54th Congress, 1st Session. | SENATE. | Document No. 284.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

May 23, 1896.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. Cockrell presented the following:

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN P. ALTGELD, GOVERNOR OF ILLINOIS AT THE AUDITORIUM, CHICAGO, MAY 16.

Governor Altgeld said:

For a number of years there has existed throughout the civilized world a severe depression with a constantly increasing train of bankruptcy, ruin, and misery. Nature has yielded her harvests as bountifully as ever, and the intelligence, energy, and ingenuity of man are as great as ever. We must therefore conclude that this sad condition is due to some unnatural and extraordinary cause. That cause is the great reduction in the volume of money in the world, incident to destroying silver as a money metal.

The financial question, in its relation to the commerce, the industry, the enterprise, and the prosperity of the world is governed by certain fundamental laws or principles. When these are followed all is well. One of these fundamental laws now universally recognized is that increase in the volume of money in the world raises the selling price of things, while a reduction in the amount of money in the world lower the selling price of things. Another of these fundamental laws now universally recognized is that with rising prices go increased activity, industry, enterprise, and prosperity. Putting more money into the world is like putting more blood into the body; it gives new life; while falling prices stop enterprise, check industry, and produce stagnation and distress because debts, taxes, and fixed charges never fall with the price of things, consequently more property has to be sold to get the same amount of money in order to pay the debts, taxes, etc., so that the debtor has no money left to spend. This soon destroys the market for commodities so that manufacturers can not sell their products and are consequently obliged to shut down. This in turn destroys the purchasing power of the laborer, so that there is paralysis and distress around the entire circle of business and industry.

When carefully examined it is found that all of the panics we have had in this country were the result of a contraction of the currency, brought about by one cause or another. Inasmuch as the panic of 1873 is sometimes mixed up in the discussion of the silver question, I desire to say a few words in regard to it, simply to point out at the beginning it had no direct connection with it. That panic was local to the United States and was due to causes which were local to this country. The panic which struck this country in 1893 was not local, but extended over the civilized world, and had been felt in other countries for a number of years before it reached us.

During our civil war the Government issued paper money in large amounts and there was neither gold nor silver in circulation in this country. After the war the Government began to contract the amount of paper which was outstanding by issuing bonds with which to take it up. In recent years attempts have been made to revise the Treasury reports, in order to make it appear that the contraction had not been great. But John J. Knox, who was for a time Comptroller of the Treasury, and is regarded as an accurate authority, published an article in Laylor's Cyclopedia based on the Treasury reports issued during and after the war, in which he gives a table showing the amount of paper money the Treasury had outstanding on July 1 of each year for a number of years and the character of each kind of notes.

According to this table the largest amount of paper money we had in circulation at any time during and immediately after the war was in 1866, when we had $1,261,415,475 in Government paper and $281,479,908 in national-bank notes, making a total of $1,542,895,383. By 1870 the Government paper was reduced to $396,894,212, while there were $299,766,984 of national-bank notes, making a total of $696,661,196. In other words, there was a reduction in the total amount of paper money in circulation in this country from 1866 to 1870 of $846,234,177. Inasmuch as the enterprise, industry, and ingenuity of our people had loaded every dollar of this paper money which had been in circulation with as much business as it could possibly carry, it was inevitable that a fall in prices corresponding to the reduction in the volume of money must follow.

Senator John Sherman recognized this fact, and in a discussion of the currency question in the United States Senate in 1869 he said:

> The contraction of the currency is a far more distressing operation than the Senators suppose. Our own and other nations have gone through that operation before. It is not possible to take that voyage without the sorest distress. To every person except a capitalist out of debt or a salaried officer or annuitant it is a period of loss, danger, lassitude of trade, fall of wages, suspension of enterprises, bankruptcy, and disaster. It means ruin of all dealers whose debts are twice their business capital though one-third less than their total property. It means the fall of all agricultural production without any great reduction of taxes. What prudent man would dare to build a house, a railroad, a factory, or a barn with this certain fact before him?

Notwithstanding this warning of danger the Government went on with its policy of contraction, and Sherman's predictions were more than verified. Universal bankruptcy, ruin, and distress, with their attendant increase in suicides, crime, and insanity, constituted the price which the American people paid to get on what was then called a "specie basis." I will not stop here to ask the question whether the American nation ever received any equivalent for the awful price which it here paid or not; I am only commenting upon an historical fact.

Toward 1880 the balance of trade was largely in our favor for a number of years, which fact tended to increase the volume of money in our country. The productions of our mines were very large for several years, so that, including Treasury and national-bank notes, there were, according to the Treasury tables in the year 1880, between $1,100,000,000 and $1,300,000,000 of money in this country, being an increase of from 60 to 80 per cent over the sum which we had when the Government had ceased contracting the currency, and there followed a corresponding increase in the price of property. This was accompanied by general activity and prosperity, which was, however, local to our country, and lasted only a few years until we began to be affected by that general depression which followed the demonetization of silver.

DEMONETIZATION OF SILVER.

While the subject of demonetizing silver had been agitated in Europe for many years, it had not been in the United States, but inasmuch as neither gold nor silver was circulating here the manipulators got our Government to take the initiative in striking down silver. Accordingly the American Congress, in February, 1873, by law demonetized silver, so that it was no longer a part of our standard coinage and was no longer a legal tender as money for large sums, thus depriving it of its function as money. The effect of this was not at once noticed here. In the fall of the same year the German Empire not only demonetized silver by law, but gradually threw nearly $400,000,000 of silver quietly onto the market as a commodity. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and some smaller States more or less dependent upon Germany, demonetized silver by law immediately thereafter. Holland struck down silver by law in 1875; Russia in 1876; France and the countries of the Latin Union by law stopped the coinage of silver in 1878. Austria established a gold standard in 1879.

In 1878 Congress attempted to remonetize silver, but the opposition was able to partially frustrate the movement. The Bland-Allison bill was passed, but it limited the amount to be coined to from two to four millions per month, and it did not make this full legal tender, and the coinage was not free as it formerly was and as that of gold is. In 1890 this law was repealed and the Sherman law was passed, under which the Government purchased $48,000,000 worth of silver every year and issued certificates against it. This added $48,000,000 to our currency every year, and helped slightly to keep up prices. But President Cleveland convened Congress in special session to repeal this law in 1893, and a further disturbance of prices ensued. The Indian mint continued coinage of silver until June, 1893, and inside of six days from the day it closed there was a fall in prices of nearly 25 per cent.

BEGINNING OF THE MOVEMENT.

Although the subject had been mooted before, there was no agitation in favor of adopting a single standard until about the beginning of this century, when a number of writers discussed it. In 1802 Citizen Berenger, who had been deputized by the French Government to make a report on this question, reported in favor of a single silver standard. Not gold, but silver. Berenger was one of the ablest men that have written upon this question, and it is noticeable that he advanced in 1802 practically all of the arguments in favor of a silver standard that have since been advanced in favor of a gold standard. Like the single standard men of to-day, he took the ridiculous position of fiercely contending that the Government could not increase or decrease the purchasing power of a metal; that the whole matter was regulated by commerce; and yet, instead of leaving it to commerce, he labored for years, in season and out of season, to get the Government to adopt one metal and strike down the other by law.

