SENATOR GORMAN AROUSED.

MR. WOLCOTT PROVOKES HIM TO A SCORCHING REBUKE.

He Indignantly Resents the Often-repeated Insinuation that the Repeal Senators Are Controlled by Improper Motives, and Says the Course of the Silver Filibusters Has Done More to Belittle the Senate than Anything that Has Ever Occurred in that Body—He Speaks of Mr. Voorhees's Management of the Bill as Liberal and Considerate to the Minority and Defends the President from the Charge of Using the Power and Patronage of the Administration to Force the Bill Through the Senate.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 27.—After the introduction of some resolutions the Senate to-day proceeded to the consideration of the Dubois resolution looking to a postponement of action on financial, tariff, and Federal election measures until next January, when the States of Washington, Montana, and Wyoming may be fully represented in the Senate, and Mr. Dubois spoke in its support. He described the importance of the question involved. Three States were now, he said, deprived of their vote and importance in measures that were vitally important to them. It was no fault of the people of those three States that they were not fully represented in the Senate. It was their misfortune, which the Senate could cure. He had no reasonable doubt that if his resolution were accepted the Governors and Legislatures of the three States would see to it that their full quota of Senators would be in the Senate before the time fixed by him. He imagined the case of a "force bill" being brought before the Senate while three of the Southern States were only partially represented, or the case of a tariff bill pending when three New England States were in the like position; and he asked whether, in the one case, the constitutional right of every State to have two Senators at all times would not be perfectly plain to Senators from the South, and, in the other case, be equally plain to Senators from New England. It was dangerous, he said, to proceed with the pending legislation until those States, which were so seriously affected by it, had a proper representation in the Senate.

Mr. Mitchell (Rep., Or.) said that while regretting, as much as the Senator from Idaho could regret, the fact that those three States were deprived, for the time being, of one Senator each, he regarded the proposition of that Senator as one of the most remarkable that had ever been presented to the Senate. For that reason, notwithstanding his great sympathy with those three States, he should oppose the resolution to the bitter end. He put the case of a Senator who had died, or had been expelled, and asked whether the Senate should then "call a halt" until the vacancy was filled. Such a proposition could not be maintained for a solitary moment, either now or at any other time. What steps had those States taken during the last month looking to a full representation in the Senate? Had the Governor of any one of them convened the Legislature for the purpose of filling them?

Mr. Chandler (Rep., N. H.) suggested to Mr. Dubois not to press the resolution for action, but to let it go over for the present, because the course of events might in a few days show its adoption to be unnecessary. He was willing to vote at any time to postpone action on the Federal Election law and on the tariff. But inasmuch as he proposed now to vote for the passage of the Repeal bill, he was not prepared to decide whether he would or would not vote to postpone action on that bill until after these three vacant seats were filled. He suggested that the consideration of the resolution be postponed until debate on the pending question be exhausted. It was conceded, he said, that there were many days yet of debate before the Repeal bill could be voted on, and if there should appear to be a large majority in favor of the Repeal bill, so that three additional votes against it would not affect the result, then he should emphatically vote "No" on the resolution. On the other hand, if it should appear probable that the votes would be so cast that the bill could not be passed with the three vacant seats filled, he should hesitate a long time before he insisted upon it that such a great question should be decided differently from the way in which it would be decided if the Senate were full.

Mr. Platt (Rep., Conn.) asked Mr. Chandler how he proposed to ascertain the probabilities of the vote on the Repeal bill.

Mr. Chandler replied that he proposed to use his own judgment on that point. Mr. Chandler then referred to the change of votes on the admission of the three appointed Senators, and quoted Mr. Mitchell as saying last session that the admission of Senators would have a majority of from twelve to fifteen.

Mr. Mitchell denied that he had made that statement, but admitted that he had said they would have a majority.

Mr. Chandler—And lo and behold! after the Senate met in this extraordinary session that majority of 12 to 15 had vanished. I make no accusation against Senators who have changed their opinion, their attitude, and their vote on that question. I make no imputation on their motives. I am bound to presume that they were not influenced by their desire for the passage of the Repeal bill or by their desire to increase the Democratic majority in the Senate.

Mr. Mitchell—I presume that the Senator refers to the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Peffer).

Mr. Chandler—I did not propose to name any Senator, but, as the Senator from Oregon has referred to the Senator from Kansas, I want to say that I honor the Senator from Kansas for changing his vote and giving his reasons for doing so much more than I honor Senators who changed their minds and gave no reasons. I introduced no name in this debate. The Senator from Oregon has chosen to introduce one. I question the motives of no Senator on this floor. They are as sincerely and they have all the right to change their minds on any question. I simply say that a surprise came when Senators were excluded from those three States whose votes would be given against the passage of this bill. The pending resolution presents a question for candid and deliberate consideration. Unless I change my mind I shall vote for the passage of the Repeal bill; but there is no exigency that requires it to be decided one way or the other while there are three unfilled vacant seats in this body.

