

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE  
PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
**Democratic National  
Convention**

This page in the original text is blank.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE  
PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
**Democratic National  
Convention**

HELD IN  
St. Louis, Mo., July 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1904

*Resulting in the Nomination of*

HON. ALTON B. PARKER

(OF NEW YORK)

FOR PRESIDENT

AND

HON. HENRY G. DAVIS

(OF WEST VIRGINIA)

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT



REPORTED BY  
MILTON W. BLUMENBERG  
OFFICIAL REPORTER

PRESS OF  
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY  
32-34 Lafayette Place  
New York

# DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION.

---

## FIRST DAY.

ST. LOUIS, MO., Wednesday, July 6, 1904.

Pursuant to the call of the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic National Convention assembled in the Coliseum this day at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chairman (Mr. James K. Jones, of Arkansas, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee) : The Convention will come to order. The Secretary will read the call for the Convention.

The Secretary read as follows :

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 18, 1904.

The Democratic National Committee, having met in the City of Washington on the 12th day of January, 1904, has appointed Wednesday, July 6, 1904, as the time, and chosen St. Louis, Missouri, as the place for holding the Democratic National Convention.

Each State is entitled to representation therein equal to double the number of its Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and each Territory, Alaska, Indian Territory and the District of Columbia shall have six delegates. All Democratic citizens of the United States who can unite with us in the effort for a pure and economical constitutional government are cordially invited to join us in sending delegates to the Convention.

JAMES K. JONES, *Chairman.*

C. A. WALSH, *Secretary.*

THE CHAIRMAN: Prayer will now be offered by the Rev. John F. Cannon, pastor of the Grand Avenue Presbyterian Church of this city.

PRAYER OF THE REV. JOHN F. CANNON, D.D.

The Rev. John F. Cannon, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father which art in Heaven, in all our ways we would acknowledge Thee in order that Thou mayest direct our paths. We bow ourselves in Thy presence and acknowledge Thee as the God in whose hands our breath is and Whose are all our ways. Lift Thou up the light of Thy countenance upon us, and bless us first of all in the forgiveness of all our sins. Turn our hearts from every evil way and incline us to the way of Thy statutes.

Humbly and gratefully we acknowledge Thee as the source of all our blessings, the Giver of every good and every perfect gift. We thank Thee for Thy unfailing goodness to us as a people. Thou hast dealt kindly and well with Thy servants. Thou hast cast our lot in a pleasant land, and we have a goodly heritage. May we possess it in Thy fear. May we have the blessedness of that people whose God is the Lord.

Give us that righteousness which exalteth a nation and save us from sin, which is a reproach to any people. Let peace and plenty prevail within all our borders, and let righteousness and justice be our sure defense. Let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end. Cause strife and oppression to cease out of our land. Drive evil men from places of honor and power, and let the righteous be exalted in their stead. God of our fathers, bless us as a people and make us a blessing to all the nations of the earth.

O Thou Master of assemblies, let Thy blessing come upon this Convention. Guide these representatives of the people by Thy counsel. Replenish them with the wisdom which is from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

Drive out of every breast all unworthy passions and prejudices and ambitions, and let all be controlled by a holy passion for the right. And may such conclusions be reached and such action taken as shall be in harmony with Thy will, for the glory of Thy name and our country's good. We humbly ask in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### TEMPORARY OFFICERS.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am directed by the National Committee to nominate as temporary officers of this organization the following gentlemen:

Temporary Chairman—Hon. John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi.

Temporary Secretary—Hon. Charles A. Walsh, of Iowa.

Temporary Sergeant-at-Arms—Hon. John I. Martin, of Missouri.

Official Reporter—Milton W. Blumenberg, of Illinois.

First Assistant Secretary—W. A. Deford, of Kansas.

Assistant Secretaries—G. C. Smith, of Kansas; Lee A. Day, of California; Walter Butler, of Iowa; Charles M. McCabe, of Tennessee; W. E. Longnecker, of Missouri; Thomas F. Smith, of New York.

Are there any other nominations? If there are none, the question is on agreeing to the recommendation of the National Committee.

The recommendation was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair appoints two Democrats who have grown old in the service of the party and whose presence in this Convention gives us earnest of great success hereafter—Col. James M. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Michael F. Tarpey, of California—a committee to escort Mr. Williams to the chair.

The Committee appointed for the purpose escorted Mr. Williams to the platform.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, I have the honor to present to you your Temporary Chairman, Hon. John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. [Applause.]

SPEECH OF THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi):

Ladies and gentlemen, this is an appropriate place and an appropriate time for a great Democratic National Convention.

The place is St. Louis, the chief city of the most populous State carved out of the Louisiana Territory, acquired by the Father of Democracy. The time is the centennial anniversary celebration of the acquisition of that territory. It was a vast area of contiguous territory, whose possession was necessary for our self defense and which was fitted in climate and soil for home-making by the sons and daughters of the Republic. It was a real and not a pseudo expansion. It was not a step in British colonization, but the first step in American expansion—an expansion of our population, our industrial life and our free institutions over uninhabited lands, or lands sparsely settled by savages whose tribal independence we recognized by treating with them, or settled in spots by white men easily and willingly assimilated; not a so-called expansion by mere superimposition of our flag and our military authority. [Applause.]

The Democratic party afterwards guided the country to further expansions of this real, free and American character, in the acquisition of Florida, the admission of Texas as a State, and in the acquisition from Mexico of the magnificent "Far West," all fit to be made States in the Union and governed under the Constitution.

The most important quadrennial event in the world is the election by the American people of their Chief Executive. [Applause.] Before the great election takes place, at which all men are supposed to arrive at a choice by ways of honesty and intelligence—would to God they did—at least two minor elections of a different character are held. There have always been at least two great parties which, since the first National



political convention, have elected delegates to conventions for the purpose of selecting candidates and promulgating a platform. One of these parties has gone through its party election of delegates, has selected a candidate and announced a platform. It was one of the quietest and "most unanimous" occasions that the muses of history have recorded. [Applause.] Everything seemed fixed beforehand. There are some conveniences about a convention of that sort. One of them is that the temporary chairman knows six or nine months beforehand that he is going to be temporary chairman. He also knows what he is wanted to say, and can compare it with what he wants to say. I could appreciate that I assure you. [Laughter.] The permanent chairman also knows half a year beforehand what is expected of him. The platform comes ready written—no discussion about it—and is perhaps revised by the candidate himself, who has also been agreed upon.

The address of the Temporary Chairman of the Republican National Convention was, in one sense, historical; in this sense that it dealt much in history at any rate—most of it ancient history, and a great deal of it false history. [Applause.] There was a labored argument to prove that the party of Roosevelt must, by something like evolutionary process, I suppose, act as the party of Lincoln and McKinley. This was necessary in order to disguise the palpable fact that it is not so acting. Not without reason, then, this labored argument by this great, and ingenious lawyer! It was to draw away attention from "Rooseveltism"—its volcanic, eruptive, and reckless character—that he dwelt so lingeringly upon the fact that at some period of its history the Republican party had been "a party which did things" and did them safely. The orator hoped to have the country lose sight of the fact that it is now, in both of its legislative branches, a party of passivity, of non-action, of obstruction to reform and progress; a party whose only sacred precept is a shibboleth which maketh known one of its members to the other—a shibboleth drawn from the gamblers' table, "stand pat"; a precept born of cowardice and fear to move. [Applause.]

I shall not pay undue attention to the temporary chairman of

the Republican Convention. After interrogating in the light of reason a few of his utterances, I shall pass on to the authoritative voice of his party, which is its platform. His speech was principally notable for containing the proof of the fact that Mr. Root knew how to pay a debt. The country has not yet forgotten that Mr. Roosevelt not long since paid a glowing tribute to his cabinet, which wound up substantially with the sentiment, "and the greatest of these is Root." But let us read first what the President did say of the junior member of the mutual admiration society. I find it in the *American Review of Reviews*, from the pen of Walter Wellman:

"Ordinarily the President of the United States is not to be interviewed, but there are exceptions to all rules. When I asked President Roosevelt for an expression of his opinion of the character and public services of Elihu Root, who within a few weeks is to retire from the Secretaryship of War, the President replied: 'I am very glad to do that. In John Hay I have a great Secretary of State.'"

Mark these I's; not "the United States," but "I" have a great Secretary of State!

"'In Philander Knox I have a great Attorney-General; in other cabinet posts I have great men. Elihu Root could take any one of these places and fill it as well as the man who is now in it, and in addition, he is probably what none of those other gentlemen could be, a great Secretary of War. Elihu Root is the ablest man I have known in our governmental service. I will go further—he is the greatest man that has appeared in the public life of any country in any position on either side of the ocean in my time.' This is praise indeed," adds Wellman.

Well, what of it? I have never heard that Secretary Root has "denied the soft impeachment." [Laughter.] "Praise indeed;" yes! And what praise in return could be adequate repayment? In this wonderful mutual admiration society of "Me, too, Teddy, and Me, too, 'Lihu," is the return rhapsody of Mr. Root's peroration at all extravagant, considered solely from the standpoint of repayment, of course?

Is it any wonder that he was the man selected by the Republican candidate to "lay it on strong?" [Laughter.] A man of ability, too, is Mr. Root. He had already defended Tweed. Why, then, not defend the Republican party in its hour of non-action, passivity, negation and mere obstruction? Indeed, he and the President have had minds so much alike that they have been suspected of "unconscious identical cerebration"—of thinking the same thoughts in the same words. [Laughter.]

I have heard that in October, 1902, Mr. Root made a political speech in Cooper Union, in which he used this language:

"If a tariff law has on the whole worked well, and if business has prospered under it and is prospering, it is better to endure some slight inconveniences and inequalities for a time than to incur the uncertainty and disturbance of business which necessarily result from the process of making changes. The mere fact that a different rate of duty would be better than the rate fixed in the statute does not settle the question whether the change should be made now or should be deferred. Every tariff deals with duties on a vast number of articles, and involves a vast number of interests, often conflicting. Whenever the law is taken up by Congress for consideration with reference to one change, every schedule in that law is going to find some one urging a change in that schedule; and all the business interests of the country are going to be left during a long continued discussion in a state of uncertainty as to what will be the outcome of duties upon the things they are producing, and therefore in uncertainty as to what competition from abroad they will be obliged to meet."

And that the President, in his political tour through the West in the spring of 1903, made a speech in which he used this language:

"If a tariff law has on the whole worked well and business has prospered under it, and is prospering, it may be better to endure some inconveniences and inequalities for a time than by making changes to risk causing a disturbance and perhaps paralysis in the industries and business of the country. The fact that a change in a given rate of duty may be thought desirable, does not settle the question whether it is advisable

to make the change immediately. Every tariff deals with duties on thousands of articles, arranged in hundreds of paragraphs and in many schedules. These duties affect a vast number of interests, which are often conflicting. If necessary for our welfare, then, of course, Congress must consider the question of changing the law as a whole or changing any given rate of duty. But we must remember that whenever a single schedule is considered, some interest will appear to demand a change in almost every schedule in the law; and when it comes to upsetting the schedules generally, the effect upon the country would be ruinous."

Verily, "Two souls with but a single thought; two speeches that read as one." [Laughter and applause.] And that single thought so harmoniously expressed is that we must not force one special interest to take its lips from the public breast for fear that the public, finding the suckling process unnecessary, might deem others so, and shake them all off. [Applause.]

It is not to be wondered at that the peroration of the "greatest of these" was a sort of deification of him who had dubbed him the "greatest of these." It was almost as natural as self-appreciation. If I may be permitted to use some bad Latin, it was only alter-egotism after all. That peroration was a regular rhapsody! What a magnificent piece of humor is this unbounded adulation of our fellow-citizen in the White House by the "chief of these!" How humorous to praise so highly this, our fellow-citizen in the White House, who in the long line of great men who have filled the seat he now occupies has himself, as a historian, found only about three in his opinion worthy of anything like unstinted praise, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and himself! [Applause.] Verily, the other humorists will have to retire from business! "The chief of these" is Mr. Root.

The Temporary Chairman, speaking of the Republican party, said: "Through it more than any other party, the moral sentiment of the American people finds expression."

Then God save us! Where? Shall we find it some years back in the *credit mobilier*; in the De Golyar, Ames Colfax

scandal; in the Whisky Ring Frauds; in the Star Route Steals; in the long saturnalia of carpet baggery instituted in the South and protected and maintained by the Republican party there until all over Dixieland Robbery and Corruption were stalking naked, to the disgust of all men? Shall we find it in more recent years? Where again? In the Post-Office Department? In the Public Lands Bureau? In the full sway of bosses, formerly so bitterly cursed, and now taken so fondly to his bosom by the President? In the pitiable telegrams from Washington inquiring just when the patriotic and "unassisted revolution" of fifty or one hundred men was expected unexpectedly to come off in Panama? [Applause.] In the celebrated order of "Hell-roaring Jake" Smith prescribing ten as the age above which children were to be killed in one of the islands of the Philippines? In the honey-combing of our national life with the corruption of legislation-bought special privileges? Time fails me to ask where.

Mr. Root says, "Offenders have been relentlessly prosecuted, and sternly punished." Is this not remarkable "thundering in the index" for you, when compared with actual Republican accomplishments, especially when compared with the refusal of the Republican House of Representatives to make culprits face even so much as a Congressional investigation; when compared with the absolute and constant refusal of the Republican Speaker even to recognize any member of the House for the purpose of making a motion of this character. If there ever was a determination fully entertained and finally carried out, it was the determination of the Republican administration and the Republican legislative body to see to it that nobody except their colleagues in the executive branch of the Government should investigate the alleged culprits in the Post-Office Department. There was more than a suspicion that the tariff was not the only thing that the Republicans wanted investigated only by its friends. Surely the ingenious ex-Secretary does not expect to be taken seriously. [Applause.]

There follows something, however, which will be taken seriously. The Secretary boasts that the per capita circulation of money among the people of the United States increased

from 23.14 in March, 1897, to 31.02 in May last, and that the credit for that increase and the consequent prosperity following it was due to the Republican party! What a curious boast this is, for those lately denying so strenuously that the quantity of money has anything to do with the value of money, with the price of other things, as measured in money, with an ascending scale of prices or with national prosperity. This was all denied but yesterday. Now it is asserted that the volume of metallic money has been increased immensely; that it has contributed to prosperity by producing a scale of rising prices, and that this is all due to Republican legislation! Due to what act of Congress passed by them? Was Republican legislation operative in South Africa and the Klondyke, and did it cause the discoveries of gold there? [Applause.] Did it cause the new inventions for the easiest and more profitable extraction of gold from refractory gold ore? Did it cause the addition of two billions in gold to the world's stock of money metal in the last eight years? Was it Republican legislation which grew and harvested immense crops of wheat, cotton, corn, etc., thereby enabling these United States to draw more than their pro rata share of the world's stock of money metals, increasing their stock of gold by \$700,000,000? What partnership is this between God, human industry and ingenuity, and the Republican party, of which the Republican party is the self-assertive senior member? What monumental effrontery is this which enables Republicans to boast of the benefits of the increased volume of standard metallic money and the consequent prosperity by necessary operation of the quantitative theory of money, which theory they found no language strong enough to deny and ridicule but yesterday? [Applause.]

The ex-Secretary next boasted that the Secretary of the Treasury can and does contract and expand the country's currency at his will, and illustrated this by occurrences in 1902, which he quoted. Remember, he boasts that this is a fact. If so, what a magnificent one-man-power it is! [Applause.] It is almost as great as that lately wielded by the ex-Secretary of War himself, when he was "ex-officio Emperor of the Philippine archipelago," when, as he himself subsequently said in a

public address, questions affecting the interests and lives of millions of people had to be decided by him upon not much more than a moment's notice and entirely within his own discretion. [Applause.]

What do the men who believe the Government ought to go out of the banking business, and the men who believe that the banks ought to go out of the governing business, think of this remarkable, this boastful assertion that one man in the United States can at his own sweet will and does contract and expand the currency, which furnishes the life-blood of commerce? [Applause.]

The Temporary Chairman then told the country that the act to expedite hearings of trust cases, namely, the act of February 11, 1903, was "Republican legislation." He forgot to tell you that every Democrat voted for it. And yet, that is my recollection. I have never known a more ingenious mind than that of ex-Secretary Root. His ingenuity is never so marvelous as when its power is illustrated by the things which he forgets to mention. [Applause.] Verily, he is "the Root of all evil" when it comes to making "the worse appear the better side of reason." [Applause.]

The ex-Secretary then tells us, in a burst of eloquence, "That the fatal 14th of September, 1901, marked no change of policy;" that when the kindly and fraternal soul of McKinley wended its way from the earth, he left behind him no break—his policy was continued in spirit by his successor. Who is there of common sense in America who does not know better? [Applause.] Changes in the spirit of the policy of the administration with regard to reciprocity with foreign nations, with regard to local self-government in the South, and in twenty respects which it would take too much time to particularize, will suggest themselves to your minds at once. But enough of this ex-cabinet officer. [Applause.]

To go on to the authoritative utterances of the Republican party in convention assembled. The platform, like the Temporary Chairman's speech, deals chiefly in boasts that the Republican party is the cause of everything good which has happened. [Applause.] It deals much also in ancient his-

tory. It did well to go back fifty years ago for a beginning. [Applause.] The present Republican party needs a running start of fully fifty years to enable the imagination of the American people to vault over the fact of its present obstructiveness and its chronic evasion of the live issues which lie in its pathway in this year of our Lord's Grace 1904. [Applause.]

The platform speaking of the access of the Republican party to power after Mr. Cleveland's second administration had expired, uses this language:

"We then found the country, after four years of Democratic rule, in evil plight, oppressed with misfortunes and doubtful of the future. Public credit had been lowered; revenues were declining; the debt was growing; the administration's attitude toward Spain was feeble and mortifying; its standard of values was threatened and uncertain; labor was unemployed; business was sunk in the depression which succeeded the panic of 1893; hope was faint and confidence was gone."

Suppose I paraphrase that utterance by saying that "when Mr. Cleveland succeeded to the Presidency in March, 1893, after four years of Republican administration under Mr. Harrison, the Democratic party found the country, after a long period of misrule and extravagance, in evil plight; oppressed with misfortunes and doubtful of the future. The public credit had been lowered; the revenues were declining.

"The outgoing administration was preparing to issue bonds. A governmental deficit was confessed. The panic which had devastated the world was relentlessly approaching our shores. A long saturnalia of extravagance, public and private, and of reckless speculation, had been already followed by depression. Corn was burned for fuel in Kansas and elsewhere in the West in 1890 and after. Cotton was at or below the price of production." The acute reaction which we call panic was inevitably approaching even before Mr. Cleveland was elected, because the first bubble which had burst in that world panic was the failure of Baring Brothers in 1890.

"Business was sunk in the depression which *preceded* with us the panic of 1893. Labor was unemployed or poorly remu-



nerated in factory and field, especially in the latter." Indeed, business depression, especially in agriculture, and the lack of adequate remuneration for labor, taken together with the high prices of manufactured articles under the McKinley Act, high prices especially accentuated in the public realization by contrasting them with the starvation prices of agricultural products which had begun to prevail in 1890—these two conditions constituted the chief industrial reasons in the public mind for turning out Mr. Harrison and the Republicans and putting in Mr. Cleveland and the Democrats. [Applause.]

To go on with the paraphrase; "Under Mr. Harrison's administration for three years hope was faint and confidence gone." The "plight of the people" was so desperate that, like drowning men, they were "catching at straws." Many nostrums were being suggested. Agrarianism, State Socialism in the shape of sub-treasury and other schemes, were rife from 1890 and thence on. The "two old parties," as they were called, were blamed for it all, but the one in power was blamed the more; hence the one out of power got in. Men advocating these nostrums in the state of public desperation then existing, counted their audiences throughout the suffering West and the depressed South no longer by numbers, but by the acre. Who will deny the historical truth of a single sentence of this paraphrase? Why pretend to have forgotten all this? Why not be honest with the people as men ought to be?

It is true that after the election of Mr. Cleveland the chronic business depression continued. It is true that it became acute, in a word, reached the banks and that then the fright stage or panic of 1893 came. It was not a local or American condition which thus culminated, but one which had existed from where Vienna nestles on the Danube to where Buenos Ayres commands its bay—one whose foundation had been laid long before it reached us, almost the last among the nations. Then, with the panic upon us, more nostrums of a national character were suggested to cure an evil of a world character.

One of them, as you will all remember, was the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act. This nostrum was suggested by wise men, and it was administered to the patient.

It did no good, of course. [Applause.] The panic went on—went on until when? Until the boil upon the body commercial burst and the poison of speculation, boom values and credit operations was released from the system. It went on until agriculture, the basic industry, revived.

In the midst of the panic all the wise men, and chief among them the Republican leaders, told us that “it was lack of confidence in the money of the country” which had brought on the panic. The Democratic administration, supported by a sufficient number of votes of both parties in the two Houses, took that view of the situation and demanded and secured the passage of the act repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman act, thereby, for the first time, practically establishing the gold standard in the United States. For, without either free, or limited, coinage of “standard” silver money, the country was, immediately after the passage of that act, necessarily and actually, as it has been since, and as it is now, and as it is destined to remain for a length of time beyond my power of computation, on a gold basis.

I was not one of those who thought the legislation adopted was wise; but wise or unwise, the result—the gold basis—was and is an accomplished fact—“plain, palpable and obvious” to all men who have common sense—and like many another step in history it is beyond recall, or fear, or hope of recall. This fact of a gold basis was accomplished then not by the Republican party, but by the dogged persistency and indomitable will of Grover Cleveland [applause], aided, it is true, by Republican legislators, who thought they saw in it the final disruption of the Democratic party. [Applause.] That was in the main their motive. Now they would “steal his thunder” in this Republican platform boast that it was “the Republican party” which “established the gold basis.”

Moreover, they would now eat their words and their votes, as well, of 1893, and tell us that the panic was not brought about as they then said by “lack of confidence in our money and too much silver,” but, forsooth, by a tariff act which was not passed until about a year after, to wit: in 1894, when the panic—that is, the fright-stage of the industrial depression, was

virtually over. [Applause.] Do not misunderstand me; a panic, of course, is not succeeded all at once by the golden hues of prosperity. Industrial depression must follow for a while, as industrial depression must precede it. So depression continued after the panic-stage had passed. As I have said, when the boil bursts and the poison is eliminated from the body commercial, the flesh begins to heal. It cannot begin to heal one minute earlier.

The process of recovery was aided by many, for us, fortuitous circumstances. The first of these was the famine in India—no Indian wheat to compete in the European market with ours. Simultaneously with it, an immense American crop of wheat, and small crops elsewhere. Wheat rose from about forty-eight to about seventy cents in a few weeks during the Bryan-McKinley campaign, while Cleveland was yet President. [Applause.] There is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not remember that. My friend, Mr. Kerr, who sits in front of me, who was the Secretary of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, that year, will remember it. My friend, Mr. Towne, will remember it. My friend, Mr. Cockran, will remember it. All of you will remember it. With seventy-cent wheat, farmers could pay the retailers the debts due them, and could buy more goods; the retailers with empty shelves or shelves becoming empty by sales, could order from the jobber; the jobbers who had been previously overstocked were then and there enabled to order from the factory; when the factories got orders, they had a reason for making goods, and they proceeded to make them; and then the wheels of industry “went round.”