In 1816 Lord Liverpool succeeded in getting the English Government to adopt the gold standard by law, and his principal argument in favor of it was that the other nations of the world were using silver almost exclusively, and if England adopted gold and coined it in denominations that were not in use in other countries her money would be less liable to be drawn from the island, and that when it was drawn from the island it would have a constant tendency to return. The idea of getting an advantage over other countries by the use of gold was not then thought of. This advantage arose later, out of the fact that England, having become the great commercial and ship-owning nation of the world and London the great financial center, her people got the benefit of the exchanges and in time got the benefit of all those advantages which are reaped by men who handle large sums of money and are in a situation to compel others to come and deal with them.

There were a number of minor steps taken by some of the Governments, which need not be noticed in this brief survey, but the advocates of a single standard increased in number and were finally divided into three classes: One class that wanted uniformity of coinage in order to escape the confusion which resulted from a great variety of coins issued by different small principalities. This class did not believe that there was enough of either metal in the world to do the world's business, and favored the theory of having some countries adopt gold and other countries adopt silver. Another class was made up chiefly of professors, who advanced various theories which they wanted to have put into practice. The third and more powerful branch consisted of the great creditor classes, who wanted to make money dear, and of nearly all the official classes who hold office for life and draw salaries from the Government.

The charter of the Bank of England being about to expire was renewed by Parliament in 1844, and in the act renewing the charter Parliament provided that the bank must buy up all gold of lawful standard that should thereafter be offered at £3 17s. 9d. per ounce of standard gold. In other words, it fixed the minimum price for gold by law and furnished the world a purchaser for it. Had it provided by law that the bank must buy every pound of wool thereafter offered at 30 cents per pound, it is evident that 30 cents per pound would have formed a minimum price for wool after that date, especially if it were limited in quantity, and this would have been due not to business or commerce, but to the arbitrary act of Government.

About the time of the great discoveries of gold in California and Australia, the creditor and officeholding class, fearing higher prices, started an agitation in favor of the demonetization of gold; and Holland, as well as some of the smaller German States, actually demonetized gold for a time. Soon after 1850, when it became evident that the new gold fields were not going to deluge the world, the agitation in favor of demonetizing gold ceased, and then became active in favor of demonetizing silver. International monetary conferences were held at different times, at which the idea of establishing a single gold standard was strongly pressed, although the folly and danger of it were pointed out by some of the ablest statesmen and financiers of the world; but the influence of the office-holding and money-lending classes was sufficiently potent to quietly carry it out, and finally they induced the American Congress to take the initiative.

RATIO BETWEEN GOLD AND SILVER.

As each little country had its own system of finance the greatest confusion prevailed until about two hundred years ago, when some of the Governments of Europe provided by law that silver and gold should be coined at the ratio of 15½ parts of silver to 1 of gold of equal fineness; in some it was 15 to 1, while in our country it was 15 to 1 until 1834, and then 16 to 1. This constituted the legal ratio or mint price, and it is remarkable that for two hundred years after the establishment of this legal ratio or mint price the market ratio or price remained substantially the same as the legal ratio, the difference being chiefly the cost of exchange, and the market ratio or price was uninfluenced by the increase or decrease in the production of either metal from time to time.

The statistical tables giving what is called the market price of gold and silver for two hundred years prior to 1873 show that there was practically no variance of the market ratio of 15½ to 1 during all that time. Sometimes one metal would be a little more plentiful than the other in a particular country, but this did not matter; the ratio or price of each remained the same, and the sum of the two metals taken together and treated practically as one constituted the measure of value of things throughout the world. During all that time commerce never lifted its finger in favor of the demonetization of either metal, and the contention that the business of the world discriminated against silver is not true.

COMMERCE OBEYS STATUTORY LAW.

The history of these two hundred years shows that instead of commerce dictating, it always adapts itself to the established laws; in fact, the theory of tariffs and of protection rests entirely upon the idea that the business of the world adjusts itself to positive statutory enactments. At present gold is protected; it is given a monopoly through the act of government.

WHAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN STATESMEN HAVE SAID ON THE SUBJECT OF A SINGLE STANDARD.

Attempts have been made to bolster this dishonest single-standard movement up with the names of distinguished statesmen and to make it appear that they favored that which in reality they denounced. In 1792 Alexander Hamilton wrote upon this subject:

> Upon the whole it seems to be most advisable, as has already been observed, 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. 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 a comparision of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation.

Jefferson wrote to Mr. Hamilton in February, 1792, these words:

> I concur with you that the unit must stand on both metals.

In 1822 William H. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury, reported to Congress as follows:

> All intelligent writers on the currency agree that when it is decreasing in amount poverty and misery must prevail.

In 1852 Mr. R. M. T. Hunter, in a report to the United States Senate, said:

> Of all the great effects produced upon human society by the discovery of America there were probably none so marked as those brought about by the great influx of the precious metals from the New World into the Old. European industry had been declining upon the decreasing stock of the precious metals and an appreciating standard of values. Human ingenuity grew dull under the paralyzing influences of declining profits, and capital absorbed nearly all that should have been divided between it and labor. * * * 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 would diminish the specie currency more than one-half, and should silver be taken as the only standard the reduction would be large enough to prove highly disastrous to the human race.

In February, 1878, Mr. James G. Blaine said:

On the much-vexed and long-mooted question as to a bimetallic or monometallic standard my views are sufficiently indicated in the remarks I have made. 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 and throughout the commercial world. The destruction of silver and establishing gold as a sole unit of value must have a ruinous effect upon all forms of property except those improvements which yield a fixed return in money. It is impossible to strike silver out of existence as money without results which will prove distressing to millions and disastrous to tens of thousands. 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 the great organic law recognized as quite independent of its own existence. No power was conferred on Congress to declare either metal should not be money. Congress has, in my judgment, no power to demonetize silver any more than to demonetize gold.

United States Senator Roger Q. Mills, in discussing this question, said:

But the crime that is now sought to be perpetrated on more than fifty millions of people, comes neither from the camp of the conqueror, the hand of the foreigner, nor the altar of an idolater. * * * It comes from the solid, phlegmatic, marble heart of avarice that seeks to paralyze labor, increase the burden of debt, and fill the land with destitution and suffering to gratify the lust for gold. * * * It demands of Congress an act that will paralyze all the forces of production, shut out labor from all employment, increase the burden of debts and taxation, and send desolation and suffering to all the homes of the poor.

In 1878 John G. Carlisle, while discussing this subject in the American Congress, 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 become so. Mankind will be fortunate indeed if the annual production of gold and silver coin shall keep pace with the annual increase of population, commerce, and industry. According to my view 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, pestilence, and famine that ever occurred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the movable property of the world including horses, ships, railroads, and all 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 of the metallic money of the world.

Contrast these words of Carlisle with the sophistry he is now uttering.

While Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John Sherman wrote to W. S. Groesbeck, of Cincinnati, Ohio, saying, among other things:

During the monetary conference in Paris I was strongly in favor of the single standard of gold, and wrote a letter which you will find in the proceedings of that conference stating my views. At that time the wisest of us did not anticipate the sudden fall of silver, or rather the rise of gold, that has occurred. Other arguments showing the dangerous effect upon industry by dropping one of the precious metals from the standard of value outweigh in my mind all the theoretical objections to the bimetallic system.

I have time to notice only a few of the utterances of the great men of Europe who were familiar with this subject. I will first notice the results of the researches and observations of the historian, Hume, expressed as follows:

It is certain that since the discovery of the mines in America industry has increased in all the nations of Europe. We find that in every kingdom in which money begins to flow in greater abundance than formerly everything takes a new faith. Labor and industry gain life, the merchant becomes more enterprising, the manufacturer more diligent and skillful.

Mr. Ernest Seyd, a high European authority, wrote years ago:

> Upon this point all authorities upon the subject are in accord, to wit: That the large increase in the supply of gold has given a universal impetus to trade, commerce, and industry, and to general social development and progress.

In 1813 Leon Fauchet, in his work entitled "Researches upon Gold and Silver," says:

> If all the nations of Europe adopted the system of Great Britain, that is, single gold standard, the price of gold would be raised beyond measure, and we should see produced in Europe a result lamentable enough.

In 1869, while the agitation in favor of demonetizing silver was in progress, the French Government appointed a commission to inquire into the subject. A number of distinguished financiers appeared before this commission and gave their views. M. Wolowski said:

> 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.

M. Rouland, the governor of the Bank of France, said:

> We have not to do with idle theories. The two moneys have actually coexisted since the origin of human society; they coexist because the two are necessary by their quantity to meet the needs of circulation.

The American people have heard much about the Rothschilds. I will quote from one. Baron Rothschild, one of the greatest financiers of the age, said to this commission:

> The simultaneous employment of the two precious metals is satisfactory and gives rise to no complaint; whether gold or silver dominates for the time being, it is always true that the two metals concur together in forming the monetary circulation of the world, and it is the general mass of the two metals combined which serves as the measure of the value of things. The suppression of silver would be a veritable destruction of values without any compensation.

Let me state here that in the many books that have been written on this subject I know of no instance in which the essence of the whole matter is given in such few words as is done here by the Baron Rothschild:

(1) The use of the two metals is satisfactory and gives rise to no complaint. (2) Whether one or the other dominates for the time, it is always true that the two together concur in forming the monetary circulation of the world. (3) It is the mass of the two metals combined which serves as the measure of the value of things. (4) The suppression of silver would be a veritable destruction of values without compensation.

Over a year ago the Secretary of the United States Treasury went to New York, and in an address to the association of bankers at a wine dinner, in speaking of bimetallism or a combined standard, said that he could not understand how there could be a combined or bimetallic standard of values any more than there could be two standard yard sticks of different lengths. Whether Mr. Rothschild would have seen two yard sticks after a wine dinner I do not know, but there are men who have seen worse things than yard sticks under such circumstances.

In 1873 the great Professor Laveleye appeared before the Belgian monetary commission, and among other things said:

> The debtors, and among them the State, have the right to pay in gold or silver, and this right can not be taken away without disturbing the relation of debtors and creditors, to the prejudice of the debtors to the extent perhaps of one-half, certainly of one-third. To increase all debts at a blow is a measure so violent, so revolutionary, that I can not believe that the Government will propose it or the chambers will vote it.

In 1876, when some countries had already stricken down silver and others were urged to do so, the Westminster Review, a standard publication, in an able article on the subject, said:

> One of the things involved is the probable appreciation of gold. In other words, an increase in its purchasing power; that consequently * * * prices have seen their highest for many a long day, and that debts contracted in gold will, by reason of this movement, tend to press more heavily on the borrowers, and that it will be well if this pressure does not become so intolerable as to suggest a way of solution something like universal repudiation.

In the article on money in the Encyclopædia Britannica, written prior to 1883, by C. F. Bastable, a distinguished English writer on finance from an English point of view, the writer estimates that from 1849 to 1869 there was an increase of 20 per cent in the volume of money in the world, and that this caused a general increase of wages and greatly improved the condition of the classes living by manual labor. On the question of a standard he says:

> The immediate introduction of a universal gold currency is, by the admission of all parties, eminently undesirable, and this is the only settled point in the controversy.

Speaking of the fall of silver, he insists that careful investigation shows that any increase in production had little to do with it, but that "the great depreciation of silver resulted mainly from its having ceased to be money over a large part of the civilized world," and that this is due to governmental action. He holds with Delmar that what is called "the cost-of-production theory" is not sound. But on the subject of restoring silver by international agreement, he claims that as England is a creditor nation it will not be to her interest to give up any advantage which the debtor nations have given her through their own legislation.

At the international monetary conference held in Paris in 1878, Mr. Goschen, who represented England, and who, by reason of his experience as a banker and as cabinet minister, may be regarded as one of the greatest financiers and statesmen in this line in the world, in a discussion of this question said:

> If, however, other states were to carry on a propaganda in favor of a gold standard and the demonetization of silver, the scramble to get rid of silver might provoke one of the greatest crises ever undergone by commerce. * * * There would be a fear on the one hand of a depression of silver, and on the other of a rise in the value of gold and a corresponding fall in the prices of all commodities. The American proposal for a universal double standard seemed impossible of realization, but the theory of a universal gold standard was Utopian, and, indeed, involved a false Utopia. It was better for the world at large that the two metals should continue in circulation than that one should be universally substituted for the other.

In 1883, when the demonetization of silver had been practically effected by most of the European nations, Mr. Goschen delivered an address before the Institute of Bankers in London, having for his audience the most experienced and conservative financiers in the world.

After referring to the argument that less money was necessary than formerly, because of certain economies effected in the way of drafts, checks, etc., he said:

> I certainly do share the opinion that the economies effected do not counterbalance the strain put upon gold, either by the increased demands of the population for pocket money or for the liquidating of the enormously increased balance of transactions, both of this country and of others. Happy, then, it is for those who have the sovereigns. On the other hand, unhappy it is for those who have commodities left on hand and produce which they have not sold.
>
> It is true [he says] that no state action on the part of England can be cited, but it would not be true of Europe generally, because if the fall of prices has been brought

about by the absorption in Germany, Italy, and the United States of nearly £200,-000,000 of gold coinage, it is by the laws passed by those Governments and not by any change in production that the serious results indicated have been caused; therefore I wish to put aside the doctrine that it is utterly out of the question for States to act. I must reply that to my mind the connection between the additional demand for gold and the position of prices seems as sound in principle as I believe it to be sustained by facts.

My fellow-citizens, you notice that Mr. Goschen not only holds that Governments can legislate in such manner as to raise the price of some things and depress the prices of others, but he believes that in this case the rise in the purchasing power of gold and the consequent fall of prices was due to Governmental actions.

In June, 1885, Mr. Robert Giffen, the official statistician of the British Board of Trade, published a remarkably able article in the Contemporary Review on the subject of the fall in the prices of commodities throughout the world. He says:

We have the facts as to the extraordinary demands for gold since 1872. In round figures there have been new demands for about £200,000,000 sterling of gold, an amount very nearly equal to the whole annual production of the period, although a larger amount than that annual production had been necessary in previous years to maintain the state of prices which then existed.

