this denial to the people of full representation makes their Representatives in Congress, to serve their constituencies in any degree, act not as self-respecting and independent men, but as cringing sycophants to the one-man power.

This situation, so depressing to independent manhood, so dangerous to the Republic, is known throughout the land, is a subject of daily comment in the press, in the coordinate branch of Congress, and in this House, and yet those who complain and have the power hesitate to correct this dangerous evil that threatens our existence. They raise their hands, but have not the courage to strike the blow.

The party in power, as individuals, admit these evils, confess this abuse of the individual rights of members; yet as a House they are pleased or forced to let their party spirit and partisanship overcome their judgment and continue these wrongs that tend to sap the foundation of our Government.

Do you ask why we should have the right to discuss and amend? The answer is found in one of the blackest pieces of legislation that ever blotted American legislative history, passed because it was unknown, not discussed. I refer to the demonetization act. One of the evils of all deliberative bodies is the danger of the passage of measures without a full understanding. If the leading statesmen Senators could be deceived in that body, where they have full and free debate, how much more are we entitled to the right of full and free discussion in this body, so clearly and so closely representative of the people. Were not Congress and the people deceived by a failure to discuss?

Let me give you the burning evidence of statesmen witnesses, living and dead. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.



Referring to the act demonetizing silver in 1873, they spoke in Congress as follows:

Judge Kelley, of Pennsylvania (see RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1605):

I was ignorant of the fact that it would demonetize the silver dollar. \* \* \*

Mr. Blaine (see RECORD of February 15, 1878, page 1063):

I did not know anything that was in the bill at all.

Mr. Voorhees (see RECORD of February 15, 1878, page 1063):

I frankly say that I did not.

Also, Mr. Voorhees (see RECORD of January 15, 1878, page 332):

Its enactment \* \* \* unknown to the people and to four-fifths of Congress.

Senator Beck, of Kentucky (see RECORD of January 10, 1878, page 258):

Illegal and unconstitutional consummation of a fraud.

Also, Senator Beck, of Kentucky (see RECORD, volume 7, part 1, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 260):

It was never understood by either House of Congress.

Mr. Burchard, of Illinois (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13, 1876, volume 4, part 5, page 4560):

Unaccompanied by written report, \* \* \* unknown to members of Congress, who without opposition allowed it to pass.

Judge Holman (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, Appendix, page 193):

Its passage \* \* \* was a colossal swindle.

Mr. Bright, of Tennessee (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 1, second session Forty-fifth Congress, page 584):

It passed by fraud in the House; \* \* \* passed without discussion, debate being cut off by operation of the previous question. It was passed to my certain information under such circumstances that the fraud escaped the attention of some of the most watchful as well as the ablest statesmen in Congress at the time.

Senator ALLISON of Iowa (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 7, part 2, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, page 1058):

The bill was doctored. \* \* \*

Senator Hereford, of West Virginia (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 14, 1877, page 205):

One of the most remarkable and to my mind one of the most fraudulent pieces of legislation this or any other country ever saw.

Mr. CANNON of Illinois (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 4, part 6, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, Appendix, page 197):

It was not discussed, as shown by the record, and neither members of Congress nor the people understood the scope of the legislation.

Why allow discussion and amendment? Look at the appalling results of a failure to discuss.

If measures of such widespread import and great disaster can be enacted without knowledge, because not discussed and debated, how many evils, great and small, can be ingrafted on our legislation when protected by the rule of no discussion?

Time will not permit me to discuss the desired remedies and the changes in the rules necessary to secure the rights of members; these are known to those who have come beneath their crushing power.

An abrogation of the Rules Committee would place all public matters of legislation regularly introduced and pending before the House on equal terms.

Annulment of rules in derogation of liberty of debate and amendment measurably would secure to each constituency represented on this floor rights that heretofore have been denied and in a marked degree to new members of the House.

The effect of the Reed rules is known, and if they are continued a time may come when a Brutus, a Cromwell, some bad man, may use this power to subvert the Republic. Mr. Chairman, I register my protest and my voice against such a dangerous system. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, if any impetus were needed to push the money question into the front of national issues, no greater could be wanted than the passage of the bill now before the House. While its advocates indulge in the vain hope of taking this great question out of the arena of politics and public discussion, they are really adding fuel to the flame of this burning issue and adding strength to the Democratic position and making it impregnable at the coming national election. A discussion of this bill is calculated to arouse the people once more to the realization of the dangerous tendency of gold monometallism and all its attendant evils in a degree that will not only surprise our adversaries, but which must sweep the Republican party from power, or else eventuate in the complete overthrow of our present economic system.

If I were asked to define the scope and effect of this bill, should it be enacted into law, I would say that it was to contract the volume of our primary money, to perpetuate industrial combinations and monopoly, build up and maintain plutocracy, firmly establish

imperialism upon the nation, and place the masses at the mercy of the classes. That such is the intention of all its advocates I can not believe, yet that such is its effect I can not doubt. That it will pass this House is a foregone conclusion, and all its opponents can hope to do is to call the attention of the country to its sweeping provisions and its blighting and disastrous results, so that the responsibility of its enactment may be placed where it belongs.

First of all, it involves a complete abandonment of bimetalism and aims to fix indefinitely the gold standard upon this country, thus proclaiming to all the nations of the world that no further effort is to be made by the United States toward international agreement on the question of bimetalism. It is a complete surrender by this nation of its independence in her fiscal affairs to the European or English financial policy. Moreover, it is a complete reversal of the policy of the national Republican party, which declared for bimetalism by international agreement and which now ignores its platform professions and yields to the demands of the gold monometallists.

It is a complete vindication of the leaders of the national Democratic party when they predicted the fallacy of the Republican position and insisted upon independent bimetalism, and will present in the future the clean-cut proposition whether the American people favor the single gold standard or the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 by this nation alone, as laid down in the Chicago platform.

But the bill does not stop at fixing the gold standard. It further provides that all interest-bearing obligations of the Government (United States bonds) and all United States notes (greenbacks) and Treasury notes (Sherman Act silver notes) shall be redeemed in gold, and that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be payable in gold.

The Secretary of the Treasury must maintain the gold-reserve fund for the redemption of all United States notes and Treasury notes, and he may, at his discretion, exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States. The United States notes and Treasury notes can not be withdrawn except for gold. No silver bullion can be coined except in subsidiary coin, and the Treasury notes upon said bullion shall be canceled and not reissued. In the event the reserve fund is insufficient for redemption purposes, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue and sell 3 per cent twenty-year bonds to replenish the reserve fund. The national banks are permitted to issue bank notes to the full amount of their bond deposit without further security, and the tax on national banks is reduced to one-tenth of 1 per cent.

That the effect of this measure is to produce contraction is too evident to be denied by its friends and advocates. In the first place, it absolutely suspends the coinage of another legal-tender silver dollar and confines silver coinage to that of subsidiary coin, which is only legal tender to the limited amount of \$10, and thus further depreciates the mint value of all silver bullion. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury practically to redeem even the silver dollars, if he deems it necessary, so that silver is virtually taken out of circulation as primary money and is degraded to a mere token money for change, like the nickel and the penny, and can henceforth have but little effect on the prices of commodities. Everything is based on gold and gold alone as a standard of value, and all other forms of money are virtually redeemable in gold, and the prices of all commodities are measured in gold. Not only so, but all obligations, both public and private, are payable henceforth in gold. In fact, when eventually the purposes of this bill are attained, all the Treasury notes, United States notes (greenbacks), and silver certificates and silver dollars will go out of circulation and there will be no other full legal-tender money for the payment of public and private contracts except gold. Can the purpose and tendency of this measure be anything else but to counteract the increasing influx in the world's production of gold and to check and contract its volume?

Not only is this the purpose, but it is evidently the further purpose of the contractionists to reduce the volume of full legal-tender silver money and thus to contract the general volume of full legal-tender money. Such a course is bound to result in an undue contraction of the circulating medium and enhance the price of money on one side and decrease the price of commodities, except such as are protected by a trust, combination, or monopoly on the other side. While population increases and commerce should expand on one side, the volume of primary money contracts on the other, and the inevitable result must be falling prices of wages and all commodities not in a trust and enhancing in value of the standard dollar; in one word, dear money and hard times.

It has been the recent boast of our Republican friends that by the great influx of gold, prices have gone up and money has gone down. We do not deny it. But now we are led to believe that our friends are apprehensive that there may be too much money and it must be made scarcer to enhance its value. It looks like



the holders of the obligations of our people, both private and public, are afraid that unless there is a contraction of the volume of money that they will not receive enough. It looks like the creditor is afraid that the debtor will not pay him enough, and his cries seem to have been heeded by the Republican party and this measure is proposed to give him relief—surely will give him relief—even if it must be done at the great sacrifice of the debtor. Let us see how our ledger stands:

Gold coin, including bullion in Treasury .....	\$963,498,384
Standard silver dollars, including bullion in Treasury .....	563,697,082
Subsidiary silver .....	74,806,552
Gold certificates .....	34,297,819
Silver certificates .....	406,085,504
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890 .....	93,518,280
United States notes .....	346,681,016
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872 .....	21,355,000
National-bank notes .....	241,350,871
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>2,745,350,508</b>
<b>In circulation:</b>	
Gold coin .....	679,738,650
Standard silver dollars .....	61,481,426
Subsidiary silver .....	69,065,824
Gold certificates .....	32,655,919
Silver certificates .....	402,136,617
Treasury notes, act July 14, 1890 .....	92,561,764
United States notes .....	308,351,842
Currency certificates, act June 8, 1872 .....	20,275,000
National-bank notes .....	237,805,439
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1,904,071,881</b>
<b>In Treasury, all kinds of money .....</b>	<b>841,278,627</b>

The total outstanding principal of the public debt, as per statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, is \$1,991,927,306.92. In this sum is included the following items, classified as part of the public debt:

<b>Amount outstanding:</b>	
Treasury notes of 1890 .....	\$93,518,280
Silver certificates .....	406,085,504
Legal-tender notes .....	346,681,016
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>846,284,800</b>
<b>Total interest-bearing debt .....</b>	<b>1,046,048,750</b>

It must be observed, at a glance at these figures, that the effect of this measure will be to place the entire stock of our different classes of money, to wit, the sum of \$1,781,852,124, upon the amount of gold coin in the Treasury, to wit, the sum of \$963,498,384, and that it virtually demonetizes the \$563,697,082—silver dollars and bullion—in the Treasury. Not only so, but it further contracts the volume of our primary money by providing for the redemption and practical retirement of the \$346,681,016 of United States notes, commonly called greenbacks. But it does not stop there, but further strains the gold standard by making the total interest-bearing bonded debt, to wit, the sum of \$1,046,048,750, and now payable in either gold or silver, payable in gold alone.

Now, it may be said by our adversaries that this bill does not contain any provision for the redemption of the silver dollar or the silver certificate in gold coin, but we reply that such must be the ultimate effect of this measure, for in section 4 it is provided:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and required to use said reserve fund in maintaining at all times the parity and equal value of every dollar issued or coined by the Government; and if at any time the Secretary of the Treasury deems it necessary, in order to maintain the parity and equal value of all the money of the United States, he may at his discretion exchange gold coin for any other money issued or coined by the United States.

What is this but a discretionary power in the Secretary of the Treasury to practically retire every silver dollar and every silver certificate and every greenback or Treasury note, even down to the subsidiary silver? The word "exchange" as here employed is synonymous to "redeem," "retire," or "withdraw;" for no one doubts that if by some legerdemain the silver dollar, the silver certificate, the Treasury note, or the greenback should fall in value as measured by gold, that a hostile Secretary of the Treasury could and would "exchange" them by paying out gold for them, and then placing them on the retired list until they could, by a little further stretch of authority, be placed in the smelting pot or macerator, and then sell them at public or private sale as curios. Whenever a greenback or other Government paper money or silver dollar is redeemed or exchanged it goes into the maw, never to see daylight again; for nothing can get it out but an equivalent in gold.

But to go back to the relation between debtor and creditor as affected by this bill: There is besides the public debt a large private debt which may now be paid in money resting on the bimetallic standard, which will further enhance the price of the gold dollar after this bill becomes a law, and which will add to the burden of the debtor, the taxpayer, and producer outside of the trust. It is estimated that this debt, consisting of bonded debt of railroads and industrial combinations, State, municipal, and other corporate

bonded debt, and mortgage indebtedness, ranges anywhere from fifteen to twenty billions in this country.

Again, the interest on this indebtedness amounts to nearly a billion dollars a year. Besides there remain the taxes and other fixed charges to be paid by the people in an enhancing gold standard amounting to something like a half million annually. In contemplating these figures the people can realize somewhat the gain of the creditor and the loss of the debtor, for it can not be denied that the people—that is, the small producers and the wage-earners—must ultimately pay these debts in labor or products and that it is not the larger operator or monopoly which pays them. These, it is true, pay them, but they pay them with the higher monopoly charges wrung from the people.

The railroads owing this debt, and all other corporations, will pay them with additional charges paid by the people, and after all the toiling masses must respond to the grinding exactions of the classes. Were these debts, public and private, paid in the money in which they were contracted, under the bimetallic standard, they would amount to no more than their face value, but under the enhancing value of the single gold standard they will require almost double the amount of products or labor to pay them, for when commodities and wages are pressed down by falling prices or limited production it requires an equivalent of greater effort or amount of commodities to pay existing and continuing indebtedness or to perform a required task of labor.

Thus we are brought face to face with the great economic question involved in this measure, to wit, the contraction of the volume of primary money and the corresponding fall of prices of commodities.

When money is plentiful and keeps pace with the demands of commerce, enterprise flourishes and is buoyant, prices tend upward, and enterprise is active and courageous in exploiting old and new activities, thus stimulating the division of labor in various directions and paying higher wages to the individual laborer. Thus the power to purchase and consume is augmented and production increased. The result is prosperity and the uplifting of the toiling masses. When money is scarce and insufficient for the demands of commerce, enterprise languishes, prices tend downward, wages decrease, labor is only partially employed, and laborers and consumers lack the means to purchase commodities. The result is hard times; the aggregation of large capital to control production ensues; trusts, combinations, and monopoly take the place of diversified labor; and the formation of the classes and the masses takes place, and industrial life is thrown out of its equipoise.

This was the condition of affairs a year ago and even some time before, when, chiefly owing to the low price of commodities, individual enterprise sought shelter under the trust or combination; in the meantime prices were stimulated by inflowing gold, partly attracted by low prices and partly augmented by larger production of gold. Short crops abroad in the staple products, too, had their effect in drawing gold to this country, and both low prices here and a want of agricultural products abroad, together with the stimulating effect of more primary money, although slight in its effect, stimulated our exports and brought into circulation among our people more money and has placed us in possession of a temporary partial prosperity.

But at what sacrifice did it come and how long will it last? In the first place, it is partial only, because prices have now been driven up chiefly by means of combination and monopoly, and the good prices our farmers are receiving for their products and our laborers for their labor are wasted again in buying their commodities at extravagant trust prices. That the present so-called prosperity is short lived can not be doubted, for as soon as the present natural stimulus subsides, the present fit of good times, of which our Republican friends delight to speak, will be at an end. Large wheat and cotton crops at home and abroad will bring lower prices to the farmer, and lockouts in the factories and other industries under the trust, under the scheme of limited production, will affect the laborer in his wages, and to add to all these causes a contracting volume of money inaugurated in this measure will do the balance, and hard times will once more be upon us, only with the aggravating evil of the trusts added to our ills.

Then it will be when this measure will produce its most blighting effects. The industrial combinations called trusts will then exercise full sway and by reason of the scarcity of money and falling prices and the extinction of competition reap their full crop of exactions and repressions. Individual enterprise will languish and be crowded from our industrial system and the owner of a small business or smaller factory will seek shelter under the trust, or, being entirely dependent, seek employment as a wage-earner of the trust and place himself at its mercy, or drop into the vast army of the unemployed or partially employed. Equal opportunity to the individual to earn according to his capacity will be a thing of the past, fair competition will be gone, and unfair competition will only lead to greater and speedier combination. Democracy will be on the wane and plutocracy will raise its hideous head and clamor for imperialism to protect and defend it.



But, say our friends, we have authorized the national banks to issue their notes to the full amount of our national bonded debt, and instead of having the present \$341,350,871 of national-bank notes we will have at least a billion of national-bank notes in circulation to do the business of the country; when money is scarce the national banks will increase their issue and when it is too plentiful the banks will contract. But we reply in the first place the principle of the national banks is wrong, because it encourages the increase and perpetuation of the national bonded debt; that the national-bank notes are after all backed by the credit of the nation and would not have the quality of money without; that they are only a limited legal tender and finally dependent upon their metallic money basis; that they receive a bonus from the Government which the Government could dispense with and issue the notes itself, etc.; but that after these objections and many more have been urged the fact remains that it is not true that the national banks will expand their issue when money is scarce and contract when it tends to plethora.

The very reverse is true, namely, that they will expand the issue during expansion and contract during contraction. This was never more true than during the great panic of 1893, when the national banks refused not only to expand, but drew in their deposits and thus increased the panic. The truth is that it is their interest to contract during panics to save their depositors as well as their assets. This is a rule that national banks as well as private banks observe, and the only relief at last can come from the Government, as but recently demonstrated, when the Secretary of the Treasury resorted to the purchase of United States bonds in advance of their maturity to relieve the money stress in New York money circles.

What this measure will accomplish is to create the greatest paper-money trust under the sun, one which will insist upon the constant augmentation of the national debt instead of its reduction, because its very life is dependent upon such a course. It will further conduce to substitute it for all the private banks and extend its ramifications to every hamlet and village, and will in time absolutely dictate the fiscal policy of the Government. What that policy may be is foreshadowed in the fact that the present bill sprang from the brains of a coterie of national bankers who have faithfully followed a foreign fiscal policy and who are opposed to anything that savors of an independent American policy.

But it may be said that the very fact of establishing a large gold reserve fund will give such confidence that there will be no necessity to redeem any other class of money, and all will circulate and remain in circulation at a perfect parity. This, too, is contradicted by past experience. If the redemption of the greenbacks had not been stayed, they would long have been out of existence. As long as the Government discriminates itself between the different classes of its money, and holds out an inducement to issue more interest-bearing gold bonds, whenever a run is made upon it, so long will money changers continue to present themselves with money which can either be redeemed or exchanged for gold and demand the gold until the last dollar other than gold is out of circulation.

Such is the inevitable logic of the situation. So that to whatever side we turn we are met with contraction and the specter of a rising gold standard and a proportionate falling of prices of all farm products, raw material, and wages, and a consequent rise of trust articles. Is it not worse than folly, amounting to hollow mockery, for our Republican friends to declare against trusts and in the next breath urge the passage of this bill, which is the mother of all trusts?

True it is that other forces go toward building up and maintaining the trusts, such as unfair and unrestricted competition, especially in transportation and in other industrial activities, and also unequal taxation, and, indeed, even remote cosmic forces; but giving equal opportunity to all and special privileges to none presupposes the existence of an equitable monetary system which produces neither undue contraction nor undue inflation; but a monetary scheme which fosters absolute contraction can only eventuate in an undue distribution of wealth, with a constant and growing tendency toward enriching the few and impoverishing the many, and is therefore the very base and life of combination, trust, and monopoly.

On the other hand, rising prices form the strongest antidote to trusts and combinations. In such an atmosphere the trusts can not thrive well, because all enterprise, however small, is stimulated to growth and advancement and equipped for the arena of a fair competition. On a falling market, however, enterprise is paralyzed and must hide itself under the cloak of combination and restricted production, thus deadening fair competition. The trusts are, moreover, the advocates of expansion and imperialism. Their interests lie in the direction of commercialism and the exploitation of distant and dependent colonies.

Not satisfied with a depressed home market and the regular reciprocal relations that foreign trade affords, they clamor for the enforced traffic with colonial dependencies, and, apprehensive of

the growing unrest among the people and their employees, they cry for a large standing army, the keystone in the arch of imperialism. Devoid of patriotism, they become the enemies of free institutions, with no other motive than greed and worldly power. No wonder that they are anxious to turn to world policies in order to divert the attention of the people from their ills at home; it is their supreme interest to do so. It is thus that we find the friends of this measure closely allied to the schemes of territorial expansion and imperialism. Both are the offspring of foreign policies and utterly un-American in their tendencies.

If there is one fact more prominent than all others it is that while this Administration has increased taxation and the bonded indebtedness of this nation it is now about to reduce the volume of money with which to pay these burdens; to place its function of issuing paper money in the hands of a gigantic bank trust protected by the credit of the Government; to turn all industrial production and private enterprise into the clutches of monopoly. To do the bidding of monopoly it proposes to substitute imperialism for democracy and to reduce the great masses of the people to poverty and make them dependent upon the crumbs that may fall from the table of monopoly. In the name of the common people, in the name of democracy, I protest! Gentlemen of the majority, you may pass this bill, but the American people are apt to reverse your judgment in 1900 by the election of W. J. Bryan and a Congress which will stand by the Chicago platform. You are sowing the wind, you will reap the whirlwind. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The passage of this bill will not settle the great money question. Before it can be settled it must be settled right, and it will not be settled right until bimetallism is restored, and bimetallism can only be restored by the independent action of this nation as declared by the Chicago platform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel some little embarrassment in attempting to discuss the matter before the House, but I think I see the way, and the thoughtful way, too, by which my course can be justified. I voted for the Teller resolution in this House, and was the only Republican in the House that did so. Now, I expect to vote for this bill, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a matter of duty to vote for it. I have reasoned myself to the conclusion that I will best serve my country by voting for this proposition, laying aside entirely the question of my loyalty to the Republican party. [Applause.]

Sir, this financial question has been discussed for twenty long years. The sprightly, eloquent gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] complained of the "gag law." Why, the discussion began in 1873, and there has been a constant, unrestricted, unrestrained, unobstructed flow of argument in the shape of periodicals and eloquence extending from the far and woolly West to the Atlantic Ocean, as steady in its course as the roar of the mighty Columbia River over the Cascades or of the Niagara over the cataracts. [Laughter and applause.] Yet the gentleman complains that he has been "gagged." [Laughter.] Why, the whole thing has become hoary with age. It is the grandfather question now in these United States. [Renewed laughter.]

It is said that man changes his entire being every seven years—the nails, and every particle, every tooth in him, and every hair upon his head is turned to something else. Seven into twenty-six goes three and nearly four times. Over three generations, taking the measure of that length of time, have been spending their energies and the best part of their life in discussing this great question. Every child has become familiar with some of the expressions, some of the favored ones, some of those that glittered, the diamonds of thought that came along from the free and unlimited coinage of silver orators throughout the country, so that "16 to 1" has been known for more than twenty years by every child from 1 to 20 years.

I heard some little girls myself in the town of Taylorsville not long ago. There were five in the group and one little boy. One said, "I do not know another little boy in all this end of the town, and I don't know why it is." Another said, "Why, on our side of town there are 16 to 1—16 girls to 1 boy." [Laughter.] So that the truth is that no question has ever attracted the attention of the people of the United States for so long a period; no question has had as many teachers and as many influences employed on the mind, taking both sides of it, in trying to enlighten the people, in trying to analyze the question, in trying to get at the ideal system of finance that will bring to this country and its people the greatest possible blessing as this question, in which we have the free coinage of silver on the one side and the gold standard on the other.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to have the ideal system. The American people are entitled to the best in everything, because the American man is the best man. Why happens it so? The commingling of the blood of the best tribes of humanity throughout



this entire universe has produced an entirely new type of manhood. In settling this new country of ours and in overcoming all the obstructions to civilization and solving them it required the most hardy representatives of the varied tribes of humanity in the world. They came from every tribe, from every nation, and almost from every tongue. From every phase of humanity the most hardy, courageous representatives of these various tribes came. They came here to this glorious land under the inspiring influence of our system, that has been properly called "the world's best hope." They put forth their best possible effort within the range of human possibility.

The commingling of the blood of the various representatives of the various tribes of the world produced this distinct species of man, the American type. It is the greatest and grandest, as it has recently shown itself, in arms, for there is no people in the world who can fight us. I do not want to brag too much of our folks, but it begins to look as if no nation of the world can now stand before the courage of this matchless American soldier, American energy, and American brains.

Then, I say, we are entitled to the best system of finance—the ideal system—if we can get it. Let us see whether we have it or not. I understand the selecting of everything that is best, whether in human character or in a system, and excluding every infirmity so as to form a type or model, is what we call the "ideal."

Now, what is the true test as to whether you have attained to an ideal system in anything, to the ideal touching human character, to the ideal touching any system? The true test is this—if I understand it—the extent of its success. Let me illustrate: Suppose "A" were to contend that he had discovered a theory by which the speed of the horse could be increased, and he argues the excellence of that theory. It might be that no human being would be able to meet his arguments in its support, but did not agree with him. But suppose that in this conflict of opinion, this war of thought touching that simple question of the increase in the speed of the horse, that some one says, Well, let us try it. Why theorize any further on it? And they put the horse upon the track and they apply to him the spurs to quicken his diligence in the race; and here is the test. If he surpasses all other horses in the race, makes better time than has before been made, there is no further room for argument, you have settled it all by actual experience.