The farmer in the wheat country with seventy-cent wheat could pay “the butcher, the baker and the candlestick-maker,” and then they could pay others, and all in turn could buy more goods. This endless chain of human relationship in the world of commerce is no mysterious thing to anybody but a platform-making politician. But wheat going up at that time had another effect. When wheat went up during the campaign while silver bullion went down, there was thereby furnished a seeming object lesson of the inaccuracy of the contention of

Mr. Bryan and his followers, of whom I was one, that there was necessarily a connection in price between the two. Western and border State farmers in the wheat belt, who had originally been Republicans anyhow and who had gone off from the Republican party because of their belief in this very theory, faced with this apparent object-lesson demonstration of error, began to leave the Bryan column and to join the McKinley column, first by the dozen, then by the score, then by hundreds, and then in shoals. Thus it came about that *Mr. McKinley was elected because wheat went up*, and because the going up of wheat and the consequent increased demand for other things, leading to higher prices and a better volume of trade, promised to the minds of Western farmers prosperity without free silver. [Applause.]

A greater falsehood was never uttered than that wheat, or anything else, ever went up "because Mr. McKinley was elected." The exact converse is the truth of history. Things had struck rockbottom and had begun to revive before Mr. McKinley was elected, and the first indisputable index of that fact was the rise in the price of wheat, followed by the rise in the price of other food products sympathetically with it. Then came the immense increase in the gold output, which kept prices up here and elsewhere.

Not only is the boast that Mr. McKinley's election was responsible for high prices not true, but it was a very dangerous falsehood. The Populists first taught the people in certain sections of this country that prosperity was chiefly dependent on government. Many men teach the doctrine now with the hope that during periods of prosperity the average voter can be persuaded to let even extravagant, dishonest and unjust governmental administration continue uninterrupted and unrebuked. This is the chief, if not the sole, hope of the Republican party to-day. [Applause.] Let the Republican party beware, and let all men who love their country beware of carrying this doctrine of government-creative prosperity any further. If the idea is once firmly embedded in the human mind, there will be no saving its teachers from the wrath to come—State socialism. [Applause.]

I quote again from the Republican platform, " We refused to palter longer with the miseries of Cuba " and declared war against Spain. Bad history again. Democrats demanded recognition of belligerent rights and independence for Cuba day in and day out. The Republican Speaker constantly refused them even so much as parliamentary recognition. The Republican President was thoroughly out of sympathy with their wishes. Finally, treachery and cruelty unprecedented, led to the blowing up of the Maine and her crew. American public opinion could no longer be withstood. " Remember the Maine " became a battle cry. It was not the " miseries of Cuba " at all, that led the Republican party to fall into line with the public demand and fight Spain. Hearing the echo of that cry, " Remember the Maine," and amidst the universal excitement and anger, the Republican Speaker and the President both stood out of the way, as well they might, of aroused popular wrath, and the latter resorted to " armed intervention."

It is unpatriotic to pretend that even this, long delayed as it was, was in any proper sense a partisan measure. Democrats voted for it as fully as Republicans. Democrats enthusiastically and unanimously gave to the President of the United States \$50,000,000 to spend at his discretion. They did this and voted for the act of intervention, not because he was a Republican President, or it a Republican measure, but because an American government was at last pursuing an American policy—a policy which had always been Democratic. [Applause.]

Then the platform adds these words: " We fought a quick, victorious war with Spain." The cornerstone of the humor of that sentence is the pronoun " we." Bad history again. Americans fought it. It would be invidious to inquire into the politics of heroes, but it seems to me I have heard that Dewey is a Democrat, that Schley is a Democrat, that Miles is a Democrat, and it seems to me, too, that I have heard that a Republican administration snubbed the first, tried to disgrace the second and insulted the third. [Applause.] It seems to me I have heard from men who were on the fighting line that Joe Wheeler was as much in evidence at Santiago as the President himself. [Applause.] It seems to me I have heard that Hobson, who

did a futile but a brave act, is a Democrat. It seems to me I have heard that young Bagley, of North Carolina—the first offering of the war upon the altar of a common country—was a Democrat. [Applause.]

I quote from the platform again: "We set Cuba free." Bad history once more. But for Democratic Senators and Representatives demanding and voting for a proviso to the act of intervention, to the effect that the people of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free and independent," and pledging our faith that we would wage no "war of conquest or territorial acquisition" and would withdraw our troops "after pacification," the Republican administration would doubtless be furnishing to the world to-day in the case of Cuba a companion piece to the picture which has been exhibited and is being exhibited in the Philippines. [Applause.]

Let us see what the Republicans have to say for themselves in connection with the great trust question. This is the language of the platform:

"Laws enacted by the Republican party, and which the Democratic party had failed to enforce, . . . have been fearlessly enforced."

Here are three statements. First, that the Republicans, instead of both parties, enacted the laws, which is not true. Second, that the Democratic party had done nothing toward their enforcement, which is not true. And third, that the Republican party has enforced the law, which is only partly true. [Applause.] The fact is that although the Democrats only had a four years' opportunity, and although the trust evil was neither very acute nor trusts very prevalent at that time, Attorney-General Harmon, one of the greatest lawyers, under one of the greatest legal administrations, this country has ever seen, found the suit of the Government against the Trans-Missouri Freight Association lost. He took it up, revived it and won it.

He then instituted suit against the Joint Traffic Association, and also against the Addyston Pipe Co. These two cases were decided for the Government after Mr. Cleveland went out, it is true, but on the lines laid down by his Attorney-General, and

the principle established in the case of the Government against the Trans-Missouri Freight Association—the principles there contended for by Cleveland's Attorney-General—is the principle which gave life to the proceedings in the Northern Securities case, and which led Gov. Van Sant and not the Republican administration, as has been falsely pretended, to inaugurate that case. [Applause.] It was a natural consequence of the cases against the Trans-Missouri Freight Association and the Joint Traffic Association.

Now, there was no excuse for ignorance upon the part of Mr. Lodge or Mr. Roosevelt of what was done under Mr. Cleveland's administration in regard to the prosecution of trusts. It is all in the *Congressional Record*. I read, as part of my remarks in the House, a letter from Mr. Edward Whitney, Assistant Attorney-General under Mr. Cleveland, setting forth all the facts.

Nor is it true in any proper sense that the Republican party deserves much credit for enforcing the anti-trust law. [Applause.] What has the Republican party done in that regard? One of the Chairmen of the Republican Convention (I have forgotten whether it was the temporary or permanent chairman), says "it has enjoined the beef trust!" We would not have known it if somebody had not specially informed us. The injunction does not seem to have had any practical effect upon the Beef Trust, or upon the price of beefsteak.

I think it was the Permanent Chairman of the Republican Convention who said that "the Democrats kill trusts with wind and the Republicans with law." Where are the corpses? [Applause.] There is but one that I know of, and it properly belong to Gov. Van Sant. It is the spoil of his sword and of his spear. The boast that the administration has executed the anti-trust laws is of course ridiculous. The Attorney-General in response to a House Resolution of my own frankly confessed that nothing had been done, and left the inference that nothing would be done towards the criminal prosecution of the men found guilty by the Supreme Court in the Northern Securities case for having violated the law and incurred its penalties. [Applause.]

The entire Republican party at the last session of the House of Representatives, with three exceptions, voted against a proviso instructing the Secretary of the Navy not to enter into governmental contracts with "trusts and unlawful combinations convicted by law" of being such. [Applause.]

The Attorney-General, in answer to another House Resolution, failed to show that anything substantial was being done, civilly or criminally, against the anthracite-coal carrying railroads and anthracite-coal mine owners constituting together, in violation of law, one of the greatest trusts in this country, although a private citizen had proceeded, at great personal expense, to institute an investigation and to get up the evidence. [Applause.]

The Attorney-General in that case hid behind the pretext that it would be "contrary to public policy" for him to give Congress any information as to what he was doing, or would do, or would not do. In God's name, how could it be! [Applause.]

This same "trust buster," as my good friend Mr. Joe Cannon would have us believe him to be, Attorney-General Knox, has just been appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania as Senator from that State, on demand, so the newspapers all say, of the very men who constitute this unlawful combination, or who are at any rate the Presidents of the railroad companies and the owners of the mines constituting it. What are you going to do when the "trust buster" is "busted" or "removed" or "promoted" out of the way? [Applause.]

Then there follows the boast of having "perfected the Interstate Commerce Law." The absurdity of this statement is made plain by the actual condition of things. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been knocking at the doors of Congress for years asking increased power; asking this power at least, that when a given rate, after investigation and full hearing from both sides, has been decided by the Commission to be unreasonable, to declare what rate would be reasonable in its stead, and to make this rate operative until set aside by due process of law on appeal, review or otherwise. A more ridiculous piece of official impotency than the Interstate Commerce



Commission at present does not exist. It can declare a given rate of fifty cents, let us say, to be unreasonable; but as it cannot prescribe what would be reasonable in its stead, the railroad can do one of two things. It can either take an appeal, which suspends the decision of the Commission while the litigation is being "long drawn out" by the railroads interested, or it can change the rate to  $49\frac{1}{2}$  cents. And when that has been declared "unreasonable," it can change it again to  $49\frac{1}{4}$  cents. When that has been declared unreasonable, it can change it again to  $49\frac{1}{8}$  cents, and so on *ad infinitum*, compelling the newly aggrieved citizen in each case to bring a new suit, at the risk of being punished industrially by the railroad for what it calls "unfriendly conduct," and that, too, without the hope of any substantial and immediate redress.

A bill to give the Interstate Commerce Commission power, not to prescribe rates generally, not to fix the schedule of rates for all the roads in the country engaged in interstate commerce, but power merely to prescribe a reasonable rate in a particular case where, after full investigation and hearing from both sides, the rate established has been declared unreasonable, this rate to be maintained until set aside by law, has been pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the House of Representatives since this Congress met, and although the Democrats on that Committee have demanded consideration of the bill, and although delegation after delegation of merchants and members of merchants' and shippers' associations have been to Washington begging enactment of it or like legislation, nothing has been done. The Republican party here, as elsewhere, "stands pat." [Applause.]

I read from the Republican platform again:

"Tariff rates should be readjusted only when conditions are so changed that public interest demands their alteration."

"Public interest," in this connection, considering the voice which uttered the words, is good; it is better than good, it is exquisite. "Public interest" really means, for the man who wrote the phrase and the Convention which adopted it, "protected interest." That is the very trouble, the protected interest will never permit the public interest to have a hearing. How

can "public interest" effectively "demand" alterations? There is only one way that I know of to make a demand of that sort heard, and that is to vote down the men who say that all is "well enough" and that the gospel of humanity, as far as the tariff is concerned, is all included in this apotheosized phrase "stand pat." Is it possible that the American people can be deceived by empty verbiage like that? Does not everybody who knows anything know that the Republican party have no idea of making any "alteration" in the tariff, unless they can thereby purchase the support of additional special interests, or tie to them already bought special interests by yet closer bonds? Are there no "conditions" demanding any changes in any of the schedules of the present tariff law when dozens of enormously "protected" steel and iron products, including rails, locomotives, barbed wire and agricultural implements of American make, are being sold daily, in competition with the so-called pauper labor of the world, in the homes of this same pauper labor? More than that, when they are being carried right by the south door of Great Britain on through the Straits of Gibraltar, and through the Suez Canal to Britain's own colony in South Africa, and sold there; and when, even more than that, they are sold after freight has been paid and profit obtained at a less price than the same goods are sold to Americans in American markets five miles from the factory? Will any sane man say that "public interest" has not already "demanded" some "alteration" in the tariff. The trouble is, and will be, as long as the Republicans are in power, that private interests will not allow it. [Applause.]

The curious thing about a man who is obtaining benefit by special legislation is that he insists upon playing two antagonistic rôles. One day he is an industrial baron boasting of having "conquered the markets of the world" and being able to keep them "because his goods are better or cheaper;" the next day he is knocking at the doors of the Committee rooms of the national legislature begging continuance of "protection" against the pauper labor of the very market in which he actually already sells his goods. What sort of "condition" is it which would justify "public interest" in demanding an "alteration?"

Suppose the following plank had been presented to the Republican Convention, does anybody believe that it would have been adopted? namely, demanding "a reduction of tariff taxation upon trust-produced articles, to the point where foreign competition may enter the American market, whenever a trust or combine seeking a monopoly raises its prices to the American consumer above a just and reasonable profit, thus using American law as a shelter to protect it in extorting from the American people by charging them prices higher than those charged foreigners for the identical article!" Suppose that an actual condition of that sort had been shown to exist, as it has been, would anybody advocating an utterance of the sort I have indicated, with a view of meeting that actual condition, have obtained any hearing from that Convention? [Applause.]

The platform then goes on to say that these "alterations cannot be safely committed to any other hands than the Republican party." What has been the matter with the hands of the Republican party since 1897, or for the last four years? Even if it were admitted that tariff changes ought to be made by the friends of the iniquitous discriminations and extortions of the present law rather than by the friends of the general interest and for the common weal (which is the same thing as admitting that changes ought to be made by the Republican party), why has not that party already made any of them? It has been in full power in the Senate, overwhelmingly in power in the House, and unanimously and strenuously in power in the White House. Who is there that does not know that this verbiage was inserted in the Republican platform with a view of enabling the "Iowa idea men" and the "Wisconsin idea men" to go back home and say they have "gotten something" and thereby "save their faces," as the Chinese say? [Applause.] Who believes for a minute that the party which has refused every tariff alteration thus far proposed, intends to recognize any sort of "condition" or any sort of "demand" or consider any "public interest" in connection with the question? Who does not know that the only way "public interest" can make effective any "demand" for any "alteration," is by putting Republicans out and Democrats in power? [Applause.]

Of course this platform had to contain the usual historical untruth, to wit: That "a Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity." Designing men and ignorant men have repeated that so often that I am afraid there are really a good many people who believe it, and yet it is false history again. The great panic of 1873, if it was caused by any tariff law at all, was necessarily caused by the then existing tariff law, which was the first one ever passed by the Republican party and which had been passed as a war measure.

Speaker Cannon, in his address to the Republican Convention said that when the Republican party came into power in 1861 it "recurred to the tariff policy of George Washington." This is a short sentence and in it there are only two statements and two mistakes; one consists in the innuendo that George Washington was a high tariff man. The tariff in vogue in Washington's day would be denounced as rampant "free trade" to-day. The second consists in the assertion that the Republican party "recurred" to a high tariff policy. The platform upon which it went into power contained not one hint of an intent to raise tariff rates. [Applause.] Even the Whigs had become perfectly satisfied with the Walker tariff of 1846, and with the amendments passed in 1857. And the Republicans as well as the Whigs recognized that the country had had theretofore unprecedented prosperity under that law, which was a Democratic tariff law, being a tariff for revenue only. As eminent a Republican historian as James G. Blaine, has recorded this historical fact in black and white. [Applause.] All that the Republicans of 1860 and 1861 proposed was "incidental protection."

Uncle Joe Cannon's short sentence of two ideas, and both of them wrong, reminds me of an anecdote about my old friend, Wiley P. Harris. Somebody in Wiley P. Harris's presence one day said, of a judge on the bench in Mississippi: "He is the best judge I ever knew." And Judge Harris replied: "Yes, with two exceptions." The gentleman said: "Judge, what are the exceptions?" He replied: "He is entirely too deaf to hear the facts of a case, and he is entirely too stupid to under-

stand the law. Otherwise your statement concerning him is eminently correct." [Laughter.]

From 1801 down to the outbreak of the Civil War the country was nine-tenths of the time under Democratic ascendancy, with Democratic tariff legislation, and nine-tenths of that time our people were prosperous beyond all precedent as compared with other peoples upon the surface of the earth contemporaneous with them or antecedent to them. What the Republican platform calls "a Democratic tariff law based on free trade principles," referring to the tariff law of 1894—the so-called Wilson-Gorman bill—was the farthest removed from "free trade" of any tariff law that has ever existed in this country, except the one which bore the name of McKinley, and the one which afterward bore the name of Dingley. But even this was a tariff law which *followed* adversity. It did not *precede* it, as is falsely insinuated.

Besides all that, statistics show that our imports were not increased under that act. Hence its operation did not hurt by inducing undue or unfair foreign competition, as has been pretended. But the *New York Times* of June 25th exposes this repeated attempt to falsify history so well that I will read from it. Under the heading: "A Question of Fact," the *Times* says:

"The author of the Republican platform, presumably Senator Lodge, who may have had the assistance and certainly had the approval of Mr. Roosevelt, makes the following sweeping statement: 'A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity.' A keen French observer remarks that a man who repeats a repeated attempt to falsify history so well that I will read from himself. The entirely unfounded and absurd declaration in the Republican platform so fully meets these conditions that it is to be inferred that the distinguished gentlemen we have named for Lodge, who may have had the assistance and certainly had paused for five minutes, just long enough to remember how many Republican and Democratic tariffs have been in our history, he would have saved his party from committing itself in this formal manner to a gross misrepresentation of the facts.

The Republican party came into power in 1861; this clearly fixes the period in which comparison between the Republican and Democratic tariff and their consequences must be made. Since that date there have been half a dozen times of great depression in business which have been accompanied by enough excitement of the public mind to be called panics. The first occurred in the Spring of 1861 and was due wholly to the impending contest with secession. The second occurred in 1866-67, the number of failures ran up to 2,780, and the liabilities of failing concerns amounted to \$96,666. In 1873 there was a third depression which has become memorable in our history, when the failures reached 5,183, and the liabilities to the then unprecedented amount of \$228,499,900. Five years later, in 1878, there was a fourth interval of stagnation and disturbance and the number of failures nearly doubled and the liabilities again increased, this time to \$234,383,132. In 1884 the fifth depression caused the record of failures to reach almost the same figures. Finally, in 1893 we had the appalling total of failures 15,542 and the total liabilities of \$346,779,889.

“Here are five periods of panic of which the record is entirely complete, and all but the earliest of which are within the memory of a very large number of experienced business men. Every one of them occurred under a Republican tariff; not one of them followed ‘a Democratic tariff’ for the conclusive reason that no Democratic tariff was in existence from the first to the last, and if they were caused by tariffs at all—and the tariff had much to do with them indirectly—it must be that they were caused by Republican tariffs. Æsop’s wolf was not more mendacious or more silly than the writer of the Republican platform.”

Amen, say I.

Remember that the author of the Republican platform is, or pretends to be, a historian. This is true, no matter which of the two suspected parties be guilty of writing it, the President or Senator Lodge. The voice was undoubtedly the voice of the Massachusetts Jacob, but the hand may have been the hand of the Presidential Esau. But both as historians knew these facts.

We are called upon in the Republican platform not to "falter" in our allegiance to protectionism "when the only free trade country in the world is agitating a return to protection." This has reference to Chamberlainism in Great Britain. The author forgot to say that what is really being agitated in Great Britain is "retaliation" against protectionist countries by a proposed system of legislation to contain as little protectionism as is possible to have any retaliation in it at all. He also neglected to state that the movement has signally failed and that it would not have had a leg to stand upon but for the enmity created in the minds of many British subjects by our inimical trade legislation. He further neglected to say what is worthy of all remembrance as a salient truth, viz., that the supreme evil of protectionism is the excitation among the nations of this very spirit of enmity and commercial war.

Perhaps the richest piece of humor in the Republican platform is where it is said "we have extended widely our foreign markets," and in another place "we conquered new markets and created a volume of exports which far surpass imagination." The "we" in each sentence is again the corner-stone of the humor of it. They might just as well say that man had a right to boast that he had increased the current of a river by putting a dam in it, because the current had not stopped, but had gone on over the dam or around it. [Laughter.] The man who would attribute the current to the fact that the dam was in the river or to the fact that he had placed any other obstruction there, would not be a greater fool than he who would attribute an increase of international commerce to the operation of a policy attempting vitally to obstruct it. [Applause.] A perfectly ideal protective policy would be one which did not admit a single possibly competing product of another country to the "protected" market. In so far as protectionism falls short of that result it is a failure from a protectionist's standpoint. The non-admission of the products of others into your own market and the refusal to purchase from them certainly do not tend to make them purchase more from you, whatever else it does. As Mr. McKinley said, "we cannot always continue to sell without buying." Plainly our foreign commerce

has grown, not because of, but in spite of, the obstructions which have been placed in the currents of trade.

How ridiculous the boast is, too, in connection with the flat-footed refusal of the Republican party in the Senate to approve the reciprocity treaties instituted and completed by Mr. McKinley and sent to that body by him for approval, especially the highly beneficial reciprocity treaty with France; how brazen in the teeth of the refusal of the Republican administration to take any initiatory step looking toward the reconvening of the Joint High Commission for the purpose of establishing reciprocal trade relations between our northern neighbor, Canada, and ourselves. Could complaisant and reckless effrontery have gone farther than it has gone in making this statement? [Applause.]

There is a succeeding statement, however, which will vie with it. It is where the platform favors "commercial reciprocity wherever reciprocal arrangements can be effected . . . without injury to American agriculture, American labor, or *any* American industry." The word "any" is good in that connection. What a stop-cog it is to the turning of the wheel of commercial reciprocity! Think of its full import! "Injury" is good in that connection, too. It all depends upon what is meant by the word. If the audience will excuse me for quoting myself, I will read what an interview with me contains on that subject:

"If the phrase means anything it means this: That the Republican party is not willing to secure immensely larger markets for the products of our farms, mines, forests, or even factories, abroad, if in return for them we shall be compelled to admit into competition with "any" even the least product of our industries, "any" articles of foreign growth or production. Judging by Senator Lodge's record in opposition to the French reciprocity treaty, which was initiated, completed and sent to the Senate by President McKinley, it would mean that the Republican party would refuse, if they were offered to us, greatly extended markets abroad for Western produce and Southern and Middle States production if thereby a cut-down



of five per cent. of the possible charges of a Massachusetts cotton-knitting mill were threatened."

This construction of the plank is in keeping, too, with the utterances of Mr. Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, perhaps the most highly accredited floor leader of the Republican party, who, amidst an outburst of Republican applause, said, on the floor of the House, that the Republican party would not have reciprocity except in "non-competing articles." He and his colleagues upon the Republican side were then challenged to name a single article produced anywhere in the world that either was not produced or could not be produced somewhere in some of the States, Territories or "appurtenant appendages" under the Stars and Stripes. Of course, this, if it means anything, means that there is to be no sort of reciprocity at all. I venture my head that Mr. Dalzell is delighted with "any." [Applause.]

There is cunningly concealed in the Republican platform the hydra head of a yet worse form of special legislation, namely, special legislation by direct subsidy, taking money directly out of the Treasury and handing it over bodily to a special class, in this case the class of ship-builders and ship-owners.

It will be noted also that the Republican party is not quite brave enough to say "out loud" what it wants and intends to do. This ship-subsidy plank is bolstered by the usual false statement, this time *in innuendo*, that the English Merchant-Marine—the most prosperous of all—is dependent upon subsidies. Every dollar of the amount paid annually by the English government to owners of ships is paid for carrying the mails, and is paid to the lowest bidder, and, moreover, foreign ships are admitted to bid.

