

# HORR AND HARVEY.

## RATIOS OF GOLD AND SILVER UNDER DISCUSSION.

The Subject, as Debated by Both Sides, Throws Some Fresh Light Into Hitherto Unexplored Regions Thereof—Where Labor Enters.

(Copyrighted, 1895, by Azel F. Hatch.) Chicago, July 22.—The Horr-Harvey debate was resumed at 1 p. m., and continued for three hours. The chief point under discussion was ratios. The condensed report is as follows:

### Depreciation of Silver.

Mr. Horr.—At the close of the debate on Saturday I had given the facts as to the constant depreciation of silver as compared with gold since the dawn of civilization. The civilized nations of the world have at some time or other, all of them, tried to fix a ratio so as to give free coinage to both metals. Through all ages the market or commercial value of the two metals has been a changing quantity, hence the ratio has been variable. A difference between the legal ratio and the commercial ratio of one-fourth of one per cent has been enough to drive the dearer metal out of any civilized country on the face of the earth. History is full of efforts of governments to force the legal ratio upon the people, and there is no instance on record where the market value of each metal has not controlled in the end, and the best money has always been driven from the field by the cheaper. Such result is in accordance with a law that is as universal and as unchangeable as the law of gravitation. Our forefathers tried the experiment and fixed the ratio at 15 to 1 in 1792. The commercial ratio at that time was about 15 1/3 to 1, and our gold coins left us. In 1834 the legal ratio was changed to 16 to 1. The commercial ratio was at that time about 15 1/2 to 1, and our silver coin left us. This became so marked that in 1853 congress passed a law for coining smaller silver coins of less value than either the legal or commercial ratio would indicate. They made such coins token money.

The government purchased the silver at its commercial value and covered the profit into the public treasury. They gave no free coinage to silver used in such subsidiary coins.

### Did France Make a Bid?

This is all history, which is disputed by none.

I know "Coin" says in his "Financial School," page 10, "During this struggle to get more silver, France made a bid for it by establishing a ratio of 15 1/2 to 1, and as our ratio was 16 to 1, this made silver worth 103.8 cents when exchanged for gold, and as gold would answer the same purpose as silver for money, it was found our silver was leaving us. So congress, in 1853, had our silver coins made of light weight to prevent their being exported." "Coin," as usual, is not accurate. France did not bid for our silver by making her ratio at 15 1/2 to 1 when ours was 16 to 1. France established the ratio of 15 1/2 to 1 in 1803.

France tried to maintain both metals as circulating mediums from 1113 to 1874 on some legal ratio, and between those dates France changed the mint price of the gold marc 146 times and the mint price of the silver marc 251 times, and thus changed the ratio a large number of times, and in 1726 she fixed her legal ratio at 14 1/2 to 1. At that time she rated silver too high, and while England became a gold-standard country, France became a silver-standard one. In 1803 she lowered the legal value of silver and fixed her ratio at 15 1/2 to 1, where it is nominally to-day, but in 1874 she ceased the free coinage of silver altogether. Here is the exact fact. The experience of the United States in an effort to establish and maintain a double standard has been the experience of the entire world. During the nineteenth century all the great civilized and commercial nations on the face of the globe have adopted the gold standard, and have done so without discounting silver as money, but every one of them refused free coinage to silver at any ratio.

The table of ratios given by "Coin," page 34 of his book, shows that from 1803, when France established the ratio of 15 1/2 to 1, up to 1874, when she stopped the free coinage of silver, in only one instance, and that was in 1861, did the commercial and legal ratios between the two metals agree. In only that one instance was the ratio of silver as 15 1/2 to 1.

### What Senator Morrill Said.

Mr. Harvey.—When I reply to the essay which Mr. Horr has just read my answer will be full and complete. But I must pause for a moment to deal with a question which you will recognize the importance of. It is by way of summary of the debate at the last session. I have had many requests, both orally and by letter, and by telegrams, since the last session to put into the record what Blaine, Garfield, Senator Beck, of Kentucky; Senator Ingalls, of Kansas, and many others have said officially, either to the effect that the act of 1873 was the result of gross ignorance on the subject, or that it was the result of fraud.