So, Mr. Chairman, with this question. In order to determine whether we have an ideal system now and whether this bill will improve it, whether this is to be the finishing touch that makes it the best we ever had, we must try the experiment. "An experiment is a trial deliberately instituted. A practical test, proof. John Adams, in speaking of political experiments, said: "Political experiment can not be made in a laboratory nor determined in a few hours. A political experiment can only be made by applying the proposed theory to the test, practical experiment." Now, then, a few years ago it was alleged that this idea of a single standard would not do. I thought so. A distinguished gentleman who sits beside me—a Democrat—also thought so, except he was a little wilder on the subject than I was, and he went for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and I wanted the limited coinage—the American product. Hundreds and thousands of the best men in this Republic thought that the double standard was the only way by which you could approach a perfect system of finance.

I followed the ordinary processes of reasoning; maybe they were simple, but still I followed them. My idea was that in order to afford the citizens the greatest possible opportunities in life there should be the largest possible amount of money in circulation that could be kept good. My notion touching it was that two agencies constituting basic money could come nearer meeting the demand of business than one, just as I thought that two men could bear a burden of 100 pounds better than one; just as I thought that two baskets of fish could meet the demand of hungry appetites of a multitude of a thousand better than one basket, if one basket was catfish; and arguing along that line of thought, I reached the conclusion that the money or redemption money of the country, that which we denominate the standard, should be a double standard and not a single. That is the conclusion to which I had come. I acted upon it.

When we come to put it to the actual test of practical experiment, it is a fact that has been established that the single standard is best. Let me see if I can not prove it.

I find, Mr. Chairman, the best definition of the ideal system of money is embraced in the message of the President of the United States, and I invite the attention of the House to it. He says: "Increased activity in industry, with its welcome attendance—a larger employment for labor at higher wages—gives to the body of the people a larger power to absorb the circulating medium."

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. LINNEY. Yes.

Mr. COX. I want to predicate my question on this extract,

which I will read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Fifty-fifth Congress:

As a creditor, no holder of any bond has any right to demand one cent more than the contract entitles him to, to wit, payment in coin. To pay less than the debt is repudiation. To force the taxpayer to pay more is an extortion. Coin is defined to be a piece of metal on which certain characters are stamped, making it legally current as money. Therefore gold and silver, at the discretion of the debtor, is the money in which, under the contract, the bonds may be legally and morally paid.

Has the gentleman shed his toe nails since he made that speech? [Laughter.]

Mr. LINNEY. That is by no means a question of importance in connection with the pending question. My friend will have no difficulty in settling that question for himself. It has no connection with the argument that I am making.

It is further true that year by year, as the President says—

Increased activity in industry, with its welcome attendant—a larger employment for labor at higher wages—gives to the body of the people a larger power to absorb the circulating medium. It is further true that year by year, with larger areas of land under cultivation, the increasing volume of agricultural products, cotton, corn, and wheat, calls for a larger volume of money supply. This is especially noticeable at the crop-harvesting and crop-moving period.

In its earlier history the national banking act seemed to prove a reasonable avenue through which needful additions to the circulation could from time to time be made. Changing conditions have apparently rendered it now inoperative to that end. The high margin in bond securities required, resulting from large premiums which Government bonds command in the market, or the tax on note issues, or both operating together, appear to be the influences which impair its public utility.

The attention of Congress is respectfully invited to this important matter with the view of ascertaining whether or not such reasonable modifications can be made in the national banking act as will render its service in the particulars here referred to more responsive to the people's needs. I again urge that national banks be authorized to organize with a capital of \$25,000.

Now, sir, the question to which I call the attention of the House, and which I believe to be the important question in this connection, is this: Is not the suggestion of the President of the United States touching the finances of the country the ideal in finance? No reflecting mind in this body can escape that conclusion.

There has been an increase in the population of this country during the last five years of at least 6,270,000 people. There has been an increase in the revenues of the country—the circulating medium—during the same period of \$302,103,408, unless the figures which have been presented to me are erroneous. They are taken from and founded upon the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. The increase during the last five years of money in circulation has kept pace with the enormous increase in population and business of the country.

Who would have dreamed during the last ten years that the existing gold standard could have the effect of thus increasing the circulating medium? Even the wildest greenback inflationist could not have claimed more for his pet financial system than has already been attained by the existing gold standard.

Now, sir, the question to which I desire to call the attention of the House is simply this, and let us see whether I am correct or not in the assertion that the ideal system embodied in the declaration of the President in the message I have just referred to has been approved by the thoughtful men of this age and commends itself to the thoughtful people of the country. Now to the proof. We can easily recur to the period and to the financial conditions existing in 1860. We had at that time in operation State banks in almost all of the States of the Union, and you all know the effect of their operations. The circulating medium of the country aggregated a per capita of about \$13.85. I have examined the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, made at that time, and believe that this statement, touching the amount of the circulating medium, is correct. On the basis of that examination I assert, and I believe I am correct in the assertion, that the aggregate per capita circulation of the country was only \$13.85; in 1861, only \$13.98; in 1862, \$10.23; in 1863, \$17.84; in 1864, \$19.67; on down, in 1873, \$18.10. Get down within five years of the present period and the amount is \$22.93; four years ago, \$21.10; three years ago, \$22.49; two years ago, \$22.66. This year, with \$1,904,071,881 of circulating medium and with 76,148,000 people, the highest ever reached in the history of this Republic from the time of the organization of the first State in it, the unprecedented per capita circulation of \$35 was reached, and that, too, under the gold standard. In the face of these facts, toe nails or no toe nails, any gentleman who has intelligence enough to cross the Mississippi River, or Coon Creek, so far as that is concerned, ought to be willing, it seems to me, to yield his preconceived views touching the matter and as a man accept the truth. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Gird up your loins, gentlemen; face these facts. Take this ideal standard, which no one can possibly deny. Follow the record, and you are as certainly led to the conclusion that I reach as that you have an existence. Figures do not lie. I know lawyers can make a great deal of harm out of figures sometimes, but in the hands of honorable gentlemen upon this floor, who will always be caught if they get wrong, they point us with absolute certainty to the truth. Twice two make four. That is absolutely



certain. Whether A died is a moral question, depending upon the evidence. I rely upon this kind of conclusion, which is absolute to a mathematical certainty, founded upon figures that no man controverts. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman answer just one question?

Mr. LINNEY. Why, certainly, my friend, with pleasure.

Mr. SIMS. In the extract that was read from your speech of less than two years ago, in which you said that to force debtors to pay a better money or higher-priced money than that named in the contract was extortion—how do you avoid such effect if this bill passes?

Mr. LINNEY. I am glad my friend called my attention to that. I was just coming to that anyway; but give me time and I will answer it. Being the only Republican upon this side that voted for the Teller resolution, I ought to be able to give a reason for it, which I will do. I believed then and I believe now that there are two crimes in this country touching finance. Repudiation is a crime. That means the failure or refusal of the debtor class to pay the last cent that is due. Extortion is likewise a crime, recognized in inspiration, recognized in the law books when it assumes a certain character touching official relations. I believe now, as I believed then, that extortion is a greater crime than repudiation; and I believe now, as I believed then, that for the Government of the United States to require its debtors—bonded debtors or otherwise—to pay more than is due is extortion.

But hear my answer further. What are the conditions now? The very moment that this gold standard is established and by this bill is settled, every dollar in the United States is gold. Your greenbacks are gold, your silver is gold, your subsidiary coin is gold. Why so? Because upon the simple gold standard when they go out gold must come in for them, and people, even under the gold standard, would in many instances rather have the subsidiary silver or the greenbacks in preference to the gold. Silver and greenbacks will still be used, but the standard by which they are measured is gold. It legally follows, therefore, that unless these bonds are repudiated they must be paid in gold, as all other debts are paid, so that there is no strain of extortion in the transaction. Let me elucidate that by a simple illustration. Yesterday morning I went to a store. I happened to have a twenty-dollar gold piece. I parted with it at once for greenbacks and for small silver coin. One day recently, in a bank, I saw the bank officers approach a man who had loaned them \$1,600, and who was holding the bank's note at 4 per cent interest. The bank officers said: "You must take your money. We would rather pay our debt in gold than to pay the 4 per cent interest." The gold was paid, the notes taken up, and the bank relieved of the 4 per cent interest. At any time within the last fifteen years prior to 1898, 8 per cent could have been obtained anywhere. So that the increased volume under the gold standard has reduced the rate of interest.

But, recurring to the suggestion of the gentleman about my views as expressed when the Teller resolution was before the House, it should be kept in mind we have now but one kind of money. It must of necessity apply to all bonds made before this and made now. Why, you have got but one sort of money to pay them in. I thought when I first looked at this bill there ought to have been this provision in it: "Provided, That the bonds executed and issued before the passage of this bill shall be paid in coin." But that was a surface view of it. I had not thought about it in the right light. I was like the gentleman who asked me the question a while ago. With his immense intellect, he has not made use of it, because if he will just reflect a little he will see that you have got but one money now with which to pay anything, and you can not pay for a drink of whisky anywhere now in the United States except you pay in gold or money measured by gold. [Laughter.] And so when you come to examine it you will see that it must apply to everything—to bonds past, present, and future. And the great mind of the President presents an equity in favor of the bondholder. We sold these for gold. What wrong is there in paying gold for them?

Mr. SIMS. If all contracts are payable in gold under existing law, and if this language in the present bill specifying that they are to be paid in gold is mere surplusage and useless, then why put it in there if debts are already payable in gold?

Mr. LINNEY. Why, it was put in, I suppose, to strengthen the credit of the United States and to make the bonds more readily salable.

Mr. SIMS. Then there is a suspicion—

Mr. LINNEY (continuing). It appears in the face of the paper. They put in the face of the paper the voice of the law.

Mr. SIMS. Then there is a suspicion that under the existing law they might be paid in silver, which might affect their value.

Mr. LINNEY. None in the world. For you could state nothing but the truth, and it just states it. A great government can only state the truth, and it is not ashamed to state the truth. [Applause.] Therefore they put to be discharged in gold, and every bond as a necessary legal inference and legal result is also to be

discharged in gold. So that I saw the foundation on which I stood was too metaphysical—does not exist and can not exist with the gold standard. What was my duty? Why, my duty was to cease to act upon a faulty argument that any man who will reflect a moment can see through.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one other idea yet about this matter. I think that these wonderful results have been accomplished under the present law. Well, let us apply a little bit of cornfield reasoning, as they say in my country, to that. The present law has accomplished these wonderful results. The present law has met the demands of increased population, has met the increased diversified industries and everything of that sort; and it is wonderful. There are in my State two streams, the Catawba and the Yadkin, running through it with laughing, rippling waters, and they both run over 50 miles. I suppose in these streams there are at least 500 shoals.

These splendid shoals and the countries immediately around them have been inhabited only by the bat and owl ever since man existed and ever since the morning stars sang together. What is the condition now? Industry has been stirred up; new life has been given; more money has come into the country and more labor found good employment at higher wages, and capitalists are seeking investments in that country on those shoals, until now in all that large area we have fabulous prices, thousands, tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of dollars in some instances, offered for the barren rocks and sterile hills in the Catawba and Yadkin valleys for shoals that have lain there from the foundation of the world to the present without turning a spindle or yielding a solitary cent for the State of North Carolina. It is not an extravagant dream picture to expect that within the next ten years, under the stimulating effect of the system of revenue and finance now existing, millions of dollars will be invested there by sound-money capitalists to bless and cheer the noble boys of Carolina by opening up new lines of hope founded in the existence of these great enterprises.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of these wonderful results, surpassing in realization the wildest dreams of the most enthusiastic American that now exists or anything ever thought of, we have an idea of what has been accomplished. But the suggestion has been made during this discussion that if all this has happened or resulted from the present revenue or financial policy of the Administration, why pass this bill; why not let well enough alone? The answer is this: Much as the existing law has accomplished, still better results are within our reach.

There is an infirmity in the system as it now exists. Who has pointed it out? Both parties in this country have pointed it out. President Cleveland pointed it out. I believe he was the author of the expression "the endless chain," was he not? Since that time President McKinley has pointed it out, and the experts of finance in this country, the business men, who are most interested in maintaining the highest business activity, have analyzed it, and they say that this is the only infirmity the system possesses to-day. This bill is intended to correct this infirmity and make it a perfect system. To do so we remove the infirmity; and it is the salvation of the South and West. I do not see how any Southern or Western man can hesitate to give his vote to, or how any North Carolinian can think of voting against, this proposition.

Here is a proposition that allows communities in the South and West having only 2,000 population to organize banks on a capital, I believe, of \$25,000. The present law requires a minimum of \$50,000. So it works it down. Why, we had State banks. By some they were considered good things. That unquestionably was a mistake; but when you can organize a national bank on a capital of \$25,000 that is absolutely secure, the State bank will be a thing of the past, and our people will resort to these new facilities—increased facilities—of being furnished with abundant supply of money by reason of this new banking provision here. Without this provision in favor of the people who do not live in the great centers of wealth—the South and West—the national banks possibly had it in their power to contract the currency. With this new feature the tooth of usury and extortion can not bite too much.

Mr. Chairman, the wisdom of the revenue and financial policy of the Government no longer rests on theory. It has been put in operation. The machine has been tested not in a "laboratory," as Adams said, but by being commanded to answer satisfactorily the demands of the business requirements of 76,000,000 of living souls for the last ten years. Our Democratic brethren can not now with any show of reason or fair play criticize it. When the new machine was launched, they with commendable industry and intelligence searched for mischiefs which they imagined lurked within it. Each and every one imagined that he had discovered its entire unfitness for the great work of restoring business life to the country, but they also had the manhood then to admit that if it proved a success they had nothing more to say.

The conservative clear leader of the Democratic side now, the



gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], denied that any increase of prosperity would ever be felt. It would be an interesting bit of history to collect all the interrogations they put almost every day in this House. "Where is your promised prosperity? The increase has not touched us yet."

In a speech delivered in this House by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] even as late as the 25th of January, 1898, that cool-headed statesman said:

I believe it will be admitted by all economists everywhere that there can be no general prosperity.

This is found on page 988 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, second session, Fifty-fifth Congress.

From this and hundreds and thousands of declarations closely akin to it, made by the illustrious leader's associates, the inference is irresistible that they were willing then to bow to the results of a trial of these laws. That trial has been had. The wisdom of the laws proven, and now they refuse to bow to the truth and will not be comforted. Not only has actual experiment overturned their position, but the voice of the people of these United States at the last general election was as potential as the results of an actual trial. The gentleman from New York, Mr. DRIGGS, a Democrat, informed his colleagues as to the extent of the verdict of the people of these United States on this question in the following language, which I read from page 250 of the RECORD of this session:

The popular majority throughout the whole Union—600,000—against us was the greatest ever recorded against any party in this country. Above all else the Democracy has to-day not a governor, not a State legislature, not a United States Senator in or from any State north of Virginia and Kentucky or east of the Mississippi River. No such condition of affairs existed before in our political history, for in the war election of 1864 New Jersey, Delaware, and Kentucky held true to the Democracy and several Democratic governors and legislatures were elected. Even in the disastrous Greeley campaign of 1872 Delaware cast its vote for the regular Democratic candidate, Mr. Hendrix. The year 1896 was indeed a disastrous year for the Democracy.

If, Mr. Chairman, an actual trial of the policy of the Administration with the most glorious results, coupled with the verdict of the people (for the recent State elections are more pronounced in favor of the Administration even than the picture drawn by the gentleman from New York), does not satisfy the Democratic members of this House that they were and are in error, there is poor encouragement, indeed, for anyone to offer them any further proof of the wisdom both of the revenue and financial policy of the Administration. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

MR. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill may be regarded as more thoroughly representing the party policy of the Republican party than any other which could have come before the House in any other way. It comes not simply with the indorsement of a majority of a committee composed of 17 members, but as the result of the unanimous voice of the entire Republican membership of the House, as shown in their party caucus.

This bill is not as innocent as at first blush it appears. It provides that the standard unit "shall, as now, be the gold dollar." If this is true, why assert it. A careful reading of the bill and a little reflection, however, will convince one that its consequences and effect are intended to be most far-reaching. I have ever deprecated any attempt to arraign one class of our people against another, but this is class legislation of the purest kind. It is brimful of benefits to the creditor class. There is not in this bill one single provision in the interest of the debtor. I am not one to arraign the debtor against the creditor or vice versa, but I do desire and demand that the one class shall be treated with the same consideration as the other.

In this bill the creditor's property is magnified and the value of his holdings increased. An increased value is added to the value of the United States bonds already outstanding, and valuable concessions are extended to the national banks, while their burdens are lightened. I am opposed to this bill because you have literally followed the saying, "To him that hath shall be given, and to him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

The first section provides that the "standard and unit of value shall, as now, be the gold dollar." The committee who formulated the bill says:

By the first and second sections of the bill which is here recommended it is sought to legalize the gold standard by a plain and definite statute, which will remove the question from all doubt and so establish the standard that it can be changed only by Congressional action, in this way giving the people's purpose the vitality of public law.

This shows that, notwithstanding the bold statement in the bill that the standard unit of value is now the gold dollar, it has never been so declared by law. On the contrary, Congress has solemnly declared that it was not. The Stanley Matthews resolution, which passed this House on the 28th day of January, 1878, under a suspension of the rules, declared as follows:

Whereas, by the act entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," approved March 18, 1869, it was provided and declared that the faith of the

United States was thereby solemnly pledged to the payment in coin or its equivalent of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of such obligations had expressly provided that the same might be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver; and

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

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

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

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

It is clearly to be seen that the gold dollar has never been recognized as the only money in which the Government could pay its debts, and the construction of the Secretary of the Treasury to pay only in gold was unauthorized.

We deny that it is the "people's purpose" that this gold dollar, as the sole unit of value, should now have "the vitality of public law." It may be and is "the purpose" of the bondholders and banks, but not necessarily of the people.

Section 2 provides that—

All interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States, as defined in section 1 of the act.

These obligations of the United States are now all payable in coin; by which is meant gold or silver coin, at the option of the Government. They were all placed upon the market and sold upon that construction. When the Cleveland Administration was forced to issue bonds, President Cleveland asked Congress to permit the bonds to be written payable in gold, and stated that the bonds could be sold at a higher rate and realize to the Treasury many millions of dollars more, the amount being estimated at about \$16,000,000. Congress rejected the proposition, and the bonds were sold, as all others have been to the present time, payable in coin.

During the present Administration \$200,000,000 of bonds, payable in coin, were sold at par, and those who were fortunate enough to have idle capital by them to purchase these bonds were able to dispose of them the same day at an increase of 5 per cent. A clear gift of \$10,000,000 of the people's money. No wonder the moneyed classes of this country continually do cry for bonds, more bonds.

The amount of bonds now outstanding, all payable in coin, to be hereafter payable in gold under this bill, is \$1,182,149,050. As a matter of fact, many of these millions were sold for greenbacks when they were worth less than par, many at par, some above par. But supposing only the ratio, as stated by President Cleveland, will be added by this bill declaring that they should be paid in gold, the amount that will be given to the holders of these bonds will be in excess of half a hundred million of dollars. Why this donation to the holders of the Government bonds without one iota of concession by them? Under this system of legislation Government bonds would continue to be good paying investments if they carried no interest. It is no secret that the bond-holding portion of the country are, to a very large extent, adherents of the party in power, and dominate and control it.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for the division of issue and redemption and the issue of gold bonds at the discretion of the Treasury. These sections provide, in effect, that the silver certificates, silver coin, United States notes, and Treasury notes, now outstanding, may be redeemed in gold, and when so redeemed shall not be reissued except for gold. The present law provides, not that said notes may be again paid out, but shall be. Mr. Cleveland argued that because the holders of the notes could go to the Treasury and get gold for them and that the Government had again to pay them out, when the same process might be gone over, it was an endless chain, and urged that it was necessary to stop it by a change in the law.

I with diffidence submit that this is not the correct view. It is no more an endless chain than any other class of money would be, and there is no more danger from it. After these notes are covered into the Treasury the only way they can get out is as money, in pursuance of appropriations made by law and in payment of the debts of the Government. It is now proposed to take from the Government the right to pay its debts with these



notes, only the right remaining of exchange for gold. The ultimate effect of this will be to withdraw from circulation all of the silver certificates now outstanding—

Amounting to.....	\$394,292,800
Silver dollars.....	71,361,740
United States notes.....	346,681,016
Treasury notes.....	87,441,680

forcing a contraction of the currency of over \$800,000,000.

What a change does this make in currency legislation in a few years! Up to 1873 we had the free coinage of silver as well as gold. The Bland-Allison Act was passed February 28, 1878, to coin not less than \$2,000,000 per month. This was followed by the Sherman law, July 14, 1890, repealed in 1893, under which the Government purchased and put in circulation annually, in payment of its debts, about \$54,000,000. Under these laws the circulating medium was very largely increased. The Sherman law was repealed in 1893, and now this bill will in time retire what is already issued of this vast sum and withdraw it from circulation.

Much of the money of the people is to be destroyed, and this is to be accomplished by the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury, unlimited as to amount, to sell gold bonds whenever he thinks it necessary to effect this planned contraction of the currency. We are to have the currency contracted, but the circulation of bonds increased. Increasing the bonds and contracting the currency seems to be the prevailing policy of the party in power.

The power to sell the bonds of the Government is too serious and fraught with too great consequences to be lodged with any one man. Congress alone should have this power. Its members are the servants of the people, and to them they would be answerable. But to whom would the Secretary of the Treasury be answerable for an error of judgment? If we were sure that all Secretaries of the Treasury would be the purest, best, and most disinterested of men (rather a violent presumption), this power would be too great to give to any one man. High-minded pure men are influenced by their associates and their surroundings. Frequently the president of some great banking institution is at the head of the Treasury Department of this Government. Trained in the banking business, he naturally looks at everything from the banker's point of view.

Sections 8 and following are the provisions containing the concessions to the national banks, and are a step in the direction of the Republican policy that the Government should not only cease to issue paper money to circulate among the people, but should give that vast and valuable privilege to the national banks. These national banks are required to purchase United States bonds to the extent of one-fourth of their capital; but there is no limit to the maximum amount. These bonds are to be deposited with the Treasurer, who is to deliver to said banks bank notes to the par value of said bonds. Under the operation of this law a national bank with a capital of \$1,000,000 could deposit a million dollars of bonds with the United States Treasury, upon which it would draw interest, and in addition would receive from the Treasury \$1,000,000 in bank notes, which it could lend out and for the use of which it would receive its usual discount. If all of these notes were kept in circulation the banks would thus receive double interest on the amount it had invested. The only tax the bank is required to pay to the Government is one-fifth of 1 per cent on the value of its franchise, "as measured by the aggregate of its capital, surplus, and undivided profits."

Not one cent upon the bank notes, which are printed and furnished at the expense, and the payment of which is guaranteed by the Government, without any consideration whatever. Why should this be done? Why should the Government abdicate its sovereign right to issue the money of the country? Why surrender to the moneyed power this mighty engine for good or evil to the people?

It is stated that while this bill was being considered by the Republican caucus one of the leaders said that he objected to the increased concessions to national banks, and gave as a reason that he was himself the holder of stocks in two national banks, and he did not care to appear before his constituents as an advocate of these features favorable to national banks. It is presumable that as soon as the reasons were made known to his associates—many of whom, possibly, were equally fortunate—they all at once and with great accord approved these features as eminently meritorious and proper.

At the last Congress a banking bill known as the McCleary bill was reported to the House; its object was very similar to the present measure so far as it relates to banks. In effect it was to take from the Government the right to issue the paper money and give it to the banks. The bill was not pressed to a vote. The occasion was thought not to be ripe for it. But now this measure, more far-reaching and destructive in its consequences than the discarded McCleary bill, is proposed.

Apart from the great benefits accorded the national banks and the special favoritism shown them, what may we reasonably expect as the practical operation of the control and ownership by the banks of the entire paper money of the country?

Banking institutions are organized and managed for the money that can be made. In flush times its money will, as far as possible, be kept in circulation, and customers will be urged to keep the loans; but in times of panic, even of doubt and uncertainty, what will be the practice of the banks? They will demand their money. A tight money market will be made tighter, and many a man with plenty of property but little ready money will be forced to the wall and into bankruptcy. The tighter the market, the more urgent the demand of the banks for their money. Not so would the Government deal with the people. In times of panic and stringency in the money market it has put money in circulation by buying its bonds, lending money to banks, giving people employment on public works, and other ways; but all of this is to be changed, and by surrendering the right to issue the paper currency of the country we are to be turned over to the tender mercies of the national banks.

But we are told now is the time to make a change which we denounce as inimical to the best interests of our people. We are told that the country is prosperous, and the Republican party is lauding itself to the skies as the particular guardian, promoter, and protector not only of the public credit but of flush times. If we consider that the bonded indebtedness of the Government has increased in amount from \$585,034,250, as of March 1, 1893, to almost double this immense sum, or \$1,037,049,690, as of November 30, 1899, or an increase on an average of about \$65,000,000 a year, one can form some idea of what the Republicans mean by prosperity. But to the holder of stock in trust combines, in national banks, and to the thousands of newly commissioned officers drawing salaries for service in the Spanish, Cuban, and Philippine wars it is flush times.

