

HARRIS AND HARVEY.

ALLEGED CRIME OF '73 STILL UNDER DISCUSSION.

The Contestants Delve Into Various Records, Including That of Congress, to Prove Their Points—The "Hottest" Session Yet Held.

(Copyrighted 1895 by Axel F. Hatch.)

Chicago, July 20.—The Harris-Harvey silver debate was continued today before the largest and most enthusiastic audience since the discussion began. The act of 1873 was gone into extensively. The essential points are covered in the following condensed report:

Legislation of 1873.

Mr. Harvey—The debate so far is of value in this: It shows that gold and silver is the money of the constitution. 2. That the silver dollars of 371½ grains of pure silver was the unit of value in our monetary system and regulated the other coins in our coinage system from 1792 to 1873. 3. That silver and gold in concurrent coinage was until 1873 the standard and measure of value of all other property and the basic principle of our monetary system. 4. That prior to 1873 when one metal increased in exchange value over the other the debtor had the right to pay in the cheaper metal. 5. That silver was not demonetized by the act of 1873 on account of the overproduction of silver. 6. That \$143,000,000 of silver was coined by our mints prior in 1873. This debate is of great value in removing these points of doubt, that are now more or less subjects of general discussion, and brings us nearer to the issue in the controversy.

Mr. Harris, in his closing speech at the last session, refers to what Mr. Potter says as to the support of the bill before the House, and accuses me of unfairness in not reading the whole of Mr. Potter's speech. I called your attention to Mr. Potter's speech to show you that the introduction of this mint bill at the time it was before the House excited his suspicion, showing that it was inappropriate to be considered at that period. Mr. Potter was suspicious. It was a Congress in which it was natural to be suspicious. Mr. Potter was satisfied that something was wrong back of the bill, and by following his speech through you see that Potter thought it was a speculation in nickel; that the bill provided for the recoinage of the cent pieces the way Hooper had it then before the House, by making these cent pieces largely of nickel, and Potter, from the experience of that Congress and the numerous investigating committees there were then in session, supposed that that was where there was something wrong or corrupt. Mr. Potter was not a bimetalist in the sense of understanding bimetalism, or he would have seen what was behind the bill, and later in his discussion I asked Mr. Harris to explain the inconsistency between Mr. Hooper's assertion as to the bill being fair and Mr. Potter's suggestion that it made a change in the coinage system. That was on April 9. Mr. Potter and Mr. Brooks, both suspicious of the bill, defeated its being taken up on that day, and the bill went over, and on May 27 it again came before the House, not in the form of the bill which Mr. Hooper had been pressing, but in the form of a new bill. This time Mr. Hooper presented it in the form of a substitute. Mr. Hooper called up the bill offered as a substitute and closed with this proposition: "I move that the rules be suspended and that the substitute be put on its passage."

Whether the change of the unit from silver to gold was in the bill up to that moment is not certain. We have only Mr. Hooper's manuscript speech; it may have been in the substitute.

Mr. Harris—Before commencing the regular work of the day I desire to call the attention of my opponent and of the people who may read this discussion to a statement made by Mr. Harvey on the day before yesterday. It is in substance this: That whenever he should make any statement which I should fail to deny he should take it for granted from my silence that I admitted the truth of what he said. Mr. Harvey, you have no power to force me into such a position.

Paris Conference.

I now proceed with the discussion of the law of 1873. My opponent, after spending the whole, nearly as I recollect, of the last session in trying to smirch the people of the United States—not only the American Congress, but the people of the city where he now lives—begins to back water and wants it understood that he does not intend to make out that everybody is wicked. I have shown you that this bill had its inception among the experts on coinage in the United States. I should have stated that previous to 1873 there had been a monetary conference held in Paris—I think he has referred to that conference—and said that Senator Sherman was present at the conference. I quote here from W. A. Shaw's "History of Currency," page 275:

"The first widely embracing international conference proper, however, was the outcome of an expression of public opinion in the convocation of the Latin Union. It was called at the invitation of France and met at Paris on the 17th of June, 1867. The states represented were—now listen!—Austria, Baden, Bavaria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, the United States, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, and Wurtemberg. The eight sessions of the conference occupied till the 6th day of July, 1867. All the states except Holland declared in favor of the gold standard."

It was after that action that our experts commenced to examine the question and see what legislation should be enacted. The bill of 1873 simply carried out a resolution of all these civilized nations of the world.