Mr. Hoar (Rep., Mass.) made some remarks as to the vote on the Montana case, in the course of which he referred to a "compromise." The word was caught up by Mr. Butler (Dem., S. C.), who wanted to know why a "compromise" might not be had on the Repeal bill.

When Mr. Wolcott (Rep., Col.) expressed his gratification that the resolution had been offered; not, he said, that any practical benefit would come out of it, but because it would make known to the people of the three States concerned that their interests were not overlooked, and because it would be a warning to them that they were neglecting the highest duty which citizenship imposed. Then he went on to talk of the action of the Senate on the claim for representation of the three States and said:

"By some sudden and inexplicable change that vote underwent a complete metamorphosis. Votes that were supposed to be in favor of admitting those Senators were cast against their admission. But I do not care to inquire into that. There have been marvellous and unusual changes during the last two months; but what gain can there be for inquiring into them? They remind me very much of that old wise saying of Sancho Panza, that 'every man is as God has made him, and a great deal worse.' (Laughter.) I cannot now conceive how the people of those three States can fail in view of the pending resolution to reform their functions. They may yet have time to be represented in the Senate when the vote on the Repeal bill is taken. I do not admit that there is any question in the tariff that should disturb them. If that was the only question, they could afford to wait for some party or political advantage. But that which is vital to the whole country, and not only vital but essential to the life of those three States, is the bill now pending in the Senate, and if the people of those three States are not negligent of every duty which citizenship imposed, they will send their representatives to the Senate. It would be infinitely better for the welfare of the country that every new Senator from those States should be Democratic, Republican, or even Populist, than that the great silver question should be overshadowed, and that a bill should be permitted to pass that would degrade and impoverish the people.

"Mr. President," he continued, with increasing earnestness, "they will be in time to vote. But from ten to thirty days' notice is required in any of those States for the convening of the Legislature. They will yet elect (if they elect promptly) their Senators to come here to vote on the pending bill. That will be true in spite of the cruel and unusual hours to which the Senate is subjected. Cruel and unusual, in view of the effort which was formally made that if Senators in favor of the bill would embrace cloture and the previous question, they could have a vote upon it. We know that the other side of the chamber is not in favor of cloture or the previous question. We know that on this side of the chamber (outside of the silver Senators) there are many Senators not favoring it. If, then, you will not vote what will permit you to close debate, if you will not amend your rules——"

Here he could finish the sentence he was asked by Mr. Aldrich (Rep., R. I.) whether he spoke for all the Senators who sympathized with him on the silver question when he said the vote on cloture might be had without much debate.

Mr. Wolcott's reply was that he did not speak for all, but that he spoke for many, and that he was safe in saying that if Senators wished a vote on cloture they could have it infinitely quicker than they could have a vote on the Repeal bill. The Senator from Indiana (Mr. Voorhees) had said that it would take weeks and months to determine the cloture question; but it would not. If that Senator introduced a resolution for cloture he could have a vote upon it within a reasonable time, and very many of those Senators who agreed with him on the silver question would interpose no debate or opposition.

Mr. Aldrich—Does the Senator mean to have us infer from that that we cannot have a vote upon the question of repeal within a reasonable time?

Mr. Wolcott—I will come to that in a moment. I mean to say that the Senator from Rhode Island will have a vote on the Repeal bill at such time as those who debate the question on this floor may determine to be reasonable, and not before. If we are not to have cloture, there should not be cruel or unusual hours. We are having them now, and we are meeting them as fairly as men can who desire to see that the question is presented fairly before the country. But we are not without information that the burden which is now imposed upon us is to be made heavier next week. We are not without definite information that an arrangement has been already consummated between certain Senators on this side of the chamber and certain Senators on the other side of the chamber. The arrangement is understood to have been made between the Senator who is supposed to be the "steerer" of so many Democratic Senators on the other side as have left their party and its platform and ranged themselves with the fortunes of the Executive, and a Senator who was supposed to belong to this side of the chamber, both Senators being now seated very close together. (The allusion was to Senators Sherman and Aldrich.)

"We understand," Mr. Wolcott continued, "that we are to be met with a demand that the Senate shall meet at 11 in the morning and sit until midnight. What may be accomplished by that sort of process I do not know. But I do know that in view of the fact that a vote may be had on the previous question or on cloture, any attempt to harass a body of men who believe the pending bill to be a question of the most vital importance, and who desire to interpose every honorable obstacle to the fatal step—any attempt to compel us to sit here longer than the hours which gentlemen should be called upon to sit in a public body is cruel and unusual, and, Mr. President," he added determinedly, "it will be futile."

The discussion was then taken up by Mr. Allen (Pop., Neb.), who favored the adoption of Mr. Dubois's resolution, although he said he voted against the claim of the Montana Senator. He yielded to Senators Hill, Gray, and Butler to reply to some of the points made by him.