"How plain a tale doth put them down." I say this is the worst form of special legislation, because it is naked and without hypocrisy even, and "hypocrisy is the reverence which vice pays to virtue." An indirect subsidy, like protectionism, is at least veiled with the pretense of being necessary taxation, and that hides its enormity from the public view. That a direct subsidy should be considered even is proof that things have almost reached the decadent days of the Roman Republic, when

government consisted chiefly in distributing bread and giving circuses. The worst of all is that it is sought to be justified, like protectionism and other frauds, upon the pretext that it is done "for the benefit of American labor." If you want to give labor, by legislation, *panem et circenses*, why not give it directly? If you are going to take money out of the Treasury in order to increase remuneration of labor, why not take it out and pay it over to labor frankly and honestly? If your object in a ship subsidy is "to increase the wages of the sailors," why not decide upon the percentage of increase advisable and make the appropriation by paying it over to the sailors themselves? [Applause.] It would be far more justifiable to pass a law to give to every sailor and to every man and woman in the United States earning less than one dollar a day an increase of fifty per cent. of their wage rate than by protectionism or ship subsidy, to pretend to have that end in view, while paying the money raised from consumers by taxation, not directly over to the laborer, who constitutes the pretext of the law, but percolating it through the hands of others, to whose fingers most of it, and sometimes all of it, sticks. [Applause.]

The Democratic party and a Democratic Administration will build up an American merchant marine without new taxes levied upon the American people, without additional burdens of any sort, by simply recurring to the old historical precedents and policies of the period when we had a merchant marine and a merchant marine of which we were proud. [Applause.]

If the precedent of direct subsidy be once established, how and where are you going to stop it? Am I going beyond the bounds of reason when I say that if it be right to vote money out of the Treasury to put into the pocket of a ship-owner or ship-builder, it is infinitely more so to vote money out of the Treasury and put it into the pockets of the men who hoe the cotton fields in the South and till the prairies of the West?

Republicans say that these laws make the corporations "able to pay more wages." Who is going to intercede effectually with the Almighty to make them willing to pay more?

Then "our friends, the enemy," speak of the "Republican policy" of Chinese exclusion and cite recent legislation upon

that subject as a reason for longer entrusting them with office. Again no mention is made of the salient fact that the votes of the Democracy were unanimously cast for the proviso presented by Mr. Hitt to continue by legislation the exclusive policy of the Chinese treaty about to expire, nor of the fact that Mr. Hitt yielded to the Democratic leader on the floor to speak in its advocacy. [Applause.] The difference between the two parties when they vote for Chinese exclusion is this: Democrats vote consistently, that is, in accordance with the traditions and principles of their party. Democrats, as a rule, make no disguise of the fact that they want to retain this country, as far as possible, as a home for the white man and a nursery for his civilization, and that they desire as far as possible to have a homogeneous population. Thus when they vote to exclude the Chinese they cast a Democratic vote. Republicans voting the same way antagonize the professions which they themselves make in connection with other racial questions. They profess, as a party, to believe that men are equal and ought to receive equal governmental and social recognition, "regardless of race." When Republicans have voted for Chinese exclusion, they have cast a good vote, a wise one, but undoubtedly an *un-Republican* one. Certainly, if it be wrong to discriminate at all because of race, and if professions of adherence to the dogma that all men of all races are equal be sincere, then the men making that profession ought not to vote to prevent a yellow man from earning a living by the sweat of his brow in America. The right to earn a living is a much more sacred and inalienable and God-given thing than the statutory privilege of voting, or the social privilege of lunching with you.

"We pledge ourselves to insist on just and equal treatment of our citizens abroad," says the Republican platform, and later on in another place, "it is a duty to procure for all our citizens, without distinctions, the rights of travel and sojourn in friendly countries." True, true, I say. "A Daniel come to judgment," but our fellow citizens of Russian birth and Jewish extraction who cannot procure from the State Department a passport to revisit Russia without being cautioned that they will *not* be protected there, will read this part of the Republican platform,

considering its source, with singular astonishment. It seems rather strange for a party so long in full possession of all branches of the Government, just upon the verge of a Presidential election, to profess an intention of doing for the first time that which has not been done and which is not now being done. If the Democracy goes into power it will be in accordance with the grand *ante bellum* record of that party to declare, that: "All over the world a duly authenticated passport issued by the Government of the United States to an American citizen shall be proof of the fact that he is an American citizen, and shall entitle him to the treatment due him as such." [Applause.] That declaration would sound sincere coming from us.

The Republican platform, to sum it all up, obeys the precept to "stand pat" in every respect except one, and that is a respect in which "well enough might very well have been left alone." That is the plank in which this language is used: "We favor such Congressional action as shall determine whether by special discrimination the elective franchise in any State has been unconstitutionally limited," followed by the promise made, in that event, to reduce representation in the House of Representatives and in the Electoral College. The pledge is to reduce representation, if it be found that the suffrage has been "unconstitutionally limited." The only "unconstitutional limitation" possible would be a limitation in violation of the Fifteenth Amendment, "because of race, color or previous condition of servitude." "Unconstitutionally limited!" The adverb "unconstitutionally" is useless and fools nobody, especially when one remembers that the author of the phrase, or at least the voice that read it, was the author of the old "force bill." [Applause.]

Whether or not the suffrage has been "unconstitutionally limited" is a matter for the courts to determine, and a report of a Republican Committee on Elections in the last Congress so confesses it. If a man be "unconstitutionally" denied the suffrage, then, after a determination to that effect, he can vote—that is his remedy and the right remedy. Having voted, of course, there could be no reduction of representation on his account. Congress cannot condone an "unconstitutional"

limitation by consenting not to count the man thus denied suffrage. His right is to vote and be counted. But all this deceives nobody, as I said. The real object of the Republican party, in so far as that plank is concerned, however specious the phraseology in which it is clothed, is to reduce Southern representation, without reducing that of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and other States having similar suffrage restrictions, wherever in the South negroes are disfranchised, not as such, but because of ignorance, by an educational qualification, or because of any other right reason, in any other constitutional way. Disfranchisement of a negro in Mississippi for ignorance is a horrible thing; disfranchisement of a white man for ignorance in Massachusetts or Connecticut is a part of New England "higher civilization!"

Let not the business interest of the country deceive itself: let those controlling it prepare, if Mr. Roosevelt is elected on this platform, for another period of uncertainty, unrest, business disturbance and possible race conflicts in the Southern States, instead of that peace and prosperity which both races now enjoy and which has been rendered possible only by home rule and by white supremacy. Let the South not deceive itself, either. If the Republican party were sincere in its proposition to reduce Southern representation on the ground of pretended "unconstitutional" disfranchisement, thus condoning the pretended "unconstitutional limitation" itself, it would accompany that proposition with another, to wit: the proposition to repeal the Fifteenth Amendment, leaving the Fourteenth in full effect, and in no part repealed by the Fifteenth as now it in part is.

Their duplicity is shown in this: they wish to maintain the Fifteenth Amendment, which forbids the negro, for racial reasons, from being disfranchised, and yet on the pretense that he is, for racial reasons, disfranchised, they would have the negro not counted as a basis of representation in the Southern States, where he chiefly resides.

It is not the white man, as a white man, who is injured by a recurrence to the tendency of force-bill days—he can and will always maintain himself; it is business, commerce, manufacturing, agriculture and the negro himself. Commercially

and industrially the white man of the South will not be much more injured by this sort of agitation than Northern people will be. The mercantile class at the South would be the first to suffer, but as they owe debts to the North and buy from the North, and as nearly everything they sell is manufactured in the North, they would not be alone in their suffering. Then again it is Northern money in railroads, mines, forests and factories which would among the first and most sensitively feel the disturbance.

This is but the entering wedge to a new period of "Southern reconstruction." It is the beginning of the old scheme, revived for political advantage, to retain as "a Republican asset," the solid negro vote in Indiana, Illinois, New Jersey and other like-conditioned States, this time without price in money paid, by disturbing all over the Southland peace and order; demoralizing reviving industries, unsettling business and labor, disintegrating society, and as a remote effect if permanently and radically successful, hybridizing the race there and Africanizing its civilization. That is the ultimate significance of it all, if indeed it be not merely "a voice in the wilderness" crying out empty promises to the negro voters in the doubtful States. I wish I could believe it was only that. I would believe it but for the "opinionated" and super-strenuous character of "the man in the White House." [Applause.]

How small in comparison would be the immediate and ultimate significance of a mere partisan victory either way, compared with the necessary results of this revived agitation!

In keeping with all this, consider the negro "Santo Bambino" scene in the Republican National Convention; the wild adoration of "my little Alabama coon," or was it a Georgia coon? Why were the two little white girls placed on the platform with the little negro boy to march around with him carrying flags? Why was it all thus *prearranged*, and by whom? Who pretends that it was accidental? What was the pretended lesson to be taught? What is the subtle, symbolical meaning of it all? Is it a meaning which no white Republican dares to put in words? Or is it a meaning to be guessed at and to be left to negro orators, speaking to negro audiences, to put in

words such as are adapted to negro race traits, tendencies and longings? [Applause.]

But enough about the other party. Some things about ourselves. First: One thing the country can rely upon, the Democracy will nominate for President a man trained in the ways of the Constitution [applause], who will not usurp legislative or judicial functions [applause]; who will not recklessly violate international usages, even with the weakest nation, no matter how tempting the profit for us to be realized by it [applause]; who will not keep people guessing about what he is going to do or say next. It will nominate him upon a platform ignoring dead issues and dealing with every present live issue in tones certain and unmistakable [applause]; favoring economy of administration, enforcement of honesty in the public service, a wise and businesslike revision and reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and of the common weal and not by tariff beneficiaries and their representatives alone, a reduction which shall aim at "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and whose ultimate object shall be to raise a revenue by taxation to support the Federal Government in virility but in simplicity, an aim to be reached in a conservative and commonsense way, with due regard to existing conditions, and by steps constituting in themselves object lessons for their own justification and for the justification of further reform. [Applause.]

It will not falter when it comes to declare for a reduction of tariff taxation on trust produced articles to the point where foreign competition may enter the American market, when combines, seeking monopoly, raise their prices to the American consumer to the point of extortion; nor will it falter in declaring for proper reductions where American concerns habitually charge American consumers higher prices than those charged foreigners for identical articles. [Applause.]

It will come out flat-footed for amicable rather than retaliatory trade relations with the other nations of the world, and especially for generous reciprocity with Canada. [Applause.]

It will undo the effects of the heedless and reckless utterances of the candidate of the Republican party for President,

in his letter to ex-Secretary Root, upon the second anniversary of Cuban independence. It will announce in no mistakable way that we have no "duty" of any sort to "intervene" in the internal affairs of other countries, because they "do not conduct themselves well," or because they "do not know how to act with decency in industrial and political matters," or because they "do not keep order," or because they "do not pay their obligations." [Applause.]

We will announce unmistakably to the world and to the nations of Europe that we will not make of the Army and Navy of the United States a constabulary for the collection of their debts from the governments or peoples of South and Central America. [Applause.] Where there is "brutal wrong-doing or impotency, which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society," to use the Acting-President's phrase, the American people will regret it and will extend every aid in the way of enlightenment and example to the people thus "living in darkness," but they decline to administer the affairs of such peoples, or to take upon the United States Treasury the burden of their internal reformation. [Applause.]

A Democratic administration will find in our treatment of Cuba an example of American courage, justice and magnanimity, an example to be imitated, as soon as can be wisely and safely, in the Philippines; ultimately leaving the Filipinos and giving them the promise now thus to leave them, free and independent, to work out their own destiny in accordance with their own race traits, tendencies and capabilities. The Democracy, in my opinion, believes that the white man will have trouble enough to maintain in its full integrity the white man's civilization in all parts of our own country, and that it is neither his duty nor his right to superpose his civilization by force upon the brown man in the brown man's country.

A Democratic President, such as he whom we shall nominate, will devote himself to the faithful execution of the laws of the United States, as they are written, without strained executive construction or usurpation, whether under the pretext of necessity or under the pretext of superior wisdom—both being pleas of tyrants and absolutists—and will leave to the legisla-



tive branch of the government the duty of making and unmaking and amending laws. [Applause.]

A Democratic administration in power will put an end, as far as it can be done, and as quickly as possible, to all existing iniquitous partnership arrangements between the Federal Government and favored special interests.

It will reduce the revenues of the general government to a sum adequate to the needs of economical and constitutional administration, *plus* a safe working margin for contingencies and emergencies which cannot be foreseen.

It will speak out unmistakably against the Republican policy of starving home development in order to feed the school-boy appetite of "national prestige" and mere display of strength. [Applause.]

Under a Democratic administration the rights of labor will be recognized as no less "vested," no less "sacred," no less "inalienable" than the rights of capital and both will be dealt with justly and impartially, according to their very right. [Applause.]

The Democratic party will not hypocritically pretend to sympathize with those who desire, or with those who would not by all lawful and constitutional means prevent, the Africanization or Mongolization of any State or community within the bounds of the American Republic. [Applause.]

Under the treaty with the Republic of Panama, which was rendered possible only by Democratic votes for its confirmation in the Senate of the United States, votes difficult for Democrats to cast, because of the manner in which the mushroom Republic had been ushered into the world, the Democracy, when entrusted with power, will construct the Panama Canal speedily, honestly and economically, thereby giving to our people what Democrats have always contended for, a great inter-oceanic canal, furnishing shorter and cheaper lines of transportation and better and less trammelled trade relations with the peoples of the world. [Applause.] However shamefully the Panama Republic was born, and however shameful our connection as a government with it, it *was* born and is now recognized by us and by the other civilized nations of the world as

an existing international entity—an independent government on the surface of the earth. In other words, it, too, is an accomplished fact. With it, as the only power having sovereignty and ownership, we were compelled to negotiate a treaty for the acquisition of the strip of land to be used for the construction of the Panama Canal, if we were going to acquire it at all. Entering into a treaty with the Republic of Panama after it was established and recognized, in order to acquire the untold benefit of a trans-isthmian canal, no more smirches us with the shame of the manner of its bringing forth as a mushroom State, than entering into an extradition treaty with Russia, Austria or Prussia would besmirch us with the shame of the partition of Poland.

Above all, and in conclusion, a good Democratic administration will ponder and practice the simple precepts of Jefferson's first inaugural address. It is the political "Sermon on the Mount" for Democratic-republicans everywhere.

It is in the power of no man or party to assure success. It is in the power of the humblest to deserve it. God grant that we may have it. Let us by the character of our platform and the character of our candidate deserve it. "Let us erect a standard to which all good men may repair." [Applause.]

With that injunction, gentlemen, I declare this Convention ready for business.

#### LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, there is an invitation to the delegates and alternates of this Convention to visit the World's Fair. The Clerk will read the invitation, after which the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Power) will be recognized to speak for the Convention in accepting the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

July 6, 1904.

*To the National Democratic Convention of 1904:*

The Louisiana Purchase Exposition extends a cordial invitation to the officers, delegates and alternates of the National Democratic Convention and to the National Democratic Com-

mittee to visit the Saint Louis World's Fair, now being held in commemoration of the acquisition of the Louisiana Territory by Thomas Jefferson in 1803.

The practically unanimous participation by the States and Territories and Possessions of our own country and by all other civilized peoples on the earth incontrovertibly establishes the universal character of this Exposition. It is an epitome of the progress of the world from the beginning of history, and will for a generation to come be a marker of the advancement of civilization. It is a fit celebration of an event in our country's history which is second in importance only to the immortal declaration of the rights of man framed by Thomas Jefferson and promulgated in 1776. The acquisition of an empire by peaceful negotiations and the extension of the jurisdiction of democratic principles from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the consequent establishment in perpetuity of the American Republic, is appropriately commemorated by a universal exposition in which all countries compete in friendly rivalry and which is a decided advance toward universal peace.

Very respectfully,

DAVID R. FRANCIS,

*President.*

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Power).

MR. JOHN POWER, of Michigan: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of the gentlemen who have the honor to sit here as delegates or alternates to the National Convention appreciate in the highest measure this invitation, coming from the governing body of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

I shall not occupy the time of the Convention in expressing the thanks which are due those gentlemen from these delegates and alternates, but will simply say that this Convention fully appreciates the graciousness and the thoughtfulness and the generosity of that body.

I move, sir, that the invitation be accepted and that the thanks of the Convention be presented to President David R. Francis and the Governing Board of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition for the invitation. [Applause.]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

### COMMITTEES.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: I move that the roll of States and Territories be now called and that the names of the persons selected by the respective delegations to serve on the several committees, as follows, the Committee on Credentials, the Committee on Permanent Organization, the Committee on Rules and Order of Business, and the Committee on Platform and Resolutions, be announced, and that the committees as thus constituted be the standing committees of this Convention:

The motion was agreed to.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will call the roll of States and Territories for the purpose indicated.

The Clerk called the roll and the committees were announced as follows:

#### COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS.

Alabama—E. M. Robinson.  
 Arkansas—O. L. Miles.  
 California—James A. Keys.  
 Colorado—Alva Adams.  
 Connecticut—Charles Kerr.  
 Delaware—Alexander M. Daly.  
 Florida—T. J. Appleyard.  
 Georgia—W. A. Little.  
 Idaho—F. W. Hunt.  
 Illinois—Fred J. Kern.  
 Indiana—G. V. Menzies.  
 Iowa—J. M. Parsons.  
 Kansas—W. P. Dillard.  
 Kentucky—Joseph C. S. Blackburn.  
 Louisiana—E. B. Kruttschnitt.

Maine—George M. Hanson.  
Maryland—Joshua W. Miles.  
Massachusetts—Charles S. Ashley.  
Michigan—George Jackson.  
Minnesota—J. R. Corrigan.  
Mississippi—T. C. Catchings.  
Missouri—D. A. Ball.  
Montana—W. G. Conrad.  
Nebraska—C. D. Casper.  
Nevada—P. C. Webber.  
New Hampshire—Nathaniel E. Martin.  
New Jersey—Howard Carrow.  
New York—James W. Ridgway.  
North Carolina—W. H. Powell.  
North Dakota—Chas. G. Bade.  
Ohio—W. D. Yaple.  
Oregon—Charles E. Redfield.  
Pennsylvania—Wm. J. Brennen.  
Rhode Island—John J. Fitzgerald.  
South Carolina—D. C. Heyward.  
South Dakota—Chauncey L. Wood.  
Tennessee—J. M. Head.  
Texas—T. W. Gregory.  
Utah—Geo. C. Whitmore.  
Vermont—V. A. Bullard.  
Virginia—Rorer A. James.  
Washington—R. W. Starr.  
West Virginia—Owen S. McKinney.  
Wisconsin—Edwin F. McCausland.  
Wyoming—John W. Rodgers.  
Alaska—L. L. Williams.  
Arizona—John Lawler.  
District of Columbia—Wm. Cranch McIntire.  
Hawaii—T. B. Lyons.  
Indian Territory—C. A. Skeen.  
New Mexico—Estanislao V. Chavez.  
Oklahoma—Wm. Buchholz.  
Porto Rico—H. E. Shaffer.

## COMMITTEE ON PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

Alabama—Emmet O'Neal.  
Arkansas—Hugh A. Dinsmore.  
California—John A. Hicks.  
Colorado—Charles J. Hughes, Jr.  
Connecticut—I. A. Sullivan.  
Delaware—E. C. Dukes.  
Florida—W. R. Fuller.  
Georgia—James M. Smith.  
Idaho—W. W. Woods.  
Illinois—W. H. Hart.  
Indiana—Samuel L. Ralston.  
Iowa—S. B. Wadsworth.  
Kansas—J. N. Haymaker.  
Kentucky—James B. McCreary.  
Louisiana—Alex Pujol.  
Maine—Frank A. Millett.  
Maryland—Joshua F. C. Talbott.  
Massachusetts—Henry W. Ely.  
Michigan—Peter Meloy.  
Minnesota—J. W. Craven.  
Mississippi—J. D. Barkdale.  
Missouri—W. D. Vandiver.  
Montana—Joseph K. Toole.  
Nebraska—G. W. Phillips.  
Nevada—W. E. Sharon.  
New Hampshire—Manasah Perkins.  
New Jersey—Robert Davis.  
New York—Frederick C. Schraub.  
North Carolina—J. C. Mills.  
North Dakota—I. P. Baker.  
Ohio—Harlan Cleveland.  
Oregon—James Gleason.  
Pennsylvania—A. G. Dewalt.  
Rhode Island—Samuel E. Daubney.  
South Carolina—Wilie Jones.  
South Dakota—John Faunslow.

Tennessee—Tom Rye.  
Texas—Wm. Capps.  
Utah—Simon Bamberger.  
Vermont—C. W. Melcher.  
Virginia—S. Gordon Cumming.  
Washington—E. C. Million.  
West Virginia—John W. Davis.  
Wisconsin—Wm. G. Fordyce.  
Wyoming—J. U. Allard.  
Alaska—George Murphy.  
Arizona—Isaac Barth.  
District of Columbia—Edwin B. Hay.  
Hawaii—C. A. Galbraith.  
Indian Territory—W. C. Rogers.  
New Mexico—L. K. McGaffey.  
Oklahoma—W. E. Worden.  
Porto Rico—A. Molina.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Alabama—George A. Searcy.  
Arkansas—J. W. Crockett.  
California—D. W. Carmichael.  
Colorado—John H. Voorhees.  
Connecticut—John J. Walsh.  
Delaware—L. Irving Handy.  
Florida—N. P. Bryan.  
Georgia—J. H. Skelton.  
Idaho—J. W. Ballantine.  
Illinois—Free P. Morris.  
Indiana—Martin Kruger.  
Iowa—Charles Reynolds.  
Kansas—J. M. McCown.  
Kentucky—June W. Gayle.  
Louisiana—W. H. Wise.  
Maine—F. Otis Gould.  
Maryland—Austin L. Crothers.  
Massachusetts—John R. Thayer.  
Michigan—Edward Ryan.

Minnesota—F. D. Larrabee.  
 Mississippi—Leroy Percy.  
 Missouri—R. B. Oliver.  
 Montana—Joseph Smith, 2d.  
 Nebraska—W. H. Thompson.  
 Nevada—W. E. Sharon.  
 New Hampshire—Manasah Perkins.  
 New Jersey—Johnston Cornish.  
 New York—Thomas F. Grady.  
 North Carolina—A. W. McLean.  
 North Dakota—Wm. M. Woods.  
 Ohio—Wellington Stillwell.  
 Oregon—Samuel M. Garland.  
 Pennsylvania—R. Scott Ammerman.  
 Rhode Island—David J. Barry.  
 South Carolina—R. G. Rhett.  
 South Dakota—W. F. Brennan.  
 Tennessee—G. F. Milton.  
 Texas—R. T. Milner.  
 Utah—Samuel A. King.  
 Vermont—J. E. Burke.  
 Virginia—Claggett B. Jones.  
 Washington—H. Blackman.  
 West Virginia—Henry S. Wilson.  
 Wisconsin—Thomas L. Cleary.  
 Wyoming—George W. Creswell.  
 Alaska—S. D. Agnew.  
 Arizona—W. A. Gillespie.  
 District of Columbia—John F. Monaghan.  
 Hawaii—C. P. Iaukea.  
 Indian Territory—L. M. Poe.  
 New Mexico—Oliver Lee.  
 Oklahoma—Frank Stevens.  
 Porto Rico—I. B. Tredway.

COMMITTEE ON PLATFORM AND RESOLUTIONS.

Alabama—Rufus N. Rhodes.  
 Arkansas—J. P. Clarke.