But in view of the important topic yet before us, and the limited number of words remaining at my disposal, I will not do so, but will try to find space for this matter in my 2,500-word summary at the close of the debate to do so. But I do wish in a few words to dispose of a few witnesses produced by Mr. Horr to the fairness of that legislation. Those whom he first mentioned were the treasurer, the comptroller of the treasury and the director of the mint, all of whom soon after the expiration of their terms of office became prominent as national bankers. Outside of these he has called no witnesses who have since 1873.

spoken upon this question, except a letter written in the last few days from an ex-congressman in Indiana, whose essential statements are contradicted by the senate proceedings. With this exception, he brings only one prominent witness; it is Senator Morrill, of Vermont, over whom Mr. Horr pronounces an eulogy. Mr. Horr says of Senator Morrill, "if there is an honest pure man inside the United States, it is Justin S. Morrill." I am going to shatter the reputation of Mr. Horr's New England idol. Mr. Horr reads an extract from a letter from Senator Morrill, in which the latter says that "congress purposely omitted to provide for the further coinage of the silver dollar," now observe I read Senator Morrill's exact language, "none having been coined for nearly forty years." I now hand Mr. Horr a report of the director of the mint for 1891, open at page 212, and call his attention to the number of silver dollars coined during the forty years next prior to 1873, and hand to the stenographer a copy of that report of the mint, showing the number of silver dollars coined for each of these years, to be inserted at this point in my remarks:

Silver Coined from 1833 to 1873.			
Year.	Silver Coined.	Year.	Silver Coined.
1836	1,000,000	1855	26,000
1839	300,000	1856	63,500
1840	61,005	1857	94,000
1841	173,000	1858	636,500
1842	184,618	1860	733,930
1843	165,100	1861	78,500
1844	20,000	1862	12,099
1845	24,500	1863	27,660
1846	169,600	1864	31,170
1847	140,750	1865	47,000
1848	15,000	1866	49,625
1849	62,600	1867	60,325
1850	47,500	1868	182,700
1851	1,300	1869	424,300
1852	1,100	1870	445,462
1853	46,110	1871	1,117,136
1854	33,140	1872	1,118,000

Look at them, Mr. Horr. See that in 1859 there were 636,000 of them coined; in 1860, 733,000 of them coined; in 1871, 1,117,000 of them; in 1872, 1,118,000, and in all those forty years, silver dollars in large quantities were coined, except in six years, and when you answer me, Mr. Horr, tell us why Mr. Morrill said there were none coined; and if he was not truthful about that what importance should be attached to what he said about the silver dollar being purposely omitted in the bill?

The secret of all this is that Senator Morrill is a bank stockholder and insurance company money-lender, and when giving utterance to the statement that serves his personal interest he has not had a strict regard for the truth.

I want to nail this statement at this point; not only to discredit the letter that Senator Morrill wrote and that was read here, but to nail that same statement that is being industriously published all over the country, and that has been reiterated here in Chicago, that there were no silver dollars coined for many years prior to 1873. There it is before Mr. Horr in the report of the director of the mint, and as published in my remarks. I now pause for Mr. Horr to justify Senator Morrill in making the statement that no silver dollars had been coined for nearly forty years prior to the act of 1873. (Applause.)

### Defends Senator Morrill.

Mr. Horr.—I desire to say in defense of Senator Morrill, that the object of that letter was to deny the general fraudulent talk that was going about the country, and originated by Mr. Harvey as much as any one, that all who were connected with the congress of 1873, or enough of them, were corrupt, and were crowding the bill through congress by the use of money. Now Senator Morrill did not intend by that expression to say that there was not one single dollar coined. He did mean to say that, substantially, there were none, and that is true. In the whole length of the time from the organization of this government up to 1873, as your book shows itself, there were less than \$8,000,000 of them silver dollars. There were over \$600,000,000 in gold, if I mistake not. I speak now from my memory.