Mr. Harvey—I am going to hold this argument on the track if I can. (Applause.)

The report of the monetary conference at Paris in 1867 will contradict the history that Mr. Harris has read from. I leave him with that.

I continue with the presentation of the substitute by Mr. Hooper, that he was so solicitous should not be read. The record shows that the clerk began to read the bill, when he was interrupted and the reading stopped with the interruption. Members then satisfied themselves with asking him questions and the reading of the bill was never continued. Mr. Holman asked this question:

"Before the question is taken upon suspending the rules and passing the bill, I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will explain the leading changes made by this bill in the existing law, especially in reference to the coinage. It would seem as if all the small coinage of the country is intended to be recoinage."

To this Mr. Hooper replied: "The bill makes no change in the existing laws in that regard."

The rules were then suspended and the substitute passed about an hour after it was offered, and passed without being read. The second session of the Forty-second Congress adjourned soon after, and the same Congress met again in December.

In the Senate.

The bill was called up in the Senate by Senator Sherman on Jan. 17, 1873. He began by saying (Congressional Globe, part 1, third session Forty-second Congress, page 68):

"I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the mint bill, as it is commonly called, revising and amending the laws relative to the mints and assay offices and coinage of the United States. I do not think it will take more than the time consumed in the reading of it."

In answer to a question from Senator Casselary he said (Congressional Globe, part 1, third session, Forty-second Congress, page 672): "If the Senator will allow me, he will see that the preceding section provides for coin which is exactly interchangeable with the English shilling and the five-franc piece of France; that is, the five-franc piece of France will be the exact equivalent of a dollar of the United States in our silver coinage."

Mr. Harris—That is right, Mr. Harvey. The bill that was reported to the Senate and that they were then discussing had in it a provision for the coining of silver dollars, the silver dollars about which you talked at the last session of this debate, containing 384 grains, and they were made with all the other silver coins subsidiary coins. There was no provision in the bill at that time, and I do not believe you dare claim there was, for the free coinage of a dollar of 384 grains.

Now, have you ever noticed that the opposition to that bill in the House came from Clarkson N. Potter, from Mr. Brooks—

Mr. Harvey—May I interrupt you? Mr. Harris—Certainly.

At Short Range Again.

Mr. Harvey—If you will show me from the record of the proceedings in the Senate on that day that the Senate struck out that dollar we will stop this debate right here. (Long and enthusiastic applause.)

Mr. Harris—I have not the record, but I can get it. The law when it was passed had the trade dollar in it. Do you deny that?

Mr. Harvey—No, sir; I do not.

Mr. Harris—And don't that take the place of the other dollar?

Mr. Harvey—No, sir. (Laughter.)

Mr. Harris—I defy you to show a word anywhere that substantiates that position. It was a simple piece of legislation, and bears that impression on its face. That bill, after it left the House, was amended, and the trade dollar was put in there at the instance of men who thought it could be coined and used in our trade with China. It was put in at the instance of the silver producers of the country.

But you stopped me just as I was calling your attention to a fact. The only men who opposed that bill in the House were Clarkson N. Potter and Mr. Brooks, both millionaires from Wall street, both representing the very men that you say were trying to impose that bill upon this country for the purpose of aiding men who are rich. Was anything ever more contemptible than a proposition of that kind?

The Substitute Bill.

But I must proceed. That bill became a law by the substitution of the trade dollar; the law in reference to making the gold dollar the unit of value was never changed at any stage in the process of the bill. They haven't even had ingenuity enough to put such a provision in brackets, and I will now say for the benefit of the country that there is not one word of truth in that whole bracket business. No such thing ever occurred in the United States, and there is no proof of it either; it is innuendo.

Here is what Senator Orrill said only a few days ago:

"There has been a loud and delusive cry about the act of Congress in 1873, which, after three years of consideration by the treasury department and by Congress, purposely omitted to provide for the further coinage of the silver dollar, and none having been coined for nearly forty years, and only 8,000,000 had ever been coined. All that time the only currency in use in the United States as money was depreciated paper, a legal tender for all debts, and debts on a specie basis could have been paid in gold at about 2 per cent less cost than in silver. It was sought to avoid its instability, which followed sooner, perhaps, than

was expected, and this prudent and politic act has been the ark which has saved our people from being wholly overwhelmed by the silver flood."

This is said by a man who served through the entire time that this bill was being discussed, and who knows what he is talking about. (Enthusiastic applause.)