California—D. M. Delmas.  
Colorado—Charles S. Thomas.  
Connecticut—Bryan F. Mahan.  
Delaware—Willard Saulsbury.  
Florida—C. L. Wilson.  
Georgia—John W. Maddox.  
Idaho—Fred T. Dubois.  
Illinois—Ben T. Cable.  
Indiana—Benj. F. Shively.  
Iowa—J. B. Weaver.  
Kansas—A. M. Jackson.  
Kentucky—J. C. W. Beckham.  
Louisiana—M. J. Foster.  
Maine—Charles F. Johnson.  
Maryland—John P. Poe.  
Massachusetts—Charles S. Hamlin.  
Michigan—T. E. Barkworth.  
Minnesota—C. E. Vasaly.  
Mississippi—John Sharp Williams.  
Missouri—J. T. Heard.  
Montana—Martin Maginnis.  
Nebraska—W. J. Bryan.  
Nevada—F. G. Newlands.  
New Hampshire—John M. Mitchell.  
New Jersey—Alvah A. Clark.  
New York—David B. Hill.  
North Carolina—Ed. Chambers Smith.  
North Dakota—Siver Serumgard.  
Ohio—John A. McMahon.  
Oregon—W. F. Butcher.  
Pennsylvania—R. E. Pattison.  
Rhode Island—George W. Greene.  
South Carolina—B. R. Tillman.  
South Dakota—R. F. Pettigrew.  
Tennessee—E. W. Carmack.  
Texas—J. W. Bailey.  
Utah—Frank J. Cannon.  
Vermont—Elisha May.

Virginia—John W. Daniel.  
Washington—M. M. Godman.  
West Virginia—Henry G. Davis.  
Wisconsin—Thomas J. Fleming.  
Wyoming—David N. Stickney.  
Alaska—W. E. Crews.  
Arizona—W. F. Timmons.  
District of Columbia—James L. Norris.  
Hawaii—James L. Coke.  
Indian Territory—Tom L. Wade.  
New Mexico—James G. Fitch.  
Oklahoma—Roy E. Stafford.  
Porto Rico—D. M. Molina.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

MR. WILLIAM BOURKE COCKRAN, of New York: I move that this body stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

MR. E. B. HAY, of the District of Columbia: I move to substitute "10 o'clock."

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: What was the motion of the gentleman from New York?

MR. COCKRAN: What hour would the chairman suggest?

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Ten o'clock.

MR. COCKRAN: Very well. I move that the Convention adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Convention adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 7, 1904, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## SECOND DAY.

### MORNING SESSION.

THE COLISEUM, ST. LOUIS, MO., Thursday, July 7, 1904.

The Convention met at 10 o'clock a. m.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, Archbishop John J. Glennon, of St. Louis, will now invoke the blessing of Almighty God.

#### PRAYER OF ARCHBISHOP JOHN J. GLENNON.

Archbishop John J. Glennon offered the following prayer:

Our Father Who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

Come, Holy Spirit, enlighten the hearts of the people; pour forth the fire of Thy divine love; send forth Thy spirit, O Lord, and they shall be created and Thou shalt renew the face of the earth.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The first business in order is the report of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

Mr. Thomas F. Grady, of New York, read the report as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Order of Business respectfully report the following:

*Resolved*, That the rules of the last Democratic National Convention, including the rules of the House of Representatives

of the Fifty-third Congress, so far as applicable, be the rules of this Convention.

The order of business shall be :

First, report of the Committee on Credentials.

Second, report of the Committee on Permanent Organization.

Third, report of Committee on Resolutions.

Fourth, presentation and selection of a candidate for President of the United States.

Fifth, presentation and selection of a candidate for Vice-President.

Sixth, motions and resolutions.

THOS. F. GRADY, *Chairman*.

MR. THOS. F. GRADY, of New York: I move the adoption of the resolution reported by the committee.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

PORTO RICO AND THE PHILIPPINES.

MR. THOS. F. GRADY, of New York: From the Committee on Rules and Order of Business I submit another report.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, July 6, 1904.

*To the Democratic National Convention:*

Your Committee on Rules and Order of Business considered the petitions of the representatives of Porto Rico and of the Philippine Islands, and agreed to report for your consideration the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the rules of the Convention are held to include as entitled to vote the Representatives of Porto Rico, accorded seats in the Convention by the action of the National Committee, when certified by the Committee on Credentials.

All of which is most respectfully submitted.

THOS. F. GRADY, *Chairman*,

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

MR. J. C. SOUTH, of Arkansas: I move to amend the report by including the Philippine Islands also. I believe the Philippine Islands are as much entitled to seats on this floor as is any island dependency. [Applause.]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas. Are there any other remarks upon the question? Gentlemen, this is a most important matter. We are about to determine whether a Democratic Convention shall declare at one and the same time that the Philippines ought not to be a part of the United States and that Philippine delegates should be admitted to seats in a governing political body of the United States. [Applause.] Does any one else desire to be heard upon the pending proposition?

MR. L. IRVING HANDY, of Delaware: Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the resolution, which attempts to deal only with the seating of delegates from Porto Rico, with the power to vote. An amendment seeking to tack on to that the seating of delegates from the Philippines with the right to vote is not germane.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair has heard the point of order made by the gentleman from Delaware and overrules it, because the resolution itself in the body of it states that the committee was dealing with the question of the admission to the floor of representatives from Porto Rico and the Philippines.

MR. L. IRVING HANDY, of Delaware: I make the point of order that the amendment is out of order, because under the law the Philippine Islands are not a part of the Government of the United States, and therefore their delegates cannot be seated.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to be heard?

MR. J. C. SOUTH, of Arkansas, rose.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

MR. J. C. SOUTH, of Arkansas: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, I desire to say that the purpose of the amendment I proposed to the report of the Committee on Rules is that all these insular possessions ought to have been and should be by this Convention treated alike. I do not recognize, and I do not believe this Convention desires to recognize, the Porto Rican delegates upon any basis different from that upon which it recognizes the representatives from the Philippine Islands.

I do not believe, speaking to the point of order, that the gentleman's point now made is well taken, because we are dealing with the question of the adoption of the report, as indicated by the Chair, and the call of the National Committee could not control the action of this Convention. It can point out and indicate what we should do, but, according to every parliamentary usage, the body of a convention is the judge of the qualifications of its own members, and not the committee that calls it into being. [Applause.]

I insist, sir, that every deliberative body, under the common parliamentary usage of this country and of England, so far back as parliamentary history is known, has ever been the exclusive judge of the qualifications of its own members; and it is untenable for the gentlemen of that committee or of the sub-committee to undertake to declare that the National Committee can indicate by its call whom it desired this Convention to admit as delegates; and to declare that a motion from a humble delegate on the floor to admit some other delegates is not in order, is in exceedingly bad taste in that committee and un-Democratic in the extreme. But I agree with the Chairman. I do not want the Philippine Islands considered as part of this country. Neither do I want Porto Rico so considered until it has been received into this Union of States by the voice of the people of that island. [Applause.]

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, desire to withdraw the amendment I offered, and to ask this Convention to reject the report of the committee proposing to seat delegates from Porto Rico.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The amendment is withdrawn. The question before the Convention is on agreeing to the resolution reported by the committee.

MR. THOS. F. GRADY, of New York: I desire simply to justify the action of the committee in view of the strictures passed upon it by the very eloquent gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. South).

The National Committee decided that there was sufficient in the position of Porto Rico toward the United States to entitle its representatives to seats upon this floor. Considering that the National Committee had the power when it issued its call, and considering that that committee had the power in its call to include Porto Rico, it certainly did not transcend the bounds of its authority.

The question came before us as to whether under the rules a delegation not specifically included within the call of the National Committee, but by them accorded seats upon the floor, were entitled to vote; and all that the Committee on Rules have done, the only presumption in which we have indulged, according to the gentleman from Arkansas, is to say that the rules shall be held to include their right to vote when their credentials are passed upon, just as his credentials were passed upon to entitle him to a vote in this Convention. [Applause.]

The gentleman forgets, or else he never knew, that the Supreme Court of the United States have decided that Porto Rico is a part of the territory of these United States. [Applause.] And it has been decided, as the gentleman from Arkansas will remember, that once a part of the United States, it can never be a part of any other government under the stars. [Applause.]

The same Supreme Court have decided that the Philippine Islands are not a part of the United States, but simply a dependency of the Government; and that distinction, approved of and recognized by the United States Supreme Court, has been followed by your Committee on Rules.

Therefore, I ask that these representatives, when their credentials shall be sanctioned, as yours have been, may have the same rights in a Democratic convention that are accorded

to the representatives of any other part of our people. [Applause.]

MR. J. C. SOUTH, of Arkansas: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, I should like to say a few words in reply to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Grady).

It is not my desire to enter at this time upon a discussion of the merits of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the insular question; but it is a well-known fact that that decision has never met the approval of the Democratic masses of this country. [Applause.] We have not time here now to enter into a discussion of the partisanship of that court; nor is it our desire so to do; but we do want to say a word on behalf of the people in this country who roll up the Democratic votes, and that is, that Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands are entitled to the same consideration. [Applause.]

If by a decision of the court this Convention will be guided as to whom it will admit as its delegates, let us agree with Roosevelt and the Republican party that when the flag is hoisted in the Philippine Islands there it shall never come down. [Applause.] If it is good doctrine in Porto Rico, it is good doctrine in the Philippine Islands.

The gentleman says that this is merely to exist pending the report of the Credentials Committee; to wait until the Credentials Committee reports. Let us fight it out now. If we say now that these delegates shall be received, then the Credentials Committee will say, "The Convention, by the adoption of that report, has already admitted Porto Rico only." Gentlemen, I ask you to treat them all alike; make them stand upon the same parity; and the way to do that is to vote down the committee's report upon this proposition. [Applause.]

MR. OSCAR SUTRO, of the Philippine Islands, endeavored to secure recognition.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman from the Philippine Islands, because he is not a member of this body.

MR. L. IRVING HANDY, of Delaware: Mr. Chairman and



gentlemen of the Convention, your committee, in recommending the admission of delegates from Porto Rico, recognizes the fact that Porto Rico is joined forever, for good or bad, to the Government of the United States. There are eight hundred thousand people living in Porto Rico. They are under the Government of the United States, and here they must remain. It is no more than justice that the people of Porto Rico should have six votes in this Convention, through which they may have a voice as to the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States.

But how is it with the Philippines? The hope of the Democratic party with regard to the Philippines is that the day shall come when the Filipinos will nominate their own President and have their own republic. [Applause.] Our aspiration for the Philippines is that human liberty shall be recognized there as we have recognized it in Cuba.

But there is no ambition for independence in Porto Rico; and no Democrat has ever lifted his voice, the Democratic party has never lifted its voice, in favor of a republic in Porto Rico. That island is near our shores; propinquity governs the case.

Let us be sensible. Let us be sane and reasonable on this subject. Let us admit Porto Rico and bid the Philippines wait for the kind day in which a triumphant Democracy may make them ready for liberty and independence in a republic of the Asiatic seas. [Applause.] [Cries of "Question."]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules (putting the question). The "ayes" seem to have it.

MR. J. C. SOUTH, of Arkansas: I demand a roll call.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Arkansas asks for a call of the roll upon the pending proposition.

The roll call was not ordered.

The resolution reported by the Committee on Rules was agreed to.

MR. A. H. MOLINA, of Porto Rico: Mr. Chairman—

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Porto Rico.

MR. A. H. MOLINA, of Porto Rico: The gentleman from

Porto Rico is already a citizen of the United States: *Civus Americanus sum.*

My first vote was for Tilden. [Applause.] My last vote will be for a Democrat [applause], a real Democrat. I am a Porto Rican by birth. I am an American by an act of my volition, not by a woman giving me birth here or there. I am an American citizen. [Applause.] I am here as a Democrat because I am thoroughly acquainted with the stupidity of the Republican party. [Applause.] It is at a clinic that a physician's knowledge is demonstrated. It is in the possessions, it is in the colonies that the knowledge of an honest statesman is shown. The best proof that the Republican party do not stand for the Republic is that they are not acknowledging the principle of the Republic. Republicanism means national sovereignty, and we know in Porto Rico that for the administration of the so-called Republican party, Republicanism means the sovereignty of the trusts, and of the privileged few. [Applause.]

Over there we are acquainted with the meaning and the principles of Democracy. It means equality before the law, and because we think the Democratic party stands for equality and not for special privileges, Porto Rico has sent us here as delegates to the Democratic National Convention. [Applause.]

Democracy means equality, and we are with you and against the Republican party because the Republican party is against equality. The Constitution of the United States in its preamble stands for the equality of all men. The Republican party has already divided the population of the United States into free men and slaves. What right have they under the Constitution to hold us as slaves?

I know very well that I must not speak very long. I thank you and I thank the American people for the honor that they have given us, the delegates of Porto Rico. [Applause.]

#### COMMITTEE ON PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will now make an announcement. It is a little out of order at this particular time, but the Chairman permits it because it will expedite the business of the Convention.

**THE CLERK:** The Chairman of the Committee on Permanent Organization, owing to unofficial information, is not yet ready to make the report of that committee, and desires immediately a conference of that committee at the place where they met yesterday.

#### COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS.

**THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** The next business in order is the report of the Committee on Credentials. [A pause.] The Chair is informed that the Committee on Credentials will not be ready to report until 2 o'clock.

#### RECESS.

**MR. WILLIAM F. SHEEHAN,** of New York: I move that the Convention take a recess until 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a. m.) the Convention took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

---

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

At the expiration of the recess the Convention resumed its session.

**THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** The first thing in the order of business is the report of the Committee on Credentials. Is the Committee on Credentials ready to report?

**MR. JAMES KERR,** of Pennsylvania: In view of the fact that apparently the Committee on Credentials are not ready to report, I move that the Convention take a recess until half past three. [A pause.] I am informed that the committee are now ready, and I withdraw the motion.

**THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** The motion is withdrawn, because it is ascertained that the committee is ready to report. The Chairman of the committee will come to the platform.

**MR. EDWARD M. ROBINSON,** of Alabama: I move that until the Chairman of the Committee on Credentials is prepared to report, the Convention hear from Governor Beckham, of Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Governor Beckham asks the Convention kindly to excuse him from addressing it at the present time.

MR. JOSHUA W. MILES, of Maryland: Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that the Chairman of the Committee on Credentials informed me as a member of that committee that he did not expect to be able to report promptly at the reconvening of the Convention this afternoon, and probably not until 3 o'clock.

MR. T. J. SPARKS, of Illinois: I move that the Honorable William Bourke Cockran, of New York, be asked to address the Convention.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion that the Honorable William Bourke Cockran, of the State of New York, be requested to address the Convention. You have heard the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. THOMAS F. GRADY, of New York: Mr. Cockran is not in the hall.

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CREDENTIALS.

MR. JAMES M. HEAD, of Tennessee: Mr. Chairman—

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee on Credentials.

Mr. Head thereupon read the report of the Committee on Credentials, which is as follows:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 7, 1904.

*To the Democratic National Convention:*

Your Committee on Credentials beg leave to submit the following report:

In these States and territories where no contests have been filed, we carefully examined the original credentials of the delegates and alternates, and find the same to have been correctly certified to the Chairman of the National Committee, and the roster as prepared by the Chairman and Secretary and sub-

nitted to this Convention for its temporary organization, is correct and accurate, and we unanimously recommend its adoption by this Convention.

In the matter of the contests of the District of Columbia and the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, and 6th Districts of the State of Pennsylvania, and the 12th District of the State of Ohio, and the 1st and 2d Districts of the State of New Jersey, and the 2d District of the State of Maine, and the 1st, 2d, 6th, 7th, 9th and 10th Districts of the State of Indiana, and the delegates from the State at large; and the 2d, 3d, 6th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 15th, 16th, 18th, 21st, 23d and 25th Districts of the State of Illinois, and two of the delegates from the State at large in said State, your Committee desires to say that they realize, as this Convention must, that it was absolutely impossible for the Committee to have done more, in the limited time which they could possibly give to this great number of contests, than to examine the principal questions involved and dispose of them in such manner as in their judgment would nearest meet the ends of justice, and best subserve the interests of the Democratic party in those States, Territories and Districts where the contests arose.

There were filed with this Committee printed arguments, briefs, records, affidavits and telegrams in several of these contests which it would have been impossible for your Committee to have even read in less than ten days, working as we did last night, from 7 o'clock in the evening until 5 o'clock this morning.

Your Committee gave to each of the contestants and contestees who desired to appear before us, all the time it was possible to do, and in each case by asking such questions as occurred to any member of the Committee, endeavored to ascertain as near as could be all the important facts bearing upon each contest. In the State of Illinois, however, the several contesting Congressional Districts were asked to select three representatives to speak for all the contests in that State.

After such consideration as it was possible to give under these circumstances, your Committee report that in each of the following contests the delegations as named by the National Committee are entitled to seats as the regularly accredited dele-

gates and alternates to this Convention, viz: The District of Columbia, the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th and 6th Districts of Pennsylvania, the entire delegation from the State of South Dakota, the 12th District in Ohio, the 1st and 2d Districts in New Jersey, the 2d District in Maine, the 1st, 2d, 6th, 7th, 9th and 10th Districts and the delegation at large from Indiana.

In the matter of the contest from the 2d, 3d, 6th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 15th, 16th, 18th, 23d and 25th, and the seats of Ben. T. Cable and John P. Hopkins from the State at large in Illinois your Committee recommend that the delegations as named by the National Committee are entitled to seats in this Convention as the regularly accredited delegates and alternates.

In the matter of the contest from the 21st District of the State of Illinois, your Committee report that Alfred Orendorff and A. B. Corman as delegates, and J. N. C. Shumway and Jesse F. Griffin as alternates are entitled to seats in this Convention as the properly accredited delegates and alternates.

In the matter of the delegate to this Convention from the State of North Dakota, who was killed in a railway accident on his way to St. Louis, the Hon. Jacob G. Birder, it appears that the alternate of said Birder, the Hon. Frank C. Myrick, has given to the Hon. Thomas R. Shaw his proxy to represent him at this Convention, which proxy was filed with your Committee. We recommend that said proxy be recognized and that said Thomas R. Shaw be recognized as the properly accredited representative in this Convention.

In the matter of the representation which the Island of Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands shall have in this Convention your Committee recommend that each of said Islands be accredited with six delegates and six alternates, and that Charles M. Boerman, Herbert E. Shaffer, D. M. Field, Miguel Sales, Dr. A. H. Molina, and H. P. Loake, as delegates from Porto Rico, are entitled to seats in this Convention as the regularly accredited delegates; and that from the Philippine Islands, Oscar Sutro, W. D. Wisdom, Hugh Bonner, Judge A. C. Carson, Barry Baldwin, and C. W. O'Brien as delegates and that William N. Swartsout, Victor Del Pan, D. W. Yancy, L. J. Lambert, J. M. Coin, and T. Hodgson, as alternates be ad-

mitted to seats in this Convention as the regularly accredited delegates and alternates.

In the matters of the representation which the Indian Territory and the Territory of Oklahoma now have in this Convention, in view of the large increase in the population of said Territories, your Committee recommend that this Convention instruct the National Executive Committee in issuing its call for the next National Convention to authorize each of said Territories to elect eight delegates and eight alternates to represent them in the next National Democratic Convention.

We attach to this report the complete roster of delegates and alternates as passed upon and approved by this Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

J. M. HEAD, *Chairman.*

ALEXANDER M. DALY, *Secretary.*

## DELEGATES TO THE CONVENTION.

### ALABAMA.

#### DELEGATES AT LARGE.

E. L. Russell.	H. S. D. Mallory.
Rufus N. Rhodes.	Wm. Richardson.

#### DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	6th District.
Edward M. Robinson.	George A. Searcy.
J. K. Kyser.	John A. Rogers.
2d District.	7th District.
R. E. Steiner.	G. W. Pratt.
W. C. Black.	Hugh H. White.
3d District.	8th District.
A. A. Evans.	E. A. O'Neal.
B. G. Farmer.	T. C. McClelland.
4th District.	9th District.
A. L. McLeod.	E. W. Barrett.
T. P. Johnston.	H. E. Reynolds.
5th District.	
A. J. Driver.	
E. J. Garrison.	

## ARKANSAS.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Jefferson Davis.	J. W. Crockett.
James H. Berry.	James P. Clarke.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	5th District.
Harry Woods.	E. A. Darr.
L. P. Berry.	Sam Frauenthal.
2d District.	6th District.
J. B. Baker.	W. H. Langford.
T. M. Woods.	W. H. Martin.
3d District.	7th District.
H. A. Dinsmore.	R. S. Warnock.
Jerry C. South.	John N. Wheeler.
4th District.	
W. H. Arnold.	
O. L. Miles.	

## CALIFORNIA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

M. F. Tarpey.	D. M. Delmas.
D. W. Carmichael.	Joseph Simons.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	6th District.
R. H. DeWitt.	Henry Brickley.
A. I. McSorley.	T. C. Butler.
2d District.	7th District.
J. B. Sanford.	D. W. Edleman
P. C. Cohn.	(½ vote).
3d District.	J. Harvey McCarthy
J. J. McDonald.	(½ vote).
James A. Keys.	Martin C. Marsh.
4th District.	8th District.
William J. McGee.	W. E. Shepherd.
M. Jasper McDonald.	R. F. Garner.
5th District.	
William M. Cannon.	
John A. Hicks.	



COLORADO.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Charles J. Hughes, Jr.	Alva Adams.
Charles S. Thomas.	William P. Seeds.
Thomas J. O'Donnell.	George E. West.

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	2d District.
Harry E. Insley.	J. H. Robeson.
Charles B. Ward.	J. H. Voorhees.

CONNECTICUT.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Homer S. Cummings.	Bryan F. Mahan.
--------------------	-----------------

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	3d District.
Ignatius A. Sullivan.	P. H. Harriman.
Henry C. Dissell.	Thomas F. Foran.
Charles B. Pinney.	Edward Mullan.
2d District.	4th District.
Louis A. Fisk.	James P. Woodruff.
James E. McCabe.	John J. Walsh.
J. Taylor Flynn.	N. B. Stevens.

DELAWARE.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Willard Saulsbury.	Richard R. Kenney.
L. Irving Handy.	Alexander M. Daly.

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

John P. Holland.	Elisha C. Dukes.
------------------	------------------

FLORIDA.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

T. J. Appleyard.	John S. Beard.
W. J. Hillman.	W. J. Bryan.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

W. R. Fuller.  
A. P. Jordan.

## 2d District.

T. S. Anderson.  
J. E. T. Bowden.

## 3d District.

F. G. Renshaw.  
C. L. Wilson.

## GEORGIA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

John W. Maddox.  
J. M. Smith.

J. R. Gray.  
C. R. Pendleton.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

R. C. Neely.  
M. W. Dixon.

## 2d District.

H. M. McIntosh.  
J. B. Norman, Jr.

## 3d District.

I. P. Cocke.  
A. C. Riley.

## 4th District.

W. A. Little.  
H. C. Fisher.

## 5th District.

A. H. Van Dyke.  
A. C. Stone.

## 6th District.

Jos. E. Pottle.  
R. T. Daniel.

## 7th District.

Moses Wright.  
Albert Strickland.

## 8th District.

J. D. Price.  
J. H. Skelton.

## 9th District.

W. E. Candler.  
W. W. Stark.

## 10th District.

C. Bruce Young.  
W. B. Crawford.

## 11th District.

J. S. Adams.  
R. G. Dickerson.

## IDAHO.

## DELEGATES.

Fred T. Dubois.  
Frank W. Hunt.  
Henry Heitfeld.

Timothy Regan.  
W. W. Woods.  
J. W. Ballentine.