Senator Morrill simply used the expression, "There were none coined," and Mr. Harvey draws the conclusion that because that is not accurately true, he cannot tell the truth about anything else.

Mr. Harvey.—Will you pardon me?

Mr. Horr.—Certainly.

Mr. Harvey.—Isn't it true, as that statement shows, that there were several millions coined, and that they were coined largely every year except six years?

Mr. Horr.—Certainly, I do not dispute it, nor does Senator Morrill intend to. Mr. Morrill may have made a mistake in the exact words he used. (Applause on the silver side of the house.)

Mr. Harvey.—In raising the question of the quantity of silver coined in thirty or forty years prior to 1873, I do it to establish the land mark in the financial discussion in the United States. The people have been misled, and at each step in this discussion, when we can set them right, the debate has been of value. The gold men are represented here by Mr. Horr, and when I show him and you that silver was copiously coined during the forty years prior to 1873, and he admits it as he must, then that question is settled.

### Scientific Bimetallism.

I now begin the discussion of bimetallism. Scientific bimetallism is this: 1. Free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver; these two metals to constitute the primary or redemption money of the government.

2. Silver dollars of 371 1/4 grains of pure silver (with us) to be the unit of value and gold to be coined into money at a ratio to be changed if necessary from time to time if the commercial parity to the legal ratio shall be affected by the action of foreign countries.

3. The money coined from both

metals to be legal tender in the payment of all debts.

4. The option as to which of the two moneys is to be paid in the liquidation of the debt to rest with the debtor, and the government also to exercise that option when desirable in paying out redemption money. (Applause.)

All of these conditions are necessary. Like any useful mechanical construction all the parts are necessary. First, as to unlimited coinage. When the mints are open to unlimited coinage of the two metals, an unlimited demand is created for them. The quantity is limited. When these two metals seek a market, they find a demand for their use in the arts and manufactures, which is limited. The surplus finds an unlimited market at the mints to be coined into money, the object for which all other products seek the market. They thus have an unlimited market, as the mints are open to all that comes. It is a question of supply and demand. Supply of precious metals is limited. When the mints are open an unlimited demand is created. This demand is limited only by the capacity of the business of the country to absorb money. With a limited supply and unlimited demand, what stops their value rising? It is this: The law says, "We coin 371 1/4 grains pure silver and 23.2 grains pure gold, respectively, into dollars, and confer upon these coins functions which make for them a permanent and equal demand." When this is the law people will not take less for their silver and gold, the quantities above named, than a dollar of current money, for they have the right to have it coined into dollars.

### Commercial Ratios.

I now make a part of my remarks an official table taken from page 108 of Compiled Laws and Coinage Statistics, an official document from Washington, showing the commercial ratio of the two metals for 200 years, to which I have added the commercial ratio for 1894. I now hand the book to Mr. Horr. I wish to give those present an opportunity to see this table, and now distribute copies of it in the audience. From this table it will be seen that under the effect of unlimited coinage up to 1873, a parity between the two metals was maintained at the legal ratio. England closing her mints in 1816 to silver, and Germany and Austria in 1854 to gold, had no perceptible effect.

Mr. Horr.—All these inquiries about the valuation in the ratio of the past are of little account in this debate. This one fact is admitted by "Coin" and disputed by no one: All the civilized nations of the world have ceased the free coinage of silver upon any ratio. \* \* \*

It is possible that my friend, Harvey, believes, when he says that the act of 1873, when it demonetized silver, cut the price of the property of the world in two, and that prices immediately, as they must have done, if their statement is true, dropped 50 per cent. I was around in the world in 1873, and I know that did not take place, and he knows it. You destroy one-half the wheat in the world and the chances are that you will increase the value of wheat probably four times—such is the estimate of political economists—but what is an article that people had to eat to live; it is all consumed from year to year, or after a short time. Gold has been accumulating for ages, and if you should destroy the primary money quality of half the gold in the world you would not change the price of the metal one-half. As soon as the price would go up there is an enormous store laid away all over the entire world that is not being used for money purposes, that would at once seek the channels and be coined into money and take the place of the money that had been destroyed.