Harvey Claims a Point.

Mr. Harvey—The other day, when Mr. Harris said that the bill before the senate, as shown by the Congressional Record, only had a trade dollar in it, I replied that when I got to the senate proceedings that he would have to retreat from that position (applause), and now he retreats of his own accord. (Applause and laughter.)

Again, Mr. Sherman, in speaking of the silver dollar on that day, said: "We are providing that it shall float all over the world." Again he said (Forty-second Congress, Vol. I, p. 672): "This bill proposed a silver coinage exactly the same as the French and what are called the associated nations of Europe (meaning the Latin Union) who have adopted the international standard of silver coinage; that is, the dollar provided for by this bill is the precise equivalent of the five-franc piece."

The idea conveyed was this: Our silver dollar was above par with gold, because of the French ratio of 15½ to 1, while ours was 16 to 1. The Latin Union alone had maintained the commercial and coinage value of silver and gold undisturbed at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and by reducing our silver dollar to 384 grains, the same size as the French five-franc piece, with our mints open to it, as was that of France, a parity of the two metals was assured and our "silver dollar would float around the world." (Applause.) It was in this form that the bill passed the senate, as it had passed the house. There was no disagreement. The only thing that had happened that they had not anticipated was that the debate in the senate had forced them to show their hand and to disclose the fact that the dollar was in the bill, the dollar that Mr. Harris said the other day was not in the bill—

Mr. Harris—I didn't. I will not be misquoted on that, and I never said anything of the kind. I appeal to the record. I have never denied that that small dollar was in the bill when it went from the house over to the senate, never, nowhere, and if I had I would take it back in half a minute, for when I am shown that I am in the wrong I always own it—I don't try to dodge it as Coin does.

Mr. Harvey—I refer this dispute to the only just judge—the record of the day's debate in which Mr. Harris said it. (Applause.)

Culmination of Alleged Conspiracy.

The bill had now passed both houses with a slight disagreement on two or three minor points only, but it made a necessity for it to go to a conference committee. Here is where the dirty work was done and the conspiracy culminated.

Mr. Harris—I wish to say now that I nowhere have ever intimated there was not at one time in that bill a provision for the small dollar of 384 grains. I do deny that in any draft of the bill that it was ever made anything but a subsidiary coin, and I defy you to prove that the clause making the gold dollar the unit of value was ever erased from the bill in any of its proceedings anywhere during the entire discussion. (Applause.)

Mr. Harvey—I claim that it was in the bill the same as gold, and was entitled to free access to the mint.

Mr. Harris—"Free access to the mint" is a quibble. I say to you, Mr. Harvey, if you will show in any way that coin in that bill was to be given free coinage in this country, I will give you my time to do it in.

Mr. Harvey—I have shown it already. Mr. Harris—He can't do it, because there isn't a word of truth in that proposition. Look at the philosophy of it. You can charge a man with a thing that is such nonsense that you can't believe he would adopt it unless you also conclude that he is a fool. This new dollar that was provided for in the bill in the House as it went to the Senate was just twice the size of the half dollar. Am I right? Ain't that true? Don't you know, Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harris—That is right.

An Important Point at Issue.

Mr. Harris—Well, then, just say so. Now, the provision existed that the silver for making such half dollars should be bought by the government and that the seigniorage arising from coining such money which was worth less than it was worth on its face value should go into the government treasury. Do you believe they provided for a coin containing double the amount of the silver in the half dollar and agreed to take all the silver that should come to the mint and coin it into such dollars, and in the same bill also provided that if it was coined into half dollars the government should get it? Mr. Harvey thinks that our forefathers established a single measure of value and that that measure was 371½ grains of pure silver, and that gold was made a single companion metal of silver and that its value was to be all the time measured by a silver dollar. I believe that those early patriots attempted to establish a measure of value out of two metals, gold and silver, and that they supposed they had hit upon a ratio which would secure the use of both gold dollars and silver dollars side by side. We agree that up to 1834 the measure of value in actual use in this country was the silver dollar. I assert that in 1834 the ratio was changed, that the gold dollar was made smaller. He admits that. I insist that when the gold dollar was cheapened it became the actual measure of value in this country and remained so up to the suspension of specie payments; that the silver dollar, though still a legal measure of