## ILLINOIS.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Samuel Alshuler.	Ben T. Cable.
John P. Hopkins.	Andrew M. Lawrence.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	11th District.
James M. Dailey.	Wm. H. Clair.
Eugene M. Keeley.	Carl Botsford.
2d District.	12th District.
Thomas Gahan.	Morris T. Moloney.
James C. Russell.	Jas. H. Eckles.
3d District.	13th District.
James A. Long.	P. O. Stiver.
George E. Brennan.	F. W. Mitchell.
4th District.	14th District.
Thomas Carey.	T. J. Sparks.
Edward J. Rainey.	John P. Sexton.
5th District.	15th District.
Wm. Loeffler.	Chas. K. Ladd.
A. J. Sabath.	Andrew Harrington.
6th District.	16th District.
John J. McLaughlin.	Samuel Woolner, Jr.
Ross C. Hall.	E. J. Kinery.
7th District.	17th District.
Wm. Legner.	Silas A. Rathbun.
Roger C. Sullivan.	J. J. Pitts.
8th District.	18th District.
Stanley H. Kunz.	Free P. Morris.
Clarence S. Darrow.	Thomas F. Donovan.
9th District.	19th District.
John H. Colvin.	John W. Yantis.
Robert E. Burke.	J. P. Gulick.
10th District.	20th District.
Thomas E. Barrett.	O. P. Thompson.
Thomas J. Hechinger.	Belmot Bollan.

## 21st District.

A. B. Corman.  
Alfred Orendorff.

## 22d District.

Fred. J. Kearn.  
Louis F. Lumaghi.

## 23d District.

Jas. B. Crowley.  
Thomas E. Ford.

## 24th District.

Charles Carroll.  
J. H. Lane.

## 25th District.

W. R. Borders.  
W. H. Hart.

## INDIANA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

John W. Kern.  
Wm. H. O'Brien.

Benj. F. Shively.  
G. V. Menzies.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

John W. Spencer.  
A. H. Taylor.

## 2d District.

Wm. N. Matthews.  
Wm. H. Vollmer.

## 3d District.

George B. Parks.  
Louis P. Benau.

## 4th District.

Joseph M. Cravens.  
James F. Cox.

## 5th District.

A. W. Knight.  
John E. Lamb.

## 6th District.

Morgan L. Miers.  
U. S. Jackson.

## 7th District.

W. W. Spencer.  
Jos. E. Bell.

## 8th District.

George T. Bebee.  
Abraham Simmons.

## 9th District.

Samuel L. Ralston.  
W. E. Longley.

## 10th District.

Daniel W. Simms.  
M. T. Kruger.

## 11th District.

B. F. Louthain.  
Jerome Herff.

## 12th District.

Henry Colerick.  
F. M. Hines.

## 13th District.

Frank Herring.  
Homer F. Neff.

IOWA.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

E. M. Carr.	J. B. Weaver.
J. M. Parsons.	S. B. Wadsworth.

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District. W. W. Baldwin. E. P. McManus.	7th District. H. C. Evans. S. M. Hamilton.
2d District. W. M. Desmond. Jerry B. Murphy.	8th District. M. B. Maring. A. V. Penn.
3d District. A. T. O'Brien. Frank J. Fowler.	9th District. E. J. Sidey. H. B. Holsman.
4th District. J. J. Kieron. A. R. McCook.	10th District. W. I. Branagan. Charles Reynolds.
5th District. Sam S. Wright. C. D. Huston.	11th District. Will C. Whiting. Charles A. Cook.
6th District. John Doner. George F. Rinehart.	

KANSAS.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

W. A. Harris.	J. G. Johnson.
H. P. Farrelly.	S. I. Hale.
David Overmeyer.	J. N. Heymaker.

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District. Frank P. Fitzwilliams. James W. Orr.	3d District. A. M. Jackson. G. W. Gabriel.
2d District. Thomas W. Morgan. W. P. Dillard.	4th District. A. S. Kemper. J. M. McCowen.

## 5th District.

T. L. Bond.  
W. H. L. Pepperell.

## 6th District.

S. C. Smith.  
A. A. Roth.

## 7th District.

C. W. Oswald.  
O. P. Scarce.

## KENTUCKY.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

J. C. S. Blackburn.                      J. C. W. Beckham.  
James B. McCreary.                      Ollie M. James.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

John L. Grayot.  
Jacob Corbett.

## 2d District.

F. M. Baker.  
Wm. Berry.

## 3d District.

W. A. Wickliffe.  
Gerald T. Finn.

## 4th District.

R. H. Moss.  
John C. Graham.

## 5th District.

Charles F. Grainger.  
Swager Shirley.

## 6th District.

C. B. Terrell.  
M. L. Downs.

## 7th District.

June W. Gayle.  
J. C. Cantrill.

## 8th District.

W. R. Ray.  
C. W. Kavanaugh.

## 9th District.

W. A. Byron.  
John E. Woods.

## 10th District.

C. B. Hili.  
J. M. Roberson.

## 11th District.

John W. Collier.  
A. Gatliff.

## LOUISIANA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Newton C. Blanchard.                      Samuel D. McEnery.  
Murphy J. Foster.                              E. B. Kruttschnitt.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	5th District.
Alex Pujol.	G. C. Goldman.
V. Mauberret.	John P. Parker.
2d District.	6th District.
L. H. Marrero.	Edward J. Gay.
John B. Fisher.	Eugene B. Watson.
3d District.	7th District.
Robert F. Broussard.	Jeff D. Marks.
Ed. McCollam.	J. J. Thompson.
4th District.	
W. H. Wise.	
D. M. Atkins.	

## MAINE.

## DELEGATES.

1st District.	3d District.
M. P. Frank.	Charles F. Johnson.
Luther R. Moore.	Wm. H. McLellan.
Nathan Clifford.	Albert B. Page.
2d District.	4th District.
E. O. Greenleaf.	H. J. Hathaway.
Frank L. Millett.	George M. Hanson.
M. W. Levensaler.	F. O. Gould.

## MARYLAND.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Arthur Pue Gorman.	Murray Vandiver.
John Walter Smith.	J. Fred C. Talbott.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	3d District.
Joshua W. Miles.	John Hannibal.
Richard D. Hynson.	Frank A. Furst.
2d District.	4th District.
Thomas H. Robinson.	John J. Mahon.
Fred Von Kapf.	Francis E. Yewell.

5th District.

George Wells.  
J. Frank Smith.

6th District.

Buchanan Schley.  
Arthur Peter.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Patrick A. Collins.  
William A. Gaston.John R. Thayer.  
William L. Douglas.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.

Henry W. Ely.  
Thomas P. Welch.

2d District.

Alfred P. Dennis.  
Wm. P. Hayes.

3d District.

John O'Gara.  
Joseph A. Smith.

4th District.

John T. Burnett.  
Frank T. Rock.

5th District.

Guy W. Carrier.  
John C. Burke.

6th District.

Lott F. McNamara.  
John H. Sheedy.

7th District.

William P. Connery.  
Dennis H. Tyrrell.

8th District.

John F. O'Brien.  
J. Frank Facey.

9th District.

Wm. T. A. Fitzgerald.  
Wm. F. McClellan.

10th District.

Wm. S. McNary.  
William J. Power.

11th District.

John H. Lee.  
Charles S. Hamlin.

12th District.

James H. Vahey.  
James E. Cotter.

13th District.

John W. Coughlin.  
Charles S. Ashley.

14th District.

Charles C. Paine.  
Edward S. Gilmore.

## MICHIGAN.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

Daniel J. Campau.  
Thomas E. Barkworth.George D. Jackson.  
John Power.



DISTRICT DELEGATES.

- |                      |                      |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1st District.        | 7th District.        |
| Francis F. Palms.    | Frank W. Hubbard.    |
| Edwin Henderson.     | J. C. Graham.        |
| 2d District.         | 8th District.        |
| Elmer R. Labadie.    | Stanley E. Parkhill. |
| Herbert B. Hathaway. | William B. Baum.     |
| 3d District.         | 9th District.        |
| Louis G. Stevenson.  | James W. Dempsey.    |
| John B. Shipman.     | A. O. White.         |
| 4th District.        | 10th District.       |
| A. C. Himebaugh.     | Casper Alpern.       |
| Fred. Collins.       | George W. McCabe.    |
| 5th District.        | 11th District.       |
| William F. McKnight. | Frank O. Gaffney.    |
| William O. Van Eyck. | Alva W. Nichols.     |
| 6th District.        | 12th District.       |
| Peter I. Meloy.      | Edward Ryan.         |
| L. E. Howlett.       | Paul Perrizzo.       |

MINNESOTA.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

- |                |                    |
|----------------|--------------------|
| John Lind.     | Leonard A. Rosing. |
| C. D. O'Brien. | H. L. Buck.        |

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

- |                    |                      |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1st District.      | 5th District.        |
| L. E. Virtue.      | F. D. Larrabee.      |
| W. W. Mayo.        | J. R. Corrigan.      |
| 2d District.       | 6th District.        |
| Frank A. Day.      | C. E. Vasaly.        |
| Charles T. Taylor. | S. J. Mealey.        |
| 3d District.       | 7th District.        |
| J. W. Craven.      | D. H. Evans.         |
| H. B. Gress.       | Thomas F. O'Hair.    |
| 4th District.      | 8th District.        |
| R. T. O'Conner.    | Charles d'Autremont. |
| J. G. Armson.      | R. W. Safford.       |

## 9th District.

Alexander Thompson.

C. A. Nye.

## MISSISSIPPI.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.\*

\* As certified by the Chairman and Secretary of the State Convention.

John Sharp Williams.

H. D. Money.

A. J. McLaurin.

Thomas C. Catchings.

James K. Vardaman.

Charles E. Hooker.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

J. M. Boon.

Walter Weaver.

## 2d District.

C. L. Sively.

J. N. Brown.

## 3d District.

F. A. Montgomery.

Leroy Percy.

## 4th District.

J. G. Smythe.

J. T. Dunn.

## 5th District.

W. D. Cameron.

J. S. Eaton.

## 6th District.

R. P. Hilton.

Jesse Bounds.

## 7th District.

J. D. Barkdull.

T. W. James.

## 8th District.

W. M. Carstarphen.

W. S. McAllister.

## MISSOURI.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

William J. Stone.

Champ Clark.

Alexander M. Dockery.

David A. DeArmond.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

J. W. McDermott.

R. M. Miller.

## 2d District.

B. B. Gill.

T. M. Bresnehan.

## 3d District.

I. J. Mead.

R. G. Yates.

## 4th District.

C. F. Stroop.

John S. Bilby.

5th District.	11th District.
Frank P. Walsh.	Harry B. Hawes.
James McGowan.	P. R. Fitzgibbons.
6th District.	12th District.
Harvey W. Salmon.	J. J. Butler.
S. W. Dooley.	E. E. Geuion.
7th District.	13th District.
John T. Heard.	Wm. R. Edgars.
J. J. Fulkerson.	J. H. Malugen.
8th District.	14th District.
H. T. Lee.	W. D. Vandiver.
W. S. Allee.	S. B. Tribble.
9th District.	15th District.
D. A. Ball.	L. C. Chenoweth.
E. L. Alford.	John M. Aarp.
10th District.	16th District.
A. C. Stenver.	A. H. Clark.
George J. Tansey.	P. L. Lyles.

## MONTANA.

### DELEGATES.

Joseph K. Toole.	W. G. Conrad.
W. A. Clark.	Martin Maginnis.
Paris Gibson.	Harry Gallway.

## NEBRASKA.

### DELEGATES AT LARGE.

William J. Bryan.	C. J. Smyth.
William H. Thompson.	G. W. Phillips.

### DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	3d District.
J. A. McGuire.	J. G. Beste.
Frank Morgan.	D. V. Stevens.
2d District.	4th District.
J. A. Creighton.	C. D. Casper.
W. H. DeFrance.	C. P. Fall.

## 5th District.

J. O. Walker.  
J. D. England.

## 6th District.

T. J. O'Keefe.  
C. F. Wilson.

## NEVADA.

## DELEGATES.

Joseph R. Ryan.	George Russell.
Francis G. Newlands.	Peter C. Weber.
W. E. Sharon.	Reinhold Sadler.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

John M. Mitchell.	Jeremiah J. Doyle.
True L. Norris.	Joseph P. Chatel.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

Nathaniel E. Martin.  
Joseph Warren.

## 2d District.

Manasah Perkins.  
John J. McGovern.

## NEW JERSEY.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

James Smith, Jr.	Howard Carrow.
Robert Davis.	Johnston Cornish.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

## 1st District.

William J. Thompson.  
James Strimple.

## 5th District.

DeWitt C. Flanagan.  
James C. Connolly.

## 2d District.

Michael A. Devine.  
B. Frank Hires.

## 6th District.

William B. Gurley.  
George Zimmerman.

## 3d District.

O. C. Bogardus.  
Edwin Furman.

## 7th District.

John R. Hardin.  
Laurence T. Fell.

## 4th District.

Alvah A. Clarke.  
Charles H. Gallagher.

## 8th District.

Gottfried Krueger.  
James R. Nugent.

9th District.

L. F. Donohue.

John Mehl.

10th District.

John Mullins.

E. A. S. Lewis.

## NEW YORK.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

David B. Hill.

Edward Murphy, Jr.

George Ehret.

James W. Ridgway.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.

Perry Belmont.

Philip T. Cronin.

2d District.

Patrick H. McCarren.

George H. Lindsley.

3d District.

Martin W. Littleton.

James D. Bell.

4th District.

Louis L. Happ.

Dennis Winters.

5th District.

Edward M. Grout.

Andrew T. Sullivan.

6th District.

James Shevlin.

Matthew E. Dooley.

7th District.

James Kane.

Luke D. Stapleton.

8th District.

Timothy D. Sullivan.

John Fox.

9th District.

Lewis Nixon.

M. Warley Platzek.

10th District.

Bird S. Coler.

William McAdoo.

11th District.

John J. Delaney.

Thomas C. O'Sullivan.

12th District.

Charles F. Murphy.

W. Bourke Cockran.

13th District.

Robert A. Van Wyck.

Franklin Bartlett.

14th District.

Charles A. Towne.

Joseph Cassidy.

15th District.

Thomas F. Grady.

John W. Gerard, Jr.

16th District.

Samuel Untermyer.

Diatado Villamena.

17th District.

Charles W. Dayton.

Victor J. Dowling.

18th District.

John J. Brady.

George M. Walgrove.

- |                       |                      |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 19th District.        | 29th District.       |
| John H. McArdle.      | John J. Cummins.     |
| Wm. Temple Emmett.    | Luke McHenry.        |
| 20th District.        | 30th District.       |
| Michael N. Kane.      | Elliot Danforth.     |
| George Holmes Smith.  | Orris U. Kellogg.    |
| 21st District.        | 31st District.       |
| W. Frank Holsapple.   | John Flannigan.      |
| Richard E. Connell.   | Thomas Carmody.      |
| 22d District.         | 32d District.        |
| Daniel E. Conway.     | George Raines.       |
| John A. Dix.          | James S. Havens.     |
| 23d District.         | 33d District.        |
| Patrick E. McCabe.    | John B. Stanchfield. |
| Wm. H. Hathaway.      | John F. Little.      |
| 24th District.        | 34th District.       |
| George M. Palmer.     | James J. Mahoney.    |
| Thomas E. Benedict.   | John J. Ryan.        |
| 25th District.        | 35th District.       |
| Charles S. Nisbet.    | William H. Ryan.     |
| Patrick Moynehan.     | William F. Kasting.  |
| 26th District.        | 36th District.       |
| George E. Van Kennen. | Joseph B. Mayer.     |
| Thomas F. Conway.     | Henry A. Guenther.   |
| 27th District.        | 37th District.       |
| Samuel A. Beardsley.  | Thomas H. Dowd.      |
| James H. Flanagan.    | Danforth W. Dean.    |
| 28th District.        |                      |
| Frederick C. Schraub. |                      |
| John N. Carlisle.     |                      |

## NORTH CAROLINA.

### DELEGATES AT LARGE.

- |                 |                  |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Julian S. Carr. | Edward J. Hale.  |
| Locke Craig.    | John E. Woodard. |

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	6th District.
E. F. Lamb.	Homer L. Lyon.
Joseph F. Tayloe.	A. W. McLean.
2d District.	7th District.
J. W. Grainger.	James G. Boylin.
W. H. Powell.	Emery E. Raper.
3d District.	8th District.
Nathan O'Berry.	Paul B. Means.
D. L. Carlton.	A. M. Vannoy.
4th District.	9th District.
Ed. Chambers Smith.	Clyde R. Hoey.
A. C. Zollicoffer.	H. N. Pharr.
5th District.	10th District.
Robert L. Holt.	James P. Sawyer.
P. B. Johnson.	John C. Mills.

NORTH DAKOTA.

DELEGATES.

M. F. Murphy.	John B. Fried.
Siver Serumgard.	I. P. Baker.
E. E. Cole.	Jacob P. Birder.*
C. G. Bade.	William Woods.

\* Frank C. Myrick, Alternate for Mr. Birder, who was killed en route to the Convention, gave his proxy to Thos. R. Shaw and by the report of the Committee on Credentials T. R. Shaw was recognized as a properly accredited representative.

OHIO.

DELEGATES AT LARGE.

John A. McMahon.	W. S. Thomas.
E. H. Moore.	C. P. Salen.

DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	3d District.
L. G. Bernard.	Edward Hanley.
B. W. Campbell.	Charles E. Mason.
2d District.	4th District.
Harlan Cleveland.	A. D. Miller.
John E. Bruce.	S. A. Hoskins.

5th District.	14th District.
A. R. Geyer.	Lewis Brucker.
Herman Long.	Wm. G. Sharpe.
6th District.	15th District.
John Wood.	Daniel B. Torpy.
Oliver N. Sams.	H. T. Sutton.
7th District.	16th District.
Charles J. Bowlus.	W. B. Francis.
V. J. Dahl.	A. N. McCombs.
8th District.	17th District.
W. L. Finley.	W. R. Pomerene.
W. R. Niven.	Wellington Stillwell.
9th District.	18th District.
John Bolan.	Thomas McNamara, Jr.
H. A. Kilmer.	Rhodes I. Gregory.
10th District.	19th District.
J. W. Guthrie.	M. M. Padgett.
Oscar W. Newman.	C. A. Corbin.
11th District.	20th District.
W. D. Yaple.	C. P. Salen.
M. A. Daugherty.	W. A. Ault.
12th District.	21st District.
James Rose.	Tom L. Johnson.
C. F. Gilliam.	John H. Clarke.
13th District.	
J. H. Platt.	
Frank P. Donnewirth.	

## OREGON.

## DELEGATES.

George E. Chamberlain.	C. E. Redfield.
W. F. Butcher.	J. D. Matlock.
F. V. Holman.	S. M. Garland.
T. R. Sheridan.	James Gleason.



## PENNSYLVANIA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

James M. Guffey.	Robert E. Wright.
Robert E. Pattison.	J. K. P. Hall.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	11th District.
Hugh Moore.	John M. Garman.
Francis Fisher Kane.	Frank T. McCormick.
2d District.	12th District.
John Cadwalader, Sr.	James A. Noecker.
William C. Bennett.	E. T. Kenny.
3d District.	13th District.
Albert H. Ladner.	A. G. Dewalt.
John J. Green.	E. J. Morris.
4th District.	14th District.
Emanuel Furth.	John M. Kelly.
Thomas J. Gavagan.	Fred. J. Billings.
5th District.	15th District.
Charles P. Donnelly.	J. Henry Cochran.
Edwin K. Borie.	N. M. Edwards.
6th District.	16th District.
Edward F. Bennis.	W. L. Dewart.
B. Gordon Bromley.	R. S. Ammerman.
7th District.	17th District.
John B. Fite.	J. C. Amig.
James G. Downward.	H. W. Petriken
8th District.	18th District.
Jacob V. Gotwals.	B. F. Myers.
Harry E. Grimm.	W. H. Peffer.
9th District.	19th District.
H. H. North, Sr.	Herman Baumer.
W. H. Kennedy.	Samuel H. Moyer.
10th District.	20th District.
Frank J. Fitzsimmons.	Edward C. Peeling.
Charles H. Schadt.	J. Upton Neely.

21st District.	27th District.
James Kerr.	Calvin Rayburn.
W. E. Wallace.	Wm. A. Hindman.
22d District.	28th District.
M. J. Kennedy.	William Hasson.
E. S. Akerman.	W. G. Barker.
23d District.	29th District.
J. B. F. Rinehart.	David T. Watson.
S. E. Frock.	Geo. A. Koehler.
24th District.	30th District.
H. T. Billick.	W. J. Brennen.
Henry H. Wilson.	Geo. S. Fleming.
25th District.	31st District.
William J. Stern.	J. A. Clair.
A. J. Palm.	A. J. Barr.
26th District.	32d District.
Howard Mutchler.	Geo. W. Guthrie.
John E. Lauer.	John F. O'Toole.

## RHODE ISLAND.

## DELEGATES.

George W. Greene.	Andrew Farrell.
John J. Fitzgerald.	P. H. Quinn.
Samuel E. Daubney.	Samuel R. Honey.
Thos. H. Connolly.	David J. Barry.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

B. R. Tillman.	Wilie Jones.
D. C. Heyward.	R. Goodwin Rhett.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	3d District.
J. St. Clair White.	R. F. Smith.
J. E. Tindal.	S. H. McGhee
2d District.	4th District.
John C. Sheppard.	J. A. Hoyt.
Claude E. Sawyer.	J. J. Gentry.

- |                   |                |
|-------------------|----------------|
| 5th District.     | 7th District.  |
| A. M. Aiken.      | Altomot Moses. |
| Leroy Springs.    | T. G. McLeod.  |
| 6th District.     |                |
| D. D. McColl, Jr. |                |
| David R. Coker.   |                |

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

## DELEGATES.

- |                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| John Fanslow.    | Henry S. Volkmar. |
| R. F. Pettigrew. | E. F. Gross.      |
| W. F. Brennan.   | Chauncey L. Wood. |
| J. A. Stransky.  | W. J. Whitmier.   |

## TENNESSEE.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

- |                  |                  |
|------------------|------------------|
| E. W. Carmack.   | James M. Head.   |
| John K. Shields. | Newton R. White. |

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

- |                    |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1st District.      | 6th District.   |
| R. L. Blevins.     | W. O. Vertrees. |
| Oscar M. Dugger.   | A. R. Gholson.  |
| 2d District.       | 7th District.   |
| Geo. F. Milton.    | B. R. Thomas.   |
| H. Clay Jones.     | D. E. McCorkel. |
| 3d District.       | 8th District.   |
| E. E. Ivins.       | J. D. Hunt.     |
| T. A. Embrey.      | T. C. Rye.      |
| 4th District.      | 9th District.   |
| D. L. Lansden.     | J. R. Cothron.  |
| N. G. Robertson.   | J. W. Thomas.   |
| 5th District.      | 10th District.  |
| T. Leigh Thompson. | T. B. Yancy.    |
| John L. Norman.    | W. A. Percy.    |

## TEXAS.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

John H. Reagan.	C. A. Culberson.
J. W. Bailey.	T. H. Ball.
James B. Wells.	T. D. Cobbs.
Howard Templeton.	Clarence N. Ousley.*

\* These delegates had no alternates.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	9th District.
B. F. Sherrill.	A. Haidusek.
H. E. Henderson.	John L. Brown.
2d District.	10th District.
George C. O'Brien.	T. W. Gregory.
E. B. Blaylock.	D. C. Giddings.
3d District.	11th District.
J. C. Adams.	Geo. C. Pendleton.
R. T. Milner.	O. P. Oltorf.
4th District.	12th District.
C. H. Smith.	Wm. Capps.
W. A. Bramlette.	J. Collin George.
5th District.	13th District.
Charles A. Rasbury.	R. E. Huff.
R. Kimball.	E. V. Terrell.
6th District.	14th District.
R. H. Hicks.	F. H. Bushick.
Richard Mays.	Clarence Martin.
7th District.	15th District.
Edward Harris.	J. N. Garner.
C. F. Stevens.	D. Odem.
8th District.	16th District.
S. J. Winston.	J. G. Murphy.
Lee Frazer.	T. J. Beall.