Then Mr. Gorman (Dem., Md.), who had been offended and irritated by the personal allusions to himself in the speeches of Senators Chandler and Wolcott, rose and addressed the Senate. He said that the course of the opponents of the Repeal bill had done more to belittle the Senate in the eyes of the people of the whole country than anything that had ever before occurred in the body. He believed that the time would come, and that speedily, when some of the actors in those scenes would regret the parts they had played, and would atone as best they might for having brought the Senate from a position of a great deliberative body to that of a county convention or a city Board of Aldermen. He had not taken part in the discussion. He was, therefore, amazed that the distinguished Senator from Colorado (for whom he had had great personal respect and friendship) should at the last forget the great duty of an American Senator as to bring into the discussion matters which did not belong to it. He was amazed that that Senator should indulge in the insinuation that Senators were controlled by motives not proper. When the Senator did so (for the first time he let Mr. Gorman) he attributed it to excitement, and to the fact that the Senator represented a State which was intensely interested in the question and desired to serve it; and he felt that the Senator ought not to be held to strict account for his conduct, and ought not to be confined to those limits of expression to which Senators are ordinarily confined.

Mr. Wolcott—I ask the Senator to what he refers? I am unconscious of any intimation that could offend him.

Mr. Gorman—The Senator from Colorado has intimated that Senators on this floor changed their votes on the question of the admission of Senators from the States of Washington, Montana, and Wyoming, and he again repeated this morning (as did the Senator from New Hampshire), that, while he respected one Senator who had changed his vote from being in favor of admission to being against it, and had given his reasons therefor, he did not know how to think of two others who had changed their votes in the same way and had given no reasons.

Mr. Wolcott—At this moment I beg to say that if the Senator from Maryland will read the report of my remarks, he will fail utterly to find in them any expression of the kind.

Mr. Gorman—Of course I accept the disclaimer of the Senator, but I venture to say that no man who can read the English language and understands it would have drawn any other conclusion from his remarks uttered a few days ago and from those uttered to-day. I will not permit, even with the disclaimer of the Senator, which I accept, that matter to rest as is. I wish to tell each of those Senators (Messrs. Chandler and Wolcott) and the Senate and the country that the question of the admission of Senators, under conditions which obtained in Montana, Washington, and Wyoming, was a new question in this body. It was a question which had taxed the best legal minds of the Senate. It is no secret that the distinguished Senator (Mr. Hoar), who made the majority report, frankly admitted that, only some days before, he had expressed an opinion contrary to that embodied in his report. So far as I know, and I believe, every Senator voted under his oath as he believed to be right in that case. With great doubts in my own mind as to what my duty was, I preferred to follow the majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I am one of the few members of this body who are not lawyers, and I leaned, necessarily and naturally, on the great lawyers of the committee. I followed that majority and voted for the admission of the Senator from Montana, as did my distinguished friend, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Voorhees). When that vote was taken (without pressure, so far as I know; without any attempt to influence any member of the body) the verdict was that the Governor of the State of Montana had not the right to make the appointment. When the motion was made to reconsider the vote, the Senator from Indiana and myself at once said: "Doubtful as this question has been and is, we will not consent to vote for the seating of these gentlemen in order that any other question shall be brought in here to change the verdict of this body, which has been given without regard to silver or gold;" and we changed our votes, voting against the motion to reconsider, so that the record of this great body might run perfect and appropriate. I do not believe that the Senator from Colorado will stand on the statement he made to-day, for I take it that he referred to the Senator from Rhode Island when he described a Senator from the other side of the chamber. When he described a Senator on this side as a "steerer," I ask him if he meant me.

Mr. Wolcott—I have been advised that there has been a consultation of Senators going on for some days. We are advised that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Aldrich) is marshalling the forces of the friends of repeal on this side of the chamber, and, that on the other side of the chamber, the Senator from Maryland has been marshalling the friends of repeal on that side, with a view of agreeing upon some further and more rigorous measures to compel the Senate to sit for long hours in order to force a vote. I shall be very glad if we have been misinformed.

Mr. Gorman (exhibiting an unusual degree of feeling, and speaking with much deliberation)—Mr. President, I have been a member of this body twelve years; I have been connected with it from the time that I was twelve years of age; I have seen during the last forty years all the great men who have represented sovereign States of this Union on this floor; I have witnessed in this body scenes of great excitement when the interest of States and sections was involved; I have seen great measures affecting the currency of the country disposed of; I have seen taxation levied which was a burden to crush great sections of our common country; but this is the first instance that I have known of a Senator, through himself or his agents, listening at the doors of a committee room, or receiving information from eavesdroppers, and then telling the Senate of the private conferences of Senators on any subject.