He then points out that £12,000,000 sterling, or $60,000,000, are annually required to replace the wear and tear of coin and meet the increase in the demand for money caused by increase of population; and then adds:

* * * Looking at all the facts, therefore, it appears impossible to avoid the conclusion that the recent course of prices is the result in part of the diminished production and the increased extraordinary demands upon the supply of gold. It is suggested, indeed, that the increase of banking facilities and other economies in the use of gold may have compensated the scarcity, but the answer clearly is that in the period between 1850 and 1873 the increase of banking facilities and similar economies was as great relatively to the arrangements existing just before as anything that has taken place since.

The same reply may also be made to the suggestion that the multiplication of commodities accounts for the entire change that has occurred. There is no reason to suppose that the multiplication of commodities has proceeded at a greater rate since 1873 than in the twenty years before that. Yet before 1873 prices were rising, notwithstanding the multiplication of commodities, and since that date the tendency has been to decline. The one thing which has changed, therefore, appears to be the supply of gold and the demands upon it, and to that cause largely we must accordingly ascribe the change in the course of prices which has occurred.

STRINGENCIES IN MONEY MARKET.

In commenting on the extraordinary demands upon gold Mr. Giffen says:

Now, the course of the market since 1871 has been full of stringencies. In almost every year except 1878 and 1880 there has been a stringency of greater or less severity directly ascribable to or aggravated by the extraordinary demands for gold and the difficulty of supplying them.

There is one more American authority which I shall quote, and that is the Chicago Tribune. It is perhaps not generally known that the Chicago Tribune gave to the world some of the ablest arguments yet made in favor of the remonetization of silver and against a single gold standard.

For example, on January 14, 1878, the Tribune said:

Silver dollars of 371¼ grains, pure, were established as the standard of value or unit of account by the act of April 2, 1792, and this continued in full force until 1873–74.

On February 23, 1878, it said:

In 1873–74, as it was two years later discovered, the coinage of this silver dollar was forbidden and silver dollars were demonetized by law. This act was done secretly and stealthily to the profound ignorance of those who voted for it and of the President who approved it. * * * Under cover of darkness it abolished the constitutional dollar and has arbitrarily, and to the immense injury of the people, added heavily to every form of indebtedness, public and private.

On January 10, 1878, the Tribune said:

The silver dollar fills the bill exactly. So long as it was a legal tender it was an honest dollar, worth one hundred cents, and had the ring of the true metal. Remonetize it and it will again be what it was for eighty years, worth one hundred cents.

And again:

The big dollar (that is at a ratio of, say, 20 to 1) is just what the country must stop if it hopes to escape universal bankruptcy. We want the old historical dollar of 371¼ grains pure silver, the equivalent of the old Spanish milled dollar, and nothing else. The present purchasing power of the gold dollar has been fearfully enhanced.

On January 5, 1878, it said:

The folly of advocating the single gold standard of money must be obvious to everyone not blind as a bat in the daylight.

On February 6, 1878, it said:

It is mere naked, unsupported, irrational, impudent assertion that remonetization of silver will not reduce the difference in value between it and gold. Silver, even as bullion, has not depreciated since it was demonetized as compared with property or labor.

And on January 8, 1878, it said.

The theory that a remonetization of the silver dollar demands that the weight of that dollar be increased to correspond to the present London value of silver as measured by cornered gold is simply absurd.

On January 5, 1878, in answer to the question as to whether the world could safely dispense with silver, it said:

Let the falling prices and the rising multitudes of unemployed men answer this question.

And on January 16 it had this editorial:

To undertake to do the business of the world on a single gold basis of measurement and equivalents means loss, bankruptcy, poverty, suffering, and despair. Debts will grow larger and taxes become more onerous. The farmer will receive small prices for his crops, labor will be forced down, down, down, and there will be a long series of strikes, lockouts, and suspension of production. Those who own property but owe for it in part will see their mortgage increasing in proportion as gold acquires new purchasing power, while the property itself will be shrinking in value. There will be no relief, it must be kept in mind, for gold will be the only recognized equivalent of values, the stock of gold will be power constantly growing and the circle of wealth will be uniformly contracting.

Nothing more prophetic was ever written.

A volume could be filled with editorials expressing similar sentiments written by the great editor of the Tribune. Now, by way of contrast, I will give you some of the arguments which the Chicago Tribune is making at present against the cause of silver and the people who advocate it: "Lunacy," "Monstrous absurdity," "Dishonesty," "Cranky notion," "Silver craze," "Dishonest dollar," "Scoundrelly scheme," "Liars," "Hypocrites," etc. To use its own language, the Tribune seems to be "as blind as a bat in daylight."

IS LESS MONEY NEEDED?

It is claimed by single-standard men that but little money is needed; that scarcely 3 per cent of the business of the world is done with actual money; that the business affairs of the world, great and little, are carried on by means of checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and bank notes. And this is unquestionably true. But it being admitted that some money is necessary as a base for it all, the single-standard advocates make a mistake in imagining that the world can get along with less money than formerly.

Immediately prior to 1873 the world was as well banked as it is now, and all the agencies and systems of credit in the use of bank notes, checks, etc., were as fully developed then as they are now, and if it at that time required all the silver and all the gold that there was in the world to form a basis for the business that was done, it will require the same to-day; in fact, it will require more money to-day than formerly to restore the business of the world to what it formerly was, because the population has greatly increased, and the area over which business has to be done has greatly increased. Business can be carried on in a city with less money than it can in new and extended countries. The principal thing which is overlooked by the single standard people is the fact that the industry, energy, and enterprise of the world are always carried to the utmost extent that the total amount of money in the world will admit of. Every dollar of money is at once loaded with as much credit as it can possibly carry. I have here a picture of an inverted pyramid, the point turned down. This pyramid represents the business of the world as it formerly stood. At the bottom, marked in black, is the actual money, both gold and silver, which supported this pyramid. You will see it constituted only about 3 per cent of the whole, although the exact proportion is immaterial to illustrate the principle involved.

Now, if every dollar was already loaded to its fullest capacity to carry, I ask you what will happen if you arbitrarily, by law, pull out from under this pyramid one-half of the money that is supporting it? I imagine I hear some one say—it will have to collapse. That is correct, and that is exactly what happened in this case; the business of the world collapsed.

EITHER HALF PRICE OR HALF AS MUCH WORK.

If the world now has only half the money that it formerly had, then it must follow that either the world's work must be done for half the former price or else only half as much work can be done. In either case the men who do the work will be ruined, for in one case they must work for half pay, and in the other there will be two men for each job; and as the debts, interest, taxes, and other fixed charges have not been lowered and will absorb nearly all the earnings, I will ask is there any hope for our agricultural classes, for our manufacturers, for our great producing classes of various kinds? Does not the single standard mean the impoverishment of these classes and a permanent lowering of their status?

AMOUNT OF MONEY IN THIS COUNTRY.