To the people who are the recipients of the difference in the expenditures of the Government in 1899, \$605,072,179.05, over 1897, of \$365,774,159.57, amounting to \$239,298,019.48, it is flush times. Under the war-revenue bill about \$150,000,000 have been taken in one year from the people. Two hundred million dollars have been borrowed upon the bonds of the people. All these vast sums wrung from the people, the bonds yet to be paid by them, make flush times for somebody. But where are the flush times for the farmer and the laborer? While the products he raises have to be sold in the open market at about the same price, the trust-protected products, fostered by the most outrageous and most unconscionable of all tariffs, have in some instances more than doubled in price.

Any spendthrift thinks he is prosperous as long as the money he has borrowed holds out, but how will it be when the money is exhausted and the day of reckoning comes? Will not the people turn from the false gods after whom they have been clamoring to the principles of an honest and economic administration of the Government; to Jeffersonian simplicity; to a reasonable standing army in times of peace; to the Monroe doctrine, confining ourselves to the Western Hemisphere, conceding the Eastern to the other nations of the earth; to the doctrine that the right to issue money and to declare the value thereof is an attribute of sovereignty and should be exercised only by the Government and not by corporate banks; to the sound proposition of a tax for revenue only, and not one that enables trust combinations to rob the people; to the reasonable demand that capital shall contribute its reasonable pro rata of taxation, by means of an income tax, to the expenses of the Government?

For these reforms we can only look to the Democratic party. Much extravagance and long lease of power have made the Republican party absolutely reckless and regardless of the rights of the people. They have surrendered at the behest and to the dictation of the great banks, trusts, and aggregations of capital which furnished the financial assistance which secured the Republican party's triumph in 1896. But an indignant people will shake off its indifference; they will be on their guard. Money will not have the power in 1900 that it had in 1896 to thwart the people's will. We know the attempt will be made, but forewarned is forearmed, and believing that "thrice is he armed who hath his quarrel just," the Democracy, while entering the coming contest with a full realization of the immense financial resources of the Republican party, will prosecute the fight upon principle and with a determination that right and justice shall triumph.

Mr. COONEY. Mr. Chairman, last Friday, when the rule for the discussion of this bill was before the House, a very able gentleman on the other side of the Chamber took occasion to felicitate himself, his colleagues, and his party on the happy and merry attitude they hold toward this bill and legislation in general. He said:

Our past is behind us, our present conditions we are proud of, our future we feel to be assured.

There is every indication that the gentleman faithfully expressed the prevailing mental attitude of Republicans. They have reasonable ground for pleasure. We are just finishing up our Spanish war, in the progress of which, if disaster had at any time befallen our arms, that party in the absolute control of affairs could not



have escaped the penalty due to its position. Our arms having achieved uninterrupted success, it is entitled to enjoy the felicity that is due to a party that holds the post of responsibility.

But, sir, I would warn Republican members that there is no reason for the exultant exhibition of joy that here gives evidence of the fact that they have reached that pinnacle of self-congratulation from which there is no ascent and there is a mighty fall.

"We rise to fortune by successive steps; we descend by only one." And I believe the enactment of this bill into law is that one step which Republicans are taking in their descent from power. I have heard of individuals who have laughed themselves to death and of those who died in the moment of their ecstasy. Violent delights have violent endings. Well-tempered assurance is always an element of success, but the cackinnation with which Republicans have dropped this "serpent's egg" in the House, and the glee with which they undertake to hatch it out, are certain symptoms of mortality.

This bill is a breaking of faith in its very foundation, and there is not a promise in the whole political life of the Republican party that does not sustain a fracture by the convulsion. "Our past is behind us" is an old and familiar announcement made by Republicans when they are about to crush the hopes they have created and violate the promises they have made. It is a favorite topic for their animadversion that the Democratic party holds to the past.

Sir, the past of this Republic is a great treasure house of the virtues and achievements of its most illustrious citizens. The men who built this Government and the principles that animated them still flash their light from out the past along the pathway of the present and the future. To the Democratic party the past is as alive with promises made to humanity as the future is pregnant with gifts to be revealed and enjoyed. To the Republican party the past is but a graveyard in which to bury broken vows and abandoned principles, and the funeral processions of that party never allow the dust to settle on the road to it.

For years the voters of the Republican party have had the gold standard pressed on them as the Old Testament of faith. It taught them the wisdom of John Sherman and all the great prophets of the single standard and parity. They had scarcely accepted it upon the conditions of the St. Louis platform when the veil of hypocrisy was rent in twain, and this bill is given to them as a New Testament of "currency reform," which they are to receive, on faith alone, as a revelation from a power higher than themselves. It will perhaps induce Republicans to receive it by having some knowledge of its antecedents.

The men who are sent here to legislate for the people could not make this bill. They did not know how to draft its provisions to meet the objects aimed at by those who desired the law. It was not made by Congress or any committee thereof, and for that reason may be the more acceptable to the people. A few men interested in national banks conceived it and drafted its provisions at Atlantic City last summer amidst the frivolities of fashion, the pomp of wealth, the gluttony of luxury, the conspiracy of greed, and all the heartless hilarity of a fashionable summer resort, where our plutocrats doth congregate. From then until this Congress met it was guarded from the public eye in that holiest of holies, the vault of a national bank. It was dispatched here in secrecy, and in secrecy its contents were revealed only to Republican members.

The gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber, who could not or would not draft this bill themselves, called a caucus to consider it. The caucus was resolved into a wild west show, in which their Buffalo Bills, already booted and spurred for the occasion, mounted and broke in all the mustangs and bronchos in the herd. They then convened in an old-fashioned protracted meeting, where the broken-spirited sinners were called to the mourners' bench to strengthen their newly-found faith in a final wrestle with their conscience and the national banker. I do not ask for the result of that spiritual wrestling match. In the case of a Republican member it is easily predicted, for where in one Testament it is written, "Resist the devil and he will flee from you," in this new testament of "currency reform" it is written, "Resist the banker and he will go for you."

Sir, I anticipate that the martial wave upon whose crest Republicans build their hope for the future will find in this bill the rock on which it will split. They have turned their back on their own party and its declared principles, and without authority from the people or necessity from the condition of the times they propose to revolutionize the finances of the country, and for the sole profit of a class to permanently install institutions that were originally created only for temporary purposes. The national bank means a national debt. Is the Republican party getting ready to perpetuate and increase our national debt?

If this bill stopped with the legal establishment of the gold standard it might possess the fair appearance of authority from the platform on which the present administration was elevated to power. The gold standard is now and has been for many years

in practical operation in this country, not by force of law, but against it. It has been put in force and maintained by the policy of the respective administrations. They could with absolute legal authority have adopted and maintained a policy that would have destroyed the gold standard and substituted that of bimetalism. But the policy adopted was ratified by the Republican convention of 1896. Under certain limitation that convention declared for the then existing gold standard, but its smile of approbation did not extend a hair's breadth further.

The first two sections of this bill make legal what was before considered by many as illegal; they establish the gold standard absolutely and beyond cavil. But these two sections constitute only a one-ninth part of this bill. What is the subject of legislation treated of by the other eight-ninths? The establishment of the gold standard? Not in any particular. Eight-ninths of the bill is wholly devoted to the construction of a legal framework within which the Secretary of the Treasury can, and is invited to, wipe out the last vestige of our paper currency and replace it with the paper issue of the national banks.

The power that this bill gives to redeem and impound our currency, to mix, exchange, and shuffle up the various funds like a pack of cards in the hands of a professional gambler, to issue and sell Government bonds, to create and extend national banks and force an increase of their paper issue upon the people, is all left absolutely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to judge the times and occasions when to act with dispatch and move in harmony with the spirit of this bill to the ultimate change in our currency and to the realization of the happiest golden dream of the national bank.

The disposition of the Secretary of the Treasury in the use of the immense discretion and powers given him in this bill can be predicted from his past history. He is himself a national banker, and for years he has officiated as high priest to currency reformers. In 1894, to those who were aiming to "tinker" with the currency under Cleveland, he wrote the following from his national bank in Chicago:

I believe the "Baltimore plan" carries the true principles of a credit currency, but we can not reach it by any step, and years may intervene before it could be realized. In the meantime the way of the Government to step out of the currency business and place the burden of redemption on the banks is plain—authorize the issue of \$250,000,000 of 2½ per cent bonds payable at such time as Congress may elect (twenty-five years desirable), to be offered to subscribers at par. Accept in payment United States legal-tender notes or Treasury notes, the same to be canceled. Amend the national bank act so that banks can obtain note issue to the face value of bonds deposited as security for circulation. Reduce the tax on circulating notes to one-half of 1 per cent. This done, national bank notes would make good the vacuum caused by the retirement of Government notes. The problem is this: To take the Government out of the note-issuing business.

And again, a year before the election of McKinley, Mr. Gage, in a speech before a currency-reform club of bankers in Chicago, said:

Our whole monetary system is the resultant of makeshift legislation and unscientific compromises. It is time that reform began. I do not assume here to offer final remedies. In my own opinion the greenbacks should be permanently retired. The silver purchased under the Sherman act should be gradually sold and the Treasury notes redeemed and canceled. Some well-guarded system of bank-note circulation, broader and more elastic than the present national bank act provides, should be inaugurated.

To sum up, the defects of our present currency system are: (1) A confusing heterogeneity, which needs simplification. (2) The greenback controversy the principle of paper money. (3) The Treasury note is a standing evidence of a foolish operation; it lies open to the just charge of being both idiotic and immoral. (4) The national bank note nearly conforms to the true principle of paper money. (5) The silver certificate encourages the use of silver to a larger extent than consists with the safe preservation of that metal on a parity with gold.

I read the foregoing expressions of faith, belief, and purposes of the man who now rules our finances—expressions made public by him years before McKinley selected him as the representative of his financial policy—to make it clear what construction is now to be placed on the provisions of this bill. From Mr. Gage's point of view there is not a single defect in our currency but what this bill will eliminate; that part of our currency he said destroy this bill destroys; what he advised as a substitute it substitutes, and in its iconoclasm it goes further and hastens the retirement of the silver dollar by providing for its redemption in gold. Clearer than any explanation that has yet been given by those who espouse the cause of this bill in this House; briefer, more pointed, with less humbug, and with less confusion of intelligence as to its purposes, Mr. Gage has already placed his construction on the bill; and he will not shirk a duty that is so pleasant to him as enforcing all its provisions at every opportunity.

Mr. Gage is not a politician. He is neither a Republican, a Democrat, a mugwump, nor a copperhead, but at different times he has been each and all of them. In every position his politics and religion have been the intrenchment and perpetuation of the national banking system in this country. He bolted the Republican party in 1892 and labored for the election of Cleveland for the purpose of securing the repeal of the Sherman law and driving another rivet of strength into the gold standard. He assisted at the birth of the Baltimore plan and was in constant consultation with Cleveland, Carlisle, and Springer, devising means to



bring that plan before Congress and forcing it on the country. That scheme came tumbling down upon him and for the moment buried him out of sight beneath its ruins.

When MARK HANNA came along in 1896 he rescued him from the debris and started him forth again to organize the national bankers into a phalanx of taxgatherers, which, in aid of McKinley's election, collected the biggest corruption fund that the world has ever seen to buy place or power for any man. He is now the ambassador at the McKinley court for all those incorporated organisms that deal in the earnings of credit, stocks, bonds, and mortgages, the elements that are most directly interested in the total destruction of silver as money, the absolute maintenance of the gold standard, and the complete substitution of national-bank paper for our present currency. They belong to no political party permanently; no party can purchase them; they are not on the market for sale, but to buy. They purchase political parties themselves.

Their connection at the present time with the Republican party can scarcely be said to have been formed on the basis of an alliance. They spent too much time and money to effect the success of that party and that party has broken too many of its pledges to the people to rebut the presumption that it is acting under force in supporting this bill. The people, whose servants we are, have not seen this bill. Its provisions have never been discussed by them, nor in any form has the change of our currency for that of a national-bank paper been passed upon by them. No party has ever submitted that question to its constituents. On the hustings and elsewhere Republicans have been charged with secretly harboring this design, but it was indignantly denied as often as charged.

One of the most familiar and potent arguments of Republican orators in favor of the gold standard during the campaigns of 1896 and 1898 was that it preserved the greenbacks, Treasury notes, and our other forms of currency intact; that it made each dollar of them equal to a dollar in gold. You told them that you wanted the gold standard to make their old historic greenback equal to gold; you did not tell them that you also wanted to retire the greenback. Why didn't you?

In considering this bill it would be well to keep before our eye the kind, quantity, and character of our currency that it marks out for slaughter. I take the report of the Treasury Department for December 1, 1899, which shows the outstanding currency in circulation on that date to be as follows:

Gold coin.....	\$627,480,101
Standard silver dollars.....	78,232,454
Subsidiary silver.....	76,322,965
Gold certificates.....	150,908,202
Silver certificates.....	394,292,800
Treasury notes (act July 14, 1890).....	87,441,680
United States notes (greenbacks).....	317,811,976
Currency certificates (act June 8, 1872).....	13,605,000
National-bank notes.....	239,835,786
Total.....	1,985,930,964

Here is what this bill is calculated by degrees, but eventually, to eliminate from the foregoing:

Standard silver dollars.....	\$78,232,454
Silver certificates.....	394,292,800
Treasury notes (act July 14, 1890).....	87,441,680
United States notes (greenbacks).....	317,811,976
Currency certificates (act June 8, 1872).....	13,605,000
Total.....	891,383,910

This amounts to nearly one-half of the currency available for circulation. It is that part of the currency which does in fact circulate and upon which falls the chief burden of exchange and business of the people; for if we add to this the subsidiary coinage and national-bank notes, amounting to \$316,158,751, we would have \$1,207,542,661 as the total sum of the currency that enters into practical circulation.

The two other so-called media of circulation in the Treasury statement as outstanding and in circulation, namely, gold coin and gold certificates, circulate intermittently and on crutches. They have a peculiar and very valuable use of their own as reserves and deposits for banks and individuals, but it is not the money that circulates among the people; and it may be well to say here that the \$627,480,101 in gold said to be in circulation is not correct, but is the amount which has been coined from the foundation of the United States Mint, and is not now held as reserve in the Treasury.

The statement does not subtract the amount that during a long period of years has been lost, exported, or used in the arts. Now, the exercise of the power given in this bill to redeem and retire \$891,383,910 of our currency must have one of two results—Government bonds must be issued as a basis for national banks to supply the vacuum in our country, or there must be an immense contraction in the currency, either one of which will be a national evil that will approach to a national curse; and I defy any man to show a different result.

The chief object of the bill is, as Mr. Gage before this expressed it: "To take the Government out of the note-issuing business."

By which he means that the Government shall stop issuing anything in the nature of paper currency and turn that privilege wholly over to the national banks. Out of all these millions of currency there are only \$239,835,786 that are issued by the national banks, and represent a debt upon which they can draw interest from the Government, while \$891,383,910, representing silver money and Government notes, is active, running at large and popular with the people, issued by the Government, and not producing a single cent of usury to the national banks.

When the currency robber looks on that \$891,383,910, carrying blessings to humble homes, animating with hope the toil-worn paths of labor, thrusting the torch of comfort into the dark corners of wretchedness and poverty, and maintaining its mission of love and charity, absolutely free from the finger of the usurer, thoughts come over him like those that came to General Blucher, when, after the battle of Waterloo, he was taking in the sights of London. That city so impressed the old freebooter, with its "confusing heterogeneity" of wealth and splendor, that he was constrained to remark to his English guide, "Mine Gott, vat a vine city to sack!"

If the American people can be induced to issue \$891,383,910 of Government bonds with which to retire this currency, then the national banks will have a basis for circulating their own notes put the best investment on earth for \$891,383,910 of their capital. The prospect which now invites their perseverance is the most alluring that has tempted the imagination since that which struck the gaze of Christ from the mount to which the devil took him. In a country the richest and greatest the sun ever shone upon, where royalty is unknown, the national bank, tempted by the same old devil, aims to enthrone itself as absolute monarch and quarter its stockholders permanently upon the people's wealth and enterprise.

The national bank is the organized power that gives life and movement to this conspiracy against the people. It has many and powerful allies, who, on account of fear, favor, or connection, are in sympathy with all its objects. Its attitude to-day makes it easy to understand the indignation of Jefferson when he declared that a national bank was more dangerous to the liberties of the people than a hostile army; and how Andrew Jackson was prompted to set his iron heel on the neck of the old national bank and grind the life out of it.

Ever since the present national bank was organized down to the present time it has been a disturbing element in our finance. It is not too much to say that did it not exist the people would have been saved from the bitter strifes and disastrous results of the conflict that has been waged on the money question during the past twenty-six years. No one can examine the many conflicts and acts of Congress on money, finance, and currency without being impressed with the irrepressible strife that has been waged between it and the people for supremacy over the nation's currency.

Through all this strife, whether waged on silver, gold, bonds, currency, or other kindred subject, it has been animated by but one unceasing purpose, and that is, to grasp from the hands of the Government the constitutional power of issuing currency for the people and exercising that power exclusively by itself. That "confusing heterogeneity which needs simplification," as Mr. Gage terms our existing currency, has been brought about by that very conflict. It is the epitomized history of the strife, and in it can be read what the people have preserved and what their enemy has gained. And I challenge the whole history of that conflict for an instance where the national-bank power has been successful in changing the law of our money or currency that has not been followed by disaster, depression, panic, or individual ruin from which there was no recovery until such action was reversed or its force broken by some remedial act.

Whatever is legal tender is, for all practical purposes, money in our currency. It will buy what each one wants, and, what is more to the purpose, the creditor is bound to accept it in discharge of his debt. Besides gold, we now have a billion legal-tender dollars for circulation with which every man can pay his debts everywhere. This bill provides that it shall retain the same legal-tender quality; but when, under the provisions of the bill, it is redeemed and retired from circulation, what is to take its place? Republicans laugh at such a simple inquiry and answer that if redeemed in gold, as provided in this bill, the gold will take its place in circulation. That is an evasive answer. Gold will not circulate when men deal in it as a commodity to make commissions and profits and collect it for purposes of reserve.

As I observed before, the purpose is to replace it with national-bank notes. National-bank notes are not a legal tender, nor does this bill provide them with that quality. If, then, our present currency is changed to a national-bank currency, the people will have nothing with which to pay their debts but this bank currency. That the creditor is not bound to receive. John Smith has given William Brown a mortgage on his farm. When interest day comes, John gathers up \$100 in national-bank notes—there is



nothing else in circulation—and takes it to William to pay his interest. William refuses to accept it. Why? Because it is not a legal tender. John says to William, "Take them; they are just as good as gold. We now have the gold standard; you can get them redeemed in gold, dollar for dollar." "I know that," says William, "but I do not have to take those notes, but you go and get them redeemed in gold and bring it to me; I will have to take the gold." John goes to town, enters the national bank, presents his \$100 of bank paper and calls for gold in exchange. The banker looks at the notes and says, "Well, Mr. Smith, these notes have not been issued by this bank. One of them was issued by the First National Bank of New Orleans, one by the First National Bank of St. Paul, one by the First National Bank of San Francisco, and the others by the First National Bank of Boston. I have no doubt but if you present these notes at the respective banks that issued them they will redeem them in gold; or you might take all of them to the United States Treasury and have them redeemed in bulk. If, however, it is inconvenient for you to make the trip, there is old Money Bags around the corner, who will pay you the gold for them at a reasonable discount."

That is an illustration of what is made possible in ordinary transactions by the provisions of the bill you now aim to make law, when under it our present legal-tender currency shall have been wiped out and the gold-redeemable nonlegal-tender paper money of the bank is substituted in its stead. It is the glory of our present currency that there is sufficient legal tender in it to save the people from the expenses and inconvenience of redemption in the free use of it in their transactions.

The national-bank notes now pass without exception and as freely as our legal-tender currency, but that is the result, to a considerable extent, of the fact that its quantity is small in comparison with the legal-tender currency, is redeemable in a large part of that currency, and is sustained and carried along by the force of its relation to the whole volume of currency. When it becomes practically the sole currency, depending upon gold redemption at inconvenient places, it will not, under the law as it now exists, nor when this bill becomes law, stand the storms of depression and panics.

It may be that future legislation will change the quality of the national-bank note and make it a legal tender. I apprehend that the American people will never be satisfied with a currency that is less than legal tender. If the national-bank note is made a legal tender, it is then no better than our present currency, while at the same time the people will have to pay for it in millions of bonds and interest.

That part of the currency which you aim to destroy you have stigmatized as fiat money. Our support of it you declare to be Populism. We are proud of the accusation. There is but one system that is free from fiat. That is where there is a dollar of real money or bullion held in reserve to redeem every dollar of paper money permitted to circulate. If \$3 of paper currency is permitted to circulate upon \$1 of redemption money, there is \$1 of fiat money in circulation.

This dollar may sustain its power of exchange by legislation, by confidence, by methods of business, or otherwise, for an hour, a day, a year, or forever, but so long as it circulates it carries with it the quality of irredeemability, of fiatism, which in our currency has been an object of aversion to national banks and now of ridicule by Republicans. There does not and there can not exist among a civilized people a system of currency without more or less of such fiatism in it. When this fiatism is placed in the currency issued by the Government the national banker hates it; when it is injected into his own national-bank currency he loves it.

This fiatism can not be eliminated from our financial system. The presumption of irredeemability, even if limited in time, must to a large and increasing degree remain with that system. It may be shifted from one part of the system to another, but it can not be taken out of it. No one knows that better than the national banker. It is the center of this whole financial struggle. It is the profit-producing part of the system. If it is left with the currency issued by the Government directly, all the people will reap profits; it saves them from Government bonds—a perpetual national indebtedness and the payment of interest to the national banks.

If the national banks can transfer that fiatism to their own paper issue and into a national bonded indebtedness, which they will surely hold, then they and their successors for all time to come will reap the profits. This bill makes that transfer. It enlarges the opportunity for fiatism in the hands of the bankers, while it makes the whole system dangerous and top-heavy by making gold alone the basis of redemption.

So far as the gold-standard feature of this bill is concerned, I am opposed to it. No matter what events have changed the opinions of gentlemen on the other side of this House within the last few years, to my mind there are no grounds for discussion and debate on that subject. If gentlemen have changed, the Constitution has not. The adoption of the gold standard by this

Government has been effected by a long campaign of organized corruption.

In that campaign many a "needy hired man" has made his fortune at the expense of his country and his conscience. Many a metropolitan newspaper has been kept upon its legs by the sale of corrupt opinions. Ministers of state and persons in high political positions have been financially profited, and there has not been an impecunious scoundrel who has sold his services to the gold trust but has become wealthy or advanced to political, professional, or commercial position to keep him from want.

Even this Republican Administration reaches out the helping hand to those two ragged and hungry fugitives and tramps from the Democratic party, William Bynum and Josiah Patterson, and places them in some of the most profitable positions in the Government because they were the more serviceable that they were traitors.

I congratulate the people of the United States on the heroic and protracted struggle they have made for financial freedom and that this is the last of all the great nations to succumb to the corruption and injustice by which the gold standard has been everywhere enacted into law. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ZENOR. Mr. Chairman, the Republican party, in its St. Louis platform in 1896, declared against the free coinage of silver—except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world—

Which it pledged itself to "promote." It further declared that—

until such agreement can be obtained the existing gold standard must be preserved, and all our silver and paper currency must be maintained at parity with gold.

It further and lastly, and as a corollary to what precedes, declared that the party would favor—

all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States, and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth.

Mr. Chairman, in this plank of the Republican platform it was and is now assumed that the country was and is upon the gold standard, and with this knowledge and the experience of more than forty-six years of the actual operation and effect of this policy—for the distinguished gentleman from the State of Iowa, Mr. DOLLIVER, and others upon that side of the Chamber have declared in the course of this discussion that the gold standard which is now proposed to be crystallized into statutory law has virtually been in force since 1853, and my distinguished colleague, Mr. OVERSTREET, from Indiana, says it has been recognized in practice for more than half a century—with all this knowledge and experience, the Republican party felt called upon when it assembled in national convention at St. Louis in 1896 to emphasize the fact that the gold standard was not satisfactory, and in language and phraseology deliberately and carefully chosen explicitly declared their preference for bimetallism and pledged their party in the most solemn manner to use every honorable means to secure its reestablishment by an international agreement. Opposed to this declaration was the declaration of the Democratic party, in these words:

We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. We demand that the standard silver dollar shall be a legal tender equally with gold for all debts, public and private, and we favor such legislation as will prevent for the future the demonetization of any kind of legal-tender money by private contract.

This is not all. We went still further. We declared—

We are opposed to the policy and practice of surrendering to the holders of the obligations of the United States the option reserved by law to the Government of redeeming such obligations in either silver or gold coin.

With the positions of the two parties thus defined and along the lines thus drawn the great contest upon this question was waged in 1896. I dare say that if the Republican party in that contest had declared that in order to preserve the alleged existing gold standard it was necessary to retire the greenbacks or impound them in the United States Treasury and substitute for them national-bank notes and redeem the silver dollars or silver certificates with gold, as has since been advocated and is now openly avowed, and especially if its leaders, advocates, and champions had announced their purpose, if elected, to reverse the unbroken practice of the Government for more than eighty years of its proudest history and to crystallize into law the usurpations and vicious practices inaugurated by the Secretaries of the Treasury of later years, without warrant and in defiance of the plain letter of the statute, by the passage of such a measure as the pending bill, Mr. McKinley would not have carried a half dozen States of the Union.

