

## THE SILVER DEBATE.

Synopsis of the Discussion in the United States Senate.

On the 11th Mr. Cockrell (dem., Mo.) continued his speech against the repeal bill. He yielded the floor to Mr. Smith (dem., N. J.), who spoke in favor, and Mr. Irby (dem., S. C.), who spoke against the pending measure. Mr. Cockrell concluded his speech at 5:15 o'clock.

Mr. Allen (pop., Neb.) took the floor to continue his speech. At 6 o'clock Mr. Dubois (rep., Idaho) announced that he had come when the senate was adjourned.

Mr. Voorhees (rep., Ind.) said it felt it his high duty to move for an adjournment, but on the contrary, to ask the senate to stay together in continuous session until the pending measure should be disposed of.

Mr. Dubois said this announcement of the senator from Indiana meant "that the senate is to be held in continuous session until a vote is reached on the pending bill, or until it is demonstrated that a vote cannot be reached. This legislation should not be rushed through by inhumane and brutal force. You know as well when you start as when you emerge from the struggle that you must fail." He said a bill was as likely to pass for the free coinage of silver as to absolutely destroy silver. He added: "If you conclude that a special session is necessary, let us have a session of this great question, a test of which side can stand the most punishment, we desire to give notice now that we shall protect our side by every means in our power. We shall insist that you furnish the quorum, and that you keep it constantly in this chamber, if it takes innumerable roll-calls. The responsibility for what is to follow must rest on you, as well as its physical effects on individual senators."

Mr. Voorhees suggested to Mr. Dubois the wisdom of the saying: "Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as that putteth it off." "We will see who fails in this transaction before we are done," said Mr. Voorhees. "I feel that my feet are on a rock, and there I shall stand and vindicate a great and mighty principle. But before I say a word upon that subject I will ask the senator from Idaho whether he will fix a day to take a vote?"

Mr. Dubois said he had not talked on the subject, and he could not say could any one say when the debate would probably close.

Mr. Voorhees replied at great length, saying that "if there could be a day named by the opponents of this bill we would come to an understanding directly. It is because obstruction is resorted to, pure and simple, against legislation, that we are in the attitude we are now. We regret exceedingly to have to resort to the methods now before us." He said he would rather be carried from his desk feet foremost and put to sleep at his home in Terre Haute forever than to yield the principle that the majority has a right to govern.

Then had come the question of whether we have a government that can administer itself. He would not injure the minority, but asked should the majority govern? He stood there not talking compromise but for the rule of the majority. If he went down it would be with his flag nailed to the masthead. If a compromise was to take place on the principle that the minority had the right to dictate, it would be by others, not by him. He continued: "In default of any answer when a vote can be reached, I invoke the spirit of wisdom, fairness, patience and manhood on both sides and we will proceed. I have no doubt of the result."

Mr. Allen continued his remarks during the night, interrupted by frequent roll calls to determine the question of a quorum being present.

On the 12th Mr. Allen (pop., Neb.) concluded his remarks at 8 a. m. after which, a motion of Mr. Voorhees, the Peffer amendment was laid on the table—37 to 17—as follows:

Years—Caffery, Camden, Carey, Cullom, Davis, Dingle, Faulkner, Frye, Gallinger, Gordon, Gray, Hall, Hawley, Hart, Hoar, Lindsay, McMillan, McPherson, Massey, Mills, Mitchell (Wis.), Murphy, Piatt, Proctor, Quay, Ransom, Sherman, Smith, Squire, Voorhees, Washburn, White (La.)—33.

Nays—Bate, Berry, Blackburn, Butler, Call, Cameron, Coke, Daniel, George, Hunton, Irby, Martin, Morgan, Pasco, Peffer, Vest, Walworth—17.