## UTAH.

## DELEGATES.

Joseph L. Rawlins.	Simon Bamberger.
Frank J. Cannon.	Joseph Monson.
George C. Whitmore.	Samuel A. King.

## VERMONT.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

V. A. Bullard.	James E. Burke.
C. W. Melcher.	Elisha May.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	2d District.
Herbert C. Comings.	Oscar C. Miller.
J. D. Hanrahan.	H. J. Voholm.

## VIRGINIA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

John W. Daniel.	Thomas S. Martin.
A. J. Montague.	A. C. Braxton.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	6th District.
C. B. Jones.	Roy B. Smith.
Frank Fletcher.	A. P. Craddock.
2d District.	7th District.
S. Gordon Cummings.	Marshall McCormick.
J. Peter Holland.	John M. White.
3d District.	8th District.
C. V. Meredith.	Frank Hume.
W. B. Bradley.	J. B. T. Thornton.
4th District.	9th District.
Robert Turnbull.	W. D. Smith.
A. R. Hobbs.	O. E. Jordan.
5th District.	10th District.
E. S. Keen.	W. E. Allen.
R. A. James	Thomas F. Ryan.

## WASHINGTON.

## DELEGATES.

L. C. Gilman.	Henry Blackman.
John Y. Terry.	A. J. Splawn.
M. M. Godman.	R. W. Starr.
Frank B. Cole.	W. J. Byham.
E. C. Million.	Frank P. Hogan.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

J. N. Camden.	W. A. MacCorkle.
Henry G. Davis.	O. S. McKinney.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	4th District.
C. H. Taney.	G. Warren Hays.
John W. Davis.	Henry S. Wilson.
2d District.	5th District.
C. W. Boyer.	C. C. Hogg.
A. J. Wilkinson.	Jarius Collins.
3d District.	
John D. Alderson.	
C. W. Osenton.	

## WISCONSIN.

## DELEGATES AT LARGE.

T. E. Ryan.	C. H. Weisse.
David S. Rose.	Neal Brown.

## DISTRICT DELEGATES.

1st District.	7th District.
George G. Sutherland.	John B. Fleming.
Charles Freeman.	Wm. R. McCaul.
2d District.	8th District.
W. S. Henry.	T. H. Hanna.
J. E. Jones.	Julius Linstedt.
3d District.	9th District.
T. L. Cleary.	R. J. McGeehan.
John M. Kelly.	M. C. Haney.
4th District.	10th District.
Thomas J. Fleming.	Henry E. Fitch.
M. A. Hoyt.	Wm. G. Fordyce.
5th District.	11th District.
John McCoy.	George B. McCall.
Rollin B. Mallory.	Edwin F. McCausland.
6th District.	
Michael E. Burke.	
H. W. Sawyer.	

## WYOMING.

## DELEGATES.

George T. Beck.	George W. Creswell.
O. N. Stickney.	Colin Hunter.
J. U. Allard.	J. W. Rogers.

## ALASKA.

## DELEGATES.

A. P. Swineford.	George Murphy.
Frank Bach.	L. L. Williams.
J. W. Troy.	W. E. Crews.

## ARIZONA.

## DELEGATES.

John Lawler.	W. A. Gillespie.
Carl Hayden.	W. F. Timmons.
John S. Taylor.	Isaac Barth.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

## DELEGATES.

James L. Norris.	J. Fred. Kelley.
Edwin B. Hay.	John F. Monaghan.
W. Cranch McIntire.	John G. Campbell.

## INDIAN TERRITORY.

## DELEGATES.

L. M. Poe.	T. L. Wade.
H. J. Stanley.	W. C. Rogers.
C. A. Skeen.	Robert Reed.

## HAWAII.

## DELEGATES.

C. P. Iaukea.	J. L. Coke.
W. S. Noblitt.	Palmer P. Woods.
T. B. Lyons.	J. D. Easton.

## NEW MEXICO.

## DELEGATES.

James G. Fitch.  
N. B. Laughlin.  
E. V. Chaves.

Oliver M. Lee.  
Antonio Lucero.  
L. K. McGaffey.

## OKLAHOMA.

## DELEGATES.

Frank Stevens.  
George W. Bellamy.  
M. C. Runyan.  
George E. Black.  
W. E. Worden.  
F. J. Gentry.

W. J. Caudill.  
Wm. Tilghman.  
Roy Stafford.  
W. L. Eagleton.  
D. B. Welty.  
Wm. Buchholz.\*

\* Each of these delegates had only one-half vote. They had no alternates.

## PORTO RICO.

## DELEGATES.

H. P. Leake.  
A. H. Molina.  
D. M. Field.

H. E. Shaffer.  
Chas. M. Boerman.  
Miguel Sales.

MR. HEAD: I move the adoption of the majority report. I will state to the Convention, however, that a minority report has been filed with reference to the District of Columbia, and I understand that one is to be prepared and filed with reference to the contests in the State of Illinois.

The minority report in reference to the District of Columbia was read as follows:

*To the Officers and Members of the Democratic National Convention:*

The undersigned member of the Committee on Credentials hereby submits the following report on the District of Columbia contested case:

I find that the following delegates are duly elected and entitled to be seated as the regular delegation in the Democratic National Convention to represent the District of Columbia, viz:



*Delegates.*

Herman J. Schulteis.  
 William E. Carr.  
 Henry W. Sherman.  
 Cornelius B. Kennealy.  
 Thomas F. Ryan.  
 Ward Savage.

*Alternates.*

William A. Vaughn.  
 Timothy J. Costello.  
 John P. Downey.  
 John J. O'Connor.  
 John F. Kenney.  
 Edward J. Ratigan.

And I hereby recommend that they be seated as the regular delegates and alternates in the Democratic National Convention.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. FITZGERALD, Rhode Island.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, you have heard the report of the Committee on Credentials, and you have heard the motion made by the Chairman of that Committee. Is there a request for a division of any question presented by the report?

MR. JAMES A. KEYS, of California: I move to amend by substituting that we seat both contesting delegations from the District of Columbia and accord them one-half vote each.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The motion is made to seat both delegations from the District of Columbia with one-half vote each.

MR. THOMAS F. GRADY, of New York: I ask for a division on the question. I ask that a separate vote be taken upon the proposition to include in representation in this Convention the Islands of the Philippines. I do not want any action taken out of courtesy or sympathy which will place the Democratic party of this country in the inconsistent position that it ever expects the Philippine Islands to be a part of the Government of the United States. [Applause.] The speech of the Temporary Chairman of this Convention might just as well not have been uttered, aye, better had it not been uttered, and the platform of the party had better not be adopted, if you propose for any reason to place the Convention in the attitude of recognizing the Philippine Islands as a possible part of the Government of the United States.

I, therefore, ask that a separate vote be taken as to that particular proposition.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, is there a separate vote demanded upon any other proposition in the report?

The Chair rules that the Convention has a right to a separate vote upon each proposition of the report, where called for. If there is not a call for a separate vote upon any other point, the Chair will put the question.

MR. M. F. TARPEY, of California: I ask separate consideration and a separate vote on the question relating to the District of Columbia.

MR. L. IRVING HANDY, of Delaware: I rise to a point of order.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Delaware will state his point of order.

MR. HANDY: I make the point of order that it is not in order for the Committee on Credentials to report in favor of seating delegates from the Philippine Islands. This point of order is based on the ground that the Philippine Islands are not a part of the United States, and that it is not within the power of that Committee or of the Convention itself to admit delegates from territory which is not a part of the United States.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Does anyone desire to discuss the point of order?

MR. OSCAR SUTRO, of the Philippine Islands: Mr. Chairman—

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: If not, the Chair is ready to rule upon it.

MR. SUTRO: I think we ought to be given the courtesy of a hearing.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from the Philippine Islands (Mr. Sutro) desires to be heard. The Chair rules that until the gentleman from the Philippine Islands has been declared by this Convention to be a delegate, with the right to a seat upon the floor, the Chair cannot recognize him.

MR. SUTRO: I ask the courtesy of the Convention to say a word.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for the reason stated. Gentlemen, is any further

discussion desired on the point of order? If not, the Chair rules that no part of the world has a right to be represented upon this floor for the purpose of nominating a candidate for President to execute the laws of the United States, unless that territory is a part of the world which is a coparcener in the governing power of the United States. [Applause.] The Chair rules that unless a given territory is a part of the United States, it cannot by delegates constitute a part of a Democratic Convention to nominate a President of the United States. The Chair therefore rules that so much of the report of the Committee on Credentials as admits to this floor as representing a part of the United States, delegates from the Philippine Islands, declared by the Supreme Court not to be a part of the United States, is out of order.

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: I demand a separate vote upon the question of the Illinois contest.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Nebraska calls for a separate vote upon the matter of the Illinois contest. The Chair rules that any member of the Convention has a right to call for a separate vote upon any part of the report. The Chair will now put the question on the adoption of the report of the Committee in so far as separate votes have not been called for. A separate vote has been called for in the contest in the District of Columbia, and another in the Illinois cases. Is it the pleasure of the Convention that the balance of the report of the Committee on Credentials shall be adopted. [Putting the question.] All of the report except those parts in connection with which separate votes have been called for is adopted.

MR. HERMAN SCHULTEIS: Mr. Chairman—

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

MR. SCHULTEIS: Gentlemen of the Convention, in the District of Columbia, we have no election laws, and our main purpose in having this vote taken and in proposing to accord to each of the contesting delegates a half vote each, is that the matter may be submitted to the suffrages of the people of the District of Columbia, when we can have a fair vote and a

registration prior to the primary election. Heretofore there has been no registration law, no regular law except that which was framed by a Commission which was designated by your National Committee, and when the Convention was held, the commission proceeded to violate the rules which they themselves had made, and made it impossible for the Hearst instructed delegates to get a fair showing in that Convention. Therefore, when the Chairman refused to abide by the laws which the commission itself had laid down, we walked out and held a Convention strictly in accordance with the rules which the election commission had made, and we sent this delegation of instructed men to this Convention, and they are the only regular Democratic delegates from the District of Columbia to this Convention.

But, we submit, that we should be glad to have them have another chance and with half a vote each, recognizing both sides, at the next Democratic Convention under fair circumstances, when there is a registration law, we shall have but one delegation. I hope the motion to seat both delegations, with a half a vote to each member, will be adopted. [Cries of question.]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, are you prepared for the question?

MR. WILLIAM CRANCH MCINTIRE, of the District of Columbia: I should like to be heard.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion to amend the report of the Committee on Credentials, by seating both the contestants and the contestees from the District of Columbia, each delegate with a half a vote.

MR. EDWIN B. HAY, of the District of Columbia: I move that the amendment be laid upon the table.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from the District of Columbia to table the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt as to the result.

MR. JOSHUA W. MILES, of Maryland: I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

MR. MILES: The Convention evidently does not understand what would be the effect of voting for the motion to lay on the table. I ask the Chair to explain to the Convention what would be the effect of voting to lay the amendment on the table? Would it not carry the whole question?

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair announces that the effect of carrying the motion to lay the amendment on the table would be to defeat the report of the Committee on Credentials with regard to the District of Columbia case.

MR. EDWIN B. HAY, of the District of Columbia: I withdraw the motion to lay on the table.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair desires to announce that the gentleman who made the motion to lay the amendment on the table has withdrawn the same. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment to the report of the Committee, to seat both delegations with one-half vote to each member.

MR. JAMES M. HEAD, of Tennessee: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, just one word upon the question of the delegates from the District of Columbia.

There has been a contest from the District of Columbia for the past twelve years. Every Executive Committee has had this question before it. The present National Committee appointed a special committee to prepare a plan for the election of delegates from the District of Columbia, and the present delegates were elected under that plan.

The matter was investigated by a sub-committee of the Executive Committee, and the present delegates were recommended to be seated. That was affirmed by the National Committee. It was investigated by your Committee on Credentials, and the Committee on Credentials, with one exception, have recommended the seating of the Norris delegates. I hope this Convention will eliminate the District of Columbia from further contests before the National Committee.

MR. G. V. MENZIES, of Indiana: I should like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Credentials a question. Was

there any proposition made before the Committee on Credentials to divide the vote of the District of Columbia?

MR. HEAD: None whatever; and that has been the fight that they have made for the past twelve years—to divide and create confusion.

MR. DANIEL W. SIMMS, of Indiana: Tell us how to vote.

MR. HEAD: Vote against the motion of the gentleman to seat both delegations, and affirm the report of the Committee. Vote "no."

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, are you prepared for the question? The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the gentleman representing the contestants from the District of Columbia, looking toward seating both delegations and a division of the vote.

The motion was not agreed to.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question now is upon agreeing to that part of the report of the Committee on Credentials which seats the delegates from the District of Columbia now upon the floor.

The report as to the District of Columbia was agreed to.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The next question which comes up, having been reserved for separate consideration, is that relating to the Illinois contests. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan).

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman, upon behalf of a minority of the Committee on Credentials, I beg leave to submit the following report:

The undersigned members of the Committee on Credentials beg leave to submit a minority report which they move to substitute for the majority report in the case of the Illinois contest. The reasons for the minority report are as follows:

First, Illinois has a State Central Committee with one, John P. Hopkins, at its head. Finding itself in a minority in the State Convention, said Committee deliberately planned to override the will of the Democratic voters of the State and secure by fraud and intimidation a majority of the delegates to the National Convention. To this end they brought contests in a

number of districts outside of those controlled by the said Committee, and placed their own men upon the temporary roll call of the Convention. Then they had a Credentials Committee made up and as far as possible had the district members of the Credentials Committee taken from the contestants whom they had seated. This Credentials Committee, without attempting to go into the merits of the contests, seated the Hopkins delegates in every instance.

The minority of the Committee on Credentials presented a report, but Mr. Quinn, the Chairman of the Convention, declared that the minority report was only advisory and would be filed for record. He then put the vote upon the majority report and declared it carried and refused a roll call, although a roll call was then and there demanded. In the hearing before the Credentials Committee of this Convention, but a very limited amount of time was allowed for a consideration of this contest, so short a time that it was impossible to present the evidence to the Committee, the time being consumed in the arguments made by the attorneys for the contestants and contestees. But the evidence is a matter of record and was presented before the sub-committee of the National Committee on Monday the 4th.

The contestants supported their case by hundreds of affidavits and hundreds of pages of documentary evidence, but the contestees offered no affidavits and no documentary evidence except the report of the Convention officers, and no evidence at all but their own unsupported oral statements. The preponderance of the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the contestants.

The evidence shows the following facts:

The delegates from the Chicago districts to the Democratic State Convention were elected at primary elections presided over by the regular election judges and clerks under the supervision of the Board of Election Commissioners. These primary elections resulted as follows:

Second Congressional District, Harrison delegates, 25; opposition delegates, 12—total, 37.

Third Congressional District, Harrison delegates, 29; opposition delegates, 13—total, 42.

Ninth Congressional District, Harrison delegates, 30; opposition delegates, 15—total, 45.

In order to convert these Harrison majorities into minorities, the State Committee assumed to decide contests and to strike from the temporary roll, in the Second and Ninth Districts, Harrison delegates who had been regularly accredited by the election judges and clerks in accordance with the Illinois primary law, and to substitute the names of persons who admittedly received a minority of votes at said election.

The unbroken and uniform custom of the party has made it the party law in Illinois that State delegates be assembled by the Congressional Districts for the selection of National delegates, and that this selection when reported to the State Convention stand, unless the State Convention in the case of the contest as to who was selected, takes action determining for itself by regular vote who is entitled to the credentials. Congressional district caucuses were convened at Springfield pursuant to this custom, which was thus recognized by the State Committee as the existing law of the party.

Contestants claim their seats by vote of caucuses of the regularly elected delegates in each of the contested districts.

In the Third District there was no contest as to the credentials of the Harrison delegates, who participated in this caucus, which must have been held (if at all) by the anti-Harrison minorities.

The caucus reports of the majority caucuses above referred to were not recognized by the Chairman and Secretary of the State Conventions. The alleged minority reports were recognized by said officers in substitution thereof.

In the Second and Ninth Districts two sets of caucuses were held, one by the regularly elected and credentialed Harrison majority delegates, and the other by the minority delegates plus the persons who had admittedly received the lowest number of votes at the primaries, and who had been wrongfully substituted by the State Committee on the temporary roll.

At the time of these caucuses the contest as to these seats



was pending before the Credentials Committee and undetermined.

The record conclusively shows that the attempted unseating of these delegates was illegal, unsupported by any evidence, the hearing farcical, and the claim absurd.

The evidence in regard to the Sixth and Tenth Congressional Districts is so conflicting that we cannot report in regard to them. The same grave irregularities were here present, but time is insufficient to ascertain the accuracy of the facts. We recommend in favor of the contestants from the Second, Third and Ninth Districts, believing that under the Illinois primary law and under the ruling of our National Committee, the State Committee had no right to unseat men who held the election credentials, and believing that the contestants represent the lawful votes of the confessed majority of the elected delegates of said districts.

[We agree with the majority of the Committee in recommending the seating of the contestees in the Sixth and Tenth Districts.]

#### ELEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

As to the contest from this district, we find from the evidence that the first and regular list of delegates from Will County should have been seated in the Springfield Convention, but as the contestants to this Convention for seats as delegates should show a majority of the delegates in the Congressional caucus, as in order to do this the Springfield Convention would have been compelled to determine whether Kane County was entitled to twenty-three delegates instead of thirteen as claimed by the contestants here, and as such Convention did not pass upon that question directly, we agree with the majority of the Committee as to this district.

#### TWELFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

In the Twelfth Congressional District, composed of La Salle County, twenty-two delegates; Boone County, two delegates; Winnebago County, six delegates; DeKalb County, five delegates; Kendall County, two delegates; Grundy County, four delegates; the contest turns on La Salle County. This

county is under the primary law, and elected one delegate to the State Convention for each primary district (sixty-six in all), although the county was entitled to but twenty-two delegates on an apportionment vote. Of the sixty-six delegates elected at the primary the contestants have thirty-four, or a majority. So it is immaterial in calculating La Salle County whether it should be calculated as sixty-six or twenty-two. The Hopkins delegates, constituting a minority of the sixty-six, met in La Salle County before the State Convention, and without legal authority proceeded to elect from their own number twenty-two to act as delegates from that county. They claim to have had proxies enough to make up a majority, but this is not supported by evidence. As under the primary law delegates are elected directly to the State Convention, there is no authority for an attempt to convene even a majority of the delegates of a county to name a delegation from the county to act for the county. The delegates in Cook County are elected directly to the State Convention as in La Salle County, and if the State delegates can meet in their county and there select from their number a number of delegates to represent the county, the same rule should apply to Cook County as to La Salle County. But it would be an unfair and unjust ruling, because it would enable a majority of the delegates to meet and disfranchise the minority. Even if it were permitted to make such selection, the anti-Hopkins delegates having a majority would be entitled to the entire delegation. Having thirty-four out of sixty-six they would be entitled to one-half each, and in either case the anti-Hopkins National delegates were selected and are now entitled to seats.

#### FIFTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

In the Fifteenth Congressional District, composed of Adams County, twenty-two delegates; Henry County, seven delegates; Knox County, eight; Schuyler County, five; Fulton County, fourteen delegates; a total of fifty-six delegates, the evidence is so clear that there can be no ground for dispute. The contestants had twenty-two uncontested delegates from Adams County; Fulton, fourteen uncontested; Schuyler, five uncon-

tested; eight from Knox contested and seven from Henry. Contestants therefore have forty-one out of fifty-six of the uncontested delegates.

Contestees had only fifteen delegates, and these were contested delegates, but even if these contests were decided in their favor it would still leave them a total of only fifteen out of the fifty-six. The contestees state that their delegates from the two contested counties were not allowed to participate in the caucus, but even if they had been admitted it could not have changed the result, because fifteen is considerably less than one-third of fifty-six.

#### SIXTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

The Sixteenth Congressional District is composed of the following counties: Bureau County, nine; Marshall County, five; Peoria County, twenty-four; Putnam County, one; Stark County, two; Tazewell County, ten; making a total of fifty-one delegates. Contestants had delegates from Bureau County uncontested, nine; Marshall, uncontested, three; Putnam, uncontested, one; Stark, uncontested, two; Tazewell, uncontested, ten; and six of the Peoria delegation uncontested and eighteen contested. The contest in this case turns upon the Peoria delegation. The contestees claim twenty-four from Peoria and two from Marshall County, making a majority of one. In Peoria County six men were on both delegations, and if these six men are entitled to seats there can be no question as to the rights of the contestants.

The contestants claim that when the twenty-four delegates from Peoria County met at Springfield, the six delegates who were anti-Hopkins were denied seats in the Convention because they would not support the Hopkins delegates. These six delegates were called before the State Central Committee on the night before the State Convention and asked with which delegation they desired to act, and they replied that being on both delegations, they were not in any contest and would not take sides; whereupon the State Committee removed them and substituted other names. As these men had been elected and their right to act was not contested, they were entitled to seats from

that district. These six men met with the delegates from all the other counties and joined in the selection of the contestants, who received twenty-nine out of fifty-one. These six delegates without being contested, or any contest whatever made against them were summarily and arbitrarily unseated because they refused to join with the Hopkins contested delegates. They carried credentials signed by the Chairman of the County Convention, Mr. Frank Quinn, who was also Chairman of the State Convention, and a member of the sub-committee of the State Committee which unseated these men.

#### EIGHTEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

The Eighteenth Congressional District includes Vermilion County, fifteen; Clark County, eight delegates; Cumberland County, five delegates; Edgar County, nine delegates; Iroquois County, nine delegates; Kankakee County, seven delegates; making a total of fifty-three delegates. Contestants are the choice of Clark County, two delegates, uncontested; Edgar three, uncontested; Cumberland, four, uncontested; Kankakee, four, uncontested, making thirteen uncontested, and fifteen from Vermilion County contested, making twenty-eight out of a total of fifty-three delegates in the district, but as they did not hold a caucus and as one of the contestants has declined to make the contest, the undersigned join with the majority of the Committee in recommending the seating of the contestees.

#### TWENTY-FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

The Twenty-first Congressional District includes Sangamon County, twenty-four delegates; Macoupin, fourteen delegates; Montgomery, ten delegates; and Christian, eleven delegates. A caucus was held in this district at which John B. Hogan, a State Central Committeeman, presided, and at this caucus Alfred Orendorff and A. B. Corman were selected as delegates to the National Convention. The ruling of the Chair, however, was so unfair, and arbitrary—roll calls being refused—that upon the adjournment a majority of the delegates, thirty-six in number, remained, and in regular caucus selected Alfred Orendorff and H. M. Minton, these having a clear majority of the

delegates from that district. This report was handed in, but the former report, including Orendorff and Corman, was accepted by the Chairman of the Convention. After the papers had announced Orendorff and Corman as the delegates, Mr. Orendorff's name was erased and the name of Duncan C. Best substituted and Mr. Best was certified to by the State Convention, but fraud was so apparent and undisputed that the majority of the Committee report in favor of seating Alfred Orendorff, notwithstanding the fact that the seating of Orendorff impeaches the action of the State Convention not only on this, but on all of the delegates unseated by this Convention, so far as the action of the State Convention is concerned. The undersigned, to carry out the wishes of the majority of the Democrats in that district, ask that H. M. Minton be substituted in place of A. B. Corman.

#### TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

The Twenty-third Congressional District comprises the following counties: Clinton, eight delegates; Crawford, five delegates; Effingham, seven delegates; Fayette, eight delegates; Jasper, six delegates; Lawrence, five delegates; Jefferson, eight delegates; Marion, ten delegates; Richland, five delegates, and Wabash, four delegates, making a total of sixty-seven delegates. The contestants had in this caucus forty-nine contested delegates out of the sixty-seven delegates, namely, Clinton, eight; Crawford, five; Fayette, eight; Jasper, six; Lawrence, five; Richland, five; Wabash, four, and Effingham, seven, and Marion, ten, contested, and Jefferson, eight, contested. This district had forty-nine uncontested delegates and eighteen contested delegates, making a total delegation of sixty-seven from the district. Effingham was seated by the Committee. The report of this caucus was duly certified to the State Convention. The contesting delegates from Marion and Jefferson counties, in number eighteen, held a caucus of their own and selected the contestees, and the contestees were by the State Convention substituted for the contestants. The action of the officers of the Convention regarding this district was most flagrant. The report of the caucus was thrown upon the floor by the officers

of the Convention, where it was found and again presented and attention called to the fact that it had been found upon the floor. It was again received, and after the Convention adjourned, was found a second time on the floor. This caucus was presided over by a member of the State Central Committee and the report was certified to by him. The contestants should be seated.

TWENTY-FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT.

The Twenty-fifth District comprises Franklin County, six delegates; Perry, six; Randolph, nine; Jackson, eight; Union, seven; Alexander, four; Pulaski, three, and Williamson, seven, making a total of fifty delegates. In this district the contestants were selected by votes of Perry, six, uncontested; Union, seven, uncontested; Pulaski, three, uncontested, and Williamson, seven, uncontested, making twenty-three uncontested. Franklin had six contested and Jackson eight contested. The action, therefore, turns upon the six from Franklin or the eight from Jackson. If three delegates of either county are seated it will give the contestants a majority. Passing over the contest in Franklin as immaterial, the facts show that the Chairman of the Convention in Jackson County enforced gavel rule, refused to entertain roll calls, motions, etc., and declared the Convention adjourned as soon as he had read a list of delegates. After he adjourned the Convention considerably more than a majority of the delegates remained, were called to order by a chairman, a secretary was regularly elected and the Convention proceeded with a majority of the delegates present and selected the delegates to the State Convention. This delegation was turned out by the State Committee and by the Committee on Credentials. In order that the will of the people of that district may prevail, the undersigned believe that the contesting delegation from this district should be seated.

To summarize our report we recommend that the persons hereafter named be seated in the National Convention as delegates from their respective districts:

## DELEGATES.

- 2—Edgar B. Tolman.  
Chas. Richards.
- 3—Howard S. Taylor.  
M. W. Cagney.
- 9—Carter H. Harrison.  
James J. Gray.
- 12—Jas. G. Doyle.  
John J. McClusky.
- 15—H. N. Wheeler.  
S. L. Marshall.
- 16—J. D. Phillips.  
F. W. Morressey.
- 21—Alfred Orendorff.  
H. M. Minton.
- 23—James L. Smith.  
E. B. Spurgeon.
- 25—E. H. Balliner.  
A. M. Brownlee.

## ALTERNATES.

- John P. McGoorty.  
F. Rydzewski.  
J. B. Gallagher.  
James McCauley.  
Wm. H. Lyman.  
Arthur Pattison.  
Harry Carroll.  
Thos. N. Haskins.  
A. M. Foster.  
W. N. Hartgrove.  
Edw. McCabe.  
J. F. Golden.  
A. B. Herdman.  
W. W. Rhodes.  
Geo. N. Parker.  
James A. Crews.  
T. E. Robertson.  
J. B. Spillman.

If the State Convention had been an orderly convention and legally conducted it might have rejected the delegates selected by the various districts and substituted delegates of its own choice, but in view of the fact that it did not attempt to do this, but passed on the names as if they had been selected by majority caucuses in the various districts, contestants can rightly claim that the State Convention did not intend to override the wishes of the districts.

As to the two contesting delegates at large the undersigned submit that a committee was appointed to recommend the delegates at large and that in this committee there was a contest against Contestees Hopkins and Cable. The records show that a resolution was formally passed by the State Convention electing as delegates at large Samuel Alschuler and A. M. Lawrence, uncontested, and Contestees John P. Hopkins and Ben T. Cable, but the evidence shows that the resolution was never proposed in the Convention, was never acted upon and is entirely an afterthought. The Committee on Credentials

virtually so declared when it substituted Alfred Orendorff for Duncan C. Best, for this resolution shows that Duncan C. Best was elected by the State Convention, just as much as any of the others. The action of this committee, therefore, impeaches the regularity and truthfulness of that report and the National Committee by unanimous report suggests that the Credential Committee act on this, as the National Committee had no jurisdiction in the matter and therefore referred it to the Credential Committee.

No minority report was allowed by the Chairman of the State Convention; one was offered and he ruled that a minority report was only advisory. The evidence shows that the conspiracy on the part of a majority of the State Central Committee to override the will of the voters as expressed in the various district caucuses was deliberate. To carry out this conspiracy the Chairman of the State Convention refused to recognize well-known principles of parliamentary law and only one roll call was permitted—a roll call on instructions—and in that case by a vote of nine hundred and thirty-six to three hundred and eighty-five positive instructions were substituted for the half-hearted instructions reported by the Committee on Resolutions.

The Chairman by his arbitrary and illegal actions showed that he recognized that the Convention was against him. But two courses were open to the delegates: First, to take possession of the chair by force of arms. But even if such a course could be recommended it was impossible in this case, as the hall had been crowded with special policemen, sergeants-at-arms and others, who filled the aisles and enabled the Chairman to carry out his arbitrary, illegal and unfair rulings.

The undersigned are not willing to advise that the delegates should go prepared to assert their rights by physical force or to go armed as though they were volunteers in the army.

The second alternative was to bolt, but there is a natural disinclination to bolt, and why should a majority of three to one bolt and leave the Convention in the hands of the minority?

The contestants have brought this question before the National Convention of the party and have been denied the



right to go into detail in this matter, owing to the time limit. The delegates had only one remedy, namely, to present a petition, which reads as follows:

*"Petition to Democratic National Convention:*

"WHEREAS, The State Democratic Convention of Illinois, held at Springfield, June 14, 1904, disregarded the Democratic precedent and ignored the rights of the Democrats of various Congressional districts through their duly chosen representatives, and

"WHEREAS, Acquiescence in such a violation of Democratic principles would injure the party in the State and therefore interfere with its legitimate progress, and

"WHEREAS, The presiding officer of said Convention by arbitrary and unfair rulings and by refusal of roll calls on all questions, excepting on instructions for President, prevented the delegates from giving expression to their wishes and the wishes of their constituents.

"Therefore, I, the undersigned, having been a duly elected delegate to said Convention, join in petitioning the Democratic National Convention and Democratic National Committee to seat and recognize as delegates to the Democratic National Convention only such persons as received a majority of the votes of the legally elected delegates as cast in caucus of their respective Congressional districts at said State Convention, as shall be shown by evidence presented in proper form.

"I also respectfully petition that the following delegates at large be given seats in said Democratic National Convention: Hon. Edward F. Dunne, of Chicago; Hon. A. M. Lawrence, of Chicago; Hon. Samuel Alschuler, of Aurora; Hon. Silas Cook, of East St. Louis.

(Signed) .....Delegate.  
From .....County, Illinois.  
Post-office address ....."

This petition is signed by eight hundred and seventy-two. As the total of the Convention was thirteen hundred and twenty-one, and as a majority is six hundred and sixty-one, it is evident that the petition represents two hundred and eleven

more than one-half of all the delegates of the Convention and at least a majority of four hundred and twenty-two if there had ever been a roll call, because the opposition would have had but four hundred and forty-nine. These petitioners constitute two hundred and eleven more than a majority of all the delegates of the Convention, and constitute an actual majority of all the delegates seated by said Convention and the Committee on Credentials, so that there is no question but that the petitioners represent a majority of the Democrats of Illinois.

[They had a majority of about four hundred of those elected to the Convention and an absolute majority of those seated in the Convention by the Convention itself. [Applause.]

Under all the circumstances, the undersigned believes that it is imperatively necessary that this Convention shall repudiate the outrageous action of the Convention of Illinois and seat men who represent the Democracy of that State. To do otherwise is to disregard the principles of the Democratic party. If the work done there by the use of the gavel is allowed to stand, there is no reason why any one should concern himself in behalf of the Democratic principles. The contestees claim that it would injure the State ticket to unseat them, but it is obvious that the State ticket has already been injured, and that the only thing that can right the wrong is to seat the contestants named herein. The Democrats of Illinois will then feel that they have been vindicated and their rights defended.

W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. Chairman, I move to substitute this minority report for the majority report in the Illinois contest and I ask a separate vote on the delegates at large and the district delegates. In order that both sides may be heard, I ask that fifteen minutes on a side be given for the discussion of the merits of this contest. [Applause.]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, you have heard the motion made by the gentleman from Nebraska. The Chair is advised that later on the gentleman

will renew his motion in a different form. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska to speak in favor of the motion he has made.

MR. BRYAN: I want to open and close.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair will give each side equal time. The gentleman from Nebraska supporting the affirmative has the right to open and close the debate. The Chair will mark the time which the gentleman takes on his first speech and will ask him afterward to state how much time he wants for his second speech and will give the sum total of the time occupied by his two speeches to the other side in the middle.

MR. JAMES M. HEAD, of Tennessee: As Chairman of the Committee on Credentials, I claim the right to close the debate.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Convention totally misunderstood the Chair if it thinks that the Chair has cut off the right of the Chairman of the Committee on Credentials to be heard, not upon either side, but as a non-partisan representative of the Committee. [Applause.]

MR. DAVID S. ROSE, of Wisconsin: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of privilege. I desire to ask a question for information.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: What is the information desired?

MR. ROSE: I wish to inquire first, was a separate or second convention held? (Cries of "No," "No.") Second, if the delegates elected by that Convention are not to be seated in this Convention—

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair is compelled to rule that the gentleman from Wisconsin is not propounding a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair cannot permit itself to be put in the attitude of a witness replying to questions with regard to the facts involved in the case.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan).

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, I came to this Convention in the hope that we would be able to agree on a plat-

form and on candidates, and have nothing to stir up feeling or arouse contention. [Applause.] I still hope that we shall be able to agree upon a platform that will represent the sentiments of all of us, so that we can present it to the country as the platform of a united party. [Applause.] I will go further than that. I still hope that we shall be able to present to the country a ticket, behind which we can stand as a united party. [Applause.] And I regret that I am compelled to come in at this time and present a subject upon which your votes will be asked. But, if there is one Democratic principle more fundamental than another, it is that the majority has a right to rule. [Applause.] If you destroy the binding force of that principle there is nothing that can hold a party together. [Applause.] It is because I want the Democratic party to stand on the Jeffersonian principle of majority rule that I present the minority report in this case. [Applause.]

In the State of Illinois the majority was not allowed to rule. [Applause.] That Convention was dominated by a clique of men who deliberately, purposely, boldly trampled upon the rights of the Democrats of Illinois. [Applause.] The evidence shows that no band of train robbers ever planned a raid upon a train more deliberately or with less conscience than they did. [Applause.] And the men who planned it and who carried it out, have the audacity, the impudence and the insolence to say that, because they certified that what they did was regular, you cannot go behind their certificate [Applause.] If that is good law in a Democratic convention it ought to be good doctrine in a court; and if it is good doctrine in court, then the only thing train robbers will have to do in the future is to make a report of their transactions and certify over their own signatures that -it was a voluntary collection taken up for religious purposes and deny the right of the robbed to go behind the returns. [Applause.]

They tell you that the law of the party in Illinois permits the State Committee to present the Chairman and they deny the right of the Convention to override the wish of the Committee. Such a rule would be undemocratic if in force, for such a doctrine would permit a past committee to fasten itself

upon a new convention and dominate a new set of delegates. [Applause.]

But, my friends, that is not the law, for two years ago John P. Hopkins, the same Chairman of the same Committee, presented the recommendation of the Committee and asked a vote upon it and submitted the Committee's recommendation to the Convention. Two years ago he recognized the right of the Democrats in the State Convention to elect their Temporary Chairman. This time he did not dare to do it, for if he had done it he would have been repudiated by the Convention there assembled. [Applause.] The minority presented a minority report, or wanted to, but the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Hopkins, brought Mr. Quinn up to the Convention platform, and, handing him the gavel, said that he was the Chairman of the Convention, and, Mr. Quinn, seizing the gavel, began his rule of unfairness, tyranny and despotism. [Applause.]

Then they had a sub-committee of the State Committee put on the temporary roll the delegates whom they wanted, but when the Credentials Committee brought in a minority report they refused to consider it and refused to allow a vote upon it. And yet, in spite of the fact that that Convention was not allowed to act upon the credentials of its own members, was not allowed to decide upon its own delegates, in spite of all that, the Committee did not seat enough, for more than half of the men actually seated by the Hopkins Committee have signed petitions asking that the contestees be sent home and that Democrats who represent the people of that State be substituted for them in this Convention. [Applause.]

In the hearing before the Committee it was asked, "Why did they not present a minority report from the Committee appointed to select delegates at large?" There was a contest in that Committee; there was opposition to Hopkins and Cable; but why should they expect a minority report to be voted upon? Why should they expect it, when the Chairman had already held that a minority report was only advisory and could be put into the waste basket and need not be acted upon? They are estopped to ask why a minority report was not filed.

They made no attempt, they declared no purpose to sub-

stitute delegates for the delegates selected by the various districts. We admit in the report that if they had legally substituted other men for the men selected by the districts, they might have done so, but it must be the act of the Convention. The Convention never attempted it; the Convention was not asked to do it; and the evidence shows that the resolution which is a part of the record and upon which they rely was never introduced and was never passed, but that it is a fraud pure and simple, presented here in defense of their claim. [Applause.]

Now, my friends, what is the duty of this Democratic Convention? These Democrats of Illinois are not like the Democrats of the South. Down South the Democrats have all the local offices, and they can reward their workers for their loyalty to the party. Up in Illinois there is a strong Republican majority and the Democrats of Illinois, in many parts of the State, at least, are struggling against overwhelming odds; they are actuated by love of principle, not by hope of office.

But, what will you tell those men? Will you indorse the action of that Convention? Will you approve the methods employed? If they had a majority of the Convention, why did they not permit roll calls? Would they deny the opposition that right if they had had the votes to control by fair means? Men do not do wrong, as a rule, unless they think it is necessary to do so to carry out some object, and the only ground upon which you can decide that these men did wrong unnecessarily is to decide that they were so perverted in conscience that they did wrong from choice rather than from necessity. [Applause.] Their whole conduct shows that their purpose was conceived in sin, brought forth in iniquity and carried out to the destruction of Democratic hopes in that State.

Give the Democrats of Illinois something to hope for. Do not tell them that when they go to a Democratic Convention, they must go armed as to war, prepared to fight their way up to the Chairman of the Convention. Let the Republican party stand as the representative of physical force, if it will; our party stands for government by the consent of the governed. [Applause.]

What could they do? They could either resort to force and risk the killing that would result, or it is said, they could bolt. Yes, three-fourths of the Convention could have walked out and left one-fourth in charge as the regular Convention. They hoped for roll calls. They knew that whenever they could get a roll call they could assert their rights. They had only this one roll call, and when the Convention was over these men had to submit to the disfranchisement of a majority of the Democratic voters of Illinois, or they had to bring their protest to this Convention.

So this petition was signed, and these men, eight hundred and seventy-one, ask this Convention to seat the men who have the right to seats from the districts as shown by the evidence. They do not ask you to seat any one man. They do not ask you to seat any set of men. They do not ask you to seat Hearst men or Parker men or anybody's men. They ask you to seat the choice of the Democrats, no matter for whom they may be. [Applause.]

That Convention was so openly, so notoriously a gag-ruled and gang-run Convention that two of the men who had been out and had made a canvass in the State for Governor, refused to be candidates before that Convention. I honor Judge Prentiss, of Chicago, and Mayor Crolius, of Joliet [applause], who refused to be candidates before that Convention, and if Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable had any respect for the right of the majority to rule, they would be ashamed to be here, the representatives of a minority of that Convention. [Applause.] But, my friends, if they have not learned to be ashamed to misrepresent a great State, you ought to teach them that they cannot do it with the approval of the Democratic party of the United States. [Applause.]

Now their sin rests upon them; you do not bear it. But if you decide to seat these men, these delegates from the districts, against the evidence presented in behalf of the contestants from the districts; if you decide to seat these two national delegates, in spite of the protests of eight hundred and seventy-one members, then you indorse their conduct; you take from the shoulders of Hopkins and Quinn and Cable the

odium that they ought to bear, and put it upon the Democratic party of the nation. [Applause.]

You have not this condition in other States to-day, but let this Convention indorse this conduct, and the next National Convention will see more than one State here with delegates chosen as the result of gavel rule. And it is because this question transcends in importance the interest of any State or any candidate or any faction that I am here to present the minority report and to ask you to do the Democrats of Illinois that justice which this gang deliberately and insolently denied them. [Applause.]

**THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** The gentleman representing the affirmative of the question pending before the Convention has occupied twenty minutes. He tells me that he will need ten minutes in conclusion. I shall, therefore, recognize gentlemen representing the other side for thirty minutes. I now recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Menzies).

**MR. G. V. MENZIES, of Indiana:** Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, it would be vain on my part to attempt to cope with the gentleman from Nebraska in oratory, but in the facts in this case I think I have a peculiar advantage over him. As a member of the Committee on Credentials, I heard the facts last night. He was conspicuous by his absence. [Applause.] If he had been present I am sure he would bear cheerful witness to the fact that that Committee exercised patience, industry and fairness in attempting to arrive at a just conclusion in the case of the contest from the State of Illinois. [Applause.]

The delegates now seated from the State of Illinois came into this Convention with credentials duly certified by the constituted authorities of the party in the State of Illinois.

After the certificates of the sitting delegation from Illinois were filed with the National Committee contests were filed. Those contests were referred to a sub-committee of the National Committee, which gave it a long and patient hearing. After the matter was passed upon by the sub-committee, the action of the sub-committee was indorsed by the full Committee. Then the case was passed to the final court of appeals of the



Democratic party—to this Convention—which referred it to its Committee on Credentials.

And, as I stated before, after an exhaustive hearing of the case there, we have reached the conclusion which has been reached in this case at each stage of its progress.

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan) dealt in strong language and positive assertion, I think, unsupported by facts or evidence. I should like to know, however, great as he is, what has constituted him a court of appeals to pass on a contest in the State of Illinois, and wherein his wisdom is superior to that of the Committee on Credentials of this Convention? [Applause.] Great as he is, he is not so omniscient that he can know a case without ever having heard it. [Applause.]

Now, let us get right down to the heart of this contention, the very pith of the controversy, and that is, primarily, whether the action of the constituted authorities of the Democratic party of the State of Illinois is to be trampled upon by bare assertions of fraud, unsupported by evidence, and whether the regular action of the duly chosen and elected Convention of the party, acting under the forms of law established by the party, is to be ignored because of pique, chagrin and disappointment.

Something has been said about gavel rule, a new figure of speech in political nomenclature. An objection has been made to the action and conduct of the Temporary Chairman of the State Convention of Illinois. I want to tell you right here an undisputed fact that came before us. That gentleman was elected Temporary Chairman at 12 o'clock, high noon, on the day that the Convention assembled, and after five hours and a half, if you can believe the gentleman from Nebraska, of nefarious conduct, he was unanimously elected Chairman at 5.30 of that day, and during all this interval of time, this interim of five and one-half hours, he practised all the political iniquity known to the catalogue of sins. So much for that.

Now, Gentlemen, another fact. My time is limited. The Chairman of our Committee is much more familiar with the facts than I am, but to one or two I will allude. That same convention which elected as delegates at large, Mr. Hopkins

and Mr. Cable, whose seats are challenged here, nominated a State ticket without a protest as to its regularity or the Convention's right to do so. That same Convention chose Presidential electors whom the contestants have recognized as constituting the valid, bona fide electoral ticket of the State of Illinois.

Something has been said here about eight hundred and seventy-one protests—I think that is the number—and nobody, if I understood the gentleman from Nebraska, gainsaid or questioned the eight hundred and seventy-one protests. If he had been present as your Committee was last night, he would have heard letters read from those so-called protestants, he would have heard telegrams read denying the right of anybody to put their names on this protest.

It is a remarkable fact that this pronounced specimen of *ex parte* evidence was never submitted to the contestees or their attorneys in this case. Not one of them ever had the privilege of looking into or examining any of those protests. I am authoritatively told—yes, by the Chairman of your Committee—that they were never heard of in this contest before any organized tribunal of the party until last night at 11.30 o'clock, I think it was, when we took up the contest from the State of Illinois.

No protest against the right of Mr. Hopkins or of Mr. Cable was ever heard until last Saturday, when the National Committee assembled in this city. During all this interval of time—four weeks—there was not a protest against the right of these delegates at large to sit in this Convention.

Now, gentlemen, in conclusion, and as Mr. Head will forcibly put it to you, the great question, the very pith of the controversy, is whether the constituted authorities of the party, acting under the forms of political procedure established by the party, shall be recognized here; or whether a case based on *ex parte* evidence, upon bare assertion without facts to support it, is going to be recognized as establishing a precedent in the Democratic party.

The gentleman from Nebraska forcibly said he believed in the great elementary principle of Democracy, that the majority

should rule. I stand behind him and will always follow him in the advocacy of that principle, but I have been taught by the same great mind that promulgated to man that cardinal principle of freedom, that the will of the majority must be ascertained by some well-defined, orderly method of parliamentary procedure, and unless ascertained in that way, it is not the will of anybody, either of the majority or the minority. [Applause.]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, Mr. Menzies has occupied fifteen minutes. Mr. Quinn, of the State of Illinois, is now recognized.

MR. FRANK J. QUINN, of Illinois: Gentlemen of the Convention, if you will give me your attention for two minutes, I will demonstrate to you that our gallant leader—

[At this point the confusion in the hall was so great that it took the Temporary Chairman several minutes to restore order.]

MR. QUINN: Gentlemen of the Convention, I want to say to you that I am and always have been a Democrat who believes that the majority of the Democratic party should rule. [Applause.] I am so good a Democrat that I do not reserve the right to bolt until after a Democratic Convention has acted. I am so good a Democrat that I will not call another Democrat a train robber and a thief unless I know the fact to be so. [Applause.]

I am so good a Democrat that in 1896, standing upon the platform of the Democratic National Convention, I stumped the State of Illinois and hurled the lie into the teeth of Democrats and Republicans who charged that William J. Bryan was dishonest, that he was a repudiator, that he could not be trusted. [Applause.]