The Comptroller of the Currency at Washington has for a number of years invited all the banks of the United States, national, State, and private, over nine thousand in all, to report the total amount of money of all kinds which they held on a certain day. These reports show that we have not in circulation in this country the amount of money that is usually claimed. For example, the last report given out by the Comptroller, December 2, 1895, shows that on July 11, 1895, all of the banks in the United States, national, State, and private, held only $631,111,290, while at the same time there was in the Treasury of the United States, as claimed by the reports, $429,517,713; but of this sum there was $108,210,555 in gold, which was held as a reserve and was not available for circulation. This left the total amount of money in the banks and in the Treasury at that time $952,418,448. This was all the money in sight at that time available for circulation. Of the sum held by the banks $127,621,099 consisted of gold, and this was all of the available gold then in the United States.

The foregoing sums comprise all the money we then had in this country except what there was in the pockets of the people. And inasmuch as we have banks in every village, and we have had years of idleness during which little savings were exhausted, and inasmuch as building associations have in late years absorbed nearly all the money that used to be held by private individuals, it is claimed by competent judges that when you include the colored people of the South and the poor everywhere that an average of $5 per family would be a high average of what there was at that time in the pockets of the people. As there were then less than fourteen million families, that would make less than $70,000,000, but if we double this sum and assume that there was on an average $10 in the hands of every family in the United States at that time it would make less than $140,000,000. Adding that to what there was then in the banks and in the Treasury and it gives us the total money in this country, which is less than $1,100,000,000.

But the Treasury officials persist in giving out figures published by the Director of the Mint, in which he claims that there are in this country altogether $1,651,310,000; that we have $23.59 per capita, and that there are $618,100,000 of gold alone in this country. But in his report for 1892 the Director explains that these figures are in part estimated and in part based on assumption. In the first place, he assumed that every dollar of paper issued by the National Government during the last thirty years or more and by the national banks of this country is still in circulation, except where a record has been made of its cancellation in Washington, and that none has been lost or destroyed in all that time. Second, he assumes that all of the gold which the records of the custom-houses and at the mints show came into this country is still in circulation, except where there is a record of its exportation or of its use in the arts. In other words, he makes no allowance for what has been lost and destroyed during a quarter of a century; he makes no allowance for what was lost by abrasion during that time; he makes no allowance for what was carried across our southern boundary for a quarter of a century, unrecorded, nor for what was carried across our northern boundary during that time, and of which no record was made, nor for what was carried to China during that time and of which no record was made.

He makes no allowance for what was used in the arts and of which no report was made, and he makes no allowance for what was carried to Europe in the pockets of our people during a quarter of a century. In his report for 1891, the Director says that the amount of money which the American people spent in Europe during the year of the Paris Exposition was estimated at over $90,000,000. Of course, most of this was registered in the form of letters of credit, etc., but so much of it as was carried in the pockets of the people was not registered, so that the tables given out by the Director of the Mint, when carefully examined in the light of information which he himself has given out in prior reports, are found to be absolutely worthless.

The other figures given by the Comptroller that I have referred to are accurate. They practically constitute an inventory of everything in sight, and they show that instead of having $23.59 per capita in circulation in this country we have not got $15 per capita in circulation, while England has $20.78, France $35.77, Germany $17.59, Belgium $27.82, and the Netherlands $24.25. We are drifting toward the basis of the pauperized countries of Europe. Italy has $10.79 per capita, Austria-Hungary $10.67, Russia $8.46; even impoverished Spain has $16.55.

It is a most remarkable fact that the position held by a people in the scale of civilization seems always to depend on the amount of money they have in actual circulation. According to the tables issued by the United States Treasurer, Turkey has $4.09 per capita, Mexico $4.95, Central American States $3.66, India $3.33, China $2.08, and Servia $3.78.

Bankers have been heard to say even during a panic that there was plenty of money. This was done to keep the public from becoming alarmed, for every business man knows that it is not true, and the fact that so many banks pay high rates of interest on deposits shows that it is not true. During the last panic the New York banks actually suspended payments and forced the public to take clearing-house certificates. It has, however, been found that after a panic produced by a great contraction the money that is left flows toward the cities and lies idle because business conditions are not favorable. Physicians tell us that if a large part of the blood is taken out of the human body the remainder flows to the heart and the extremities get cold; and the same law applies to money, which is the blood of commerce. Reduce its quantity and the body gets cold, while the heart may be congested. At present money is in demand, not for new business enterprises, but by debtors who are carrying a heavy load of old debts and are forced to make new arrangements. If prices were again to go up new life would come into the business world, and money would then be in demand and new enterprises would be begun.

GOLD IN THE WORLD INSUFFICIENT.

In June, 1892, Edward O. Leech, Director of the Mint, published an article in the Forum on the money question, in which, among other things, he said:

> I find that one of the most serious dangers which confronts us is the insufficiency of the supply of gold as a basis of the present and prospective business of the commercial world, and the consequent disturbances attending its accumulation and movement. * * * It is seriously proposed to throw the burdens of an increasing population and business upon the gold stock. The annual product of gold of the world is only about $125,000,000, of which nearly one-half is used in the industrial arts, so that the annual supply for monetary purposes is hardly in excess of $65,000,000. If this plan is carried out, then the existing stock of gold must for many years form the basis of business and credit and serve as the medium of all exchanges.
>
> That such a narrowing of the basis of credit and trade is attended by incalculable difficulties and hardships must be apparent. Already monetary panics have been inaugurated. * * * Europe has no gold to spare. She has drawn within the last year large quantities of gold from this country, at times when the rate of sterling exchange did not justify such shipments—that is, a premium has been paid for American gold. The struggle for the possession of gold, with its consequent train of financial disturbances, is well under way. * * * If gold is to be the sole money of the world, not only will the extension of business and of foreign investments be seriously crippled, but the immense fabric of credit is liable to totter. Where is the gold to come from when the States of Europe not having a paper standard resume specie payments? * * *
>
> The truth is, the total supply of the precious metals is not more than sufficient to keep pace with the rapid increase of foreign trade. What is to be gained by discontinuing the use of one of the money metals and throwing all the work upon the other? Not stability of value, for, as already shown, for nearly a century when the

bimetallic system existed in France the relative value of gold and silver did not vary appreciably. * * * If the experience of the last nineteen years has proven anything, it is that the value of gold and silver depends upon the monetary use which is made of them. The experience of the first seventy years of this century has demonstrated that both metals can be used as money with greater stability of values than one alone.

It is a remarkable fact that nearly all of the great European financiers, including those who favor a single standard, declare that there is not enough gold in the world to do its business and that it was a fatal step to take for the nations to all confine themselves to the use of either metal. I know we have new-born financiers in this country who argue that all that is needed is simply a standard of value, and that the quantity is immaterial. Carried to its legitimate conclusion their argument would be that if you take a single gold dollar and tie it to a string and hang it up in the Treasury Department that will constitute a standard of value and is all that is needed. But the experience of the world is that while a vast amount of business can be done by the use of what are called credits there must always be a certain amount of money at the bottom of this, and there is a limit to the amount of credit which a dollar can carry; consequently the amount of money at the bottom will practically determine the amount of business that can be done in the world.