Mr. Martin (dem., Kan.) expressed the opinion the time had come for democrats to act together and arrive at some agreement—see whether they could do anything to relieve the party and the country. He read the newspaper reports of the meeting between Secretary Carlisle and the New York bankers at the house of President Williams of the Chemical national bank, and said the reports were convincing testimony that the panic was general and had been manufactured expressly for the occasion. It had two purposes—one to force the government to issue bonds, and the other to destroy silver as a money metal. He acquitted Mr. Carlisle of any complicity in the conspiracy. He discussed the question of national banks and asserted the wisest and best thing for the democratic party to do would be to wipe out every vestige of the national banking system. He regarded the repeal bill as so bad, so wicked, so cruel, so remorseless, so unjust he felt justified in resorting to every constitutional right to defeat it.

At 4:15 Mr. Teller (rep., Col.) proceeded with a speech begun the previous week, but yielded the floor with the understanding that he could resume on the 13th.

Mr. Stewart (rep., Nev.) then took the floor. He said that within a year, probably sooner, the country would rejoice that there had been those in the senate who had the courage to call a halt on the attempt to establish the single gold basis. If silver countries would be true to themselves the gold countries would have to change their policies in order to trade with the more powerful countries. Mr. Stewart continued his speech till after midnight, subject to many interruptions for inquiries as to the presence of a quorum.

After a report by the sergeant-at-arms at 10 o'clock on the morning of the 13th as to the absences, Mr. Voorhees said in view of such report, it was evident no further business could be transacted, and he therefore moved an adjournment, to which motion there was no opposition, and the senate adjourned until 11 o'clock.

On the 14th after the introduction of amendments by Mr. Vest (dem., Mo.) and Mr. Allen (pop., Neb.)—the former providing for the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman act, the issue of coin certificates, the coining of native silver, deposited by owners, up to \$900,000,000, the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on state banks, etc.; and the latter providing for the free coining of silver—Mr. Stewart (rep., Nev.) resumed his speech and debated further against the pending repeal measure.

Mr. Peffer (pop., Kan.) took the floor at 8 p. m. and continued the argument against repeal.

An adjournment was had at 11:30 for want of a quorum.

On the 14th Mr. Jones (rep., Nev.) spoke in opposition to the repeal. He said the pending measure was a veiled attempt to impose the gold standard upon the people of the United States. It was evident to him that the universality of the denial of its own principles "The last doth protest too much, methinks."

In reply to a question by Mr. Vilas (dem., Wis.) as to whether he (Mr. Jones) did not fear a serious monetary disturbance if "free coinage" were given to silver at the rate of 16 to 1, Mr. Jones replied that he had not the slightest doubt that in ten minutes after a free coining bill became a law silver would be on a parity with gold and would stay there.

Taking advantage of a break in the discussion Mr. Voorhees asked if it would be agreeable to the senator from Nevada to yield to a motion to adjourn, to which Mr. Jones responded that it would be, and that he "will give the convenience of an hour's consultation with the friends of the pending measure. I have a motion to make at this hour. Before I do so however, I desire to correct any misapprehensions that may prevail in some minds. There are some eager minds in certain directions just at this time. I remember reading one with great interest an account of the battle of the first commodore of the American navy, John Paul Jones, of the coast of Scotland, by moonlight, with the Seraph and her allies. When the British commander asked him whether he surrendered he said in reply: 'Have only begun to fight.' If there is anybody who thinks that the friends and advocates of this bill have surrendered, or have it in contemplation, I desire to assure you in the language of the immortal hero of the salt seas, that we have only begun the fight, and with that I move that the senate now adjourn." The motion was agreed to and the senate, at 5:05, adjourned.

On the 16th, after considerable discussion of other business, Mr. Peffer (pop., Kan.) resumed his speech against the repeal bill. Yielding temporarily to Mr. Palmer (dem., Ill.) the last was required that he remain in the chamber right after night listening, not in debt, but to speeches which, as the newspapers asserted, were made to consume time. On being asked to specify any particular speech he started to express his belief that the senator from Nebraska (Mr. Allen) had—but before he could finish the sentence he was interrupted by Mr. Allen himself, who angrily insisted that Mr. Palmer had right to make such an imputation, and he called him to order for violating the rules. Mr. Palmer said he would not take anything back. And then Mr. Allen retorted by saying he was not in the senate with a brass collar around his neck, as other senators were; that he was not here to do the bidding of some man who had put chains upon his neck and told him what to do.