### The Cheap Dollar.

What "Coin" is really after is a cheap dollar. He would reduce at one stroke, if need be, the value of the money unit of this country one-half. If that is not adopting a 50-cent dollar, what is it?

Now, I am here to protest against the whole scheme, because it is an effort to cheapen labor. That civilization is the highest; I care not in what part of the world you seek for examples, you will find that civilization is the highest where the best wages are paid for human effort, both mental and physical. Now, I hope my opponent will give me attention. The real measure of values is human toil. To decide whether any system of finances is best you must inquire into its effect upon the toiling millions. (Applause.) The greatest commodity ever placed on the markets of the world is labor. To know whether gold has appreciated or depreciated in real value the price paid for any human effort must never be omitted. Hence, this thought about the general range of prices being stable is pure nonsense. Under which system will each day's labor bring the most comforts of life to the greatest number of human beings? That is the vital question which we should attend to. (Applause.) Is it best to cheapen the unit of value, decrease the purchasing power of our dollar? Will such action harm or bless the mass of our people? That is the only question in dispute, Mr. Harvey, between you and myself. You say the dollar buys too much of the product of labor. I say the effort of the human race is continually to better the condition of all people. The tendency of true civilization is to constantly decrease the cost of the products of labor and constantly increase the wages for work.

### The Dear Dollar.

Mr. Harvey.—Mr. Horr argues that the dear dollar is of more benefit to laborers than a cheaper dollar. The terms dearer and cheaper are relative terms, as compared with your property and your services. If he is right that a dearer dollar is the best and the dearer it gets the better it is—because his argument must be followed to its logical

conclusion—then we might find some metal in the world that is scarcer than gold is and dearer than gold, with which a laboring man could purchase more than he can at present with the gold dollar. Mr. Horr, we do not intend to let you, before the American people, cloak yourself behind the laboring man. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr asks me about prices, why they did not drop suddenly 50 per cent in 1873 when silver was demonetized? The reply is this: We were not then on a specie basis. We began again in 1879, the demand for gold was not thrown on it to answer the entire purpose of primary money until 1879, and then it was cushioned in this country by the disputed position of silver.

The commercial parity of silver with gold in 1879 was so near together, not having fallen but about 15 per cent, that it ceased materially, and for a number of years silver hung, as it were, like Mahomet's coffin, between the ceiling and the floor. It was hard to tell where its true position was, so many misrepresentations were made in regard to it. About the same position was occupied by silver in the balance of the commercial nations. They had demonetized it until the demand that had, prior to that time, been on both gold and silver in Europe and partly in America was gradually shifted from both of the metals to gold alone. It is only in the last three or four years that it has been pronounced, and the treasurer at Washington, among the statutes made for that purpose, has construed them to be that gold alone is our redemption money. He says my illustration about half the gold being destroyed is not like the wheat if one-half of that were suddenly destroyed. In this whole argument you can apply one safe principle, and that is, that supply and demand regulate values, and if the supply is cut in two, and the demand remains at what it was before, that it does affect the rise in the price of an article the same as it would in the illustration of wheat, gold or any other article.