value, was not used in this country as the actual measure after 1834. He denies that. We both agree that from 1862 to 1873 the domestic business of this country was done by using the greenback dollar as the measure of value, which was during none of these years equal in value to either the gold dollar or the silver dollar. He states that in his book—we both agree. Now mark: We both agree that in 1873, since the resumption of specie payments, the domestic and international business of this country had been done on a gold basis. We agree that Great Britain had been on a gold basis since 1816; no dispute about it. I claim that Germany ceased the coinage of silver in 1871, and he claims that it was not done until later, in 1873, but we both agree that since Jan. 1, 1874, Germany has been entirely upon a gold basis. We agree that the nations which compose the Latin Union, to-wit, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and Greece, are all of them today gold standard countries. There is no dispute between us that British America and Australia are also gold standard countries. We agree that Mexico, China, Japan, and several of the republics of South America are silver standard nations. There is today no nation on the face of the earth that is actually using a double standard. The actual measure of value in each of the countries of the world is either gold alone or silver alone except in some countries where depreciated paper money is the circulating medium and metal money is bought and sold as a commodity, just as was the case in this country during the suspension of specie payments. Mr. Harris claims that the law of 1873 was secretly and fraudulently passed. He won't deny that he claims that. That I have denied and still deny. I say there is not a grain of truth in such a statement. But we both agree that the law was passed and is in force today. Now, the important question before the American people at this moment, and the one we are here to discuss, is this: Ought the law to be repealed? Ought we to again throw open the mints of the United States to the free coinage of silver, upon the old ratio of 16 to 1, when the actual ratio of value in the markets of the world is fully 30 to 1?

Points of Agreement.

Mr. Harvey—When I have read the printed record of what Mr. Harris has just now said it will be time enough for me to take up a new subject. I am not done with the present subject yet. The act of 1853 served the purpose of the men who were seeking to overthrow our constitutional standards of money in this way. In 1853, on account of the exportation of our silver coins by reason of the French ratio of 15½ to 1 being less than ours, 16 to 1, Congress, preserving the silver unit, ordered by act that the fractional silver, 50 cents and less, should be cut down in size to the French ratio to stop its exportation. The silver unit was preserved without even coining one of them. It would regulate the other coins all the same.

Now, with that explanation, I proceed. I want all the men and women of America to read the words uttered in the two houses of Congress on the day the bill was passed, May 27, 1872, and Jan. 17, 1873. It is the best school on this question that they can attend. The reading of it will cause them to agree with me. It can be found in the Congressional Record or in No. 7 of the Financial Series, published by the Coin Publishing Company, of this city, wherein it is copied, and I hope all publishers of books on finance will include it in the appendix of every book they publish.

But I had not finished with my proofs. Proofs precede comments. Plain facts are more eloquent than words.

I have before me on this table the files of the Chicago Tribune for 1873. (Laughter.) I want Mr. Harris and his assistants to inspect it. I turn first to Jan. 18, 1873. This bill that was supposed to have had in it a silver dollar that would float around the world was passed in the Senate on Jan. 17, so that the morning papers of the 18th would contain any news, if there were any, showing that the fundamental laws of the government had been changed. The only reference that appears in that paper is in a press telegram from Washington, which is this: "Mr. Sherman called up the bill to revise and amend the laws relating to mints, assay offices, and coinage of the United States, which was amended and passed." That is all; not another word.

Asserts It Was Misunderstood.

No information of the fact that one of the money metals of the United States was struck down was conveyed to the people through the newspapers of the country. (Applause.) The reporters at Washington did not know it; the congressmen as a whole did not know it. The money of the people that had served them well was destroyed, and I now challenge Mr. Harris to show me anywhere in the newspapers of the United States during the passage of the bill, which he says has no taint of fraud attached to it, where the people knew that a bill was being considered by Congress that was to destroy as money one-half of the money metal of the country, or that they had passed such a bill.

Mr. Harris—I desire to say that Mr. Harris is mistaken when he says that the money of the people had been stricken down.

The money of the people should be just as good as the money of the nabob, and before I get through I will show the people of the United States that I have come here to defend the rights of the millions who live by toil, who live by work, whose wages would be cut in two by the passage of this law which my friend advocates. (Long-continued applause.)

I will now go back to it. I was just saying that Mr. Harvey and myself

agree that the law of 1873 was passed. Dropping the matter of how it happened to be, the fact still exists.