Mr. Gorman paused, as if to let the full force of the last sentence be realized, and then he added:

"It is not necessary, Mr. President, to say more of such an incident. But let me say to Senators on the other side of the question that this great measure is managed and controlled by one who is venerable in the public service, whose ability is equal to that of any of his peers on this floor; that he has managed it (surrounded as he has been with opponents on both sides of the chamber) as well as, if not better, than it could have been managed by any man within the sound of my voice, and with a degree of fairness and liberality to the minority which I have never seen exceeded in this chamber. He has been kind and courteous and willing to give all the time you (addressing the opponents of the bill) wanted, and to suit your own convenience. And it has been impossible for the Senator from Colorado, or any other Senator, to say that he has not been treated with perfect fairness. I have been simply content to follow him. I am not managing it or leading it for him. He is more able and capable of doing it than any man that I know of. And yet for that generosity, for that forbearance, for that consideration of your (again addressing the opponents of the bill) personal convenience, of your public duties, he has been treated with a want of consideration which I have never seen equalled on this floor. As a silent member of this body I have regretted it. I have hoped that reason would resume its sway, and that Senators would come back to the rule which has always prevailed in this body. I have hoped that the time would come—not possibly on this bill, but mainly upon this bill—when something might be done that would conciliate and accommodate."

Mr. Gorman went on to say that the extraordinary treatment of the case on the other side had not been confined alone to the intimations of want of good faith on the part of the supporters of the bill, but had gone to the extent of indicting, or attempting to indict, the Chief Magistrate of the Union, and to charge that he had used the power and patronage of the Government for the purpose of forcing the bill through. He (Mr. Gorman) was not the mouthpiece or spokesman of the President. He knew nothing about the President's patronage, and cared nothing for it. He had never had it nor wished it. But it was due to the President to say that no man could have been more careful to avoid using the great powers of his office for party good. If he might be criticised at all, it would be proper to say that he had been so careful that he had scarcely done the party justice. He hoped and trusted that the Senate would come back, and speedily, to the unwritten law of the body, which was more binding than written rules, and would remember that there was nothing to be compared with the importance of preserving the Senate's reputation for fair dealing, for full and free discussion, and for final action without personalities.

Mr. Aldrich (Rep., R. I.) said that he did not deem it incumbent on him to make any disclaimer as to any consultation that he might have had with Senators on either side of the chamber. But any assertion that he had ever at any time undertaken, in any conversation or conference, to represent anybody but himself, was the would say to the Senator from Colorado) not true, whoever that Senator's informant might be, or whether he had or had not obtained his information as the Senator from Maryland had intimated. And he now said to the Senator from Colorado that he intended, on his own responsibility as a Senator, to coöperate with the Senator from Maryland, or with any other Senator in saving the American Senate, if possible, from further humiliation in the eyes of the American people. The question whether the Senate should be permitted to legislate to carry out its constitutional functions was a question above party and above party consideration. If, at the dictation of a minority, legislation was to cease, it was high time that patriotic Senators on both sides should confer as to some method by which the Government should be preserved and carried out.

Mr. Wolcott, replying to Mr. Gorman's remarks, said he regretted that that Senator should have seen fit to inject into the discussion matters of a personal or of a slanderous nature. The Senator from Maryland would find, on examining the report of his (Mr. Wolcott's) remarks, that he had not cast the slightest reflection upon that Senator, by intent or otherwise. His disclaimer should have satisfied the Senator. But it did not; because what rankled in his mind was that he had been characterized as one of a steering committee. But he (Mr. Wolcott) had not named him by name. If the Senator was a "steerer," he ought not to have objected to a reference to that fact. He would not have risen to reply to the Senator had it not been for the fact that he had seen fit to suggest that he (Mr. Wolcott) had listened at committee room doors, and had been followed by his faithful ally and pupil, the Senator from Rhode Island, with the same intimation.

"I said," interposed Mr. Gorman, "that the Senator obtained his information from eavesdroppers who listened at doors."

"I understood," Mr. Wolcott persisted, "the Senator to intimate that I had listened at committee room doors. Nobody knows better than he that I would scorn a dishonorable method or dishonorable means. I am glad he now says that he did not say so."

Mr. Wolcott closed with a passionate appeal on behalf of the people of the silver-producing States, and received applause for his peroration.

Mr. Gallinger (Rep., N. H.) asked that the Dubois resolution lie over till to-morrow as he wished to speak upon it; but objection was made by Mr. McPherson (Dem., N. J.) and the resolution went to the calendar.

The repeal bill was then taken up, nearly an hour after the time when it might have been, and Mr. Pasco (Dem., Fla.) addressed the Senate against repeal.