### The French Ratio.

Mr. Horr.—I quoted the exact words from "Coin's Financial School." What "Coin" said then I supposed for the purposes of this debate brother Harvey would stick to now. You said "during this struggle to get more silver France made a bid for it by establishing a ratio of 15 1/2 to 1, and as our ratio was 16 to 1, this made silver worth more." etc. Now, I submit that you attempted by that book to teach the people of the United States that as soon as we, or after, we had raised our ratio to 16, France made a bid by putting her ratio, and paying one-half more for silver, putting it at 15 1/2, and that she got our silver away from us by doing that. The fact is, that she didn't change her ratio at all, that her ratio had been changed thirty-one years previous to our establishing 16 to 1. And now he says France was blockaded at that time. Well, suppose she was, she didn't change her coinage in order to underbid us for silver if it had already been changed, did she? That is the thing. I had just commenced to tell you my idea about labor being the real measure of values. I have little doubt that the first unit of value, when one was adopted, was determined by the amount of human effort required to produce it. When men came to trade, they did it by barter, an exchange of one commodity for another, which was in reality only an exchange of one man's labor for another. For ages no other kind of commerce was known to the world. I want this audience to understand this principle: Money at first received its entire value from the labor represented in it, and the reason gold and silver came to be used was because each one represented a certain amount of work, and when people wanted to make exchanges their only effort was that they should get in exchange as much honest toil as they gave.

### Labor Comes In.

Now any statesman or philosopher who examines the question and proposes any mode of action, and leaves out of his calculation how his plan will affect the pay for labor, ignores the most important part of this subject and is giving his attention to a mere show.

My first criticism of this whole business of brother Harvey, and all the silver advocates, is this: They leave out of the question the great human product, labor, and the manner in which it will be affected by the legislation that they propose. Their whole plan seems to be to enable people who have run into debt to pay their debts without returning full value for what they have received, and nowhere do they take into account the much larger army of the human family who live week in and week out on their daily earnings. I have received letters, two or three of them, asking, "What do you mean, Mr. Horr, when you say that the creditors of the country outnumber the debtors, five to one?" What do I mean? Why, I mean to tell the truth. I might have expressed it a great deal stronger than that. All the men who commence their daily toil, the first hour they have labored, have become creditors for the work they have done.

Mr. Harvey.—If the reader of this debate will bear with me until we examine scientifically what a monetary system should be, I will make plain this labor question. I want first to examine the science of money. Mr. Horr can take all the credit out of this discussion that he can get, when I am through with the labor question, but for the present I ask your indulgence—let us first see what bimetallism is. Another word, I will force Mr. Horr, when I get to it, to retreat from his position that the creditors of this country outnumber the debtors. (Applause.)

Mr. Horr.—You will have a good time.

### Effect on Trade.

Mr. Harvey.—And I think he will do it voluntarily when I get there. I will

also force him from his position that increasing the primary money of the country as we would do it, is only in the interest of the debtor. I will then call his attention to the merchants and manufacturers of this country who have been doing business for 22 years on a falling market, who purchased their goods last year, for instance, and find this year that the price has fallen so that they cannot sell them for more than what they cost them (applause), or so nearly those figures that there was no profit left in the business to them, but a loss. The examination of that question and its results upon the manufacturing, mercantile and trading business of the country is startling, and it will certainly be very interesting to Mr. Horr when I give him the census figures on it.

Germany followed the United States in demonetization in July, 1873, and France and the Latin Union in January, 1874. It has been said that Germany demonetized silver in 1871. In that year she called in all the silver coins of the confederation and issued a common coin of the empire, and her mints were left open to unlimited coinage of silver till July, 1873. (Applause.) To say that Germany demonetized silver in 1871 is like the statement that we demonetized silver in 1853. (Applause.)