The important question before the American people at this moment, and the one we are here to discuss, is this: Ought the law to be repealed? Ought we to again throw open the mints of the United States to the free coinage of silver upon the old ratio of 16 to 1 when the actual ratio of value in the markets of the world is fully 30 to 1?

If Mr. Harris—now listen—shall succeed in proving that the people of the United States in 1873 were mostly a set of corrupt scoundrels and that he is really the only pure and upright man left in the entire city of Chicago, it won't avail him anything in this debate. These questions are not pertinent to the question in dispute. The law of 1873 did pass; it is today the law of the land. Several attempts have been made to repeal it in congress and they have thus far failed. Mr. Harris claims that the law should be repealed at once and that this nation should instantly be placed upon a silver basis; that is, that 371½ grains of pure silver should be made the only unit of value in the United States—now mark—and if the gold dollar shall prove to be more valuable than such a silver dollar, then the gold dollar should be reduced in size until the gold contained in it is worth no more than 371½ grains of pure silver. You claim that in this book; that is, "Coin" does, and I suppose he won't deny that.

Mr. Harris—You state me wrongly.

Mr. Harris—Here the issue between us is clear-cut, and I oppose such legislation with all my soul and with all my strength. That is really the only question in dispute between us.

In order to decide intelligently, we must inquire somewhat into the doctrine of ratios. I now ask, is it possible by legal enactment to fix a ratio of value between two substances and then maintain such a ratio for any great length of time, either in the markets of the world or in the country where such law is enacted?

Question of Ratios.

I pass to the discussion of the question of ratio, as leading up to the correct solution of the dispute between us.

Mr. Harris—We were discussing the question of whether the act of 1873 was secretly and surreptitiously passed, and I supposed that Mr. Harris would address himself to the fact that I called his attention to, that none of the people in the United States, including the newspaper reporters at Washington, knew that the bill had passed.

Senator Thurman on Feb. 15, 1878, in debate, said: "I cannot say what took place in the house, but know when this bill was pending in the senate we thought it was simply a bill to reform the mint, regulate coinage, and fix up one thing or another, and there was not a single man in the senate, I think, unless a member of the committee from which the bill came, who had the slightest idea that it was even a squint toward demonetization."—Congressional Record, Vol. 7, Part II, Forty-fifth Congress, second session, p. 1064.

Senator Allison, on Feb. 15, 1878, said: "But when the secret history of this bill of 1873 comes to be told it will disclose the fact that the house of representatives intended to coin both gold and silver, and intended to place both metals upon the French relation instead of on our own, which was the true scientific position in reference to this subject in 1873, but that bill afterward was doctored." (Applause.)—Congressional Record, Vol. 7, Part II, second session, p. 1068.

I call Mr. Harris's special attention to what I have just read. There is the testimony of a man who was present and among the men who were deceived—Mr. Allison, at present senator from Iowa.

Passed, did you say in your opening, without the least taint of suspicion of its integrity? (Long applause.) And that the records would demonstrate that you were right?

Corruption Charge Denied.

Mr. Harris—I desire to say to the gentleman that just what one congressman or another may have said about this bill I neither know nor care (laughter and applause). I know this, that the men composing the congress of 1873, personally and individually, have every one of them denied the statement of corruption that you charge in the passage of this bill. I know that they have nothing but intentions to base the charge upon. I know that they cannot make a case unless they first prove that no decency was left in the American congress in 1873 (laughter). Oh, I know what I am talking about. In order to make out their case they must make out that the best men of this nation were a set of villains, and have been for the last twenty-five years (cries of "No, no!"). Harvey proposes to do that.

Mr. Harris—No, I don't.

Mr. Harris—He has attempted it. I say that every charge that he has made against the members of the American congress is false (cries of "No, no!").

The Chairman—It is not proper for anybody in the audience to interrupt the speaker.

Mr. Harris—That is so. Don't do that.

Mr. Harris—I am well acquainted with you gentlemen. It is not the first time I have met you face to face. The disease which you men have got always breaks out by running at the mouth (loud laughter and applause). It is one of the symptoms that shows the silver craze.

Now I proceed. I am not to be diverted from completing this debate some time during this year. I propose to take up now the question of ratio.

Mr. Harris—Would you let me finish on this subject, and then we can go along together on the ratio, if you will

hold back so as to get this out of the way.

Mr. Harris—I couldn't do that. If he wants to still keep barking at that old hole let him bark. I am proceeding to discuss the question before us.