Mr. Teller (Rep., Col.) then took the floor. He said that this debate had taken, within a few days, a somewhat singular direction, and to-day the Senate had been treated to a lecture as to the improprieties of the discussion. In the first place he had been rebuked for a statement to the contrary to good taste for a member of this body to criticise the President of the United States. He (Mr. Teller) would regard a personal attack upon the President as out of order. But the criticism that had been made on the President was not a personal assault. It was an official criticism of his acts; and if the doctrine were to prevail here that a Senator was not to criticise official conduct, there would be an end in this country of free government. The silver Senators were told that they were in a minority, and were resisting the public will. The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Aldrich) said that he would cooperate with any Senator to maintain the honor and prevent the humiliation of the Senate. If the keeping of the honor of the Senate was in the hands of the Senator from Rhode Island the Senate had indeed reached a sorry pass. Who made the Senator from Rhode Island keeper of the honor of the Senate? Did the Senator represent a larger constituency than other Senators did? Had he any commission to speak with reference to preserving the American Senate from humiliation and disgrace? The gentlemen who represented the great States of the Northwest were quite able to take care of their honor. They needed no assistance from the Senator from Rhode Island or anybody else. They had constituencies which were brave, enterprising, and intelligent. They would stand up and be counted with the people of Rhode Island at any time and on any day. They represented constituencies that would not take off their hats to Rhode Island.

Before the conclusion of Mr. Teller's remarks the Senate went into executive session, and at 6 o'clock adjourned until to-morrow.

A COMPROMISE SILVER BILL.

It Provides for a Commission and the Coinage of the Bullion in the Treasury.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 27.—The compromise silver measure, prepared by Senator Jones of Arkansas, was to-day introduced in the Senate by its author. It provides that there shall be a Commission composed of three Senators, to be selected by the Senate, three Representatives, to be selected by the Speaker of the House, and three persons to be selected by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The Commission is to hold its sessions in the Capitol and in such other places as a majority shall direct, and employ necessary stenographers, employees, and may administer oaths and send for persons and papers.

The Commission is to examine into the financial and monetary condition of the Government and people of the United States with a view to devising means for the betterment thereof, and to specially examine and report upon, by one or more bills, the following subjects: The full or partial remonetization of silver, and a proper ratio between it and gold; revision of legal tender laws to prevent discrimination between various descriptions of money; State bank tax repeal with necessary restrictions; the cause of the present paralysis of trade, and the necessity of legislation to prevent national banks from abusing their power.

The second section directs the Secretary of the Treasury to set apart and retain in the Treasury such of the silver bullion now in the Treasury as will be necessary to redeem the outstanding Treasury notes, in compliance with the terms of the act of July 14, 1890, and provides that the remainder of the bullion shall be set apart to be coined, and the Secretary is required to coin it at the rate of not less than 4,000,000 standard dollars per month, which, when coined, shall be an asset in the Treasury, and, while this coinage is in progress, the purchases of silver bullion under the terms of the Sherman act shall be suspended.

Mr. Morse Stops Business for Three Hours in the House.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 27.—Three hours of to-day's session of the House were occupied in an effort to secure the adoption of a resolution to which there was no objection. This apparent paradox was due to the attitude assumed by Mr. Morse (Rep., Mass.). Several days ago he made some remarks about Pension Commissioner Lochren, and said that he would include in his remarks in the *Record* some newspaper clippings. These clippings had been withheld from the *Record* by Speaker Crisp because Mr. Morse had not formally obtained unanimous consent of the House for their insertion. To-day he made the request, but Mr. Fithian (Dem., Ill.) objected, whereupon Mr. Morse declined to permit business to proceed in the absence of a quorum, and it was 3:15 before Mr. Morse could get the resolution passed, which called on the Secretary of the Treasury for the reason why he had not bought 4,500,000 ounces of silver in each of July and August, as required by the Sherman law. That having been finally accomplished, with no dissenting votes, the bill to repeal the Federal Election laws was taken up, and Messrs. Lawson (Dem., Ga.) and Daniels (Rep., N. Y.), members of the Committee on the election of President and Vice-President and Representatives in Congress, spoke respectively for and against the bill. At 5:40 the House adjourned until noon to-morrow.

Secretary Gresham on the Silver Bill.

INDIANAPOLIS, Sept. 27.—Secretary Gresham was here to-day on his way to see his mother in southern Indiana. Referring to the Silver Repeal bill, Mr. Gresham said:

"I think the Silver bill will pass. There is a clear majority in favor of it. The silver men admit it."

America Is Forging Ahead

In everything. Urbana Wine Company's "Gold Seal" Champagne is excelled by no foreign brand.—Adv.

Flint's Furniture

Always wears well, however low the price may be.—Adv.

THE REPEAL DEBATE.

SENATOR CAMERON'S SPEECH.

Delivered in the Senate at Washington on Monday, Sept. 25.

From the Congressional Record, Sept. 26.

MR. PRESIDENT: The Senate will admit that I do not often occupy its time. Nothing but conviction that our action now is vital to the public interest forces me to speak to-day.

I shall begin by calling your closest attention, not to my own views, but to those of Mr. Gladstone, the Prime Minister of England, given officially by him in the House of Commons, on the 28th of last February, when the silver question was last debated. As far as I know, this is the latest and most formal, as well as most explicit statement of the British Government on the subject.