The spectacle which we see now is that of the great nations of the earth running after the little bit of gold that there is in the world just like boys run after a football; it is shifted hither to-day, dragged yonder to-morrow, and every time it shifts there is a disturbance in prices, even a disturbance in the low prices which now prevail. The amount of available gold in sight in the world is so small that a few large financial houses can manipulate it. As the Chicago Tribune says, they can "corner" it, and in recent years we have seen repeated instances of their doing so. Certainly it seems like the very height of madness to even suggest the idea of having the great business interests of this country and of the world rest upon a standard and a measure of values which can be manipulated.

ASSUMED SUPERIORITY OF GOLD.

An American gold standard man recently declared that gold went with the higher civilization and that silver belonged to a lower civilization. Let us a look at this a moment. Until 1873 silver was the money that was chiefly used by nearly all of the great nations of the world. Germany was on a silver basis up to that time. The foundations of the great German Empire were laid and the entire fabric of German civilization and German achievement and German greatness was reared on the basis of silver. Since she adopted a gold standard she has not advanced. Her industries are crippled and there is stagnation and distress throughout her entire borders. France, generally considered the most highly civilized country in the world, was a great silver-using country, and her unit of value is a silver coin.

The greatness of the United States of America was achieved prior to 1873. Our institutions were reared, the rebellion was crushed, the slaves were liberated, while the unit of value in our country was a silver dollar, provided by the act of 1792. Look where you will, you find that the progress of the world was made while silver was the money that was chiefly in use. And since the nations of the earth have been trying to get onto a gold basis there is universal depression and stagnation. Instead of advancing civilization, gold is causing retrogression, because there is not enough of it to do the world's work.

THEORY OF OVERPRODUCTION.

Attempts have been made in this country to attribute the general fall of prices to cheapness of production and to consequent overproduction. No doubt cheapening production tends to lower prices, but increased production does not necessarily lower prices if there is also increased consumption. It is said that three times as much wheat is now sent to Liverpool as formerly, therefore wheat must fall in price. I ask, What is done with this wheat at Liverpool? Is there only as much sold and consumed as there formerly was and is the rest poured into the sea? Oh, no; it is all sold and consumed. If that is the case, then consumption has increased as much as production, and if this is so then it does not follow that there must be a fall in price simply because there is increased production. In fact, wheat has not fallen in price much more than the average fall of all commodities.

As Mr. Giffen stated, from 1850 to 1873 there was relatively as great an increase in production, taking it the world over, as there has been since that time; yet from 1850 to 1873 prices the world over continued to rise, while since 1873 they have continuously fallen. But the argument that improved methods of production, and consequently the cheapening of production, have been the cause of lower prices as compared with gold, overreaches itself, because there have been more improvements in the methods of mining both gold and silver than there have in almost any other department of industry. Consequently, if improved methods and cheapening the cost of production are to be considered, gold should have declined in purchasing power together with other commodities, and certainly with silver. It is not overproduction, it is underconsumption that ails us.

Furthermore, there has been no overproduction of land; on the contrary, the struggle for land and for homes is more fierce than ever. Years ago we had the great West open to settlers, yet lands in the Central and Eastern States were valuable and remunerative, because farm products brought a fair price. At present there is scarcely any more productive land open to settlement, but lands, instead of going up, have fallen in price the same as all other property and commodities, and there are thousands of farmers who have to lose their farms because they can not get living prices for what they produce.

OVERPRODUCTION OF SILVER.

The claim made that there is an overproduction of silver since 1873 as compared with gold, and that this is the cause of its fall in price, is absolutely without foundation. According to the tables issued by the Treasury Department August 16, 1893, showing the total production of gold and silver in the world at coinage value, it appears that from the year 1792, when our monetary system was founded, to the year 1852, being a period of sixty years, the total production of silver in the world, rating it at coinage value, was $1,769,197,000, and the total production of gold during that time was $960,236,000; that is, there was almost twice as much silver produced as gold. The production of each metal of course varied greatly during the different years, and yet the market ratio between the two metals remained practically the same during all that time. The tables show that during those sixty years there was a variance of only seven-tenths of 1 point, or just about the cost of exchange.

The same tables show that from 1852 to 1873 the total gold production of the world was $2,516,575,000, while the total silver production was $989,225,000; that is, there was two and one-half times as much gold produced as silver, yet the market ratio remained undisturbed during those twenty-one years, just as it had during the period of sixty years, when there was twice as much silver as gold.

Again, the same Treasury tables show that from 1873 to 1892, inclusive, the total gold production of the world was $2,176,505,000, while the total silver production was $2,347,087,000; that is, the production of gold was nearly equal to that of silver. During the first two periods silver was a money metal; during the last period it was not. The fact that during the first two periods, covering over eighty years, the market ratio remained the same, although the production of each metal varied greatly from time to time, shows that the market price or ratio was practically the same as the legal ratio or mint price, so long as both metals were used as money. Now, inasmuch as silver did not fall in value as measured in gold during sixty years in which there was twice as much silver produced as gold, it is clear that had silver not been demonetized it would not have fallen when the gold production was nearly equal to that of silver, as it was after 1873.

Again, silver has not fallen in comparison with other property. By taking the average price of all commodities known to the markets it is found that a pound of silver will buy as great an amount of commodities, as great an amount of property, as ever. It is gold that has gone up. The law, by striking down the competition, has given gold a monopoly. Practically, the gold dollar is a 200-cent dollar. Nominally, it still has only 100 cents in it, but it takes 200 cents' worth of commodities to get one when measured by bimetallic prices.

PRICE PAID FIRST FOR SPECIE BASIS AND NOW FOR GOLD STANDARD.

For some years during and after the war we were on a paper basis, and for a while a paper dollar was not worth over 40 cents in gold, but our people prospered as they had never prospered before. There were no strikes and no tramps; labor was employed and was content. There were enterprise, thrift, and industry everywhere. Then we contracted our currency, and paid the awful price of six years of panic, with all the misery and ruin which it spread over the land, in order to get on a coin or specie basis, as it was then called.

Now, my fellow-citizens, look at the price our country with the rest of the world is paying for this gold standard. Bankruptcy, paralysis, ruin, endless suffering and misery for all these years, and we are getting absolutely nothing in return for it. Debts have been practically doubled by law; that is a condition that was created by law which so affects prices that it forces the debtor to sell twice as much property as was formerly needed to pay off his debt. All the great European countries are even worse off than we are. A year ago Mr. Depew returned from a general tour of Europe, and in an interview stated that the one thing which struck him everywhere was the almost universal paralysis in the industries and in trade, and the misery which goes with it. In making this statement he simply verified what other travelers, as well as the European writers, have already proclaimed to the world. No man has pointed out or can point out wherein the people of the world have derived one dollar's worth of benefit by the adoption of the single gold standard. This fearful payment of the lifeblood of the nations of the earth has gone practically for nothing, and there is no hope or prospect of restoring the prosperity and happiness of our people until this great wrong is in some manner righted.

CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

We frequently hear men who have more zeal than knowledge refer to Mexico as a terrible example of a silver basis and a 50-cent dollar. These gentlemen do not seem to be aware of the fact that since the demonetization of silver in other countries Mexico has been more prosperous than ever before. Mexico, like some South American countries, was very far behind the United States on account of poor government, oppression, superstition, fanaticism, limited money, and general disorder; but she has made greater strides toward becoming a mighty nation since 1873 than ever before.

In June, 1895, the Mexican minister at Washington, M. Romero, published an article in the North American Review on the silver question so far as it affected Mexico, in which he shows that while the demonetization of silver and the consequent burden on gold had forced the purchasing power of gold up so that a Mexican silver dollar was worth only 50 cents as measured in gold, still the Mexican silver dollar bought as much commodity in Mexico as it ever did. In other words, there was no decline in the silver dollar as compared with the price of commodities. That the mere fact of the Mexican dollar being worth less than a dollar in gold prevented it from going out of the country as it formerly did, so that finally money became more plentiful in Mexico. Further, that as imports had to be paid for in gold, which was at a premium, the amount of imports were greatly reduced, while the purchases in the home market were correspondingly increased, and the result was that not only all their factories were working to their utmost capacity, but that everywhere new factories were being started, and their laborers were all employed and wages greatly increased over what they formerly were. He gave figures to show that the railroads in Mexico, the banks, the manufacturers, the farmers, the laborers, are all prospering, and agricultural products, instead of going down as measured by their home dollar, have advanced. And he also says that so far as he has been able to observe similar conditions exist in other silver-using countries.

While railroads in the United States are going into the hands of receivers, railroads in Mexico are prospering and are paying properties. It is true the Mexican railroads, like our home, have to pay the interest on their bonds in gold and have to pay a very high premium to get that gold, but after paying this premium they still have large profits left. The owners of railroads in the United States could learn a lesson from the Mexicans. About a year ago President Andrews, of Brown University, called attention to the fact that the gold-using countries could not trade successfully with silver-using countries, and were liable to forever lose this trade because the low price of silver was giving such an impetus to manufacturing and to all kinds of trade in these silver countries that they would cease buying of outsiders. That consequently if we would restore silver we could get and could hold this trade against all Europe.

ARE WE NOW PROSPEROUS?

I saw a statement in a gold-standard newspaper recently to the effect that we are now prosperous, had about everything we needed, and ought to thank the Lord that we are as well off as we are. Now, I have no argument to make in answer to such wild statements as that. I simply leave it for every laborer, for every manufacturer, for every business man, yea for every railroad man and every banker to answer. We have unlimited resources, have the most productive country in the world, we have every kind and character of industry, and the ingenuity, enterprise, push, and intelligence of our people are unsurpassed anywhere; therefore we should be prosperous and happy.

LABOR NEEDS A MARKET.

The very first thing and the last thing that labor needs is a market for its products. You may speculate to a laborer until he is blind on the beauties of a dear dollar and it will do him no good. His wife will be in rags and his children will starve. He must have somebody to buy that which he makes. If nobody comes to buy the things which he makes then the factory in which he works must shut down. If it shuts down he is in distress and his purchasing power is gone. The difficulty that has existed in our country in late years is underconsumption, not overproduction. The people are not in a condition to buy what they need, and they will not be until there is a rise in prices. When this happens then the whole debtor and producing classes will again be able to buy and there will be a restoration of our home market.

JUGGLING FIGURES AS TO WAGES.

Attempts have lately been made by men holding positions under the Federal Administration and by men who have been hired to work for a gold standard to show that wages have not fallen. This is simply a dishonest juggling with figures. Every mechanic and laboring man in the United States knows that it is not true, and thorough investigation by Congress shows that just the opposite is the case. In 1891 a committee of the United States Senate made a thorough investigation of the entire subject of wages. John G. Carlisle was a member of this committee. It made an exhaustive report, and showed that from 1840 to 1873 wages had nearly doubled, but, in the language of the committee, "after 1873 there was a marked falling off."

The committee then shows that while there was a slight rise about 1880 in wages, it never reached the point occupied before, and that afterwards there was a continuous decline.

One method of juggling with figures which is sometimes resorted to is the following: The salaries of higher officials of a corporation, which as a rule have not been reduced, are added to the sum paid the workmen; in this way they get a high average. For example, take a corporation which formerly employed 100 men and gave each on an average $600 a year, making $60,000 for a hundred; at the same time it paid one high official $10,000 a year; by adding this to the $60,000 would make the pay roll $70,000; then dividing this sum by 101, being the number of employees, including the high official, it makes nearly $700 as the average. The same corporation may to-day employ only 50 men and give each on an average only $500, making $25,000; it pays the present high official $10,000, which, added to the $25,000, makes the present pay roll $35,000; dividing that sum by 51 it makes nearly $700 as the average, although formerly twice as many men were employed as now and each man got one-fifth more than he gets now. This illustrates the adage that while figures don't lie, liars can figure.

SHALL WE CONTINUE THE SINGLE STANDARD OR RETURN TO BIMETALLISM.

This is the only question before us. For at present there is an organized and desperate effort being made by the Federal Administration and its adherents and by those who control great concentrations of capital to perpetuate the single gold standard for the world, while all fixed charges must remain the same or increase. The movement to force the great nations of the earth to a gold basis has been a campaign of organized corruption. Every influence that money could in any way control has been brought to bear. Nearly all the great newspapers and other agencies for molding public thought have been bought up or forced into line and that army of men who have been called "handy hired men" is now at work with all manner of sophistry to prevent the people from rising to overthrow this system. Catch phrases are invented, and everything possible is resorted to to delude the public. Much is said about an honest dollar.

My fellow-citizens, the most dishonest dollar ever given to man, a dollar that has blood on it, is the present gold dollar, which has doubled the burdens of all debtors and destroyed the happiness of all toilers. It is a 200-cent dollar. This is what the gold standard has given you. You have noticed that wherever the adherents of the Federal Administration are able to control they are adopting resolutions in favor of the single gold standard. Here in Chicago these men have for about a week again talked bimetallism, but to see that this talk on their part is insincere and is intended simply to enable them to get an advantage in primary elections and conventions it is only necessary to glance at their own utterances of a few weeks' earlier date. That newspaper which is the especial organ of the Administration has for months been upholding the single gold standard and ridiculing and denouncing those who are in favor of anything else.

And an ex-judge who is regarded as the spokesman of that faction only recently in an address argued for the maintenance of the single gold standard and ridiculed the people who are demanding the restoration of the coinage of silver. The capitalists and the Federal Administration have forced the issue, and for the time at least the question of a proper ratio and of the best method of procedure are shoved into the background.

The immediate question which confronts us is, are we for or against the single gold standard? There is at present absolutely nothing to divide those who favor bimetallism and demand the free coinage of both gold and silver. We must first save the principle of bimetallism, for by the use of those peculiar and corrupting influences which capital always uses to carry its ends, bimetallism has not only been overthrown, but a desperate and determined effort is now being made to drive the last nail into its coffin.

QUESTION OF RATIO.