So, when France closed her mints in January, 1874, the mints of no large country were open to silver. Its price then began to ease off. Go back to the table now giving the commercial ratio of the two metals for 200 years and see how they parted company; beginning with 1873, gradually the commercial ratio widened. One ounce of gold soon bought 18 ounces of silver, then 20 ounces, and now at the end of a short period of 22 years one ounce of gold will buy 32 1/2 ounces of silver. For 200 years under bimetalism there was a parity. \* \* \*

### Gold as an Available Measure.

Mr. Horr.—I desire to state to Mr. Harvey that he either misinterpreted me or I misspoke myself if I said in answer to the question asked me that silver had been demonetized by the nations of the world on account of its growing cheaper. That wasn't the question asked me. The question asked me, as I remember it, was: Did the people of this country, in 1873, demonetize silver on account of its overproduction? Now, right here—I stated then and I state again now, that the nations of the world which first demonetized silver, gave as the reason that they did it because gold is a better measure of values and a better metal to be used in the great transactions of the world than silver is. I repeat it. England, in 1816, demonetized silver. Did any one ever claim that she did it because silver was cheap, or because it was scarce? At that time nothing of the kind, so far as I know, was mentioned by any one who discussed the question. Mr. Harvey seems to forget that the question of the impossibility of keeping up a double standard of measures had been argued in this country for one century. The great philosophers of the world—the greatest philosophers of the world—had said over and over again that a double standard or measure of value was as impossible as a double standard of weight. Locke had said so, Sir Isaac Newton had said so, Copernicus had written a book and said so. Every man—so far as I know—of brains in those early centuries had written that it was impossible to do business with two measures of value.

Mr. Harvey.—Mr. Horr said that when England demonetized silver in 1816 and when the Paris conference was held, and when Dr. Linderman and, as the Tribune calls them, his co-conspirators at Washington advocated it, none of them mentioned or thought of the overproduction of silver as reason for it. I quote him correctly, I think, and the table that I have given you last so thoroughly disposes of that argument that I am not surprised at Mr. Horr for yielding that position. It is one of the remarkable instances wherein this debate is of great value to the people of the United States that we eliminate these disputed points as we go along.

### Decline of Values.

It seems to worry Mr. Horr that I have not backed down yet on any fact or proposition stated in "Coin's Financial School," except in one instance, and that exception is what makes the worry the greater for him, because in that one instance where I said that the silver coined prior to 1873 was \$105,000,000, the correction of the error shows that it is \$143,000,000. The only error thus far that Mr. Horr has found in the book is an error that was against us. (Applause.) Now, as to the prosperity of this country between 1879 and 1892. You could not break down a great nation like this in one year. It has taken a short period to bring us to the bitter cup of disappointment and distress. Each four years the political parties have charged each other with having destroyed the prosperity of the previous four years. (Applause and laughter.) In 1884 the Democrats arraigned you, the Republicans, with being responsible for the terribly hard times, and on that they put in Mr. Cleveland. But in 1888 you came back at the Democrats, and you arraigned them for the terrible disaster that spread from ocean to ocean. (Applause and laughter.) And the poor working man who was out of employment and the people, knowing that something was wrong, but not knowing what it was, believed what you said, Mr. Horr, and the Republican orators, and they voted the Democrats out. Why? Because of the distress in this country, resulting from some unknown cause, and Mr. Harrison was elected. But when 1892 came, then came the Democrats and accused you, Mr. Horr, and the Republicans, of all the sins that were then piled upon the people, and the people again knowing that something was wrong, but not knowing

what it was, believed that Mr. Harrison and his party were responsible for it and voted them out.

Now, since 1892, a flood of calamities have come. No. Don't you in this debate refer to the prosperity of this country from 1873 to 1895.

The word "tramp" was coined in 1873, and the United States census shows that depression has been increasing at a disproportionate ratio. So has the number of penitentiary convicts, persons confined in all classes of prisons, insane asylums, and of suicides. No, don't you refer to the prosperity that has built up millionaires and multimillionaires and strewed this country with millions of tramps and paupers and men that don't know how they are going to provide for their families in the coming year. (Applause.)

Referring to that table I last gave you, the fourth column gives the world's quantity ratio between gold and silver produced in the world. The fifth column gives the commercial ratio. Between 1545 and 1560, the quantity ratio was 36 6-10 of silver to 1 of gold. Between 1581 and 1600, it was 58 8-10 of silver to 1 of gold. From that time on down to 1850, the relative proportion fluctuates. For 1801 and 1810, it is 50 3-10 of silver to 1 of gold.

By 1850, a sudden change sets in and the relative quantity that year is only 14 3-10 of silver to 1 of gold. By 1855, the relative production has fallen to only 4 4-10 of silver to 1 of gold. Then it rises again, and in 1893 it is 18 6-10 of silver to 1 of gold. In 1871-75, at the period of demonetization, it is 11 3-10 to 1 of gold; less than 16 of silver to 1 of gold at the very time of demonetization.

This table covers a period prior to 1873 of 328 years. In that time the quantity ratio between the two metals fluctuated, as we see, enormously, from 56 to 1 to 4 to 1, and yet the commercial ratio hung tenaciously to the legal ratio. A change in relative production had no effect as long as the mints were open to the two metals. (Applause.)

### Corrects Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Horr.—I desire right now to see if I can state my proposition so plainly that brother Harvey will cease to misquote me, or attempt to drive me into a position which I do not occupy. I have never said that the cheap price of silver was not on account of its overproduction, I have never intimated anything of the kind; and in order that you may understand me, and have it last over twenty-four hours, I will tell you now, silver has become cheap in this world just precisely the same as wheat and iron and zinc and lead and other articles have been cheapened, just precisely for the same reason. (Applause.)

I want to state this proposition: All of these articles have been cheapened by the natural laws which govern the production of every substance known to the producers in the world.

Mr. W. D. Wilcox, of Chicago—How about gold?

Mr. Horr.—Gold the same. I am glad you asked me. That is a question I will answer right now. Gold has depreciated in value in less than 100 years 50 per cent. It is cheaper now than it was in 1873. All articles that can be produced by inventions are cheaper than they were before the invention was made. Every method which brings machinery into play and puts less human toil into the production of any article, cheapens that article. The whole trend to civilization is to cheapen human products, gold as well as silver and wheat. A large number of the articles to-day produced in the world have not been decreased in value at all by the demonetization of silver, simply because the laws of production have crowded down the price. How do I know that gold is cheaper than it was in 1873? I will tell you. Now listen (addressing Mr. Wilcox): you are a younger man than I am, and you have a respectable face—I wish I could say as much for the crazy man beside you. As to the measure of value by human toil: The rate of wages, the amount of gold that a man can get for a certain number of hours' work, tells me whether gold has decreased in price or not. I can get to-day twice as much gold for a day's work following the plow as I did in 1849. The people of this country are paid in gold for their work; so they were in 1860. Wages are 70 per cent higher, paid in gold, for the same amount of work than in 1860. Has not gold depreciated then when you measure it with the great commodity of human toil?

What I find fault with is, that the silver men invariably leave out of their calculation this article of labor, and the article of labor is the greatest known in the civilized world. You think for a moment. Do you know how much would have to be produced in this great nation of ours to supply the necessities of life before we accumulate property at all? Before there is anything left of accumulated capital this nation alone has to be supplied with \$15,000,000,000 of products. That much has to be produced by the workers of this country to supply the consumption of the people. Consequently the question of how labor is paid is a great question in this and every other country.

### Present Purchasing Power of Gold.

Mr. Harvey.—Mr. Horr says that everything has been cheapened, including gold. To say that gold and products cheapen simultaneously is a financial contradiction. You buy gold by exchanging other property for it. When it takes more property to buy gold than formerly, gold has risen. Instead of becoming cheaper, gold has become dearer. That is the case now. And yet Mr. Horr, by sophistry, reasons that it has become cheaper. He says to the laboring man: You can buy more with a gold dollar now than you ever could, and then turns to you and says that gold is growing cheaper all the time. He transforms himself at pleasure from a dear dollar advocate to a cheap dollar advocate.

(Continued July 23.)