"England," said Mr. Gladstone, "is the great creditor of the countries of the world; of that there can be no doubt whatever; and it is increasingly the great creditor of the countries of the world. I suppose there is not a year which passes over our heads which does not largely add to the mass of British investments abroad. I am almost afraid to estimate the total amount of the property which the United Kingdom holds beyond the limits of the United Kingdom; but of this I am well convinced, that it is not to be estimated by tens or hundreds of millions. One thousand millions probably would be an extremely low and inadequate estimate. Two thousand millions, or something even more than that, is very likely to be nearer the mark. I think, under these circumstances, it is rather a serious matter to ask this country to consider the question of proceeding to perform this supreme act of self-sacrifice."

I will not trouble you further with Mr. Gladstone's remarks, although he went on to develop his idea in terms even more forcible than those I have quoted. Senators can read the debate for themselves. I have no wish to excite angry feelings against any one, whether abroad or at home; but you will observe that the "supreme act of self-sacrifice" which Mr. Gladstone considers to be contrary to the interests of England as the great creditor of the world, is the attempt to maintain or restore to silver the function of serving as money.

I am tempted to sit down and leave this speech of Mr. Gladstone to stand alone as the ground for the vote I shall give on the bill now before us. It is ground enough. To my mind it carries conviction as to the true course of an American; but every one cannot be expected to leap at once across a gap which represents a lifetime of my feelings and thoughts; and not one lifetime only, but fully two hundred years of American history. I trust the Senate will have patience with me if I explain what seems to me, and perhaps to them, self-evident. I want to carry with me their unanimous assent.

More than once in this debate we have heard the remark that the United States are the greatest country in the world. The sentiment is no doubt patriotic and honorable, although I am not sure that it is perfectly good taste; but if the fact is true, or if it is even partly true, I would like to ask Senators to what our national greatness consists of. Some will say that it consists in the energy and numbers of our citizens; in their virtues, their intelligence, their education, their enlightenment; in the extent and resources of their territory, and its unrivalled variety of blessings; in its agriculture, its minerals, its rivers, and its lakes.

To all these titles to greatness I will add another. The chief claim of our nation to merit in the eyes of us who have a share in its government and in the eyes of every republican citizen, white or black, rich or poor, whose opinion we regard, is that from first to last, on all occasions and in every form, America has asserted the most emphatic possible negative to the policy and methods of the moneyed power of England. From the day when the Pilgrims landed Plymouth Rock to the day when Penn founded Philadelphia; from the day when the tea was thrown into Boston harbor to the day when Washington was inaugurated President; from the day when Jefferson imposed his embargo to the day when the civil war ended, and down to the day we passed the act now under discussion, the chief interest of our history in the struggles of America, as the result of our legislation, every principle of our national polity supports me. My vote needs no defence. If any one is to offer explanation or excuse for his vote it is not I; it is the Senators who vote on the other side. The burden of proving their case is on them.

Here I would stop, confident that Senators must all assent to the force of the reasoning, but many of my friends who agree that, as so stated, my reasoning is sound, and that the burden of proof does rest on them, advocate this measure on the ground that it is in reality hostile to the British policy; that the further depreciation of silver will increase the difficulties of England, especially in India, and will in the end force her to unite with us in restoring silver to its function as money.

I cannot admit this argument as a proper basis for our legislation. The idea of legislating for the purpose of embarrassing a foreign Government is neither dignified nor safe. I do not care to embarrass England or any other Government. Such a motive is not fit to be acted upon; still less to be avowed. Further, I doubt its success. All history proves that the moneyed interest of England never recoils before such difficulties as are suggested by this line of argument. If India suffers, India will have to submit. If the people are ruined, they will have to die. If the laboring class in England resists, it will be starved out, or will be shot down. This has been invariable experience. The moneyed interest of England will never yield until it is ruined; and if ruin is impending over it, the ruin will come without our aid.

I am therefore reluctantly obliged to dissent from my friends on this ground. Here again I might stop, and leave to Senators on the other side the task of justifying their votes, of establishing the proof of their case which I do not need for mine; but the State which I have the honor in part to represent has a right to ask more than this from the men she has chosen to express her feelings and watch over her interests here. Pennsylvania has not, as a rule, been ignored in national legislation. Her opinions have weighed for much; her interests have counted for still more.

How does this much-abused Sherman act injure Pennsylvania? In no way whatever. Under this act we increase the currency now about $54,000,000 per year, nearly enough to meet the needs of the natural increase of population. In a very few years this act will be a measure of absolute contraction. It will unduly restrict the coinage. The people of Pennsylvania want even now, and expressly require, a greater increase than this, and ask for it in paper. But what advantage has paper over silver, which has at least an intrinsic value equal to 50 per cent. of its nominal value in gold, and is also guaranteed by our gold reserve, whereas the paper would be guaranteed by the gold alone?