The President in his first message told the country our money was all now perfectly good, but that "currency reform" was needed to remove alleged doubts and ambiguities in our financial system. He signally failed, however, to point out the defects supposed to exist, and he proposed no plan of reform, but contented himself with calling attention to the scheme of his Secretary of the Treasury then pending, or soon thereafter introduced, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.



He neither indorsed, criticised, nor disapproved it. He must have known what the commission of the monetary convention of Indianapolis proposed. He could not have been ignorant of the plans of currency reform introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Walker, and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FOWLER, and Mr. McCLEARY, of Minnesota; and yet the President publicly expressed no opinion about any of them. He said in his banquet speech in New York City, shortly after his inauguration, that his interpretation of the victory of 1896 was that the people commissioned the Republican party "to enact such laws as would not permit a doubt to exist anywhere concerning the stability and integrity of our currency or the inviolability of our obligations of every kind."

If this was his view at that time and he was convinced that the remedy was the establishment of the gold standard, then it was his plain duty to put the money question to the front and to have had some measure of reform ready for submission to Congress. Instead of this, however, he sent a high-salaried commission abroad on a junketing tour to the capitals of Europe to secure foreign consent for us to do what we are well capable of doing for ourselves, and then called an extra session to reenact the McKinley tariff law to legislate the country prosperous. The result is not prosperity for the great mass of the people, but for trusts and monopolies, which have forced up the price of practically everything the farmers of the country are compelled to buy in the way of necessary supplies without a corresponding increase in the price of their products and what they have to sell, and an estimated deficit of more than \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending 1901, with continued war taxes and probably more bond issues.

In his banquet speech the President dropped bimetalism by international agreement and made no suggestion of what he thought ought to be done to "reform our currency." His whole address was nothing if not a well-formed and eloquent group of glittering generalities and pleasing platitudes. As Hamlet said to Polonius, "Words, words, words." He did not say the bonds or other obligations should be paid in gold, for fear of driving off the bimetallic Republicans, but said they must be paid in the "best money of the world," to hold his gold supporters. The President said:

Nothing should ever tempt us—nothing ever will tempt us—to scale down the sacred debt of the nation through a legal technicality. Whatever may be the language of the contract, the United States will discharge all of its obligations in the currency recognized as the best throughout the civilized world at the times of payment.

Mr. Chairman, this is remarkable language. The rights of the parties—the United States and the bondholders—are not to be determined by the terms of the contract; not even paid in our own money, whatever it may be at the time of payment, but in the money of other nations if it is thought to be "better" than ours! Shylock refused his principal and demanded his "pound of flesh" because it was "so nominated in the bond." The President proposed to give more than is "nominated in the bond," the "pound of flesh" cut from over the heart of the American people, blood and all!

And now his party proposes in the pending measure to carry out this policy and fasten upon the country the gold standard and thereby give to the owners of Government securities an unearned increment of millions of dollars. But when, without any submission of the question to the great mass of the people, like a similar contribution made to their greed and avarice in 1873, you have done this grateful service to the bondholders, it will arouse such a storm of indignation as will cause the modern Shylocks to exclaim with Shakespeare's prototype, "Give me my principal and let me go."

And in his later messages the President is even less explicit, if possible, than he has been on the currency question. He speaks no word of commendation of the views of his Secretary of the Treasury in his report to Congress, and contributes nothing of importance to help in forming public opinion on this momentous issue.

Secretary Gage and Comptroller Dawes have openly antagonized each other on the money question, which has doubtless led the President to be more guarded and less aggressive, looking out for the first chance to return to his first love and prepared for the opportune moment.

The truth is, the President has had no well-defined and fixed financial policy.

The President has really been in an uncomfortable dilemma on this money question. The record of his whole public life has been and is for silver. He voted for the Bland-Allison bill over the veto of President Hayes in 1878, and for the Matthews resolution of the same year, passed again by the Senate in February, 1898. He voted for the Sherman purchasing act of 1890, and was one of the most vigorous advocates of free silver on this floor. When his party surrendered to the money power at St. Louis he was confronted with this silver record, and first sought to have the platform avoid the use of the word "gold;" but his friends failing in this, his next and only remaining resort was to speak in vague

generalities from his porch in Canton about "sound money" and "making every dollar as good as every other dollar."

But when the time for action comes his eloquent periods and captivating appeals upon the subject of sound money will not do, and he apparently has no plan. He has endeavored to placate his turbulent bimetallic friends in the form of promises to continue negotiations with other nations for bimetalism, while his Secretary is known to have laughed at it as folly, and emphasizes his opposition to it by making the primary purpose of his financial bill "to commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard and remove as far as possible all doubts and fears on that point."

Secretary Gage seems to be of a different composition from his chief, and has omitted no occasion to define his views. In speeches and public interviews he has repeatedly declared that the only solution of our difficulties is the permanent establishment of the single gold standard. In his "statement" of December 17, 1897, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Secretary said:

A bimetallic standard does not exist anywhere on earth. A bimetallic currency, as I understand bimetalism, does exist in the United States now. The firm establishment of our system upon the gold standard and the recognition of silver by the Government in the way of such interchangeability as may be necessary to keep it equal to gold will better maintain bimetalism on the general principle I have just outlined. This has, in a manner, been going on for eighteen or nineteen years. There is nothing at all in the proposition to more firmly establish the gold standard to prevent us from doing all reasonable things to accomplish such an increase in the value of silver money as will bring it to a natural parity with gold, and thus relieve the Government from the expense of artificial maintenance and the embarrassment which has prevailed for many years and which will perhaps prevail for many years to come in our financial system.

That is to say, what silver dollars we now have or may hereafter coin must be exchangeable or redeemable in gold, for which, perhaps, bonds will have to be issued to secure enough of it, in order to have a true bimetallic currency. This is the theory now sought to be enacted into law. For such bimetalism, of course, no international arrangement would be necessary, because the ratio would be wholly immaterial.

But if there was any doubt at any time about the position of Secretary Gage on this subject, there could be none whatever about the position of the Indianapolis commission, which represented the gold wing of the Republican party as well as the Gold Democrats. In their report they said that the object of their plan was to remove all doubt at once and forever about the stability of our currency by establishing the gold standard in a permanent form; and to do this, among other things, they contended that the coinage of silver dollars must cease. They said:

Many of our fellow-citizens have hoped in all sincerity that the problem of the standard would be solved by international bimetalism. An earnest effort has been made to realize that hope, but it must now be abandoned.

Senator WOLCOTT, one of the commission, in his speech in the Senate reviewing the work of the commission in that behalf, declared that he and his colleagues met a serious obstacle in their efforts to secure the cooperation of foreign nations for bimetalism in the fact that it was believed that the United States did not really desire the success of the commission, and that this belief was founded on the expressed opinions in public interviews of Secretary Gage and minor official representatives of the Administration.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have a right to know whether there has been double dealing in this important matter. Has the President been "running with the hare and holding with the hounds?" Has he and his party been giving lip service to bimetalism and secretly stabbing it? However this may be, it is certain that Secretary Gage has not disavowed any of the alleged interviews, nor has he withdrawn his bill or statements from the committee of the House, and he still remains the close friend and financial adviser of the President in the Cabinet.

To placate the suspicious silver Republicans, the President has removed Mr. Preston, Director of the Mint, who made bold to speak out on the futility and absurdity of any attempt to secure international bimetalism; but this was a very weak "apology" to his clamorous silver followers of the Republican persuasion. The people will draw their own conclusions from these damaging facts, and the President and his party must answer to the country for their good faith in their attempt to redeem this pledge of their platform.

Why this sudden and almost hysterical cry for a "reform" of the currency and strengthening of the public credit? Where is the source of danger to the credit of the nation, and who is complaining of the currency? The President assures the country that all our money is perfectly good, and Secretary Gage informed us by a telegram to ex-Secretary Fairchild during the silver debate in the Senate in the winter of 1897-98 that the obligations of the Government were being paid indifferently in gold, silver, or paper, and this assurance has since been quite often repeated.

The gold reserve in the Treasury is about \$240,000,000 and constantly increasing. The balance of trade is largely in our favor and gold is pouring into the country in quantities never before known in our history. The open and avowed purpose of the pending bill



is to fasten the gold standard permanently on the country. The people of the country thoroughly understand the movement, and while powerless for the time to successfully resist the passage of the present vicious and revolutionary measure, the time will come when they will enter their indignant protest at the ballot box.

The act of November 1, 1893, repealing the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890, declared it—

to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coin of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts.

This law was passed by the votes of Democrats and Republicans on this floor and in the other branch of Congress. This is the solemn declaration of policy of the United States on the money question, and it still stands on the statute book. The Republican party now repudiates and abandons that wise policy. The Democratic party will adhere to it. Admitting that "international agreement" has failed and is entirely hopeless, must we give up and sink under the blighting influence of the single gold standard?

It is not true that gold was the "existing standard" when the St. Louis platform was adopted, or at any other time by any authority of law. The act of 1873 discontinued the coinage of legal-tender silver dollars, but the acts of 1878 and 1890, whereby about 500,000,000 silver dollars were coined and made a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, necessarily repealed that act and reestablished the bimetallic system. Really, technically speaking, there never has been any such thing as a money standard of value.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the legal-tender case declared:

It is hardly correct to speak of a standard of value. The Constitution does not speak of it. It contemplates a standard for that which has gravity or extension; but value is an ideal thing. The coinage acts fix the 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. There might never have been a piece of money of the denomination of a dollar. There never was a pound sterling coined until 1815, if we except a few coins struck in the reign of Henry VIII, almost immediately debased, yet it has been the unit of British currency for many generations. It is, then, a mistake to regard the legal-tender acts as either fixing a standard of value or regulating money values.

This is the language of the highest judicial tribunal in the world.

The more zealous advocates of the "gold standard" insist that there can be no successful establishment of that standard in our monetary system until the gold unit is regarded precisely the same as the unit of the measure of weight or length. The absurdity of the contention is easily exposed by reference to everyday transactions in business. A pound or a yard is the same in the Klondike country as in the States; but a dollar, whether of gold, silver, or paper, will not purchase one-fourth as much flour or meat in Dawson City as in Washington.

Money has two functions—it constitutes the circulating medium and at the same time acts as a measure of value, or price, rather. No "standard of value" is conceivable independent of the circulating medium. The measure of price or value depends on the quantity of all the money in circulation, not on the quality of any particular portion of it. Greenbacks were necessarily the "standard" until the resumption of specie payments, because gold and silver had disappeared, and because all business was conducted and prices determined by the paper circulation.

When resumption was accomplished, all debts, public or private, were payable in gold or silver, because the word "coin" in the refunding act of July 14, 1870, meant both gold and silver. Until 1873 both gold and silver, in contemplation of law, were the "standards," or, perhaps more accurately speaking, the "standard," and had been since 1792, the date of the first coinage act, although one of the metals had more or less disappeared from circulation from time to time, leaving the other the controlling currency, along with the notes of banks.

The safeguards of our own laws are still left us under this statute of 1893 to establish and maintain the double standard of gold and silver without the "aid or consent" of any foreign nation. When the bill to repeal the purchasing clause of that act was under discussion on this floor, the friends of silver made motion after motion to so amend the law that the ratio might be made to conform, as far as practicable, to the relative commercial value of the two metals, but the Republicans joined hands with the misguided followers of President Cleveland to vote them all down, because the purpose was then, as it is now, to place the country on the single gold basis.

No "safeguards" will be required other than the natural operation of the automatic system of bimetalism at the ratio established by law. The Democratic party believes, as I understand it, that the free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 will not drive gold out of the country nor send it to a premium; that it will not impair the public credit or disturb values, but, on the contrary, preserve both, as it always did before silver was stricken down. The act of 1873 was not the only

crime against the people, but, supplemented as it was by the surrender by our Secretaries of the Treasury of the option conferred by law to pay public creditors in either gold or silver coin, constituted an essential part in the final culmination of this great wrong.

The Democratic party believes that with both gold and silver as primary money, supplemented, if necessary, by the issue of Government notes, a volume of currency can always be had adequate to the wants of business and necessary to give activity to trade and employment to labor. The Democratic party believes that the adoption of the single gold standard will have one of two effects—either to further contract the currency, cripple industry, and reduce prices, or else, with the banking schemes proposed to be hitched onto gold, will inflate credit money to a degree dangerous to the people by causing suspensions of specie payments and periodical panics. These are fears, if well founded, well calculated to cause hesitation and challenge thoughtful consideration even among those who feel inclined to favor some well-guarded measure of currency reform, in giving their support to the pending bill.

In 1841 Thomas H. Benton, referring to the overthrow of the Bank of the United States, said: "We have driven the tigress to the jungle, but I fear that some day she will return, bringing her whelps with her." The prediction was realized. The "whelps" did return. The country was flooded with "wildcat" banks, carrying suspensions and panics in their course. During the war (1863) came the national-bank system, and now come various schemes to extend, perpetuate, and enlarge their powers. The Democratic party takes its stand against all these measures. They are all obnoxious to the fundamental objection that the Government prerogative and exclusive function of establishing the currency of the people is to be surrendered to private corporations.

The greenbacks are to be withdrawn or impounded and bank notes substituted. An interest-bearing debt is to be created in the place of one bearing no interest and the silver money of the people ultimately destroyed. Approached by many cross paths, winding in and out in bewildering mazes, like the labyrinth of Grecian mythology, which concealed the Minotaur that fed on human flesh, the monster gold standard has its fixed habitation in this proposed measure to do its deadly work in safety.

A Thesens will yet be found to penetrate this modern labyrinth of the artful money power and slay its monster. The Gage bill, the original monetary-commission bill, the Walker bill, and the Fowler bill all proposed a partnership between the Government and the banks, in which the banks were to make all the profits and the Government assume all the responsibility. The pending bill, a compromise of the conflicting views and opposing opinions of the Republican members of this House, necessarily involves some sacrifice of the more radical element of the Republican party of their extreme ideas upon the subject of currency reform, and yet it embraces the basic principle of their contention, viz, the establishment of the "gold standard" and other provisions claimed to be necessary to carry it into effect.

Why all this indirection and circumlocution of detail when the Government can supply all the paper money needed? All did not seem to be lovely in the gold camp at Indianapolis. One of the delegates, a Mr. Cross, a banker, I suppose, and an expert in the mysteries of banking, was thus quoted in the public press while the Indianapolis convention was sitting:

Mr. Cross said there was little chance of the bill ever passing, so the matter would be allowed to rest for the present in its present shape. He said under the plan it would be possible for swindlers to organize a chain of banks, place the stock in irresponsible hands, loot the concerns with straw investments, and leave the honest banks to bear the loss.

The representatives were averse to talking on account of their agreement with the leaders of the movement to maintain silence at this time. The New York delegations organized without recognizing the "Merchants' Association" representatives. Their silence at this time is with the distinct understanding that the bill will never become a law in its present form. Should there be any chance of its becoming a law, the fight will be opened against it. Every effort was made to keep the opposition a secret during the convention.

The great Pitt once declared: "Let the Americans adopt their funding system and go into their banking institutions, and their independence will be a mere phantom." Yet, with all the instructive experience of England and our own as imitators, it is proposed not only to continue a false and disastrous system, but to extend and render it permanent. These "reform" measures, "so called," are perhaps as well guarded as human ingenuity can devise to prevent abuse, but the fatal weakness of credit money can never be cured by human laws. The foundation is fiction, not capital.

The Bank of England is probably as perfect a system as has ever been devised; yet the first year after it opened, in 1696, it suspended specie payments. The catastrophe was repeated thirty-seven times afterwards, ruining the merchants and business in England with panics and bankruptcy. These suspensions disastrously affected the banks of this country by withdrawing our gold and involving our people in the common ruin. It was the greenbacks that saved us in the suspension of 1866, because they were the medium of exchange, and the \$45,000,000 of gold that



was shipped for the use of the Bank of England did not cause the slightest ripple in the business affairs of this country.

The Bank of England furnishes us another instructive lesson. The bank suspended from 1797 to 1823 by permission of Parliament, and having no gold or silver, or at least only in insufficient quantities, for twenty-five years the bank issued paper currency not made redeemable, nor even made a legal tender. The historian Sir Archibald Alison thus speaks of this period:

The next eighteen years of the war—from 1797 to 1815—were, as all the world knows, the most glorious and, taken as a whole, the most prosperous which Great Britain had ever known. Ushered in by a combination of circumstances the most calamitous, both with reference to external security and internal industry, it terminated in a blaze of glory and a flood of prosperity which have never since the beginning of the world descended upon any nation.

Prosperity, universal and unheard of, pervaded every department of the Empire. Our colonial possessions encircled the earth. Agriculture, commerce, and manufactures at home had increased in an unparalleled ratio; the landed proprietors were in affluence; wealth to an unheard of extent had been created among the farmers; the soil, daily increasing in fertility and breadth of cultivation, had become almost adequate to the maintenance of a rapidly increasing population; our exports, imports, and tonnage had more than doubled since the war began; and though distress, especially during 1810 and 1811, had at times been severely experienced among the manufacturing operatives, occasioned by Bonaparte's decrees against British goods, yet upon the whole and in average years their condition was one of extraordinary prosperity.

But this pleasing picture was soon destined to be overcast. England had her "resumption of specie payments," so called, as we have had ours, and the same historian thus describes the results:

The effects of this extraordinary piece of legislation were soon apparent. The industry of the nation was speedily congealed, as a flowing stream is by the severity of an arctic winter. The alarm became as universal and widespread as confidence and activity had recently been. The country bankers, who had advanced largely on the stocks of goods imported, refused to continue their support to their customers, and they were forced to bring their stocks into the market. Prices in consequence fell rapidly; that of cotton in particular sank in three months to half its former level. The Country Bankers' Association was contracted by no less than five millions sterling (\$24,000,000), and the entire circulation of England fell from \$235,545,000 in 1818 to \$174,385,000 in 1820, and in the succeeding year it sank as low as \$142,757,000.

The effects of this sudden and prodigious contraction of the currency were soon apparent, and they rendered the next three years a period of ceaseless distress and suffering in the British Islands. The accommodation granted by bankers diminished so much in consequence of the obligation laid upon them to pay in specie, which was not to be got, that the paper under discount at the Bank of England, which in 1810 had been \$115,000,000 and in 1815 not less than \$103,000,000, sank in 1820 to \$23,360,000 and in 1821 to \$13,610,000. The effect upon prices was not less immediate or appalling. They declined in general, within six months, to half their former amount and remained at that low level for the next three years. Distress was universal in the latter months of 1819, and that distrust and discouragement were felt in all branches of industry which are at once the forerunner and cause of disaster.

If this truthful writer had been in the United States during the hard process of "resumption" in this country, he would have drawn the picture of ruin and distress in no modified terms. Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, Thomas H. Benton, and all the original lights of Democracy, are safe to follow. Jefferson said:

Bank paper must be suppressed, and the circulating medium must be restored to the nation, to whom it belongs. It is the only fund on which they can rely for loans; it is the only recourse which can never fail them, and it is an abundant one for every necessary purpose. Treasury bills bottomed on taxes, bearing or not bearing interest, as may be found necessary, thrown into circulation, will take the place of so much gold and silver, which, as, when crowded, will find an efflux into other countries, and thus keep the quantum of medium at its salutary level. Let banks continue, if they please, but let them discount for cash alone or for Treasury notes.

Jackson fought the old United States Bank mainly on the ground that Congress had no constitutional power to clothe a corporation with the Government function of issuing paper money.

John Sherman, when he first entered the Senate, and before he took sides with the money power against the people, used this language, in February, 1862:

I much prefer the credit of the United States, based as it is upon all the productions and property of the United States, to the issues of any corporation, however well guaranteed and managed. The only objection to the issue of this paper money [the greenbacks] is that too many may be issued. If, in our Revolutionary war, the amount of the Revolutionary scrip, and in the French Revolution the amount of assignats, had been confined to a small sum in proportion to the wealth of the country—if, for instance, it had been limited to one-tenth of the annual production of the country—there would have been no danger.

The doctrine thus announced by Thomas Jefferson and John Sherman is the doctrine of the Chicago platform of 1896. But the two men are quite different. Jefferson was the friend of the people; Sherman is the associate of the rich and the defender of capital. No man in the United States, if he had followed the principle he announced in the Senate in 1862, could have been of more service to his country. As it was, no man has done more harm. His name is identified with every movement during and since the war to enhance the value of a dollar in the hands of the rich by the stealthy establishment of the gold standard and to bring distress by his contraction schemes to the homes of the poor. He and his associates mutilated and took the life out of the original greenback in the Senate by putting in the "exceptional clause" that the Government notes would not be receivable for interest on the public debt or for customs dues.

Under the disguise of "strengthening the public credit" and "resuming specie payments," he doubled the public debt and made one currency for the people and another for the bondholders. The scathing arraignment of Catiline and Verres by the eloquent Cicero was mild in comparison to what the great Roman orator would have used against our sleek offender if he had been the subject of accusation. Catiline sought only to change the form of a doubtful government, which would probably have flourished as well under one as another. Verres plundered a single province. But men of high positions, trusted officials, and statesmen of reputation and renown during this era of ruthless riot and licentious reign of the money power conspired against the people of a whole nation. Alexander Hamilton went into public life a poor man.

In his funding schemes he could have made millions, as his friends did. He retired to practice his profession, because he could not afford to hold public office. Webster was in the Senate longer than Sherman, and many other public men since his day, and went back to Marshfield poorer than he left it. History will furnish the names of some men since prominent in the annals of legislation who entered public life comparatively penniless and retired with handsome fortunes, if not multimillionaires. People involuntarily remember the opportunities for money getting during the war and since; the position of chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate; the rise in securities as a result of legislation; the "rings" and combines of all kinds that were formed to loot the Treasury and enrich their members.

People will not unjustly conclude that the immense fortune of a public man who comes in poor and goes out rich was never acquired by methods compatible with the responsibility and dignity of a public trust.

Mr. Chairman, the act of July 14, 1890, declared it to be "the established policy of the United States to maintain" the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present "legal ratio (16 to 1) or such ratio as may be provided by law." It is on this provision of the statute that the Republicans rely for the pretense that it is necessary in order to preserve parity that silver dollars should be redeemed by gold dollars or exchanged for gold dollars at the will of the holder.

It furnishes also the pretense for the charge that, as the legal ratio does not express by at least one-half the commercial ratio between gold and silver bullion, it is impossible to have free coinage of silver without putting the Government to vast expense or without accepting silver alone as the standard of value, for the reason that gold and silver would not circulate together at such a wide disparity. The Democratic party contends, on the other hand, that legitimate parity does not mean that silver dollars must be redeemed with gold dollars or that the relative commercial value of the two metals has any necessary connection with the coin or money values of the two metals.

If the contention of the gold people were true, and if 16 to 1 does not express the real commercial ratio, the statute does not limit the coinage at that ratio, but expressly provides that some other ratio may be established by law, so that free coinage need not be abandoned simply because the present legal ratio is not deemed to be the proper one. Under the constitutional power to regulate the value of our coined money the ratio may be changed or the alloy in gold increased and the number of fine grains in silver increased, as was done in the mintage act of 1837, and thus the commercial parity be preserved sufficiently for all practical purposes.

Now, if it is not necessary to pay in gold instead of silver, nor to redeem silver dollars with gold dollars in order to maintain parity, the whole argument against free coinage falls to the ground. Preceding the clause which I have quoted from the act of 1890 is the following language:

That upon demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes (for the purchase of silver bullion) herein provided for the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin, at his discretion.

But so far as these particular notes are concerned, the Secretary has no discretion, because it is further provided in section 3 of the act that after the 1st day of July, 1891, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed—

to coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of the act of 1890 as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes therein provided for—

showing that it was the intention of Congress that this class of notes at least was to be redeemed in silver coin.

To redeem or exchange or swap silver dollars for gold dollars at the option of either the holder or the Government is not parity; it is substitution. Such a process does not preserve parity; it destroys it, because the discrimination against silver makes it less desirable. The discredited dollar is merged in the preferred one, and in reality there is then but one money metal. What gives the silver dollar value is its legal-tender quality and use in a money function. The true way, therefore, to have preserved the parity between gold and silver dollars would have been for



the Government to pay out silver instead of gold, kept it in circulation, and given it the widest employment as money, as ex-Secretary Carlisle fully explained it could have been done if the practice had been inaugurated and maintained by the Secretaries after the resumption of specie payments.

Secretary Manning, in Cleveland's first term, was right when he told the New York bankers if they undertook to raid the Treasury to get its gold he would pay them in silver. This was the end of his campaign with Wall street, and gold neither went to a premium nor left the country. If his successors had adopted the same policy, we never would have had any trouble with our finances. If we had gone along with the original policy of Hamilton and Jefferson, paid all public creditors with silver or gold at the option of the Government, we never would have had this agitation on the money question nor heard of the single gold standard.

The panic of 1873 was caused by a greater crime, if possible, than the demonetization of silver. It was brought on by the policy of contraction consequent upon the resumption of specie payment, and to aid in the accomplishment of the scheme to ultimately place the country upon the single gold standard then contemplated by John Sherman and Hugh McCulloch, Secretary of the Treasury, at the instigation of the money power, aided and abetted by the Republican party. On the 1st of July, 1865, the total amount of available currency in the country was estimated at about \$1,999,588,995.16, consisting of gold, silver, State bank notes, national bank notes, and Government issues of all kinds.