The question of ratio is scarcely open for discussion. We must first decide whether we shall have gold monometallism or gold and silver bimetallism. If we are to continue the single gold standard, then there is nothing further to discuss. Every intelligent man can see at a glance that the reestablishing of the great principle of bimetallism does not depend on any particular ratio. No man in this country has yet declared that we must have any named ratio or nothing. If we ever reach a point where the Government has to consider the question of ratio, the battle for bimetallism will already have been won. And an intelligent consideration of the financial history of the world and of existing conditions will readily solve the problem when the time comes. I will only say it would be manifestly wrong to adopt the present market ratio, which is the result of giving gold a monopoly of the money function in the world and of demonetizing silver by law. To do this would be to permanently lower the value of silver and to reduce the volume of money which could be coined from it in the future.

It would be a little like making the present low price of wheat permanent, and as it is probable that the whole production of both metals will be insufficient to meet the increased demands of the world in the future such an unjust ratio would affect the prosperity for all time. I believe that if an international agreement is ever made it will be on a basis of 15½ to 1, as that was the ratio which formerly existed in nearly all countries of the world and which worked so satisfactorily for two hundred years.

In our country the ratio was 16 to 1—that is, 16 parts of silver to 1 of gold of equal fineness. Many are demanding a return to the old standard, leaving the subject then to be dealt with as necessity may require. They regard this as the first step toward getting out of the woods and back onto the great highway. They would be satisfied with any other fair ratio, but nothing else is offered them. For none of the men who criticise this restoration of the old standard has offered anything. Not one of them. If any man who is honestly for bimetallism can offer something better, let them do so, and it will be considered. But the fact is that these critics are simply helping to maintain the single standard. That is the result of their attitude. I favor the immediate restoration of the free coinage of both gold and silver according to the old standard, and I believe if this is achieved the ratio question will be solved. But I say to all men, let us defeat this gold standard and make it possible for our country to again prosper, and if you can suggest something better than the old standard, do so.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT.

There are men who want an international agreement, and I am in hearty accord with them if we can get it. But this mighty nation can not forever sit in the dumps and wait for other nations which are just as badly off to come and pull us out. We must relieve our people whether the other nations come or not. Inasmuch as our Government led the way in striking down silver, it should lead the way in restoring it, and it can in the very act of restoration make such trade regulations as will compel those nations which desire to trade with us to enter into an agreement with us on the money question. We will secure international agreement a great deal quicker by being in a position to dictate than we will if we remain in a condition in which we can only implore. The present Federal Administration has done nothing to further an international agreement. On the contrary, it is straining every nerve to maintain the single standard. Therefore, when a man indorses the financial policy of Cleveland and yet pretends to be a bimetallist you are warranted in questioning his sincerity.

WITHDRAWAL OF GOLD.

A banker said to me lately:

> Suppose you restore silver, will not all the gold in this country at once leave and produce a further contraction before you can coin much silver?

I answer no. The moment you restore silver some of the burden will be taken off of gold, so that there will be less demand for it. Second, as already shown, there are only $127,000,000 of gold in all the banks of the United States, national, State, and private. This constitutes all of the available gold in this country. Suppose the banks were to let it go and it were all to leave for awhile, it could not make matters worse than they are now. But if silver were restored, there would be several dollars for every one that left. The statement that only a limited amount could be coined in a year needs no notice. If we had not the machinery now, we could soon get it. Better still, certificates should be issued, just as there are against gold. Nobody now carries much of either silver or gold; everybody prefers paper certificates.

EFFECT ON LABOR OF RESTORING SILVER.

Let us have all the silver we can possibly get converted into money. It will not lie idle. It will be used to buy lands, buy labor, build houses, build factories, build railroads, and carry on business. It will be that much new blood and will give us an activity and a prosperity better than we have yet seen. The laborer will be the first to feel its benefits, for there will be an immediate demand for his services—not only will all be employed, but wages will go up.

CAN WE GO IT ALONE.

If a number of European nations were to restore the free coinage of both gold and silver at the former ratio, and again make each a legal tender, nobody would question that it would be absolutely successful. The two metals would circulate again as formerly, because these are the great commercial nations of the world. Well, the United States has a population nearly equal to that of France and Germany put together, we have more railroads than all Europe, and under favorable conditions our internal trade exceeds that of all Europe, for while some European countries have large populations they have but little purchasing power and but little internal business. If Europe could go it alone we could. The mere act of remonetizing silver, and thus reducing the importance of gold, would reduce the purchasing power of gold; the tendency of the two metals would be to come together, because each could be used for the same purposes. When silver can be used in payment of taxes, payment of debts, used to travel on the railways, buy property, etc., the market ratio will again be what it was before silver was destroyed as money. The market ratio will be the mint ratio.

But, says some one, what about our foreign business? Well, it amounts to less than 5 per cent of all our business, and will occasion no difficulty—certainly not if both are what we call at par, and inasmuch as the field in which both are to circulate on the same basis is so great, they would circulate on a par basis. Again, some one asks, How would the Government get gold then? Why, it would get it in the natural course of business, for there would be less demand for it then than there is now. There would be an end to the bond selling business in which the Government is now engaged.

BANKS, RAILROADS, MANUFACTURES, ETC.

If we did not know that the most of the 9,000 banks of the United States are a good deal like sheep and go in flocks, following directions received from a few Eastern bankers, and if we did not know that the managers of large railroads have to take their instructions from the same source, and if we did not know that the large manufacturers are dependent on banks and are obliged to court favor, we would be utterly at a loss to understand why so many of the bankers, railroad managers, and some manufacturers should oppose the restoration of silver; because the restoration of silver, by increasing the volume of money, would raise prices; a raise in prices would again restore our home market and do what it always has done in all countries and in all times; it would give activity so that our railroads would earn nearly twice the money, our banks would prosper, and our manufacturers would have all they could do, while the laborer would be employed and his family be comfortable.

INJUSTICE TO CREDITORS.

But, says someone, there are many debts that were made since prices have gone, and if you now increase the volume of money and raise prices will you not do these creditors an injustice? I answer, No. There is just this difference between increasing the burden of debts by making money scarce and reducing the burden by making money cheap when money is scarce; it first destroys the debtor, but it does not stop there. It produces that general stagnation which in time reaches the creditor and injures him. For instance, every holder of securities in the United States has found that this universal depression has reduced the value of some of his securities. Every time that a railroad was forced into the hands of a receiver the securities of that road were worth less in the market. On the other hand, when the burden of his debt is lightened by making money plentiful it begets such a general activity that new enterprises are started and the capitalist or the creditor derives a benefit from the universal prosperity.

Now, my fellow-citizens, this is not merely a question of the day. It is a question that will affect the entire future of our country; that will affect the perpetuity of republican institutions in our land. It affects the toilers of to-day and will affect the millions of toilers yet unborn. Upon its solution will largely depend the question whether we shall be entirely Europeanized; whether we shall have a small class excessively rich reveling in luxury while the great masses are groaning under constantly increasing burdens and sinking in the standard of citizenship, or whether our land shall continue to be the home of intelligent freemen and a happy abiding place for all men who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow.