

demonetized. It is, however, equally undeniable that labor saving machinery has aided to produce wheat and cotton at less cost than in former years, just as labor saving machinery has aided to reduce the cost of producing both gold and silver. Nor can I see that to destroy one half the circulating medium of the United States is equal to destroying one half the national wealth. I cannot believe that statement true were $\frac{1}{2}$ the money of the whole world destroyed instead of the fraction of it represented by the silver coinage of the United States, which is a little less than one-seventh of the whole. The wealth of the world is its surplus production in all pursuits that the civilization of the race has made necessary to the convenience and existence of man. Gold and silver of themselves are only intrinsically valuable as they are necessary to satisfy the desires of the race. For centuries, however, these metals have been invested by mankind with an additional value. They have been established as a measure to accommodate the demand of the race for an easier exchange of products. If all the gold and silver of the world were destroyed there would be no fewer buildings, the productive capacity of the soil would not necessarily be diminished, steamboats, railroads, cattle, and so on would remain—every particle of the surplus production of the human family—the accumulation of ages would remain as before. The only direct loss would be the amount of human labor involved in the production of the articles in metals destroyed. There would, of course, be consequential damages. All producers would suffer, and suffer materially, just as we are now suffering because of the design to destroy half of our money or rather to rob half the measure of its measure character. Mankind would soon establish another. There would not long be no representative of the wealth which was subject to barter. But this wealth—the surplus product of the ages—would remain, less valuable, of course, because more difficult to dispose of.

Everything that facilitates trade promotes values. Confidence promotes trade. Therefore it measures values. This is the chief argument of the disciple of a gold standard. He argues that the United States alone of all the advanced nations in a commercial sense, cannot force a bimetallic standard; and that, as other nations would distrust our securities, the effect would be a loss of confidence, and consequently a decrease in domestic values. The argument is well taken, and were it not overcome by other conditions would be invulnerable. Europe might reject our securities, yet our inherent wealth would remain just the same. The argument as to confidence would apply with more force did Europe not already largely own our securities. Suppose we do declare that a legal tender for all debts in this nation shall be either gold or silver at a fixed ratio? And suppose Europe does object and declare that we have agreed to pay in gold? Europe will not part with our securities under these circumstances as many timid bond holders apprehend, for the simple and yet effective reason that to force these securities upon this nation under the conditions that a bi-metallic standard must establish would be to depreciate enormously their own holdings. Moreover, our contracts, as has already been

shown, can never be filled. Gold enough does not exist for this nation alone to meet its obligations with. Every gold debt is paid by contracting another, if not a larger gold debt. This is not alone true of the United States. It is true of all nations and all people. Those that demand a single standard, are placing on their children, and their children's children, for untold generations, a burden from which they can escape only by death or by repudiation. In that day repudiation will be enshrined in loyal hearts as the highest type of patriotism. The farther we depart from a double standard the nearer we approach that condition when mankind at large will be the slave of a few in the stronger nations of the earth.

Confidence is a great factor in human affairs. But the absolute and unquestioned ability of a man to keep his contracts is vastly better. If we sacrifice the confidence of Europe, and by reason of the high intelligence, foresight, invention and industry of our people, we still produce a profit, it will serve us in much better stead than the wealth of usurers who lend to us that they may own us. This nation is too rich to be destroyed, her people too intelligent and industrious to remain unclothed or hungered, because a few European money-lenders have lost confidence in us for the reason that we will insist on recognizing the value of two measures for the wealth that, under the blessing of God, we have produced and saved to the world.

Yet were it true that the loss of confidence would leave us to go naked and without food, what worse then than now? Business today is paralyzed because we cannot pay what we owe. Has the nation done too much business, or has it gone too much in debt? If it has done too much business then to curtail is essential to a re-establishment of confidence; and to curtail means a continuance of existing conditions, of enforced idleness to men, and perhaps starvation. If we have not done too much business, then we have gone too much in debt—we have had too much speculation. The volume of business being legitimate the debt was necessary, because the circulating medium was insufficient, and because the cry of wise and the unwise ones alike in the east has been for a destruction of one half the representative of our wealth.

Are we then to secure a return of European confidence by continuing in the way that inevitably leads to distress and ruin? By an increase of eighty per cent in the credit transactions above what they were during these times,—when we are suffering through excess of the credit system already?

While confidence enhances values, money enhances values also. But there is this advantage to money—it keeps values enhanced. Of all qualities that seem generally advanced confidence is the most noted. Yet it is the most ungrateful, calloused and treacherous in all the infamous list of attributes peculiar to human affairs. This much should always be borne in mind—that Europe is unable to feed herself or her animals. She cannot produce the clothes she wears independently of the world; and she is dependent on the other continents for her money. Does it not seem that she is designed for a servant? And yet America, the young giant, with locks of wool, bone of iron and steel, veins of

gold and silver, and a soil to produce food for billions, is told by her own degenerate children, who love money better than freedom, that she must bow to the demands of a country that would seem doomed to ultimate pauperism.

Europe is as the old man, ripe in years, whose productive days are well-nigh past. With discretion he has saved and can exist now by lending to the younger nations. The more money the younger nations possess the less they will need to borrow and the lower will be the rates of interest, until the aged lender must ultimately consume his principal or starve. To prevent this, money must be kept scarce, and the only kind of money that shall anywhere be recognized as a standard must be the gold which the veteran usurer and usurper alone possesses. Thus the rates of interest are maintained and wealth can be exchanged only by the medium which Europe has established. So long as the strength and ignorance of the Western hemisphere continue there will be underlings, following the wake of European sentiment, to hold this theory up to approval, and when the load of debt grows irksome and the young nations increase in other wealth, there are not wanting a class to warn us that we are destroying confidence and imperiling our future and existence by pursuing a course that will lead the usurer to fear us.

Of all the gold money in the world the U. S. Mexico, Cuba, Hayti, Canada and South America own \$735,000,000,000 one fifth—China, India, and Africa, have not a dollar. Japan has \$90,000,000—all the rest is in Europe. Why should not Europe, as the owner of four-fifths of the world's gold, want a gold standard so that she may control absolutely the only measure of values, and so dictate terms to all the world?

The gross production of gold in 1890 was \$116,000,000. Of this the United States supplied \$32,000,000, and all the rest of this continent \$11,000,000—in all about \$43,000,000. This leaves to Africa, Russia and Australia, and the balance of the world, \$73,000,000. Herein it becomes evident why the interests of these nations lie—in the maintenance of gold as a single standard. If we absolutely degrade silver, we cut off so far as this continent is concerned in a mining sense the production of gold and lead; because these metals are found in conjunction, and are seldom mined separately. It is estimated that our silver-lead ores carry from 33 to 66 per cent of gold. If by the complete demonetization of silver, therefore, we stop the production of silver we also reduce the output of gold say 50 per cent. This would leave the gold production of this continent at about \$21,500,000 as against \$43,000,000 now—or about 25 per cent of the world's gross product as against nearly 40 per cent heretofore.

Of the world's product of \$166,000,000 in silver, however, in the same year this continent contributed \$140,000,000, or over five-sixths. Take the total value of gold and silver produced by all the rest of the world in 1890 (leaving out this continent) and it aggregates about \$100,000,000. The combined gold and silver product of this continent was over \$180,000,000. In the light of the contest now waging against silver surely these figures are significant. Let silver once be rehabilitated by all the nations and what would be the result? The