I here insert a tabulated statement taken from the official records of the Treasury Department showing paper and currency circulation for years 1864, 1865, 1866, and 1867, marked Exhibit A.

TABULATED STATEMENT A.  
Paper-money circulation.

Exhibit A of the paper-money circulation in the United States from 1864 to 1867. Prepared from official reports of the Treasury Department by Hon. F. M. COCKRELL, Senator from the State of Missouri.

Title.	June 30, 1864.	June 30, 1865.
State-bank circulation	\$179,157,717.00	\$142,919,628.09
National-bank circulation	31,235,270.00	146,137,860.00
Demand notes of July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861	780,999.00	472,603.00
United States notes (legal tenders), Feb. 25 and July 11, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	431,178,670.84	432,687,966.00
One and two 5 per cent notes, Mar. 3, 1863	153,471,450.00	42,338,710.00
Compound interest 3-year notes, Mar. 3, 1863, and June 30, 1864 (6 per cent)	15,000,000.00	193,756,080.00
Fractional currency, June 17, 1862 (including postal currency)	22,894,877.25	25,005,826.76
United States Treasury notes of 1857, 1860, and 1861	174,000.00	15,200.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861, payable in 3 years	109,356,150.00	139,155,650.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, June 30, 1864, Mar. 3, 1865, payable in 3 years		671,610,400.00
Temporary loan certificates, Feb. 25, Mar. 17, and July 11, 1862, and June 30, 1864	72,330,191.44	89,717,061.40
Certificates of indebtedness, Mar. 1, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	160,729,000.00	115,772,000.00
3 per cent certificates, Mar. 2, 1867, and July 25, 1868		
Total paper circulation used as money	1,176,308,325.53	1,999,588,995.16

Title.	June 30, 1866.	June 30, 1867.
State-bank circulation	\$19,996,163.00	\$4,484,112.00
National-bank circulation	281,479,908.00	236,630,000.00
Demand notes of July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861	272,162.00	208,432.00
United States notes (legal tenders), Feb. 25 and July 11, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	400,619,203.00	371,783,597.00
One and two 5 per cent notes, Mar. 3, 1863	3,454,330.00	1,123,630.00
Compound interest 3-year notes, Mar. 3, 1863, and June 30, 1864 (6 per cent)	159,012,140.00	122,394,480.00
Fractional currency, June 17, 1862 (including postal currency)	27,070,876.96	28,307,523.52
United States Treasury notes of 1857, 1860, and 1861	13,000.00	6,800.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, July 17 and Aug. 5, 1861, payable in 3 years	130,301,700.00	139,315,350.00
Seven-thirty Treasury notes, June 30, 1864, Mar. 3, 1865, payable in 3 years	806,251,550.00	488,647,425.00
Temporary loan certificates, Feb. 25, Mar. 17, and July 11, 1862, and June 30, 1864	120,176,196.65	20,225,070.00
Certificates of indebtedness, Mar. 1, 1862, and Mar. 3, 1863	26,391,000.00	36,000.00
3 per cent certificates, Mar. 2, 1867, and July 25, 1868		
Total paper circulation used as money	1,984,038,232.61	1,475,157,419.52

For verification of above table see report of the Secretary of the Treasury for years 1865, 1866, and report for 1867 on page iv.

That was a per capita of about \$38 for 34,000,000 people. By the policy of contraction as thus inaugurated for monetary strangulation, in order to reach a gold standard, our money circulation was reduced in 1869 to less than \$700,000,000, and up to December 1, 1873, the total reduction was \$1,230,999,085.

The armies of both North and South had disbanded, and from consumers and destroyers they became producers. The time was propitious for renewal of all branches of industry, but the means were taken away, and the consequence was hard times. On the 1st of January, 1877, 3,000,000 people were out of work. Tramps filled the highways for the first time in our history, and labor strikes and riots with red torch lighted up the country from Pittsburgh to Chicago. The financial ruin and distress were only paralleled by those of England at the close of the Napoleonic wars so graphically described by the historian from whom I have quoted. How plain was the path of duty for Secretary McCulloch.

It was to save the American people all the interest on their debt that could be carried in "legal tenders;" to pay the principal as fast as practicable in gold or silver "coin," according to the terms of contract with the public creditors, and to fund the rest of the debt from time to time, guarding against contraction injurious to business. In the performance of this sacred duty there was glory enough for any human being. But he fell under sinister influences and preferred to retire to Lombard street to share as a banker the fruits of his policy with the sharks and shylocks of the money power.

What was the cause of the panic and hard times of 1893? It was pretended that a doubt had arisen as to the effect upon public credit of our large coinage of silver and that confidence was disappearing. With this view, President Cleveland convened Congress in extraordinary session to repeal the purchasing clause of the act of July 14, 1890. His wishes were obeyed, but the panic continued. The repeal proved no remedy. The fact is, it was a senseless proceeding, based on a false and erroneous conception of the real cause of the trouble. In an interview with the Senate Finance Committee in March, 1879, John Sherman said there would be no danger from free silver if the coinage did not exceed \$100,000,000. Beyond that he was quite certain gold would leave the country and financial disturbance would ensue. We coined \$500,000,000 under the acts of 1878 and 1890, and no such thing happened.

President Hayes was equally confident when he vetoed the Bland-Allison bill of 1878 that its passage into law would drive all the gold out of the country. Prophecy again failed. Is it not fair to assume, in view of all the false prophecy of the past by Republican seers concerning silver money, that they may be unreliable in the future? The report of the Director of the Mint for 1889 shows that, instead of leaving the country, gold flowed in, the increase from 1878 to 1890 being \$592,000,000. There was never any lack of confidence in our financial system until Hayes and Sherman, Harrison and Foster, Cleveland and Carlisle invited gold raids upon the Treasury by announcing the policy officially and privately to the money changers of Wall street and elsewhere that the greenbacks would be redeemed in gold and all public obligations would be discharged in gold.

The panic of 1893 was caused by a hypochondriacal clamor of the money sharks, who set up a howl against the soundness of the currency and the stability of public credit. They locked up their money, contracted credits, and paralyzed the business of the country. They made a rush upon the Treasury for the gold reserve and for the issue of gold bonds. Cleveland yielded and came down with \$262,000,000 of gold bonds.

The Republican party applauds his act, and McKinley and the Republican party is ready to repeat it.

Let us briefly notice one of the many important things proposed in this bill. The bill contains eleven sections. In the first section it is proposed to establish permanently the gold standard. Recognizing as we do the power of the dominant majority to write their will and record their arbitrary decree upon the statute books of the nation, it may yet be well to pause and reflect whether—even if the unit of value is to be permanently fixed at 25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine—the moment is yet opportune for this nation to crystallize the same into statutory law.

We have recently observed the statement reputed to have been made by the Secretary of the Treasury that he hopes in the near future to be able to refund the interest-bearing obligations of the Government on a 2 per cent basis, and the friends of this measure claim that it will very much facilitate the accomplishment of this much-desired object. This would be an undertaking that would challenge the eager and unhesitating approbation of all, regardless of party division and party differences of opinion upon the merits of this bill, and with this in view our paramount duty is to exercise wise judgment, that nothing may now be done in the way of hasty legislation to embarrass the consummation of this much-desired purpose or make it more difficult of accomplishment.

In a message submitted to this House by President Cleveland during the Fifty-third Congress in which he expressed his determination, in order to meet the exigencies of the situation then confronting the country, to issue \$62,000,000 bonds, he said that if Congress would authorize the insertion of the word "gold" instead of "coin" in the bonds the bidders for these securities would give \$16,000,000 more for them. In other words, the bond



speculators and money magnates of the world placed their own estimate upon the difference in value between a bond payable in "coin" and one payable in "gold."

Congress refused to yield to the demand. Now, you do not suppose, do you, that this difference in valuation was a mere chance guess, or the theoretic deduction of some visionary politician? No, sir; it was the careful and reliable estimate of the most skillful and best-informed financiers of the whole world. By this bill we are now asked not only to violate the solemn terms of written contracts—the written contracts between the people of the United States and the bondholders—but to voluntarily contribute to them, not upon sixty-two millions of bonds alone, as we were asked to do under the Cleveland Administration, but upon the enormous sum of \$1,046,000,000, the difference in value between the bonds as they now stand, payable in "coin," and the bonds as they will be under the terms of this bill, if it shall pass, payable in "gold."

The estimate made by the world's best financiers, and has been carefully made and stated upon the floor of this House pending this discussion in the able and eloquent speech of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCLELLAN] upon the difference in value of gold and coin bonds of the par value of \$62,000,000 was sixteen millions, or about 25.92 per cent, which valuation, if extended to the total issue of interest-bearing bonds now outstanding, would mean an enhancement of value to the holders of such obligations of more than \$260,000,000.

This, Mr. Chairman, is but one of the many vicious features of this remarkable measure. And yet our distinguished and eloquent friend from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] boastfully declares upon this floor that it would be the proudest moment of his life if he could witness the passage of this bill before the holidays and its presentation made to the American people as a Christmas gift.

When the Government came to adopt the first mintage act, in 1793, Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of Jefferson, Secretary of State, adopted both gold and silver as standard money. They called it a double standard. Three hundred and seventy-one and one-fourth grains of fine silver was one money unit, and 25.8 grains of fine gold was the other.

Hamilton said there were reasons, if but one of the metals should be selected, in favor of gold as the most suitable metal, but that these reasons were overbalanced by the advantage of having both metals, because the selection of one to the exclusion of the other would narrow the money basis and lead to contraction. It is true Hamilton consulted the markets to find the relative value of the two metals when he put the ratio at 15 to 1, but this was more for convenience than for any idea or expectation that the money values of the two metals would always correspond with their bullion or commercial values.

Experience soon showed that was impossible. "Fifteen to one" were words of description rather than of value. The same purpose would have been accomplished if he had provided that the silver dollar and the gold eagle (for there was no gold dollar coined) should be described by some superficial measure as diameter and circumference. Money is the creation of law. When a material is selected for money purposes which has an intrinsic or commercial value as a commodity, it operates under two laws. One regulates its value by legal-tender quality, quantity, and demand; the other determines its commodity value.

To illustrate: Gold was undervalued at the ratio of 15 to 1 and disappeared to a large extent because more valuable for circulation in other countries and for manufacturing purposes. It went to the melting pot or was exported. It is claimed that under free coinage instead of more money we will have less, because about \$625,000,000 of gold would disappear. In the same breath we are told that all the silver in the world would come to our mints and make money so plentiful that it would be worthless.

Both objections are ridiculous. Why should gold go out of circulation? Hoarding would be ruinous to the holders, and it would not go to the melting pots for manufacture into plate and ornaments beyond the demand, because that would bring the price down to a losing point. It could not go into foreign circulation without a demand for it, and, if no demand, the gold supply would be overstocked and a decline in purchasing power be sure to follow. Silver would not come in excessive quantities, because that would defeat its own object, and the continued use of it in other countries as currency would make it more profitable than to send it here. All these false specters can be safely left to the operation of economic laws.

In 1834 the ratio was changed to 16 to 1, but this overvalued gold, and silver largely disappeared. It was next tried to preserve both metals in circulation by putting more alloy in the gold coin and more grains of pure silver in the silver coins, 412½ instead of 371½, but this failed to establish absolute commercial equality. And so, in 1853, subsidiary silver coinage was made less valuable as money by limiting its legal tender to \$5. But all plans failed, and silver dollars were few in circulation, until finally silver rose to 4 per cent premium, for many years before the act of 1873 was passed.

After the increased alloy in the gold coins double eagles were

6 per cent less valuable than before, but \$94 in these eagles paid debts of \$100 in eagles contracted before the act of 1837. When the Matthews resolutions of 1878 passed this House and the other branch of Congress the silver dollar was 8 per cent less in metal value than the coin value, and yet Republicans and Democrats voted that it was no breach of faith to pay public creditors in 92-cent dollars. McKinley himself voted to commit this act of repudiation.

Jefferson did not suspend silver coinage in 1806 to destroy silver money like the act of 1873, but to preserve bimetallism, because his object was to prevent exportation of the silver coins. The act of 1853 was not to abandon the "double standard," but to make silver less valuable as money and bring it back to circulate with gold. Notwithstanding this disparity in commercial value and the temporary disappearance of first one coin then the other, there was always abundance of both metals for money use. Up to 1873 the Government had coined 8,031,238 silver dollars and about \$76,734,964.50 of subsidiary coins, and a much larger quantity of gold, which, in proportion to mining resources and facilities and population, was sufficient for all business purposes with the bank notes in circulation.

Political economists of the highest authority discard the theory of the intrinsic value of money. Thus speaks Aristotle:

Money by itself has value only by law and not by nature; so that a change of convention between those who use it is sufficient to deprive it of all its value and power to satisfy all our wants. But with regard to a future exchange (if we want nothing at present), money is, as it were, our security that it may take place when we do want something.

Thus Locke:

Mankind having covenanted to put an imaginary value upon gold and silver by reason of their durability, scarcity, and not being very liable to be counterfeited, have made them, by general consent, the common pledges whereby men are assured, in exchange for them, to receive equally valuable things to those they parted with, for any quantity of those metals; by which means it comes to pass that the intrinsic value regard in those metals, made the common barter, is nothing but the quantity which men give or receive of them, they having, as money, no other value but as pledged to procure what one wants or desires.

Thus John Stuart Mill:

The pounds or shillings which a person receives are a sort of ticket or order which he can present for payment at any shop he pleases, and which entitle him to receive a certain value of any commodity that he makes choice of.

Mr. Chairman, if it is objected that I am advocating "fiat money," I reply that, according to the very best authority, there never was any other kind of money in the world. The greenback is fiat money. The difference between the bullion and coin value of our silver dollar is fiat. It is fiat that makes one of our silver dollars worth two Mexican dollars, though they contain several grains more of pure silver.

In 1763 the British Parliament declared all colonial acts for the issue of paper currency to be void. "Every medium of exchange," said the British Board of Trade, "should have an intrinsic value, which paper has not." Dr. Franklin appeared before the board and completely exploded this nonsense. He said:

However fit a particular thing may be for a particular purpose, whenever that thing is not to be had, or not to be had in sufficient quantity, it becomes necessary to use something else, the fittest thing that can be got in lieu of it.

Bank bills and bankers' notes are in daily use here [in London] as a medium of trade, yet they have no intrinsic value, but rest on the credit of those that issued them, as paper bills in the colonies do on the credit of the respective settlements there. Being payable in cash upon sight by the drawers is indeed a circumstance that can not attend the colony bills, their cash being drawn from them by the British trade; but the legal tender being instituted is rather a greater advantage to the possessor, since he need not be at the trouble of going to a particular bank or banker to demand the money.

At this very time—

Continued Franklin—

the silver money in England depends on its legal-tender quality for a part of its value—that part which is the difference between its real weight and its denomination. A great part of the shillings and sixpences now current are, in wearing, become 5, 10, 20, and some of the sixpences even 50 per cent too light. For this difference between the real and nominal you have no intrinsic value; you have not so much as paper; you have nothing.

It is the legal tender, with the knowledge that it can easily be repassed for the same value, that makes threepenny worth of silver pass for sixpence. Gold and silver are not intrinsically of equal value with iron, a metal in itself capable of many more benefits to mankind. Their value rests chiefly in the estimation they happen to be in among the generality of nations, and the credit given to the opinion that the estimation will continue. Otherwise a pound of gold would not be the real equivalent of even a bushel of wheat.

It is said that law can not create value. Law certainly does create the money value of anything adopted for currency, because it can not exist without law. In the legal-tender cases the majority of the Supreme Court of the United States first held (opinion delivered by Chief Justice Chase) that Congress had no constitutional power to pass a legal-tender act by which paper money could be substituted for gold and silver, and that gold and silver were the money of the Constitution, because of their intrinsic value. But on a rehearing of the cases this decision was reversed, the majority holding (opinion by Justice Strong) that the money of a people was a creation of the legislative power.

The court says that Congress can not legislate commercial value into valueless things, but they do say, in effect, that it is competent



to use any material as the representative of values. The Constitution does not say in the article about money that Congress can not make something else a legal tender besides gold and silver. This prohibition is addressed to the States. It is not the value of gold and silver as bullion that Congress regulates under the Constitution, which it would be powerless to do, but the value of the money made from it, and the value of foreign coins introduced into the United States.

Roman law did not create sheep and oxen, nor give them their commercial value; but the law did create the money function of the "pecus" (flock), from which we derive our word "pecuniary." It is tiresome to hear this "rot" about "50-cent dollars." As well talk of a "two-dollar" dollar in gold, because with the double standard it is as proper to measure the gold by the silver as to measure the silver by the gold. But in the performance of a money function both are 100-cent dollars, because the unit in one is fixed by law as equivalent to the unit in the other. It is the same yard of cloth whether measured by a tape-line or a wooden yardstick; it is the same bushel of wheat whether the bushel measure is of oak or walnut; it is the same pound of flour whether the scales be constructed of iron or steel; so it is the same price or value whether measured by gold or silver dollars of equal monetary function.

Our present silver dollar contains about 46 cents worth of silver, but it pays as much debt or buys as much goods as any other dollar, not because a gold dollar is under it, which is all fiction, but because the legal-tender quality with the stamp of the Government gives it a money function. The Mexican dollar is only worth with us the amount of silver in it, because it is not legal-tender money in this country, but at home it is a full dollar. Its legal-tender quality can not travel beyond the jurisdiction of the Government that coins it. An Englishman could not pay for a dinner in this city with a "sovereign" except at its exchangeable rate as bullion. There is no such thing as international currency, or "money of the world." We pay for our imports by our exports, and settle balances against us, as do all other nations, by gold or silver bullion as commodities, not as money.

But suppose the fiat theory of money is unsound and that our gold and silver dollars depend on the intrinsic value of the metal contained in them, will the fact of free and unlimited coinage at 16 to 1 with the quality of full legal tender and the free opportunity for use as money restore parity? I think it will. There was practical parity before demonetization of silver, and if the cause of disparity is removed the effect will cease. For four thousand years the ratio between gold and silver was never less than 11 nor more than 16 to 1, until silver was demonetized by the principal powers of the world. The relative amounts of the world's stock of gold and silver has remained about the same through all time and is now about \$4,000,000,000 each.

Our stock of gold is about \$696,260,542, of silver about \$634,509,780. In the United States from 1873 to 1896 there were only two years, 1892 and 1896, when the stock of silver was greater than that of gold, showing that the decline in silver must be due to some other cause than overproduction. What was that cause? Evidently the lessened use of silver as a money metal, because the use in the arts and manufactures has rather increased than diminished the world over.

But it is said that if the restoration of silver as a standard money metal would bring its value up or gold down to the old ratio of 16 to 1 it could not be done without the cooperation of those nations who have united in demonetization. True, not to the same extent, but the tendency would be in that direction, and the vast increase of gold production by the rich discoveries of the Klondike regions, in South Africa, and in the increased output of our own mines by improved methods of production will soon so enlarge our stock of gold as to materially reduce its price compared to silver.

Natural conditions must be trusted to restore the equilibrium. Demonetization did not occur by any international agreement, and no such agreement is required to undo the wrong. France alone by her own policy has kept the two metals at a ratio of 15½ to 1 for one hundred years, and she maintains that ratio now with a relative stock of gold and silver about the same as ours. She has not demonetized but only suspended silver coinage since 1876. She maintains parity by paying gold or silver at the option of her great bank, and floats eight hundred millions in paper without any provision whatever for redemption. Her paper is a pure case of fiat money.

France differs from both England and Germany in her money system, and although nominally classed with the gold-standard countries, she is not really so. With the independent action of the United States for the free coinage of silver and gold at about the same ratio as France an impetus would be given to bimetalism that would soon bring the other great commercial powers into line in self-defense. The weakness of the Latin Union—Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Greece, and Italy—in 1867 to maintain the

bimetallic system was in the very attempt at union. Each was differently situated, and when each attempted to control the money affairs of the others the whole thing broke down.

The gold standard was established in Germany in 1871 in the interest of the moneyed classes, but the masses of the people in the Empire had always been used to silver, and would prefer it now if their voice could be heard. Bismarck has said the change from the old order of things was a great mistake and that he had been deceived into its support. India has become restless under the gold standard foisted upon her people by the selfishness of England and is moving towards the restoration of the white metal.

The absorption of our island populations of Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Ladrones, and the Philippines, aggregating more than 10,000,000 souls, is a long step toward bimetalism. For more than two hundred years the Spanish portion of the islands has been accustomed to silver money, and they must of necessity use the silver coinage of the United States in commercial transactions among themselves and with us, now that the Spanish authority has disappeared. Whatever may be the fate of Cuba, her people are most familiar with silver money, though nominally under the gold standard.

Every achievement of American enterprise and industry in developing the rich resources of these islands will compel important additions to the volume of silver currency. Such conditions will go far to establish our silver-mining industry and force up the price of the metal perhaps to commercial parity with gold. Added to this, it must be remembered that we are reaching out, if not for more territorial acquisitions, at least for increased trade with the balance of the West Indies, with the Central and South American States, and with China and Japan, all of which are silver-using countries and will be identified with us in our money policy.

The attempt to establish the gold standard in Russia, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Brazil, the Argentine Republic, Chili, and Japan is a complete failure. In each large amounts of bonds have been issued to buy gold, but the experiment has only worked to oppress the people with heavy taxes, contract the currency, and introduce indescribable distress. The reason of the failure is not far to seek. By the necessity of the case exchange is always against poor and indebted countries and in favor of rich creditor nations, which in this way ultimately absorb the wealth of the debtor country. The gold standard is a luxury which none but rich nations like England, dominated by money kings, can afford to have.

The day may not be far distant when England will be crucified on her cross of gold, and the commercial and money centers of the world will be transferred from London and Liverpool to New York and San Francisco. New York now leads London in the amount of annual commerce, while the instructive fact appears that the exports of England are constantly diminishing, while those of the United States are constantly increasing. Truly has it been written that the nations which rule in unrighteousness shall perish from the earth. Who knows but a time will come when the proud mistress of the seas shall realize the picture of Macaulay, when a New Zealander of some future day will sit on a broken arch of London Bridge to contemplate the ruins of St. Paul?

The new policy of colonial expansion, full of difficulties and dangers as it undoubtedly is, may not be without its compensatory advantages. "The stone that was rejected by the builders may become the head of the corner." Both free coinage and free trade are involved in it. The "open door" for the Orient with a Chinese wall for ourselves will never work together. Those "twin relics of barbarism," protection and restrictive navigation laws, which have closed against us the markets of the world and destroyed our merchant marine and carrying trade, will be left behind in the march of events.

The only practicable way to secure international bimetalism is for all the gold-standard countries to act separately and independently. International "agreements" or "arrangements" can never fix commercial ratios. Let two great powers like the United States and France set the successful example of free coinage and bring the two metals to an equilibrium by equalizing coinage value and the others would soon follow. We want neither the gold basis nor the silver basis, neither a cheap dollar nor a dear dollar, but the broad basis of the money of the Constitution established by the fathers.

Let the old greenback that successfully conducted the country through the most gigantic war of modern times, and gave the country such prosperity after its close as it never had, stand as a model paper money. Let the seigniorage of silver now in the Treasury be coined. Let certificates under existing laws issue for the silver dollars coined or to be coined at the option of the holders. Abolish the national bank and substitute Government notes for their currency; pay out to public creditors all kinds of lawful money; open the mints to free coinage without the aid or consent of any foreign nation; and all will be well. And to secure the ultimate accomplishment of this great achievement I hope and



trust that this bill will be defeated and thereby prevent the establishment of the gold standard permanently upon the people of this country.

The Democracy of the United States stands as it has always stood upon these questions, and will oppose to its utmost the propositions embraced in this measure. In the name of the six and a half millions of voters who supported William Jennings Bryan in 1896, we will hold our banners aloft, full high advanced, with the inspiring inscription, "By this sign shall ye conquer." The campaign of 1896 was but a skirmish for position; the great struggle will be fought to a finish in 1900. Then again will be unfurled the same colors that went down in honorable defeat in 1896, and our tried and trusted leader, that great advocate of the people's cause, William J. Bryan, will once more challenge to battle the mercenary cohorts of the money power and appeal to the honest yeomanry of his country to rally round the standard of the masses against the classes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I would not speak at this late hour were it not for the fact that, you being in the chair, there is a presumption that a quorum of the House is present, and for the further fact that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] in charge of the pending bill is also here, so that I shall assume that I am speaking to the entire body of Republicans of this House.

This bill is not the product of this House or any of its committees, though this Republican House is going to adopt it. A caucus of the Republicans made a committee last winter, who during the summer met at Atlantic City under every influence calculated to induce them to approve the monetary views of the great national banks of the large cities, and prepared this bill. On the meeting of this Congress the Republican caucus decided to pass it without amendment. Its avowed purpose is to place the financial question, so far as the retirement of the greenbacks and the enlargement of the powers and privileges of the national banks are concerned beyond the reach of the next Administration should it be Democratic, as they hope the gold-standard national bank influence will predominate in the Senate for the next four years. Fearing our success, they determine to yield to the demand to pay the debt their party owes to the moneyed shysters of Wall street while they have the power. If the people are susceptible to the teachings of great lessons, if they hate extravagance, if they cherish liberty and revere the principles of our Revolution, if they love humanity and humanity's rights, then it is more than probable that they will intrust this Government again in the hands of the Democratic party at the next election. The Republicans in the last thirty years have not carried the country in any two successive Presidential elections. In this bill they attempt to deprive the people of the country of the natural fruits of the next Democratic success.