Considerable time was consumed on the question of the presence of a quorum, several roll calls being had, after which Mr. Peffer continued his remarks. He said a time would come if that majority had patience and would hear what the senators had to say on this question, when senators would vote, but not until then. But if the senate insists on forcing this bill, refusing all offers of a compromise, so long will we insist that we are the majority; that we represent the great mass of the people. He said the supporters of the pending bill claimed to be bimetallists. Let them prove their words by their works. In reply to a query by Mr. Palmer if he meant that the majority must consent to a compromise before a vote could be had Mr. Peffer replied that if they (the majority) could prevent a vote until then they would do so.

The colloquy between Mr. Peffer and Mr. Palmer kept up until 10 o'clock, when a motion for adjournment made by Mr. Voorhees was agreed to.

## THE CHINESE BILL.

Synopsis of the Debate in the National House of Representatives.

On the 14th Mr. McCrory (dem., Ky.), author of the proposed amendment to the Geary Chinese exclusion bill, explained that the pending measure provided that the act of May 5, 1892, be so amended as to extend the time six months in which Chinese persons may register and obtain certificates of residence, and also amended said act so as to require one credible witness other than Chinese that an applicant for a certificate was a resident of the United States on the 5th of May, 1892, instead of "one credible white witness." The bill also amended the act by providing that the word "laborer" or "laborers" shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled manual laborers, including Chinese employed in mining, fishing, lumbering, and in digging, drying, or otherwise preserving shell or other fish for home consumption or exportation. It seemed just and fair that the Chinese should have additional time in which to register and obtain certificates of residence. If all the Chinese persons who were not now registered should be transported to China the cost to the government would be about \$7,000,000.

Mr. Geary (dem., Col.), in opposing the bill, said if he believed that through the operation of this bill if enacted into law the Chinese would comply with the law he would vote for the measure. But he did not so believe. He wanted to act in accordance with civilization, Christianity and morality. He wanted to exclude Chinese from coming to the United States but not to add that the Chinese should be imposed upon those already here. He denied that the bill which bore his name was any violation of treaty stipulations. Within the last thirty years \$500,000,000 had been taken from the Pacific coast to foreign lands. Gentlemen from the east expressed their wonder that the people of California did not like the Chinese. How would they like a foreign colony located in their region? He then went on to denounce the competition of the cheap Chinese labor with free American labor. He ridiculed the statement that it would take \$7,000,000 to deport the unregistered Chinese. It would not be declared into law a expenditure of \$1,000,000 and he voted in action of the house in favor of it in enforcing the laws. He was a democrat and loved the democratic party, but if that party permitted the men of its selection to violate the laws it had no right to ask for a continuance of public confidence.

On the 12th Mr. Pitt (rep., Ill.) spoke in favor of the bill. He denounced the Geary law. It was a violation of the public faith, but it was a law, and it was the duty of congress to make it as light upon the victims as possible. It carried out what was a great evil, but the way to stop it was by international agreement.

Mr. Loud (rep., Cal.) described the evils of the Chinese invasion of the Pacific coast. He criticized the administration for not enforcing the law. He claimed that the executive power was trying to overrule the legislative power.

Mr. Hooker (dem., Miss.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Blewett (dem., N. Y.) opposed the bill. He said there would follow the enactment of this law as there were tests to the McCrory amendment as there were tests to the Geary law.

The object of this legislation was to allow the Six Companies to try the case again and have a majority of the supreme court turned into a minority. He closed with a criticism of the Six Companies for preventing Chinamen from registering.

On the 13th Mr. Raynor (dem., Md.) said the passage of the pending McCrory bill was an act of self evident justice, one that should command itself to every member of the house. "If we are going to exercise natural justice in this country," he said, "if we are going to maintain human rights we must pass this bill." In reply to questions by Mr. Ray (rep., N. Y.) he said the administration had rightfully done nothing to enforce the present law, because of want of the necessary funds, and be cause, after the law had been pronounced constitutional by the supreme court there was a likelihood of its being rejected by the present congress.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.

Mr. Teller (rep., Cal.) spoke in favor of the bill.