There has been an effort among the civilized nations of the world from the earliest days of history to try and do business by using gold and silver as money. There has been always an attempt among all these people to fix some ratio between the real value of gold and silver, so as to use both metals indiscriminately.

Early Silver Ratios.

Del Mar tells us that in the archaic epoch, in the very earliest days, where the records were kept on the papyrus of Boulaq, that gold and silver were equal in value, one exchangeable for the other. At that time an ounce of gold was worth just as much as an ounce of silver, people cared nothing as to which one they received. He then tells us that in the Vedic epoch silver had depreciated so that it took four ounces of silver to buy one of gold. He next tells us that in the Brahminical epoch, that was away down in 1600, the ratio was 1 to 5, and in 1367 the ratio in some of the countries of the east was 6 to 1. In the Buddhist epoch it had changed to 6½ to one. In India it was 6½ to 1, and then remained so for long years. In 1700 in India it raised—that is, lowered—the price of silver to 6½. In 1150 the ratio had become 8 to 1. In Marco Polo, middle ages, he tells us that in 1290 it varied in different countries from 4 to 1 even to 10 to 1; different countries had different ratios. In 1295 in the Jul-al-ad-din epoch, the ratio had got to be 7 to 1. In 1351 again it went back to 6½; but again it went up in India to 7. Now he gives the limit in the days of Akbar the Great 9½ to 1, then went up to 9, and was for a long time. The East India companies lowered the value of silver and put it 10 to 1; in the days of the India company that was the ratio for a long time. In 1769 in the country of Mohurs the ratio was down to 14 to 1. I say now silver was cheaper all the while in Bombay and Bengal from 1493, 10 to 1.

Mr. Harris—To something that occurred in this audience when Mr. Harris failed to reply to what Senator Allison and others said as to the manner of the passage of the act of 1873, Mr. Harris said that your enthusiastic expression or manner was derogatory, or implied that it was, to your character or intelligence and that it was a falling of men who had the silver craze. Mr. Harris, I want to answer that right now. There have been periods in the history of the United States when we have had crazes; one of those first instances when you might have used that language was just preceding the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill. (Loud applause.) There have been two or three instances since, and there is another coming (applause) when the integrity of the American people intends to restore the integrity of this nation and take it away from the men who are now driving us upon the reefs of disaster, and hurling ridicule at us because we exercise the rights of American citizens to investigate. (Cries of "Hear, hear," and applause.) We will arraign you and these men you defend for their acts, and when they come back at us with ridicule we will answer them with arguments. (Applause, and cries of "Hear, hear!") When we have presented an argument to you so strong as that of Senators Allison and Holman, Grant, Blaine, and others, that that act was a fraud, and you fail to answer it intelligently, you cannot answer it with ridicule. (Cries of "Hear, hear!" and applause, and renewed applause.) I had intended to quote from Mr. Blaine, Garfield, and many others on this subject, all in harmony with what I had read (cries of "Go on, go on!") but Mr. Harris's utter retreat in answering what I have read makes it unnecessary. (Applause.)

Chicago Tribune Quoted.

I now come nearer home for testimony. The Chicago Tribune of Feb. 23, 1878, says: "In 1873-74, as it was two years and more later discovered, the coinage of this silver dollar was forbidden 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; had, without the knowledge of the country, removed one of the landmarks of the government; had, under cover of darkness, abolished the constitutional dollar, and had arbitrarily, and to the immense injury of the people, added heavily to every form of indebtedness, public and private." (Applause.)

Gold standard men, this was what your beloved Chicago Tribune said (laughter) when it was honest. It now repeats what Mr. Harris says, and is publishing a one-sided report of this debate. (Cries of "Good, good," and applause.) A cause that depends on suppression of the truth should not be the cause of honest men. (Cries and applause.)

I want the record of this debate to contain the proper reference to General Grant's letter on this subject. It is in McPherson's Hand-Book, 1872-76, p. 134, in which General Grant, eight months after the passage of this bill, says in a letter to Mr. Cowdrey: "We have got the silver and it will soon commence coming to the mints, and with silver and gold we will pay our public debt." He goes on, and shows, in as plain language as you would have it stated, that he knew nothing of the passage of the act. Twenty-two years have passed—it is but a moment in the flight of time—but we who lived then, and who know now how the country was deceived, will write the criminal records of these modern Benedict Arnolds of America. (Applause.)

(Continued July 27.)