There is one consolation in this measure to the American people, and that is that the Republican party has thrown off the mask which it has so frequently worn in the last few years upon this great financial question. No longer can they pretend to be the friends of bimetalism. Heretofore when we charged them with hostility to silver, they replied by proclaiming great love for it. Two years ago in this Hall I charged that the Republican party was bound soul and body to the gold standard. The Secretary of the Treasury had already outlined the policy.

The President of the United States, at the rich manufacturers' banquet in New York City, had foreshadowed it, and, notwithstanding all that, there were many Republicans in this country who honestly believed, because they were misled, that there was friendship in the Republican party to silver and to genuine bimetalism. They were misled because the Republican platform of 1888 had denounced "efforts to demonetize silver." The Republican platform of 1892 said that the "American people, from tradition and interest, favored bimetalism." In 1890 Major McKinley, now President of the United States, had spoken strongly and clearly in favor of silver. In this House he had voted for silver. In 1896 the Republican party, in its national platform, had again expressed friendliness to silver. No longer can they pretend it.

The gold standard, and especially the bond-holding interests, have at last induced the Republican party to come out from the entanglements of duplicity and boldly take its position against the best interests of mankind on the great question of bimetalism and the Government's surrender to corporations of its sovereign power to issue paper currency. It has listened to the siren's song and turned deaf ears to the people's needs.

Who is it that has demanded this bill? Who is it that has sent his petition here for its passage? Who was it that met in the Indianapolis convention in its behalf? Who was it that lent the caucus committee his influence? It was not the cotton grower and it was not the laborer that worked in the cotton fields. It was not the tobacco grower nor the laborer that worked in the tobacco fields. It was not the wheat grower nor the laborer who worked in the wheat fields. It was not the blacksmith. It was

not the wood workman. It was not the carpenter nor the brick mason. It was not the mill man nor the operatives that work in the mill. None of these demanded it; none of these ask it. It was the trust magnate. It was the great banker, the great bondholder. It was the great national shlylock. His influence was in the last Republican convention. His influence surrounds this bill. He rejoices that he controls the party now in power.

What is this bill? It is a repudiation of the Stanley Matthews resolution. It is a repudiation of the policies of Blaine and Garfield. It is a reversal of a national policy. It is intended to be the final death blow to silver. It is intended to diminish the volume of standard money. The great principle for which we contend is an increase in the volume of standard money. A Republican majority may strike this principle to the ground, but when it touches the people, Antæus-like, it will rise with greater power.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LINNEY] has said that the Southern members ought to vote for this bill. Mr. Chairman, not only ought not the Southern members to vote for it, but they and the Western members, and all men who love right and justice throughout the country, ought to vote against the bill and in favor of common justice between the creditor and debtor, between the people and the bondholders.

Mr. McKinley, in his letter of acceptance in 1896 of the Presidential nomination, when he was going before the people for votes, used this language:

It—

The Republican party—

has inaugurated no new policy. It will keep in circulation and as good as gold all the silver and paper money now included in the currency of the country.

That is the promise he made to the American people when he was after their support. Here is the demand he sent to Congress in his last message:

In this connection I repeat my former recommendation that a portion of the gold holdings shall be placed in a trust fund from which greenbacks shall be redeemed upon presentation, but when once redeemed shall not thereafter be paid out except for gold.

Then he promised to keep them in circulation; now he demands that they be impounded. If it is to be paid out only for gold, then it is dead as a greenback, for it will be but a gold certificate, and the circulation will be decreased. One can get a gold certificate at any time for his gold. He proposes not only to destroy the greenback, but to do it in such manner as to mislead the unthinking.

Let me call attention to the fact that in regard to the establishing of the gold standard the President in his message made two distinct recommendations, but when considering the trusts, which are drinking the lifeblood of the industry of the country's best people, he has no recommendation, but merely expresses a few indefinite hopes.

The first section of the pending bill declares the gold dollar shall be the standard of value. No longer does the other side attempt to deceive the people with international-agreement propositions. It is now going to, as Secretary Gage said, "commit the country more thoroughly to the gold standard." Having in the last Congress given an argument against the gold standard and in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, I have not the time now to repeat it, but I shall endeavor to show that this bill is freighted with disaster and oppression to the great body of the American people. I admit that its first section is practically law now, and is one of the laws against which the great silver forces of the country are at war. This bill is intended to more thoroughly fortify it, but all the battlements that can be raised around it can not protect it against the power of a free people's will when once their understanding is thoroughly informed and that will thoroughly determined against it.

The second section declares that all interest-bearing obligations of the Government, now over \$1,000,000,000, and all United States notes and Treasury notes, now about \$440,000,000, shall be payable in gold coin. All these are now payable in coin, gold or silver. By their very terms they are so payable. Written in the face of every Government bond it is declared they are "redeemable in coin of the standard value of the United States on July 14, 1870," at which date the silver dollar was a standard coin. This bill further provides that all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established by the bill. Mr. Chairman, a reading of the bonds and then a reading of section 2 by a simple, honest-minded man, unused to the financial world, untrained in Republican politics, would shock his moral sensibilities.

The bond contracts say they are payable in coin, gold or silver. This bill says they shall be payable in gold only. It has heretofore been estimated by gold-standard advocates, I believe, that having the simple word "coin" instead of "gold" in those bonds cost the Government \$60,000,000. In other words, that from their sale the Government received that amount less than it would have



received if gold had been the payment money. If that be true, it becomes dishonest to afterwards write the word "gold" in those bonds when it cost the people \$60,000,000 to leave it out.

If some friend of the people were to suggest that the word "coin" be stricken out of those bonds and in its stead write the word "greenbacks," a shout of indignation would be heard in every money center in all the land. If we were to propose to amend the law so as to make all those bonds payable in greenbacks, charges of dishonesty and anarchy would fill the air between this Capitol and Wall street until we could no longer hear a humble man's petition in the matter. As it would be wrong to change the contract and make them payable in greenbacks, it is wrong to change it to make them payable in gold. No law ought to be passed by Congress that would impair the obligation of a contract. In this respect this bill violates a constitutional principle. Under the Constitution no State can pass a law impairing the obligation of a contract.

Congress should not violate the principle. It is as morally wrong for Congress to impair the obligation of a contract as it is for a State to do so. The Federalist says that laws impairing the obligation of a contract are "contrary to the first principles of the social compact and to every principle of sound legislation." For these reasons I denounce this measure as subversive of the common principles of public integrity, which should be preserved for the interests of taxpayers and to prevent extortion in the interests of bondholders. Lawmakers, Mr. Chairman, should even be more jealous of the rights of the masses, for they require and deserve more protection than the fortunate few.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not a pessimist; I hope that I am not inclined to look on the dark side of all matters, but in this age of greed for gold, when so many men of wealth and influence lend themselves to great undertakings whose moral principle is bad, whose effects are injurious to the people, when so many corruptions are charged upon men in high places, and these corruptions so frequently proven to a moral certainty without serious effect upon their standing in the public estimation, I sometimes think that public fidelity and loyalty to the inflexible and eternal right in all things is not of that high character which we attribute to the fathers of our Republic. Representatives, I fear, coming into this gay and magnificent city, listening to the glorious tales of a full Treasury, hearing the shoutings of prosperity, often from trust quarters, are prone to forget not only in what manner the Treasury is filled and from what sources it derives its revenue, but also the struggling man at home in his district who is striving to make an honest living by the sweat of his face. If one can forget that man, then I can easily understand how he can vote for this bill; I can then understand how he can vote to change the country's contract in favor of its creditors and against its people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This bill confers on the Secretary of the Treasury the unusual power to sell bonds when he thinks it necessary to preserve the gold reserve. Such power should not be given to any one man. Congress has the power to borrow money, and its judgment should be exercised upon the necessity of each and every loan. It should not have and in my judgment has no rightful authority to delegate to the Secretary of the Treasury this general and practically unlimited power to sell bonds. It is not necessary to intrust to him the extraordinary power to issue bonds in time of peace, and I enter the protest of as good constituency as exists in this Union against giving him the power to sell bonds to get gold to exchange for silver dollars in order to perpetually imprison those silver dollars.

The power to borrow money conferred by the Constitution was intended to be and should be used only in case of necessity, as, for instance, to carry on a just war or to pay current expenses or other necessary expenses. No good lawyer on the other side will deny this. No man can successfully contend that it is a necessary expense to swap gold for silver dollars. To borrow money for the purpose of killing or retiring the silver dollar is a wrongful use of power. The silver dollar under the Constitution is the equal of the gold dollar, and it is contrary to principle and the interests of the people to load them with debt to get gold to destroy silver.

Although at present it will take more than twice as much of any of the great agricultural products, such as cotton, wheat, and tobacco to pay off one of the Government's \$1,000 bonds, as it would have taken in 1873, when the first stab was given to the white metal, yet a great purpose of this bill is to render that bond more valuable, and the result of it will be to make it harder to pay. And, under this bill, as that bond becomes harder to pay, so will all other indebtedness—public and private—become harder to pay. All this is to be done for the benefit of a few wealthy money lenders, and it is done under the name of national honor. The highest honor to which any government can attain is to treat its great masses with absolute fairness and justice. The greatest shame to a government should be placed upon it by every intelligent man of honesty when it deliberately writes into its statutes laws which

militerate against its masses in the interest of a few, which place heavier burdens upon its poor that it may gratify the demands of the rich.

Section 4 is intended to kill the greenbacks. The United States notes and Treasury notes are to be redeemed in gold and there in the Treasury held securely until someone wants to give the Government gold for them. As I have said, they are practically destroyed, for thereafter they can be used only as a gold certificate, and whether they are in existence or not the Government would give anyone a gold certificate for his gold, just as is now done. So this section in reality gives the death blow to \$440,000,000 of paper money and when in the judgment of the Secretary it is necessary gives him the power to sell \$440,000,000 of gold bonds, thus changing four hundred and forty millions of money which serves the people well, which facilitates their exchanges, which has built the churches and schoolhouses and homes of this land into an interest-bearing debt, to be paid by us and our posterity. More than that, under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell gold bonds, if he sees fit to do so and the occasion presents itself, to the additional sum of \$490,000,000, and with this money impound the \$490,000,000 of silver dollars which have been coined, thus altogether withdrawing from circulation more than \$900,000,000 and adding to our public interest-bearing indebtedness that vast sum.

These silver dollars, if the Secretary of the Treasury should see fit, may be transferred to the fiscal department and paid out and give him the opportunity of selling more bonds for gold with which to again redeem them, and thus the "endless chain" will continue to exist under this bill. Not a dollar of silver should ever be redeemed. It is money itself. It needs no redemption. It is an outrage on the rights of the people to treat it as a promise to pay.

But this bill gives the right—no, not right, for nothing can make it right, but gives the power—to retire it. How does that accord with the President's letter of acceptance? Mr. Chairman, my observation has taught me that the Republican party is the only party and its leaders the only leaders who boast of their inconsistencies. It is the juggler who glories in deceiving his spectators, and congratulates himself that his trick is performed in their full view. I venture to say that the political history of the world can not discover another example of a party of equal changes upon great and fundamental questions within a quarter of a century as to-day ornaments the Republican party.

Mr. Chairman, if these vast powers are ever exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury, if these greenbacks and silver dollars are retired from circulation, if this vast increase of the public indebtedness shall be made, ruin and disaster will overtake the farms and factories of this land, and the dread specter of panic will again visit the industries of our people. The dollar, under the increased demand for gold, will go up, and prices will go down, and as hard times touch the great consumers of our country their terrible influence soon affects all who toil and all whose happiness depends upon industry of any kind.

The Republican party hopes to avert the evils to which I have alluded by bestowing greater favors and privileges upon the national banks. I admit that the banks may under this bill, if they see fit, increase their circulation as the greenbacks and silver dollars are retired, and thus in a large measure prevent these evils. But it is supreme folly for the Congress, which ought to hold the interests of the people at heart, to surrender those interests to the mercies of those whose object is to make private profit from money traffic.

The Government should not delegate the sovereign right to issue currency for the benefit of the people to any man or set of men. Whatever paper money the business of the country requires, and it requires more than we now have, should be issued by the Government, and I know of no form of currency better than the existing greenbacks. I would make them full legal tender for all debts and dues. If there is no escape from the national banking system, if we are to forever endure its possession of special privileges, then I see no objection to allowing the banks to issue notes to the par value of the bonds deposited, and I think small towns should have the privilege of having national banks, and I do not think that whether such banks should be established in small towns or not should be left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

But such power as is given in this bill to the national banks has never before been bestowed upon them. It is a dangerous power—the power to expand and contract the currency at will. It is a power such as no monarch has, such as the President himself does not to-day have. How easy it will be for the national banks to form an immense bank trust! Nothing in this bill will prevent it, and the Republicans will not allow an amendment to it to prevent the formation of a gigantic trust to control all banks. How certainly will a few of the larger banks control the entire banking business of the country! Allow the banks, as is the purpose of



this bill, to put out and control our paper currency, and they can create a panic at a day's notice.

Let a President be in the chair whom they wish to destroy; let a bill be proposed in Congress which they oppose; let any measure be pending which they desire to force through, and in order to accomplish their purposes they can, under organization and the possibilities afforded by this bill, cause such a panic as the world has never felt. The head man of the banking trust could touch a button and immediately the circulation from the remotest corners of our land would contract, loans would be called in, business would be paralyzed, products would be sacrificed on the altar of debt, and every evil known to the lack of money would curse the people, until they and their representatives should either in suppliance yield to the demands of the banks or else their lion nature assert itself in the destruction of their oppressors.

My countrymen of the Republican side, let me appeal to you to grant no such possible powers and privileges to the banks. You may be turning loose upon your country a power that may curse your children and which your older age may regret but may not remedy. Let our Government issue more greenbacks. Let it, and it alone, issue our national paper money. It will not decrease its circulation for profit. It will not hold a terrible power over the people and their representatives to constrain their wills and violate their judgments.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asked what prophecies we made in the last campaign had come true. Mr. Chairman, we predicted that if the Republicans elected McKinley, they would make the bonds payable in gold. This was denied by Republican orators. To-day you are doing it. We predicted that you would retire the greenbacks. This was denied. To-day you are doing it. We admit, however, that it is most difficult to foretell the conduct of a party which changes its position upon great questions so easily. The only means by which we foretold these two things were that we knew from what sources it drew its sustenance.

Throughout this debate Republicans have talked of maintaining the parity of the silver dollar with gold. Mr. Chairman, the standard silver dollar has never been below par, and, further, our paper money, which was full legal tender, never went below par. I refer to the \$60,000,000 of greenbacks or United States notes issued in 1862, which were full legal tender for all debts. Our other paper money, which was not legal tender for customs dues and interest on the public debt, did go below par. It is the legal-tender quality of the silver dollar that keeps and will forever keep it to hundred-cents point. Let it retain this legal-tender quality; keep your laws intended to disgrace it from your statute books, and never will it be begging for help in order to remain a hundred-cents dollar. As long as it retains its life as money, unshackled and unpoisoned by Republican policies, just so long will it bear the fearless Goddess of Liberty throughout the land to make homes happy and be at par wherever in all the wide world it goes.

Strike the life out of it by law, and it falls to the earth 50 cents' worth of silver. Place the life back into it by law, and it rises to the hundred-cents value at once. Open the mints of the greatest country the world has ever known, give all silver these great rights to bless mankind, and all silver rises, and then will be fulfilled that purpose set out in the Republican national platform from which the President in his late message quoted—that is, the maintenance of the parity of the values of the two metals, not coins, will be attained. The parity of the two coins has been maintained and will forever be under our existing laws. Under free coinage the parity of the metals will exist.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a few words about prosperity, and I am done. In the last Presidential campaign our cry was for more money, and the especial means we advocated was free coinage of silver. Our opponents and our gold-standard friends all said the country had plenty of money. You could not get any gold-standard advocate to admit that the country did not have money enough, and yet now Republican speakers are daily speaking of the increased money in circulation. The gentleman from Iowa says under this Administration our circulation has increased more than \$300,000,000, and every Republican says, "Behold the prosperity of the land!"

Yes, the money has increased. The present conditions prove that we were right in demanding more money; and, Mr. Chairman, if our mints during this time had been freely opened to both gold and silver, our prosperity would to-day be unrivaled in all the branches of our industry. Yes, our people are better off, take the country altogether, than they were two, three, or four years ago. The Almighty has blessed this land. Our people, compelled by hard times, have learned to depend more upon themselves and not so much upon the merchant for their supplies. A war authorized by Congress took tens of thousands of men into our Army. It caused the purchase of millions of goods. It caused the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars. It created a \$200,000,000

debt on the people, borrowed that money, and placed it again in circulation.

The President's war in the Philippines continues these vast expenditures. A war is prevailing in South Africa between a free people and a European monarchy. That such conditions as I have just recited bring a degree of prosperity for the time being is familiar knowledge. It followed our civil war. As such conditions are not permanent, the prosperity they cause is not permanent. It may be that if the Republican party can have its way in their imperialistic desires, it will see to it that the expenditures shall be sufficient to uphold the prosperity for several years. They have an idea, it seems, that you can tax a people into prosperity. They forget that the people are to-day groaning under war taxes, under the stamp taxes, under the tobacco taxes.

Has it occurred to you that tobacco, a great agricultural product, is taxed probably to twice its value to the farmer? That tax ought to be reduced. It adds 12 cents per pound to the manufactured article. This lessens the demand for it. Reduce the tax greatly and the demand will be stronger for tobacco, and a large mass of our agricultural people will be benefited, and especially will this be true if the power of the American and Continental Tobacco companies to control the trade and prices of so much of that great crop can be destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to think that we are in the course of a long era of prosperity. Nothing can more thoroughly gratify one who loves his country than to know that the toilers of the land, the tillers of the soil, the workmen in the shops, and all artisans and all professional men are happy and prosperous. To know that manufacturers and traders are prosperous and happy and on a sure foundation is a source of happiness to every patriot. With genuine, safe prosperity on an enduring foundation, civilization and progress will go forward.

The humble citizen will educate his children. He will help build his church and schoolhouse. He will, withal, be independent and self-respecting. He will not be dissatisfied. I know, Mr. Chairman, and it is with great pleasure that I am able to say it, that the manufacturing industries of the South are almost universally prosperous. Usually it is a superior class of business men who are in that industry, and they are situated in the most advantageous position in all the world. To prophesy that for many years they will remain prosperous and in a few years control the cotton goods world is not a rash but a pleasant prediction. But let no one think that the farmers of this land are enjoying the same degree of prosperity or that theirs is upon so sure a foundation.

The Republican candidate in the next campaign will find little consolation in the rural districts in proclaiming prosperity in support of this bill. Here are some plain figures, all taken from the monthly summary of Commerce and Finance of the Treasury Department, a copy of which was sent to each member of this House to-day, except the quotations for yesterday's prices, which I take from to-day's paper. Cotton, our great export crop, was selling on the 6th day of November, 1896, the week of McKinley's election, in New York for 8½ cents per pound. Yesterday, December 12, 1899, it was there selling for 7½ cents per pound. In other words, to-day cotton is about one-half cent lower now than it was when McKinley was elected. On November 5, 1896, wheat was selling for 86 cents per bushel.

On March 4, 1897, the day of McKinley's inauguration, wheat was selling for 94 cents per bushel; yesterday wheat was selling for 74 cents per bushel in the same market; so wheat was 20 cents a bushel more when Mr. McKinley became President than it is to-day. In this summary I find no tobacco prices farther back than October, 1898. The average domestic value of our export tobacco for that month was 10 cents per pound. Since then there has been a general decline in price, so that the average price of export tobacco for October, 1899, the last price given, was only 8½ cents per pound, or a decline of 19 per cent in the last year; and, Mr. Chairman, while I have been unable to verify my opinion by departmental statistics, I think that since March 4, 1897, when the Republicans took charge of the Government, tobacco prices have declined so that tobacco is not worth as much to the Carolina and Virginia farmers as it was three years ago.

Each tobacco farmer must be his own judge as to the relative price of tobacco now and in former years. It is universally conceded that the tobacco grown in North Carolina and Virginia does not sell for more than half what it brought ten and fifteen years ago. No doubt much of this decline is due to trusts, of which I shall probably speak hereafter. So much for prices of farmers' products. Let me quote from the same high authority prices at wholesale on some articles for which farmers have to exchange their produce directly or indirectly. Many of these articles are controlled by trusts, which fact, no doubt, in a large measure accounts for the great rise in their prices. Manila, hemp, and jute have under their administration increased more than 100 per cent. Manila was worth 4 cents per pound on March 4, 1897.



On November 27, 1899, the last price given it was worth 14 cents per pound. Since McKinley's inauguration common leather has risen from 20 cents to 25 cents per pound. Rubber has in that time risen from 80 cents to \$1.04 per pound. Iron and steel have doubled in price since McKinley's inauguration. Kerosene oil has risen in price from 6½ cents per gallon to 9½ cents. Sugar, on March 4, 1897, was \$3.98 per 100 pounds; on November 16, 1899, the last date given in the summary, sugar was \$4.82½ per 100 pounds. Tin plate has advanced since McKinley's inauguration from \$3.75 to \$4.87½. Nails have increased in price in the last twelve months from \$1.90 to \$2.60.

Such, Mr. Chairman, are some of the prices disclosed by the Treasury statistics. I give them that gentlemen may have their benefit in discussing prosperity. They deserve the careful consideration of the country. But, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to talk so much of prices. I rose for the purpose of giving my reasons in brief for considering this bill a dangerous one. Having done so, I must content myself with voting against it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I can not permit this bill to pass without recording my unequivocal protest against it. There are some things which are clearly evident in regard to this financial question. Prior to the year 1896 no political party ever dared to mention the words "gold standard" in its platform, except to declare against and repudiate that standard. In that year the Republican party declared in favor of it only until international bimetalism could be secured. Since that year the Republican party have advanced on the subject and have now forsaken international bimetalism.

It is strikingly significant that this bill was not brought forward at the last session of Congress and pressed to a passage. And, again, it is worth our while to note that while this bill resembles very much the Gage bill that was before the Banking and Currency Committee, it omits his feature of funding the Treasury notes of 1890, the greenbacks, and the bonded indebtedness of the United States into long-term interest-bearing gold bonds. Why is this omission made? Sir, it is for the purpose of first enacting the gold standard into statutory law to test the temper of the people. Then, if the sentiment of the people be not aroused against it, either at this session or after the next election the Republican party will resort to that same infamous scheme of funding all of the paper money and Government obligations in long-term gold bonds, to last for all futurity as a footing for the national banking system. This bill is the first step, and the funding project will come next. Then the toiling millions, the brawn and muscle of the honest yeomanry, will be chained for years to come as financial serfs to the money oligarchy of the nation.

When the Constitution of 1789 was adopted the framers of that instrument wrote in it that "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in the payment of debts." By this expression they intended that no State should be permitted to say that anything except gold and silver shall ever be a legal tender in the payment of debts, and, furthermore, that the Federal Government would forever enforce the provision that both gold and silver should be legal tender, and that no public obligation or private contract should or could discredit and demonetize either metal. This constitutional provision was designed to perpetuate both metals as the coined money of the nation. This bill, however, permits, either by public obligation or private contract, the complete elimination of silver as a legal tender. It strikes down the fundamental law in regard to our coinage.

After the first section, defining that the standard shall be gold, the second section says that all obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established—the gold standard. In other words, hereafter all obligations of the Government and all private contracts entered into by individuals shall be performed and paid in the gold coin of the country. It is fair to presume that the framers of the bill meant to make this section retroactive and prospective and to require all debts, public and private, past and future, to be paid in gold. They prohibit a contract to pay in anything but gold. A contract to pay in anything else is intended to be a nullity.

This act will curse the nation and the debt-burdened people more than any measure ever placed in the statutes. I would not be honest with myself if I failed to characterize such legislation in terms in harmony with my feelings and denounce it as oppressive, cruel, infamous! This section will immensely increase the demand for gold and enormously enhance its value. It is estimated that the public and private indebtedness of the United States to-day amounts to about \$50,000,000,000. Hereafter it will amount to much more than that and every dollar must be paid in gold coin according to this new statutory standard. We have now only about seven hundred millions of gold in existence in the United States. Hence the strain upon gold will be terrific and cause it to rise continually in value.

Sections 3 and 4 provide for impounding the silver certificates,

all the silver dollars, the Treasury notes of 1890, and the greenbacks in the Treasury of the United States, and that they there remain, to be paid out for gold only at the sweet will of some great banker at the head of the Treasury Department. Then gold and national-bank notes will be the only money in circulation, and will be controlled and manipulated by the moneyed ring. All the Government paper money and silver will be locked up in this great public pound to make way for gold and national-bank currency. It contracts the money volume and crushes the people.

Section 4 confers unlimited power upon the Secretary of the Treasury. While the people are denied the right of having unlimited coinage of silver, this official may, under the new law, issue without limit gold bonds and fasten them upon the resources of the country. This act says:

He is hereby authorized to issue and sell, whenever in his judgment it is necessary to the maintenance of said fund, bonds of the United States, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable in gold coin at the end of twenty years, but redeemable in gold coin at the option of the United States after one year.

This section empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to issue gold bonds to the extent of \$100,000,000, \$500,000,000, a billion or two billion dollars, and so on, without let or hindrance, without authority from Congress or any other power in this Government. No such power has ever heretofore been conferred upon the Secretary of the Treasury or any other official in the Government. No man in this Republic or in any government should be intrusted with such unbridled power. This immense authority should remain in Congress, to be exercised at the instance of the people, and should not be handed over by them to some official selected by the money trust and bondholders. The act is calling down a curse upon the people, the true repository of sovereignty and all power. The people will feel the effects of this surrender of authority to their eternal detriment and misery.

When we were about to declare war against Spain to free the Cubans I voted for the appropriation of \$50,000,000 to be placed in the hands of the President of the United States to inaugurate the war. Every Democrat, I believe, voted for the measure. This, sir, invested the President with a great power and reposed the highest confidence in his integrity. Yet it did not compare in magnitude to the authority here given the Secretary of the Treasury. And when the conflict was waging, when the great naval victory of Santiago was achieved and the Spanish ships were swept from the seas, and Winfield Scott Schley appeared before the world as the real hero of that memorable battle, I was proud that I voted for thus appropriating the \$50,000,000! [Loud applause.]

Why is it necessary to give this power to the Secretary of the Treasury? Let us return to the coinage laws as they existed prior to 1873, as the founders of the Republic made them. Let us coin both gold and silver, free and in unlimited quantities, and whenever we issue paper money make it redeemable in both these coins, and it will not be necessary to clothe the Secretary of the Treasury with such high privileges, nor will it be necessary to issue bonds.

Mr. ADAMSON. It will break the chain.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes, and it will break the chain.

With the free coinage of both metals and paper money redeemable in such coins we could have fought the war against Spain without issuing one dollar in gold bonds. The issue is at last clearly presented between those who believe in the gold standard and those who are opposed to it. For the first time in our history Congress has an opportunity of voting squarely upon the proposition, and for my part I feel renewed hope when we go before the people in 1900 on the same incomparable platform and with the same intrepid leader. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The masses now clearly perceive the hypocrisy of the Republican party in declaring in favor of international bimetalism in 1896 and turning their backs upon it in 1899. The plain truth is that in 1866, after the civil war had ended, the banking fraternity of this nation inaugurated a crusade and warfare against the greenbacks and paper money of the Government in favor of giving the banks the privilege of issuing all of the paper money. That war has unceasingly continued since that year, and this bill is the very acme of their highest ambition in that direction.

First, they enormously increased their investments by procuring the passage of the act of 1869 strengthening the public credit of the United States in declaring all Government obligations payable in coin. This more than doubled the value of their investment. Next silver was demonetized in 1873, and the one coin being discredited the other doubled in value by being more in demand. The gold owners and bondholders alone profited by that change in the monetary standard. Then, next, they clamored for the retirement from circulation of all the Government's paper money, and that they be endowed with the supreme function of issuing all the paper money and controlling the currency.

They cared not then, nor do they care now, particularly about



gold or silver; they only wish to seize hold of the money-issuing business of the Government and appropriate it to their own control. By this act they secure the imprisonment of the silver and paper money in the newly created division of issue and redemption, and their rights and privileges are greatly amplified and augmented with reference to national banks. Beyond the peradventure of a doubt, this bill clothes the banks and moneyed few with the power of dominating and controlling the money volume of America.

A brief reference to recent political history is here interesting. In 1888, it is said, Mr. McKinley, now the President, wrote this language in the Republican platform:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration for its effort to demonetize silver.

If they were honest then, they are not honest now in their pretension for the gold standard and their enmity to free silver.

Again, in 1892, they declared in favor of gold and silver as standard money, and in 1896 they declared for international bimetalism. And now they have openly abandoned their position upon that question and say to the American people that they did not mean what they said when they promised it. As surely as God reigns, such action will be rebuked by the enlightened consciences of a free people! The American people of all parties are honest and believe in good faith, and when they record their verdict in 1900 it will not be the one expected by the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber. This will be the first American statute to contain the term gold standard, and it involves more to the masses of the American people than many of you gentlemen think.

You deluded many by the false hope of international bimetalism in 1896. Many voters believed you sincere. It is well understood by the people that from 1792 to 1834 we did have the free coinage of both metals at the ratio of 15 to 1; that from 1834 to 1873 we had the free coinage of both metals at the ratio of 16 to 1, and that when silver was demonetized it was at a premium over gold. These facts the people do know and understand, and when they vote in 1900 they will again manifest their undying friendship for the constitutional money of this country, that served us for nearly a hundred years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A review of bimetalism in this country will disclose the hideous features of this gold-standard measure.

#### BIMETALLISM.

Money is governed by the law of supply and demand, just as any other commodity. We buy money with commodities in the same sense that we buy commodities with money. When we say cotton is worth so much money, we say money is worth so much cotton. They are equal to each other. Then we know that whatever causes dollars to go up in value must necessarily cause commodities to go down. Hence, whatever causes money to come down in value causes commodities to rise in value. We must ever keep this central idea in our minds, that money is bought and sold just as cotton, wheat, and other commodities.

Inevitably, then, whenever the supply of money in a country is decreased its value is increased. Then commodities measured by this supply of money must decrease in value as the money becomes scarcer. Undoubtedly, then, to increase the supply of money will be to increase the value of commodities, because the value of money is falling. The gold-standard advocates thoroughly understood these truths when they demonetized silver. They destroyed one-half the supply of money and doubled the value of the remaining half by creating a greater demand for the half supply left. Hence they demonetized silver in 1873 to decrease the supply of money and create a double demand for the remaining quantity of money left. The gold money at once went up in value and commodities measured by it went down in value.

John Locke stated the true theory of money when he said:

The value of money in general is the quantity of all the money in the world in proportion to the trade.

And Ricardo said:

The demand for money is regulated entirely by its value, and its value by its quantity.

It is the unanimous opinion of political economists that the quantity of money in the country regulates the prices of commodities. Without understanding this unanswerable and unanswered truth it is idle and vain to undertake to understand the science of money. No man has ever given happier expression to these thoughts than Senator JOHN P. JONES. He says:

There is one principle of monetary science that, if held steadfastly in view, will constitute an unerring guide through what would otherwise be a path of inextricable difficulty. That principle is that the value of the unit of money in any country is determined by the number of units in circulation. In other words, the value of every dollar depends on the number of dollars out. The greater the number of dollars out, other things being equal, the less will be the value of each dollar; the fewer the number out, other things remaining the same, the greater the value of each, and this without any regard whatever to the material of which the dollars are composed. This is the key to the financial situation of the United States. Much more, it is the key to the financial situation in many lands. Without this key it is in vain that the student attempts to unlock the door leading to the arcanum of monetary knowledge. Unlike many of the locks made by men, the lock on that door is unpickable.

Is his proposition true? If so, a dastardly crime indeed was perpetrated against the people in 1873, when silver was demonetized and one-half of the quantity of money in this country was destroyed. It was an infamy to thus send up in value the other half of the quantity of money belonging to the few gold owners and send down the values of the property and products of this country.

Take the statements of the following eminent gentlemen and see with what striking unanimity they vie with each other in proclaiming the eternal truth that the demand for money goes according to its value and its value by its quantity:

To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from the comparison of the benefits of a full, with the evils of a scanty, circulation.—*Alexander Hamilton, Report on the Mint, 1791.*

I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals.—*Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Hamilton, February, 1792.*

Wolowski says:

The sum total of the precious metals is reckoned at 50 milliards, one-half gold and one-half silver. If, by a stroke of the pen, they suppress one of these metals in the monetary service, they double the demand for the other metal, to the ruin of all debtors.

Cernuschi says:

The purchasing power of money is in direct proportion to the volume of money existing.

Prof. Francis A. Walker, in his work on Money (page 57), says:

The value of money in any country is determined by the amount existing.

Sir James Graham says:

The value of money is in the inverse ratio of its quantity, the supply of commodities remaining the same.

John Stuart Mill (Political Economy) says:

The value of money, other things being the same, varies inversely as its quantity, every increase of quantity lowering the value and every diminution raising it in a ratio exactly equivalent.

Ricardo (reply to Bosanquet) says:

The value of money in any country is determined by the amount existing. \* \* \*

That commodities would rise or fall in price in proportion to the increase or diminution of money I assume as a fact that is incontrovertible. \* \* \*

The famous gold-standard advocate of England, Lord Overstone, said:

A reduction of circulation must tend to lower prices.—*Lord Overstone's Tracts, page 202.*

And the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Robert Giffen, who declaimed against our theory, said:

To say that the quantity of money regulates prices is only the same thing as to say of any article that is bought or sold that its quantity is a material factor in determining its value.—*A Chapter on Standard Money, Giffen.*

The authorities verifying this quantitative theory come from Aristotle to the present time. During all these years every political economist of any note has announced the theory as being true, and none, living or dead, has refuted it. To-day no Republican of repute denies it. They all boast of the verification of its truth in the recent increased output of gold and say it has made times better.

#### BIRTH OF BIMETALLISM IN THE UNITED STATES.

The advent of bimetalism in the United States was coeval with the birth of liberty in this Republic. It blessed mankind for nearly a century of our march of freedom and happiness.

Without a long-spun argument, it will suffice to simply state that money arose out of necessity. It was found necessary to find some intermediary to supersede the barter and exchange of commodity for commodity and to serve as a standard or measure of values or prices, if you please, a pricing instrument for the commodities. After the human family had resorted to many things for use as money, it finally fixed upon gold and silver as a natural money. Our Government was formed in 1789, and our written Constitution plainly and unequivocally perpetuates both gold and silver as the money of the American people. True and lofty patriots wrote these words in our Constitution for the benefit of themselves and their posterity to follow. The United States in Congress assembled shall have the power "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin," and "no State shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

Now, this last clause means that no State, nor the United States, could or should permit anything or any one metal but gold or silver to be legal tender; and it ought to embrace a clear prohibition of gold contracts, and I believe it was so intended and does interdict them. Thus, gold and silver were constitutionally embedded into our theory and system of Government as a measure of values and pricing instruments for all commodities and property. On April 2, 1792, the United States Mint was established by the act of Congress. It gave us a bimetallic money system. It contained these provisions, that we ought to keep constantly in our minds:

SEC. 9. That there shall be from time to time struck and coined at said Mint coins of gold, silver, and copper of the following denominations, descriptions, and values, viz: Dollars or units, each to be of the value of a Spanish milled dollar as the same is now current, and to contain 371 grains and four-sixteenths part of a grain of pure, or 416 grains of standard silver.

This act provided for the coinage of certain other gold and silver coins to be reckoned from this dollar unit.



It placed us upon a bimetallic basis. Section 11 fixed the ratio at 15 of silver to 1 of gold. Section 14 provided:

That it shall be lawful for any person or persons to bring to the said mint gold and silver bullion in order to their being coined; and the bullion so brought shall be there assayed and coined as speedily as may be after the receipt thereof, and that free of expense to the person or persons by whom the same shall have been brought.

This was "free" coinage, and it was "unlimited" coinage of both gold and silver. This is what free and unlimited coinage means.

Section 16 provided:

That all the gold and silver coins which have been struck at, and issued from the said mint, shall be a lawful tender in all payments whatsoever, those of full weight according to the respective values herein before declared and those of less than full weight at values proportional to their respective weights.

This made both gold and silver coins of equal debt-paying power; there was no discrimination against either, and this was true and genuine bimetalism, which we enjoyed until 1873, when the unit of value was changed. The change was as follows, and I put it here in order that we may distinctly and sharply contrast the two laws in regard to the unit of values. Here is the section of the silver demonetization act of 1873:

SEC. 14. The gold coins of the United States shall be a dollar piece, which, at the standard weight of 25.8 grains, shall be the unit of value.

The unit of value adopted by our fathers was changed in a very few simple words. The standard silver dollar by that act was dropped from the coinage laws and the trade dollar substituted with legal-tender qualities limited to \$5. And I now propound this query to the Goldite, to anyone, to the enemies of silver. Why was the unit of value changed from silver to gold? It seems to honest thinking men now that it was done to benefit those whom it has benefited, the creditor classes and the gold holders, for they have profited by it and reaped the fruits of the crime. And this is the surest way of locating a criminal—to find the person benefited by the commission of a crime.

Then the legal-tender qualities of the silver dollar were limited to the amount of \$5. Here silver was demonetized, and one-half of our money metal was stricken down and made incapable of measuring values, and destroyed as a standard money and money of ultimate redemption. And this bill makes all the paper and silver money redeemable in gold.

#### FALLING PRICES.

What effect did this act of 1873 have upon silver? My contention is that it placed silver along with other commodities to be measured with the gold standard. It ceased to become a pricing instrument and is priced by the gold unit. It is now a mere representative money and promise to pay. Gold at once began to appreciate in value and to become dearer. From that fatal day there began and continued a deadly fall of prices of all the commodities produced by the laboring classes, including the agriculturists.

Now, since silver has been placed along with other commodities, let us take it together with wheat and cotton and see how these three commodities have fallen. Here are the figures from a book issued by the Treasury Department of the United States called the "Coinage Laws of the United States, 1793 to 1893, with an appendix of statistics relative thereto," and it is to be presumed that this book is correct, coming from Mr. Carlisle's Department.

Depreciations of wheat, cotton, and silver since 1873.

Year.	Wheat.	Cot- ton.	Silver.
		<i>Cents.</i>	
1872	\$1.47	19.3	\$1.32
1873	1.31	18.8	1.29
1874	1.43	15.4	1.27
1875	1.12	15	1.24
1876	1.24	12.9	1.15
1877	1.17	11.8	1.20
1878	1.34	11.1	1.15
1879	1.07	9.9	1.12
1880	1.23	11.5	1.14
1881	1.11	11.4	1.13
1882	1.19	11.4	1.13
1883	1.13	10.8	1.11
1884	1.07	10.5	1.01
1885	.86	10.6	1.06
1886	.87	9.9	.99
1887	.89	9.5	.97
1888	.85	9.8	.95
1889	.90	9.9	.95
1890	.83	10.1	1.04
1891	.85	10	.90
1892	.80	8.7	.86
1893	.50	7.2	.75

And we all know in 1894, 1896, and 1897 cotton came down to 4 cents per pound. This ought to be convincing that silver, cotton, corn, wheat, and other products have continually fallen in value since 1873; in other words, that gold, the unit of value, has continually risen in value. Now, it will be contended that this fall

in values has not been an injury to anyone. Mr. E. Benjamin Andrews, president of Brown University, a member of the International Monetary Conference at Brussels in 1892, and a great international bimetalist, says:

The decline in prices now going on in itself marks no advance in civilization. One may, indeed, speak of a fall in prices as a sign of economic advance, while under the world's present economic system it often is, but never as itself an element in such advance, for this it is not. That many manufactured articles have long been decreasing in intrinsic cost is a great blessing, and articles of this class would doubtless have gone down more or less under an ideal system of money. But it was not necessary that general prices should fall; and this fall, I maintain, has been an absolute and unmitigated curse to human civilization. Mark, it is not low prices which I condemn; low prices once established are as desirable as high. That is to say, the words "high" and "low" in respect to prices are not absolute but relative terms.

The continual fall of prices, the act of sinking, is the accursed thing. None profit from it but such as are annuitants without being producers; and we may be sure that no civilized state is going to legislate to keep prices falling when it is once seen, as it must soon be seen, that the fall injures all but the very few unproductive people who live upon their incomes. Bankers and money lenders, as such, are not interested to have prices fall and the value of money increase. What enriches bankers is lively business, plentiful trade, demand for capital, high interest—phenomena which never accompany appreciating money, and in the nature of the case can not do so.

This is from a great authority, and a thorough study by any person conscientiously seeking the truth will be convinced of the absolute verity of Professor Andrews' remarks. The fact is that it is only the creditor classes, the money lenders, the persons with fixed income, and the annuitants that are benefited by falling prices and the rise in the value of money.

All other classes are injured. Let us take the farmer, for instance. There are certain fixed charges that have never been reduced for him. Taxes are the same, railroad freights, salaries, pensions, schooling for his children, and interest for borrowed money are the same. He does not get the benefit of falling prices, for he sells at reduced prices and pays about the same fixed charges he always paid. This class constitutes over 45 per cent of our population, and if the agriculturalist happens to be in debt, owing a balance on his farm, as many do, he is only plunged in deeper woe by the falling prices of his products, and yet he must pay the same upon his debts and fixed charges.

#### STANDARD OR MEASURE OF VALUES; WHAT IS IT?

With this we pass on to another phase of the question. It is contended by the gold-standard advocates that we can not have a double standard. That we must either have a single gold standard of values or a single silver standard of values. The greatest writers upon the question of money now concur in this fundamental principle: the value of money in a country, other things being equal, varies inversely as its quantity, every increase of quantity lowering the value and every diminution raising it in a ratio exactly equivalent.

Therefore it follows beyond dispute that if the act of 1873 demonetized silver, destroyed it as a standard or measure of values, the other half of our metallic money, being gold, was doubled in value. Property would be worth just half what it was before. Now, suppose you restore silver to its rightful position that it occupied before 1873, you double the value of all property by making silver real money, and doubling the quantity of our real money puts us back upon a genuine bimetallic basis and not upon a so called double standard.

It is the quantity of real legal-tender debt-paying money that determines the values of property, and not the "two-yard sticks" theory so flippantly asserted. All real thinkers upon this point have arrived at this conclusion. Accordingly, so long as we are upon a gold unit of value, the prices of property and commodities must continue to fall and remain low. Restore silver to its position as standard money, and prices will rise, industries will be stimulated, factories will hum, labor will be justly rewarded, and a great era of new prosperity will dawn upon us.

#### ANOTHER DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—AMERICAN BIMETALLISM.

The United States is able to maintain her own independent bimetallic system without leaning upon any other country. In the first place it is admitted that we are the greatest silver-producing country in the world. I will argue this question of the ability of the United States to maintain bimetalism from three standpoints: First, that there is no danger of a silver deluge; second, that 96 per cent of our commerce is domestic and we should legislate in favor of our home industries and commerce, and third, that there is no prospect of any international agreement or international bimetalism. It is estimated that the silver and gold money to-day of the world amounts to about \$8,000,000,000, of this amount \$4,000,000,000 being in silver and \$4,000,000,000 being in gold.

Now, this is the metallic money of the world. In the United States only gold is redemption money, the other money being merely credit money redeemable in gold—simply a promise to pay in gold. Now, in the United States we have in all kinds of money, gold, silver, and paper, about \$1,800,000,000. One-third of this is silver money, to wit, \$600,000,000. This money, by the act of 1873, ceased to be the unit of values and passed to the stage of credit money, or representative money. Many say they would be willing to join with us in the free coinage of silver if they were

not afraid that we would be made the "dumping ground" for the silver of the world—that they are afraid of the silver deluge. A great many honest men believe this to be a real and good objection.

Mr. Mulhall, the English statistician, views the matter in this way in regard to the relative production of gold and silver: In 1848 there were 31 tons of silver to 1 ton of gold in the world. In 1880 there were 18 tons of silver to 1 ton of gold, and in 1890, 18 tons of silver to 1 ton of gold. Now, you see, from 1848 to 1880 the relative supply of silver decreased, and from 1880 to 1890 it just about held its own. Since this time there have been no newly discovered mines from which this deluge of silver is to come, and the old ones have been worked until it is now unprofitable to work most of them.

Think what relation the increase of money bears to the increase of population—business industries and enterprises calling for an augmented volume of money! The statement of the proposition makes an unanswerable argument. Where is this increase of silver coming from? The gold-standard advocates are challenged to state where. It is admitted by all thinking and investigating men that there is not for sale in the world to-day enough silver bullion to create an overproduction of money in the United States. Examine carefully the figures and you will convince yourself that this argument about a silver deluge is only an assertion, and that there is no possibility of too much money coming into circulation in proportion to the increase in population and business.

John G. Carlisle—the Carlisle that used to be a friend of the people—when he was honestly seeking to represent his people and made earnest investigation for their benefit, said:

I know that the world's stock of precious metals is none too large, and I see no reason to apprehend that it will ever be so. Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population and industry. According to my views of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy, by legislation and otherwise, from three-sevenths to one-half the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age. The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilences, and famines that ever occurred in the history of the world.

The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads, and other appliances for carrying on commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment, would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half the metallic money of the world.

These utterances were made in 1878 in the halls of Congress, before Mr. Carlisle felt the blighting touch of Wall street, the Rothschilds, the Morgan syndicates, and the coupon clippers. Has that deluge of silver come? Call on Mr. Carlisle's report again. Here are the figures from his Department:

According to the revised figures the world's production of gold and silver for the last three years has been as follows:

Year.	Gold.	Silver.
1890.....	\$113,149,600	\$172,234,500
1891.....	120,518,800	186,755,000
1892.....	130,816,600	196,605,200

These figures show that up to the time of the repeal of the Sherman law there was no overproduction of either gold or silver and that the annual entire output of the money of the world would just a little more than pay our yearly pension roll of \$150,000,000. These figures ought to convince any person honestly seeking information that there is no danger of getting too much silver in circulation. The foreign nations would not bring the silver here to be coined, because their ratio is 15 to 1. They would not lose the difference in the ratio and then pay shipping charges, insurance, and other expenses, for this would not profit them one particle. Hence the mere statement of these facts carries an abundant argument with it.

The fact is that the sum total of the amount of gold and silver that could be added each year to the world's metal money can not much exceed \$200,000,000. It is only a little more than 2 or 2½ per cent of the present volume of silver and gold. This annual increase, added to the total amount of money in the world, is not adequate for commercial needs and business enterprises. History does not record a country in all time that had too much metallic money.

#### AMERICAN CURRENCY FOR AMERICAN COMMERCE.

It is estimated and can not be disputed that 96 per cent of our commerce is domestic commerce, and only 4 per cent is with foreign nations and 2 per cent of that is with silver-using countries. Let us relieve the distress at home by enlarging our money volume and putting new life into our home commerce. Official reports show that our commerce with foreign nations amounts to about \$1,714,000,116, and our domestic commerce amounts to something over \$110,000,000,000. We have transactions at home that amount to more than fifty times the transactions we have abroad.

New enterprises are springing up, corporations are making

large investments, railroads are making vast extensions and building new lines, commercial schemes are in operation all around us, and they all demand more money—money at home. I say do not impoverish our domestic commerce, but take the shackles off and give us an increased supply of money. We need it here, and we ought to stand by our own homes and firesides first. Give us all the money of our mines as standard money, and we have a place for it. We can use it. We are large enough, grand enough, and progressive enough to absorb it.

In his balance sheet of the world Mr. Mulhall, the statistician of the Royal Society of England, says:

It would be impossible to find a parallel to the progress of the United States in the last ten years. Every day the sun rises upon the American people it sees an addition of \$2,500,000 to the accumulation of wealth in the Republic, which is equal to one-third of the daily accumulation of all mankind outside of the United States.

Thus one-third of the world in daily productive power is here represented, and will it be argued that such a power can not sustain its ancient, its much-needed money?

We produce more than two-fifths of the silver of the world and we can use it as redemption money.

We should not wait for England or any other country to join with us in going to bimetalism. The European countries are not ready to join us. England never will. She is a creditor nation. There the bondholders and coupon clippers live, and they have the mother country by the throat. There the Rothschilds live, and they own one-half of the gold of the world. They want to make their gold go up in value and not go down.

They well know that scarcity of gold appreciates its value. We owe England. She wants to depreciate the value of our silver and agricultural products, and knows, since they are measured by gold, she can do so by retaining the single gold standard, and make her gold coming from her Australian gold mines go on rising in value, and measure our products by this enhancing standard. She well knows that so long as her standard of values is measuring our products and still rising the prices of our products are declining, and she is getting our silver, cotton, wheat, rye, barley, and other products for smaller and smaller prices, and Shylock continues to fatten. Then why should she take the initiative when it is profit and all profit to her constantly?

If we but announce to the civilized world that we propose to coin all the gold and silver obtainable alike and make them primary money, the other nations, knowing our capacity to produce gold and silver, will join hands with us. It is estimated that England harvests from us annually as interest on bonds, mortgages, and other securities the sum of \$200,000,000 in gold. Three years would take all the gold we use as money in America, for we only have \$600,000,000. Then where is the money to circulate at home and pay off private debts and carry on our own transactions? It is understood that England alone holds more than \$5,000,000,000 of our railroad bonds, municipal bonds, and other securities. The interest is payable in gold. This bill makes the principal and interest of all obligations payable in gold.

#### INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM.

The delusive hope of international bimetalism has vanished, and no sane man any longer holds out this false promise. Mr. McKinley's bimetallic European exploiters have returned bearing no fruit. The Aunt Nancy party, conceived and brought forth at Indianapolis, announce, through their monetary commission's report, that the prospects for international bimetalism have faded away like a dream. The Secretary of the Treasury and his avaricious cohorts say that we must be chained to the gold standard as a purely American policy.

In 1892 there was a monetary conference in Brussels, Belgium, and England there boldly and candidly, through her delegates, stated her position upon monetary units and standards. She demonstrated clearly that she had no idea of abandoning the gold standard, and it seems to me that this ought to be an indisputable and everlasting answer to those who hope for international bimetalism. Here is her answer, and it satisfies me that England is eternally set upon the gold standard under present conditions. I take this from the Report of the International Monetary Conference, held at Brussels, page 113. Sir Rivers Wilson, delegate from England, said:

In order to avoid all misunderstanding, I desire, on behalf of Sir Charles Freeman and myself, to make in the face of this assembly our profession of faith. Our faith is that of the school of monometallism pure and simple. We do not admit that any other than the single gold standard would be applicable to our country.

Do you want any further answer from England? But this bill repudiates international bimetalism; hence that question is eliminated.

When I say that I favor returning to our monetary system that existed prior to 1873, I mean that we ought not to make one metal dollar redeemable in another metal dollar. The dollar ought to be the redeemer, not the redeemed. Both gold and silver dollars ought to be made by our laws redeemers, and then they will be



treated alike. This is bimetallism. The true essentials of bimetallism are these: A legally fixed ratio between the two metals; impartial coinage at that ratio.

They should be legal tender for all debts. They should be collected and paid out alike. And both should be used as standards and redemption money.

16 TO 1 SHOULD BE THE RATIO.

I favor the ratio of 16 to 1 because it is our present legal ratio, and it would be a great expense to change the ratio, and the amount of pure silver in the silver dollar has never been changed since 1792. I believe in keeping the gold and silver dollars at a parity, and I believe 16 to 1 will do it. It did exist on a parity at that ratio for 200 years, according to the very best statistical authorities. Take the shackles off silver and it will come up to an even value with gold according to our ratio. Our Treasury Department has published the figures showing that gold and silver were at a parity at the ratio of 16 to 1 up until 1873, when silver received the fatal blow. It then went down under the operation of a cruel law, and not because it was an inferior money.

If bimetallism succeeded this way for nearly a hundred years, I am willing to try it again. If the ratio does not prove correct, it will then be time enough to try something else. Until the gold-ites unfold the ratio they propose, which they have never yet done, I shall stay by the old time-tried ratio. We do not contend that the law can absolutely fix the values of gold and silver, but we contend that it can liberate certain economic forces which will make gold and silver regulate their values at about the ratio of 16 to 1.

We recognize the law of supply and demand. A child can understand that if Congress passed a law saying that no hogs should be killed for food, nor eaten by any person in the United States, the price of pork would go down and the price of beef and mutton would go up. So with silver. The law depressed its value by saying it should not be used as money, and gold went up. Suppose the law should decree that it should be no longer legal to use gold as money or to use it in the arts. Do you not know it would go down in value?

We had the free coinage of gold and silver from 1816 (when England went to the gold standard) until 1873, and the two metals were at a parity at our legal ratio. We did not need England then, and we do not need her help now. Again, for seventy years France walked alone with her bimetallic standard and maintained the ratio of gold and silver at 15½ to 1, and even drew our gold from us, and did not need the help of England. How did France with her financial environments compare with the mighty resources and energies of our country in its grandeur? Double our money volume and fix our own ratio, and gold and silver will counterbalance and regulate each other, and the argument of experience demonstrates it.

It can not be denied truthfully that silver has been ill treated by many nations and gold has been fostered and legislated in favor of. The gold and silver bimetallism that Sir Isaac Newton recommended for England was destroyed in 1816, and Lord Liverpool succeeded in placing England upon the gold basis. The bimetalism that France enjoyed and that Napoleon favored has been destroyed, and in 1874 France went upon the gold standard. In 1873 Germany planted herself upon the gold standard, and in 1873 the Latin Union, along with France, adopted the gold standard. In 1873 the Democratic bimetalism that existed in the United States, the true bimetallism of Jefferson, Hamilton, and Jackson, was crushed out and our country laid prostrate at the feet of gold-standard England.

Now, India, with her millions of population, has wiped out silver coinage. The demand for gold has become immense, while the rejection of silver as money has gone in another direction in a corresponding degree. So that since these demonetization acts more than 500,000,000 people are fighting for and demanding gold for their standard of values when the supply of gold for monetary purposes is trifling. This we know—that since these acts of 1873 legislating against silver we have had panics, distress, strikes, falling prices, and misery all over the globe. They have not been confined to our own country, but have been felt in England and throughout the civilized world.

What people have these acts benefited? None, save only the moneyed few, the bondholders, and money lenders. We do know that since about 1873 we have had evil days everywhere. Here is a studied report of a royal commission created by England in 1885. This ought to be read and pondered over by every patriotic citizen in this country. It will change the minds of some honest men. The commission reported:

1. That the depression dated from the year 1873, or thereabouts.
2. That it extended to every branch of industry, including agriculture, manufactures, and mining, and that it was not confined to England, but had been experienced in a greater or less degree in all the industrial countries of the world.
3. That no adequate cause for this state of things was discoverable, unless it could be found in some 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 covered.

The panic has come, and it has come to stay until bimetallism is restored.

SILVER WILL NOT DRIVE OUT GOLD.

It is urged that to restore silver to the position of redemption money would drive gold out of circulation. This same prediction was made when the Bland-Allison Act was pending, and the gold-standard advocates said that it would drive all of the gold out of the country, but the official reports show that immediately upon the passage of that act our gold stock went up from \$230,000,000 to \$700,000,000. These are facts and can not be denied, and yet the gold men tell you and expect you to believe that the rehabilitation of silver will drive gold out of the country. What if it did? Would not we have a good volume of silver money, and would not other money come to take the place of the gold? And if gold does leave the country when we restore silver to its proper functions is that a sound argument against raising the prices of our products by remonetizing silver? Sir, we this day have a gold panic in this country and we are now on the gold standard.

The estimated wheat crop of the world for the year 1891 was 2,432,000,000 bushels; for 1892 it was 2,403,000,000 bushels; for the year 1893 it was 1,904,000,000 bushels. With a reduced crop for 1893 the Liverpool price has gone down from \$1.15 per bushel in 1891 to 77 cents a bushel in 1893. In the United States the wheat crop in the year 1892 was 516,000,000 bushels, and for 1893, 396,000,000 bushels. In 1892 the cotton crop of this country was 6,717,000 bales, and for 1893 it was 6,600,000 bales. The price went down from 8.4 cents a pound in 1892 to 6.89 cents per pound in 1893, and we all know that in 1894 it went down as low as 4 cents a pound. Prices in cotton, wheat, and other farm products have steadily declined in value since 1873. Ought this decline to be stopped, and can it be done?

The fall in prices began in 1873, when our standard was reduced by striking off one-half the quantity of our standard—striking off the silver half—reducing the dimension of the standard that priced our commodities. Then, if this be so, restore that standard to its normal proportions and you restore prices to their normal conditions. The scramble for gold has made it go up in value, and we have to pay more of our products for it. John Locke said years ago:

The greater scarcity of money enhances its price and increases the scramble, there being nothing that does supply the want of it. The lessening of its quantity always increases its price and makes an equal portion of it exchange for a greater of any other thing.

Then, if this be true, coin gold and silver just alike; make one metal just as good as another; make no law apply to one that does not apply to the other; make both redemption money, and coin them at a proper ratio in our country, and prices of agricultural products will rise, trade will be restored, and we will once again feel the life of a new era in all our business transactions.

#### OUR LOSSES SINCE 1873.

The demonetization of silver when it was at a premium of 8 cents over gold lost annually the producer on cotton and wheat \$155,550,000, while the mine owner lost only \$13,000,000 annually. Carefully analyze the following statement:

#### LOSSES CAUSED BY THE DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER, 1873 TO 1893.

Loss to silver producers, \$198,617,908.  
 Loss to wheat producers, \$3,900,542,602, or \$19,638 for every \$1,000 lost by silver producers.  
 Loss to corn producers, \$9,441,525,243, or \$47,536 for every \$1,000 lost by silver producers.  
 Loss to cotton producers, \$4,810,210,344, or \$24,218 to every \$1,000 lost by silver producers.  
 Or for every \$1,000 to the silver producers caused by the demonetization of silver, the wheat, corn, and cotton producers lose \$91,332, to say nothing of the wool and pig-iron producers and all the other labor products of the country.  
 The average population of the United States for the period from 1872 to 1893 was 50,000,000. The loss during that time, caused by the demonetization of silver, upon the three great staple products of the country—corn, cotton, and wheat—amounted to \$18,152,273,189, or a loss per capita of \$363; so it is safe to assume that the loss to all industries has been at least \$1,000 per capita.

It is not a question of benefiting a mine owner. It is a question of reinvesting one of the elements of nature's God with its ancient money function and restoring the prices upon our drooping and depressed products. It is a question of liberating silver as a pricing instrument from the tyrannical heel of gold as a robbing standard. Yes, all the metallic money in the world does not exceed \$8,000,000,000, and to raise the amount of our primary money \$4,000,000,000 would enhance the value of our property many billions of dollars by simply doubling the value thereof, while the profit to all the miners in the world would hardly be noticeable compared to this immense increase in the value of our property and commodities.

Think of the proposition and take it home with you. We must do something to relieve this distress. The 35,000,000 people we have engaged in agricultural pursuits (the prices of their products continually falling) will have nothing to purchase the products, wares, and merchandise of those persons engaged in other pursuits, and the factories will have to stop and many industries



call a halt. The farming class must get something for its products to buy from the other classes, for if the agriculturist can not buy the other classes can not sell to many others, and business must be paralyzed. Then the wages of all the laboring classes must fall and in many instances cease altogether.

Falling prices must be arrested or ruin is close at hand for millions of people. But bimetalism is coming; the people are aroused and will resurrect the silver of their fathers. The young men of this country will live to see our Republic again blossom as the rose under true bimetalism.

The Democrats have always favored the coinage of gold and silver as the standard legal-tender money of the country, and in the fullness of time the patriotic hearts and minds of the American freemen will revivify the coinage laws of the builders of our Republic that blessed mankind for nearly a century. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The hour of 10.30 having arrived, under the order, the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. GAMBLE having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 1 and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The hour of 10.30 having arrived, the House, under the order, will stand adjourned until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, recommending an increase of the employees of the heating and ventilating department of the House wing—to the Committee on Accounts, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, presenting a detailed statement of the expenditures of all appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1899—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 3993) providing for the adjustment and payment of the accounts of laborers and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 3994) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at East St. Louis, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 3995) for removal of Diamond Reef—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 3996) to provide for the erection of a public building at McKeesport, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 3997) authorizing the Secretary of War to cause to be erected monuments and markers at Gettysburg, Pa., to commemorate the valorous deeds of certain regiments and batteries of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3998) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Walla Walla, in the State of Washington—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 3999) for the erection of a public building at Mansfield, Ohio—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 4000) to authorize the Southeastern Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Lumber River within the boundary lines of Robeson County, N. C.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 4001) authorizing the adjustment of rights of settlers on the Navajo Indian Reservation, Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4002) to incorporate the Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 4003) making an appropriation for the purchase of the scale known as Fairbanks's infallible American gold and silver coin scale and counterfeit coin detector, for use in the post-offices throughout the United States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4004) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Spartanburg, in the State of South Carolina—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 4005) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Cowpens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 4006) to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 4007) making an appropriation for experimental rural free delivery of the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4008) to establish a light and fog signal to mark the main southern entrance of the new breakwater at Buffalo, N. Y.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELLAMY: A bill (H. R. 4009) to provide for the education and support of the children of the Croatan or Hatteras Indians, in the southeastern part of North Carolina—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 4010) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4024) to further define the duties of the Federal courts concerning contempt and punishments therefor—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) to provide for the assessment, by jury, of the punishment of persons found guilty of felony in courts of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 4026) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to change the material to be used in the construction of the dry docks at the navy-yards at League Island, Pa., and Mare Island, Cal., from timber to concrete and stone—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4027) to provide for the purchase of a site for barracks and other buildings required for troops garrisoning fortifications at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) to establish a marine hospital at Galveston, Tex.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 4029) appropriating money to pay the claim of the Western Paving and Supply Company for paving streets adjacent to the post-office and court-house of the United States at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4144) making appropriations for site, pedestals, and statues of Gens. Francis Marion, Thomas Sumter, and Andrew Pickens in the city of Columbia, State of South Carolina—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 74) authorizing articles imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at San Antonio International Fair and at the Texas State Fair and Dallas Exposition, to be held in the cities of San Antonio, Tex., and Dallas, Tex., to be imported free of duty, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 75) to amend act of Congress approved July 1, 1898, making provision for the sundry and civil expenses of the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ACHESON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing the enlargement and improvement of locks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 in the Monongahela River, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ESCH: A memorial of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring American shipbuilding and merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 4011) to correct the military record of John E. McCollough, of Florence, Washington County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4012) granting a pension to Mrs. Maggie J. Garrett, Nineveh, Greene County, Pa.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4013) to correct the military record of W. H. Palmer, of Homestead, Allegheny County, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4014) to correct the military record of John Blue, of Uniontown, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.



By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 4015) to place Daniel M. Page, late first lieutenant, Thirty-eighth United States Infantry, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 4016) granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Lyon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRENNER: A bill (H. R. 4017) granting pension to Hiram Johnson, late Company F, One hundred and fifty-sixth Ohio Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4018) granting pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Dinnon, widow of the late John Dinnon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 4019) for the relief of Jonathan J. Totten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4020) for the relief of William Burke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: A bill (H. R. 4021) to correct the military record of Albert Boker—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARMACK: A bill (H. R. 4022) for the relief of J. P. McGaw, sr., of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 4023) to correct the military record of William Parsons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CORLISS: A bill (H. R. 4030) for the relief of Minnie and Lotta M. Coleman, helpless children of Thomas R. Coleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 4031) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of the legal representatives and assigns of the firm of Carpenter & Plass against the United States of America for munitions of war and labor and materials furnished the Government and claims arising under contracts made by said firm with the Government of the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4032) to remove the charge of dismissal standing against William H. Harlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) for the relief of Eliza Percival—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Christopher Mullen, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) granting a pension to Annie Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4036) granting a pension to John J. Griffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4037) granting a pension to Mrs. Annie M. Churchward, widow of William F. Churchward, late private, Company H, One hundred and fifty-ninth New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4038) granting an increase of pension to James Fitzpatrick, late a private, Company F, Fifth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4039) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John Groom, late private, One hundred and sixty-fourth New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4040) increasing the pension of James Hands—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4041) granting a pension to Margaret Donovan, widow of Patrick H. Donovan, late private, Fourteenth New York Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4042) granting a pension to Matilda and George J. Gammel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4043) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4044) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4045) to increase pension of John Hillbert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) for the relief of James E. Simpson and others—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4047) granting an increase of pension to James S. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) granting an increase of pension to David H. Greene—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4049) granting an increase of pension to Catherine V. Chevallier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4050) to pension Edward B. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4051) for the relief of Robert D. Benedict—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 4052) for the relief of Thomas Rosbrugh—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) for the relief of Mrs. S. E. Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) for the relief of W. S. Hutchinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) for the relief of James B. Martin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 4056) for the benefit of H. P. Bottom, of Perryville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4057) for the benefit of George Price, of Simpsonville, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 4058) granting a pension to Carroll A. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of John H. McLaughlin—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4060) granting a pension to Peter Lynch—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 4061) for the relief of Hannah E. Boardman, administratrix of William Boardman, deceased, surviving partner of the firm of Boardman, Holbrook & Co., of the Neptune Works—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 4062) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas J. Cooper—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4063) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph M. Black—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4064) to remove the charge of desertion against Benjamin F. Cox—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4065) to remove the charge of desertion against David Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 4066) for the relief of R. A. Schellhaus—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 4067) to remove the charge of desertion against Patrick Cassidy, of Amboy, Ill., late private, Company C, Thirty-fourth Ohio—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4068) granting an increase of pension to Maria N. Flint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACK: A bill (H. R. 4069) to restore the name of Julia A. Kinkead to the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4070) granting a pension to William Love—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 4071) to remove the charge of desertion against James McCombs—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4072) granting a pension to Jefferson Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 4073) granting a pension to Edgar C. Trowbridge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 4074) for the relief of Fritz Horn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4075) granting a pension to Hester A. Godman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4076) granting an increase of pension to John W. Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4077) granting an increase of pension to Solomon C. Payne—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4078) granting a pension to John D. Allen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4079) granting a pension to Mahala Alexander—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4080) granting a pension to James E. Arvin, Teresa Arvin, and Anna Arvin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4081) for the relief of William J. Alexander—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4082) granting a pension to Peter Ballenger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4083) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Brim—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4084) granting a pension to Mary Case—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4085) to correct the military record of Edward Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4086) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lockwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4087) to correct the military record of Cornelius Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4088) granting an increase of pension to John Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4089) granting a pension to Emily Burke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4090) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4091) granting an increase of pension to August Eckstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4092) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4093) granting a pension to Sarah Murray—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4094) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4095) for the relief of George A. Exline, of Sullivan, Ind.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4096) granting a pension to Milton Roseberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 4097) to increase pension of David L. Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4098) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William R. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 4099) for the relief of the Marion Trust Company, administrator of the estate of Samuel Milliked, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 4100) for increase of pension to Martha A. Gould—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4101) to remove charge of desertion against Lucius O. Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4102) granting an increase of pension to Abram O. Kindy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Mary P. Broughton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4104) granting a pension to Mary Bunting—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4105) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George W. Leland, late a private in Company H, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, in the war of the rebellion, and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4106) granting an honorable discharge to Robert Henry McNeal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4107) to pay claim of David Reed, deceased, to Prentiss B. Reed and Lucretia H. Reed Regnier, his only surviving children—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4108) for the relief of William H. Schriver, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-sixth Illinois Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4109) granting a pension to William Holgate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4110) for the relief of Capt. Jefferson Dickerson, of Fort Wayne, Ind.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4111) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Sigfried—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 4112) granting an increase of pension to Arabella L. Tucker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 4113) granting a pension to Mrs. Helen M. Hamilton, widow of William J. Hamilton, late chief engineer in the United States Navy in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4114) granting an increase of pension to William B. Johnson, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 4115) to increase the pension of Walter P. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4116) to correct the military record of Joachim Buenz—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4117) for the relief of Nathaniel M. Ayers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4118) granting an increase of pension to Enos H. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4119) to correct the military record of Miles Durkee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 4120) to pay Eliza R. Crawford the amount of a United States loan certificate issued in 1779—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 4121) to correct the military record of Stewart Hodge, late of Company K, Sixty-third Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4122) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Andrew Donaldson, Company F, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4123) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of James W. Denniston and to grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4124) to correct the military record of William Daniels, late of Company F, One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4125) to correct the military record of Perry Childs, late of Company I, Fifty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4126) for the relief of John Evans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4127) granting a pension to H. S. McGown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4128) granting a pension to Jane Patterson, widow of the late Samuel R. Patterson, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4129) granting a pension to David Potts, late of Company G, Forty-sixth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4130) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Clark, widow of Calvin B. Clark, late of the One hundred and fifth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4131) increasing the pension of Lieut. James A. Morrison, late of Company E, Fourth Pennsylvania Veteran Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4132) increasing the pension of Elijah Baxter, late of Company H, One hundred and first Pennsylvania Volunteers, and Company M, One hundred and fifty-second Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4133) granting an increase of pension to William Ewing, late of Company E, One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4134) granting an increase of pension to Findley Brandon, late of Company C, One hundredth Pennsylvania Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4135) increasing the pension of Dewitt C. Ayers, late of Company I, One hundred and second Pennsylvania Veteran Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4136) increasing the pension of Mrs. Mary W. Townsend—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 4137) to increase the pensions of Mrs. Margaret B. Shipp, widow of Lieut. William E. Shipp, who was killed at San Juan, and Mrs. Louise D. Smith, widow of Lieut. William H. Smith, who was killed at San Juan—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 4138) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Hyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4139) granting a pension to Jennie Mills—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 4140) to place the name of Henry Weifenbach upon the pension roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 4141) granting a pension to Mary Ann Fell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4142) to increase the pension of Katharine R. Prince—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 4143) granting a pension to Laura V. Swearer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 4145) authorizing and permitting J. H. Heyward, of Greenville, S. C., to lay and maintain a walk way upon the Government lot at Greenville, S. C., and to lay, maintain, and repair sewer, water, and gas pipes thereunder—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4146) for the relief of George W. Fisher—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4147) for the relief of the heirs of John P. F. Scott—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4148) for the relief of Edward P. M. Robinson, of Fairfield County, S. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4149) for the relief of F. G. Fuller and J. A. Mitchell, executors of the will of John O'Dell, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4150) for the relief of Mount Zion Society—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4151) for the relief of Capt. Martin Hammer—to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petitions of Carrie E. Phillips and others, of Washington, D. C.; C. A. Wrikeman and others, of the District of Columbia, for the antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of William Parsons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Papers to accompany House bill granting an honorable discharge to Albert Baker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRIGGS: Paper relating to the claim of James E. Simpson and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the present duty on hides and asking that the same be abrogated and that hides be again placed on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. GROUT: Testimony in the matter of granting an increase of pension to Carroll A. McKnight—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, testimony relative to the removal of the charge of desertion from the military record of Alexander Sleight, of West-haven, Vt.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Hannah E. Boardman—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of the employees of the Quartermaster's Department at the Philadelphia depot, Schuyl-kill Arsenal, for pay for extra services during the Spanish-American war—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN: Petition of the Protestant Orphan Asylum of Natchez, Miss., for allowance for use and occupation of asylum property by the United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Edward Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of ——— to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Cornelius Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Papers to accompany House bill No. 3599, for the relief of Lewis M. Millard—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: Petition of the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, favoring amendments to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Resolution of Hughes Post, No. 285, of Malta, Ohio, requesting the passage of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Baltimore, asking that the currency question be removed from politics—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of the national encampment, Grand Army of the Republic, relating to civil-service appointments—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, resolution of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the single gold standard—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, paper to accompany House bill to place John and Laura V. Swearer in the pension rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2892, granting an increase of pension to Franklin Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 2889, to remove the charge of desertion against Cornelius O'Callaghan, alias William Blake—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE: Paper to accompany House joint resolution No. 15, to amend act of Congress making provision for sundry civil expenses of the Government—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Martin Harmer—to the Committee on War Claims.

Petitions, etc., against the seating of Brigham H. Roberts as a Representative from Utah were laid on the Clerk's desk and severally referred to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions of the Dubuque Ladies' Literary Association, First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Auburn, N. Y.; A. H. Ames and others, of Washington, D. C.; Mabel Tompkins and others, of Stanfordville, N. Y., and women's clubs, of Knoxville, Tenn.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Clurg McMillan and other citizens of McKeesport, Pa.

By Mr. BELL: Petitions of citizens of Salida Methodist Episcopal Church of Lamar, and letter of Mrs. Nora W. Frisbie, of Lamar, Colo.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Meriden, N. H.

By Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin: Petition of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists of Wisconsin.

By Mr. FARIS: Petitions of A. W. Shields and others, of Paragon and Avon, Ind.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of 96 citizens of Farmington, Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian churches of Dunlap, voters of Hopedale, Avon, Brimfield, and Peoria, Ill.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of citizens of Edgeworth, Sewickley, Sharpsburg, and Christian Endeavorers of Bakerstown and Richland Township, Allegheny County, Pa.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of a mass meeting of men at Reading, Pa.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of citizens of Rykers Ridge, Jefferson County, Ind.

By Mr. GROUT: Petitions of residents of the Second Congressional district of Vermont.

By Mr. HARMER: Fifteen petitions of citizens of the Fifth Congressional district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of 210 citizens of San Jose and vicinity, State of California.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petitions of Frank Stillwell and others, J. Ward Gamble, of Vineland, and G. E. Palen, of Ocean City, N. J.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petitions of S. E. Sears and others, of Creston, and J. W. Martin and others, of Holmes County, Ohio.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of Ed. E. Long, of Shoals, Ind., and vicinity.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: Petition of Helen A. Hanscom and others, of Haverhill, Mass.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petitions of H. E. Merrill and others, of San Jacinto, and 23 citizens of Villapark; D. C. Reed and others, of Redland, Cal.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of F. E. Sanborn and others, of Melrose, Mass.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of F. W. Gookin and others, of Weston, Mich.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petition of Frank F. Lewis and 13 others, of the State of Nebraska.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of Bishop John F. Hurst and others.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of George M. Bowker and 19 citizens of Concord Junction, Mass.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. E. R. Tracey and others, of Philadelphia, Pa.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 14, 1899.

Prayer by Rev. LUCIEN CLARK, D. D., of the city of Washington. Mr. WILLIAM J. DEBOE, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings; when, on motion of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, if there be no objection.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator from Maine will withhold that motion for a moment. I am in hopes that in the course of the day the standing and select committees of the Senate may be appointed. I understand that the Senators sitting on the other side of the Chamber have not quite completed their list, and if it should not be completed it may be necessary to have a session to-morrow simply for the purpose of appointing the committees, and for no other purpose.

Mr. HALE. Then I withhold the motion for the present.

### THE GALAPAGOS ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of December 6, 1899, requesting the President "to inform the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public interests, whether this Government has any information as to the proposed sale of the Galapagos Islands by the Republic of Ecuador to Great Britain, or to any European power, and whether, if such report be well founded, what steps, if any, have been taken by the United States with reference to it," I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,  
Washington, December 13, 1899.

### CONGRESSIONAL REFERENCE LIBRARY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress relative to the establishment of a Congressional reference library at the Capitol; which was referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. LORENZO DANFORD, late a Representative from the State of Ohio, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing that when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, the 20th day of December, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Wednesday, January 3, 1900; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.