My friends admit this, but they say that this silver, hanging over the market, terrifies capital; prevents foreigners from investing in our securities; drives out gold, and paralyzes enterprise. Granting that we repeal this act, and granting even that you discard silver altogether, if we can find two or three or four hundred millions of gold to take its place, does any Senator venture to maintain that the sense of security will be greater? On the contrary, are we not all agreed that the danger of panic will be increased? I take no account now of the possible increase in the relative value of gold which might follow the increased demand for it. I ask you only to look at the present condition of Germany and Austria, and tell me whether any sane man, who sees the nervous apprehension caused there by the export of every few thousand of gold coins, can possibly maintain that we in America should feel safer under such a constant terror.

The condition of Europe is, in every point of view, much worse, far more complicated, and infinitely more alarming than ours. I am not, I admit, as a mere matter of personal opinion, especially anxious to see much foreign capital come here; but the probability of its coming depends far less on our silver than on their political and social prospects. This leads me to another necessary point in the situation. What is to be the effect of stopping silver coinage on our political and social conditions? Does any Senator think it will quiet them? On this point I might say much, but I want to be brief. I am not used to occupying your time. A few minutes will be enough.

We all know the history of the Sherman act. In effect it was a compromise between somewhat violent interests; a compromise in which the silver miners, the manufacturers, and the gold men acquiesced. The miners got a market for their silver; the manufacturers got a market for their goods; other interests were conciliated in their turn. In spite of this agreement silver continued to fall, or gold to rise, I care not which. The Government of England, in a sudden panic for fear that we should stop our silver coinage first, decided that something must be done, and, against the long-expressed wishes of India, the mint was closed. Silver fell; a panic followed here, and nearly the entire press and the whole capitalist class joined in calling for the closure of our mints, too.

In this cry the voice of the manufacturers was among the loudest, yet obviously the interest of the manufacturers was with silver, not with gold. I will not argue this point, which will be clear enough to those who study it. If the silver is sacrificed, the manufacturers will have lost their best friend in the States. I take it for granted that the silver States will revenge themselves by throwing all their weight on the side of a reduction of the tariff. Our manufacturers might flourish on low silver and a high tariff; they must perish on gold and a low tariff.

My tariff friends may look on this prospect with equanimity, but I advise them to talk seriously with their constituents before acting, for the time may come when the mill owners and mill operatives will hold them responsible for any evils that may follow. For my part I feel a deep sense of responsibility to my people, and I ask them to consider the wisdom of what is now passing in England shall happen in Pennsylvania, and a hundred and fifty thousand miners starving for food after a strike which has already lasted two months shall unanimously vote to continue the strike even if they die for it, rather than consent to a reduction of their wages.

The British miners, half a million of them, are to be starved into accepting low wages in order that the British Government may enhance the value of the gold in which America pays the interest on her British debts. The process is one which I would gladly avoid. The British Government refuses to shoot its miners, as it has lately done. I do not think that a Senator of the United States should legislate with a view to shooting his constituents.

Pennsylvania for 200 years has followed one invariable system. She never aims to destroy, but she tries to create, to preserve, to produce. She does not want to destroy, but to conciliate; she wants union, not discord. She tries to be gentle with the weak; to be liberal to the poor; to be generous even to her enemies, if she has any. All her influence has ever been exerted not to separate, but to unite. Within the limits of this Union her duty and her interest combine to make of her the mediator, to stand between contending forces, receiving sometimes the blows of each, but strong enough to befriend both. Beyond the limits of this Union she has never much cared to go. The rest of the world may do what it pleases; Pennsylvania has always been satisfied to mind her own business.

Acting now on these fixed principles which start and end in common facts that command, I hope, your unanimous assent, I can do nothing to hurt the interests or the feelings of another State. I will not vote to ruin Colorado or Nevada. I will vote to help them, and in return I will ask their help to assist the other weak interests that are struggling throughout the Union for existence against heavy odds. I will vote in such a way as to lighten the many difficulties of the Southern States, and aid them to keep abreast of the national movement. I will give support to every portion of our Union, remote or near, but I will not knowingly deny assistance to any, least of all to a weak or struggling State. Pennsylvania sent me here to be generous as well as to be practical, and you may be sure she will stand by me.

Then my propositions are these: We all agree that, with Europe and Asia in their present critical state of equilibrium, any silver or paper currency needs a larger guarantee than usual. For that purpose I propose a gold loan of so many hundred millions as Congress may decide, to be bought at the market rate, and held in the Treasury as the gold reserve is held in the Bank of France and by the Governments of the Latin Union.

I propose to open our mints to the free coinage of American silver, imposing a duty on the import of foreign silver.

I propose further, for the benefit of the poorer and weaker States, especially in the South, to repeal the tax on State bank circulation, a measure which is intended to give them a free hand in moving their own crops, developing their resources, and relieving them from their servitude to the great capitalist cities. I look to no effect, or but little, from this step, as far as the North is concerned.

I would also press once more for action in favor of our shipping. The bill for that purpose is known to you, and neither its object nor its methods should be a matter of party division.

To meet, in part, the deficit of our income for next year, I would reimpose the duty of two cents a pound on sugar and repeal the bounty.

Then I would wait a year to see how the system worked and how far we were affected by foreign influences.

As for our foreign exchanges, they are automatic and will take care of themselves under any system. They have done so when we had no currency at all, when we had gold, when we had irredeemable paper, and when we had silver. If Europe wants our gold, let her have it if she can pay for it; that is to say, all except the gold in our Treasury.

No general or special legislation is likely to pass this Senate unless it is comprehensive enough to command practically universal assent. To that object I have addressed myself. If any other Senator brings forward a scheme more comprehensive, more liberal, conceived in a spirit of wider or more generous union, I will give him my support.

The Yale Rush a Fizzle.

NEW HAVEN, Sept. 27.—College sport at Yale opened to-night with a meeting of the freshmen and sophomore classes on the Grammar School lot for the annual rush. The rush was a fizzle and was practically stopped by upperclass men, under instructions of the faculty. Wrestling was allowed, however, with this result: Light weight, Adams, '96, won from Wheelwright, '97; middle weight, Smith, '96, won from Campbell, '97; heavy weight, Coonley, '96, Young, '97, declared a draw.

When Baby was sick, we gave her Castoria,
When she was a Child, she cried for Castoria,
When she became Miss, she clung to Castoria,
When she had Children, she gave them Castoria.

MEN OF CORRECT TASTE

aim to have exclusive designs in Neck-dress. In our selection of Novelties we have avoided such colorings and patterns as are so frequently found in the lower grades of Silk.

TO-DAY [Thursday]

we will make a special offering of high-class neck-wear at **popular prices.** Also equal inducements in

Underwear, Hosiery and Gloves.

Gans & Co.

279, 281 AND 283 BROADWAY,
Bet. Chambers and Reade Sts.

Satisfaction guaranteed or money returned.

LIVE WASHINGTON TOPICS.

$446,459,450 OF GOVERNMENT BONDS PURCHASED SINCE 1879.

The Treasury Department Redeeming a Million and a Quarter of Soiled Paper Money Daily—Absenteeism in the House—Nominations Made by the President.

WASHINGTON, Sept. 27.—The Secretary of the Treasury has replied to the Senate resolution of the 19th inst., asking what amounts of Government bonds have been purchased since 1879; the rate and the aggregate amount of premium paid on such purchases; whether any such purchases have been made without the notice required by law, and what amount of public moneys, by years, has been deposited in national banks since 1879, and what interest these institutions paid for the use of the money. It appears from the Treasury statement that during the fourteen years covered by the inquiry bonds have been purchased only during six years, 1880, 1881, and 1888 to 1891 inclusive, the total aggregating $446,459,450, and the net premium on the same being $60,125,217.98. There were no bonds purchased from 1882 to 1887, inclusive. During that period there were outstanding bonds which had become redeemable at the pleasure of the Government, and the surplus revenues were applied to their redemption at par. There have been no purchases since 1891. In regard to the implied violation of law, the Secretary says there is no law requiring the department to give public notice of the purchase by the Government of its bonds; but that there have been no such purchases since 1877 except in pursuance of public notice. The amount of public money held by national bank depositories is found to range from a little more than $7,000,000 in 1879 to the high-water mark of almost $55,000,000 in 1888, from which point it declined to a little more than $12,000,000 for the last fiscal year. No interest has been paid for the use of this money.

The failure of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase in the months of July and August last the amount of silver required under the Sherman law was the subject of discussion by the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures to-day. The subject came before the committee in the form of a resolution introduced by Mr. Loud of California, requesting the Secretary to inform the House as to the number of ounces of silver purchased in these months, the amount offered, the price asked, and the price paid. After discussion the committee adopted a substitute for the Loud resolution offered by Mr. Dingley of Maine. The substitute, as agreed upon, requests the Secretary of the Treasury to inform the House why silver bullion was not purchased in the months of July and August to the full amount authorized by the act of July 14, 1890.

The Treasury Department is redeeming United States paper money and National Bank notes at the rate of about $1,250,000 a day. The paper money coming in for redemption is of an unusually dirty and torn character, and shows that it has been used up to the last of both, as regards health and safety of value. During the financial stringency, when paper money, and, in fact, every class of money, was scarce, banks and other holders of paper money would not part with it as long as a bill would hold together, but now that money is becoming more plentiful, the amount being sent daily to the Treasury for redemption is increasing. It takes only forty-eight hours to replace old bills with new ones; so that the holders are not kept out of their money long. Most of the new notes issued in place of the old notes destroyed are of the denominations of $5, $10, and $20.

A man has at last been found to make Senator Stewart stop talking. Curiously enough, it is Mr. Stewart's colleague in the filibustering business, Mr. Teller, who has accomplished the feat. This afternoon, when the Colorado Senator arose to continue the remarks that he was making on Sept. 11, when the Senate adjourned, he was very much annoyed by the loud talking of Mr. Stewart, who sat on the s