In 1896 I ran for the office of State's Attorney in my county and was defeated, but I never arrogated to myself the right, by reason of that defeat, to nominate pound-masters, coroners, etc., and mix up in Democratic petty quarrels all over that State. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the Convention, for nine long hours, the Na-

tional sub-Committee heard our contest. W. J. Bryan was there three-quarters of an hour. He was not present when the evidence was heard before the Committee on Contests, and he read to you the brief and argument of Mr. Tolman, of Chicago, who, as attorney for the contestants, is here contesting us.

I want to say more to you. This is a contest for the purpose of advancing the personal spleen of Mr. Millard Fillmore Dunlap, of Illinois, who sits here upon the stage prompting Mr. Bryan. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the Convention, what do you think of a man who says "in order to be fair, we will give each side fifteen minutes to argue this case," when he has already taken up an hour and a half in argument. I desire to say to you that if Mr. Bryan wants to be fair, let him answer this question to you: Mr. Bryan, when, where and from what source came any objection to the selection of Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable? His answer will be "the gavel rule; no protest could be heard."

We held our Convention on the fourteenth day of June last. No notice of contest was ever served until last Saturday upon any of the men whose seats are now attacked. We came here without a bit of proof except what we could gather up hurriedly, and came unprepared for a contest, not knowing any was contemplated or that any right to make a contest existed.

SEVERAL GENTLEMEN: How about gavel rule?

MR. QUINN: I will tell you about gavel rule. Let me tell you about gavel rule in the Illinois Convention. The report of every committee, except one, was unanimous. Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable were selected by a committee of twenty-five, one from each Congressional District, and the report was unanimous, and they were unanimously elected. [Applause.] That is gavel rule. The report of the Committee on Permanent Organization, made at 5 o'clock, was unanimous in my favor, and I was unanimously elected the Chairman of that Convention, Judge Browning putting the motion.

I want to say to you in conclusion that we are the Democrats who believe in working at the polls, in working before elections, and in working after elections, to elect Democrats. We put in our time; we organize the counties; and I want to

say to you that the gentlemen whose seats are here contested are the men who are in the saddle, who control the party, and who delivered its electoral votes to Grover Cleveland in 1892. [Applause.] The only thing that we ask of you is this. Mr. Bryan wants his personality to influence your judgment. We ask you, do you know the facts? We ask you, are you prepared to vote, or will you look to the facts, to the conclusion of this committee of yours? We ask you for fair play. We ask you for fair treatment. The State of Illinois and its rights are greater than the desires or wishes of any man. [Applause.]

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman—

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for ten minutes.

MR. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the first speaker said that I had not heard the evidence. I stayed in the sub-Committee of the National Committee and heard evidence until nearly 3 o'clock in the morning [Applause], and I have heard more evidence than the gentleman who talked to you and who questioned my knowledge of this case. [Applause.] More than that, I have examined affidavits; I have examined petitions; I have examined protests, and I know ten times as much about the facts of this case as the gentleman who denied my right to speak in this case. [Applause.]

The gentleman desires to make use of the report of the National Committee. The National Committee referred this case to the Credentials Committee on the ground that the National Committee did not have time or authority to investigate the merits, and in doing so, by unanimous vote, said "in some Congressional Districts there was evidence to show that questionable methods prevailed; in some it appears that delegates selected by district caucuses were replaced by persons who had not been selected by the delegates from the districts, and in some instances it was at least doubtful whether the substitutions were properly made." That was the unanimous report of your National Committee after listening nine hours to the testimony. [Applause.]

And now this Committee considers the case for two hours,

does not take any evidence, but only hears argument, and then reports that there was no fraud and that you ought to seat these contestees.

Mr. Quinn, the Chairman of the Illinois Convention, says that he was unanimously reelected five hours after he began his gavel rule. Yes, my friends, everything done in that Convention was unanimous. [Applause.] It was unanimous. If you do not believe it, read the sworn testimony of the highwaymen who raided the Convention. The gentleman says that he is not a man who bolts or who waits until after the Convention to decide, but he is the man who with gavel rule tries to force upon the loyal Democrats of his State two men who supported Palmer and Buckner in 1896. [Applause.]

These two men who seek seats in this Convention against the protests of eight hundred and seventy-one delegates were the men who kept the path hot between Palmer and Buckner headquarters and Republican headquarters when the hundreds of thousands of Democrats of Illinois were marching up to support the ticket. [Applause.]

Mr. Quinn asks, "Where does the protest against John P. Hopkins come from," and he wanted me to answer it. I will answer it. It comes from eight hundred and seventy-one better Democrats than John P. Hopkins ever was. [Applause.] I am willing that the men who left us shall come back and share with the party in the shaping of its destiny; but God forbid that the loyal Democrats of Illinois shall by force and intimidation be made to march beneath the soiled banner of these men. [Applause.]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Head), Chairman of the Committee on Credentials.

MR. JAMES M. HEAD, of Tennessee: Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of your Committee on Credentials, I claim the right to be heard in behalf of that harmony of which my friend Mr. Bryan has preached, but to which he has contributed so little. [Applause.] For eighteen months, as his friend, I have pleaded with him to come to this Convention, and in the interest of the

great Democratic party of this country not to sacrifice the great power which he has. [Applause.]

I appeal to you as Democrats, in behalf of that harmony which is absolutely essential if we are to have the faintest prospect of success, to stand by the action of the Committee on Credentials, which you have chosen to represent you in this contest. [Applause.] There is much more at stake in this contest than the mere seating of delegates from Illinois.

The success of the Democratic party is in peril, and in her name I appeal to you to be considerate of the opinions and actions of others.

Is it necessary for me to tell this Convention that there was not a man upon your Committee on Credentials who did not go into that meeting with the earnest desire to do what was right and what was best for the great interest of the party? They are your representatives. They have heard these troubles. They have listened to the appeals that have been made in the interest of the one and the other of these parties. They have acted; and they appeal to you not to impugn their motives, or their loyalty to the best interests of the Democratic party.

No man who is familiar with current politics would undertake to defend all that took place in the State of Illinois. Where is there a delegate upon this floor who has not in his own State had troubles which would not bear the light of investigation?

These troubles have been investigated, both by your National Committee, and by a committee of your own selection; and I want to say in behalf of the action of that Committee which labored from 7 o'clock last night until 5 o'clock this morning, that I have never in all my experience as a Democrat witnessed a body of men more anxious to do right, nor have I ever witnessed a minority more willing to yield to the opinions and views of the majority than the members of that Committee. [Applause.]

I appeal to that Democratic doctrine, the right of the majority to rule, for which my friend Bryan so eloquently pleads. I shall detain you but a moment longer. I do not intend to discuss the evidence in this case. I submit to this Convention's candid judgment, that the facts set forth in the paper that Mr.

Bryan read, and the facts of similar papers presented on the other side, are sufficient to satisfy you of the difficulties your Committee had to contend with. We have done what we thought was best after careful consideration of all the facts, and as your representatives I come and appeal to you in behalf of that Committee to do them the justice to believe that they have done what they thought was for the best interest of this great party, which we all love, and which you are here at so much discomfort to serve. [Applause.]

Now, one word more and I shall be through. I am always willing to leave every question that comes up to the decision of the great mass of the Democratic party; and I am willing to leave this question to the decision of the majority of this Convention. In the votes that were taken upon these contests last night, more than two-thirds of that Committee were in favor of the majority report. The minority report up to this hour is signed only by William J. Bryan, who was not a member of that Committee except by proxy, and who never heard one word of the evidence or arguments that were made before our Committee. He never attended a meeting of the Committee until more than two hours after the Illinois contest had been disposed of, and then merely to ask leave to file a minority report.

There were not exceeding ten members of the Committee who voted against the majority report. There was no member of the Committee who endorsed any fraud that may have been committed; but we have made that report which we believe the facts in the case fully justified, and I am here in behalf of that Committee, your chosen representatives, to ask at your hands that you vote down the minority report, and sustain the action of the majority as the best that can be done under all the circumstances for the interest of the Democratic party, not only in Illinois, but in all these United States.

MR. LEONARD A. ROSING, of Minnesota: Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the minority report, and declare the Illinois Convention illegal, what becomes of the Hearst instructions?

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair is compelled to rule that that is not a parliamentary inquiry. The question is



on agreeing to the minority report presented by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan), as a substitute for the report of the Committee on Credentials' as respects Illinois. Are you ready for the question? [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

MR. O. P. THOMPSON, of Illinois. I demand a roll call.

[There were cries of "No!" "No!"]

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: I demand a roll call.

The roll call was ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll of States.

MR. THOMAS F. DONOVAN, of Illinois: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state his point of order.

MR. DONOVAN: It is that the Chair had announced the result before a roll call was asked for.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair had not announced the result. The Chair had announced that the noes seemed to have it. That is the usual course, in order to give an opportunity to demand a call of the roll of States. If a roll call had not been demanded, the Chair would have announced that the noes had it; but it was called for. The Clerk will call the roll of States.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

MR. JOHN P. HOPKINS, of Illinois (when the State of Illinois was called): Illinois desires to be passed.

MR. THOMAS CAREY, of Illinois: I rise as one of the delegates from Illinois to enter a protest against the wrecking crew and its Chairman.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan (when the State of Michigan was called): Under the unit rule Michigan casts twenty-eight "nays."

MR. WILLIAM F. McKNIGHT, of Michigan: I ask for a poll of the Michigan delegation—the right of each man to have his vote announced.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman demand a poll of the delegation?

MR. MCKNIGHT: For the purpose of showing that the entire vote is not "nay."

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: Mr. Chairman, a poll of the delegation has been made, and Michigan, under the directions of the State Convention, votes under the unit rule. We cast twenty-eight votes "nay."

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: If the Michigan delegation is instructed by its State Convention to cast its votes in accordance with the unit rule, it will cast it as the majority shall determine; but any gentleman who is a member of the Michigan delegation has a right to have the roll of the delegation called in order that the Convention may know that a majority has so determined.

MR. CAMPAU: The gentleman asked for a poll of the delegation, and a poll has been made in his presence.

MR. MCKNIGHT, of Michigan: No, I will waive that and ask that an announcement be made of the vote as it stood.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Let the gentleman understand the distinction. The gentleman has a right to demand a poll of the delegation.

MR. MCKNIGHT, of Michigan: I waive that part of it.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: That is the only right the gentleman has.

MR. MCKNIGHT: I do not question the announcement of the Chairman of our delegation, but I want the yea and nay votes announced to the Convention.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman has no right to that. If Michigan has instructed the delegation to vote as a unit, the right the gentleman has is to have the Convention witness the vote, if he desires it, by a call of the roll. If he admits that a majority of his delegation has determined to cast the vote, as the Chairman has announced, and if he admits furthermore that the Michigan delegation is operating under the unit rule, his present demand cannot be granted.

MR. MCKNIGHT: I am informed that the vote was nine to seventeen, but we are under the unit rule.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Very well. The vote of Michigan was nine to seventeen; the Michigan delegation is under the unit rule, and in deference to the instructions of its Convention, its vote will be cast as a unit.

The roll call was resumed.

When the vote of Pennsylvania was announced—

MR. JOHN M. GARMAN, of Pennsylvania: I demand a poll of the Pennsylvania delegation.

MR. WILLIAM J. STERN, of Pennsylvania: There has been a poll.

MR. GARMAN: There has been no poll.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair wishes to ask whether the State of Pennsylvania is or is not operating under the unit rule.

MR. CHARLES P. DONNELLY, of Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania is operating under the unit rule.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Garman) demands a call of the roll of delegates from the State of Pennsylvania. He has a right to do that. The Clerk will now call the roll of delegates from the State of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk called the roll of the delegates from the State of Pennsylvania, and their votes were recorded as follows:

James M. Guffey, nay; Robert E. Pattison, nay; Robert E. Wright, nay; J. K. P. Hall, nay; Hugh Moore, nay; F. F. Kane, yea; John Cadwallader, nay; William C. Bennett, nay; Albert H. Ladner, nay; John J. Green, nay; Emanuel Furth, nay; Thomas J. Gavaghan, nay; Charles P. Donnelly, nay; Edwin K. Borie, nay; Edward F. Bennis, nay; B. Gordon Bromley, yea; John P. Fite, nay; Harry E. Grimm, nay; H. H. North, Sr., nay; W. H. Kennedy, nay; Frank J. Fitzsimmons, nay; Charles H. Schadt, nay; John M. Garman, yea; Frank T. McCormick, yea; James A. Noecker, nay; E. T. Kenny, nay; A. G. Dewalt, nay; E. J. Norris, nay; Fred J. Billings, nay; W. L. Dewart, nay; R. S. Ammerman, nay; J. C. Amig, nay; Harvey W. Petriken, yea; B. F. Myers, nay; W. H. Peffer, nay; Samuel H. Moyer, yea; Edward C. Peeling, nay; James

Kerr, nay; W. E. Wallace, nay; J. B. F. Rinehart, yea; S. E. Frock, yea; H. T. Billick, nay; Henry H. Wilson, yea; William J. Stern, nay; A. J. Palm, yea; John E. Lauer, nay; Calvin Rayburn, nay; William A. Hindman, nay; William Hasson, nay; W. G. Barker, nay; David T. Watson, nay; George A. Koehler, yea; W. J. Brennan, nay; George S. Fleming, nay; J. A. Clair, nay; A. J. Barr, nay; George W. Guthrie, nay; John F. O'Toole, nay.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will announce the result of the poll of the Pennsylvania delegation.

THE CLERK: Fifty-eight votes were cast—forty-seven nays and eleven yeas.

MR. CHARLES P. DONNELLY: The Pennsylvania delegation is instructed by its State Convention to vote under the unit rule on all questions. The sixty-eight votes of Pennsylvania should therefore be counted "nay."

MR. J. HENRY COCHRAN, of Pennsylvania: My name and that of my colleague, Mr. Edwards, were not called.

THE CLERK: Those names do not appear on the Pennsylvania poll call. They are, however, on the roster.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The names will be called.

The Clerk called the names of Mr. Cochran and Mr. Edwards, and they voted in the negative.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, it being admitted that Pennsylvania delegation under instructions from the State Convention of Pennsylvania is operating under the unit rule, and a majority of that delegation having voted "nay," the delegated strength of Pennsylvania in this Convention will be recorded "nay."

The roll call was resumed and concluded.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: For fear there may be errors in the roll call, the Clerk will recapitulate the vote.

The Clerk proceeded to recapitulate the vote.

MR. MICHAEL T. O'BRIEN, of Maine (when the vote of Maine was announced): I came here as a representative of the State of Maine, and I say those twelve delegates from the State of Maine are not regular.

MR. L. IRVING HANDY, of Delaware: The gentleman is not a delegate.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, I am a delegate.

MR. HANDY: He was turned down by the report of the Committee on Credentials and is not a member of this body.

MR. O'BRIEN: But that does not go to show that I am not a delegate. I tell you by the Bible that I am entitled to my seat here.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: If the gentleman is not a member of this body, he is out of order and will take his seat.

The vote having been recapitulated, the result was announced, total votes cast, 946; yeas, 299; nays, 647, as follows:

	Total Vote.	Yeas.	Nays.
Alabama .....	22	..	22
Arkansas .....	18	..	18
California .....	20	20	..
Colorado .....	10	2	8
Connecticut .....	14	..	14
Delaware .....	6	3	3
Florida .....	10	4	6
Georgia .....	26	..	26
Idaho .....	6	3	3
Illinois .....	54	..	..
Indiana .....	30	..	30
Iowa .....	26	26	..
Kansas .....	20	13	7
Kentucky .....	26	26	..
Louisiana .....	18	..	18
Maine .....	12	6	6
Maryland .....	16	..	16
Massachusetts .....	32	..	32
Michigan .....	28	..	28
Minnesota .....	22	12	10
Mississippi .....	20	..	20
Missouri .....	36	36	..
Montana .....	6	..	6
Nebraska .....	16	16	..

	Total Vote.	Yeas.	Nays.
Nevada .....	6	3	3
New Hampshire .....	8	..	8
New Jersey .....	24	..	24
New York .....	78	..	78
North Carolina .....	24	..	24
North Dakota .....	8	8	..
Ohio .....	36	21	25
Oregon .....	8	4	4
Pennsylvania .....	68	..	68
Rhode Island .....	8	6	2
South Carolina .....	18	18	..
South Dakota .....	8	8	..
Tennessee .....	24	..	24
Texas .....	36	..	36
Utah .....	6	..	6
Vermont .....	8	..	8
Virginia .....	24	..	24
Washington .....	10	10	..
West Virginia .....	14	3	11
Wisconsin .....	26	26	..
Wyoming .....	6	6	..
Alaska .....	6	..	6
Arizona .....	6	6	..
District of Columbia .....	6	..	6
Indian Territory .....	6	2	4
Hawaii .....	6	2	4
New Mexico .....	6	3	3
Oklahoma .....	6	2	4
Porto Rico .....	6	4	2

So the Convention refused to adopt the minority report as a substitute for the majority report of the Committee on Credentials as respects the Illinois contests.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the report of the Committee on Credentials.

The report was agreed to.

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the report of the Committee on Permanent Organization.

MR. HUGH A. DINSMORE, of Arkansas: Mr. Chairman—

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Committee on Permanent Organization, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Dinsmore).

MR. HUGH A. DINSMORE, of Arkansas: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on Permanent Organization I beg leave to submit the following report:

## DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 7, 1904.

The Committee on Permanent Organization report a recommendation of the following permanent officers for the Convention, namely:

Chairman, Champ Clark, of Missouri.

Secretary, C. A. Walsh, of Iowa.

Sergeant-at-Arms, John I. Martin, of Missouri.

As to all other officers, the Committee recommend that the present temporary organization be made permanent. The Committee further recommend that each delegation of the Convention suggest to the Chairman one Honorary Vice-President of the Convention.

HUGH A. DINSMORE, *Chairman*.

CHARLES J. HUGHES, JR., *Secretary*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I move the adoption of the report.

The report was unanimously agreed to.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, it now becomes my duty, but it is very much more largely my pleasure, to give way to the gentleman who has been recommended for Permanent Chairman. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Culberson) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. Cockran) a committee to escort the Permanent Chairman to the platform.

MR. W. D. VANDIVER, of Missouri: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Convention adjourn until 8.30 o'clock this evening. [Cries of "No," "No."]

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The present occupant of the Chair will not entertain a motion to adjourn while the Permanent Chairman is being escorted to the platform. The motion can be renewed immediately afterward.

The committee appointed for that purpose escorted Mr. Clark to the platform.

THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, I have the honor to present to the Convention one of the noblest Romans of them all [applause]; one of the truest, strictest, broadest and best Democrats that ever stood even upon Missouri's soil. I have the honor of presenting to you as your Permanent Chairman a man who, when it comes to tariff legislation, is a Democrat; who, when it comes to trust legislation is a Democrat, who, when it comes to the great principle of equal opportunities and equal burdens for all the sons and daughters of men is a Democrat; a man who is a Democrat in the narrow, American, partisan sense, and a man who, beyond all that, is a democrat in the world sense of believing in equal rights all over the surface of God's earth, for all of God's children, and special privileges to none of them. [Applause.] I introduce Mr. Clark. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN (Mr. Champ Clark, of Missouri): Gentlemen of the Convention, the principal part of the speech-making by the Chairman in this Convention has been accomplished. My business is to run this Convention so that its nominees will be elected next November [applause], and it shall be done without fear or favor to any one. King David once declared: "I said in my haste, all men are liars." If he had been in Chicago about the time Senator Henry Cabot Lodge was reading the Republican platform, he would no doubt have pronounced the same opinion more leisurely, for surely there was never more mendacity packed into the same space in any



document purporting to be a grave State paper. [Laughter and applause.]

Shakespeare says:

“Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just;  
And he but naked, though locked up in steel,  
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted.”

In the impending conflict our quarrel is just, and we are in the right beyond all cavil.

To state it in a general way, our contention is that the Government shall be restored to the democratic-republican basis on which the fathers of the Republic intended it to rest, and shall be made once more a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, instead of a government of the classes, by the classes, and for the classes. [Applause.]

#### WHAT DEMOCRATS DEMAND.

To state it with more particularity, we insist that exorbitant taxation shall be reduced to just and reasonable rates; that extravagance in appropriations shall cease; that economy shall prevail in all the transactions of the Government; that all the departments shall be thoroughly investigated from top to bottom by Congressional committees; that all evildoers of whatever degree shall be driven from the public service and properly punished; that the trusts shall be proceeded against by indictment as are common and smaller criminals; that the Constitution accompanies the American flag into our new possessions. [Applause.]

The proposition that we must support President Roosevelt's Philippine policy—if he has any—right or wrong, is the veriest rot, a tale told by an idiot. I am willing to go as far as any one in patriotism; I will support my country in any emergency, but the President is not the country. The time has not yet arrived—I pray Almighty God that it will never arrive—when the American people will accept the arrogant dictum of Louis XIV. if repeated by an American President: “I am the State.”

If President Roosevelt is at all worthy of his high position, he must entertain a supreme contempt for those political syc-

phants, particularly for those claiming to be Democrats, who go about with sanctimonious moan, saying :

“The President is wrong in his Philippine policy, but we must support the President.” Out upon all such cringing idiocy. Suppose a case: Suppose that when George III. undertook to force our fathers to pay the stamp tax, Patrick Henry, instead of delivering that great lyric speech before the Virginia House of Burgesses which precipitated the Revolution, and which still stirs the heart like strains of martial music, had arisen in his place and said gently as a cooing dove :

“His Most Gracious Majesty is wrong about this stamp tax business, but we must, as loyal subjects, support him, right or wrong;” and suppose Washington, Jefferson, Warren, Adams, Greene, Lee, Hamilton—all that glorious host of warriors and sages—had weakly agreed to that—what would we be to-day? Instead of being the richest, most puissant Republic in all the flood of time, we would still be English colonies, ruled by British pro-Consuls and Governor-Generals without any voice whatever in the Government under which we live.

#### CONDEMNED THE WRONG.

Those immortal State builders were reared on the fiction that “the King can do no wrong,” but when he did do wrong they boldly and iconoclastically trampled that preposterous falsehood in the dust, and, wresting a continent from his iron grasp, dedicated it as the home of freedom and to the twin propositions that “Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed” and that “All men are created equal.”

There were men in the land of 1776. Are there only manikins now? I do not believe such a monstrous libel. George III. did wrong; our fathers fought and conquered him. President Roosevelt does wrong; we will oppose and overthrow him.

Support the President's policy? Will some gentleman please tell us what that policy is? Has he any? If so, why doesn't he say so? The truth is, he has none. He is an opportunist waiting for something to turn up. He is letting things drift, and they are drifting whither no man knows. Mean-

time, our soldiers are being killed and are dying of disease in shoals. For what purpose? Will anybody undertake to say?

I defy any jingo to stand up and declare with a straight face what the President's policy or the Republican policy is. No one will say; no one can say. But some say—more's the pity and shame: "The President is wrong, but we must support the President."

To this complexion has it come at last by reason of the new-fangled jingoism that we must shut up our thinkers, close our mouths, and chloroform our consciences in order to be considered patriots.

It avails nothing to claim—as some do—that Colonel Roosevelt is better than his party. It is to be hoped most fervently that he is—a great deal better; but, truth to tell, a President cannot be better than his party. Even if he tries to be, he is ruined politically. Johnson, Hayes, Arthur, and the younger Harrison all tried that experiment, and all of them were refused second terms either in convention or at the polls.

So it will be with Colonel Roosevelt. His particular friends may deem him better than his party. He may think so himself, but nevertheless the party will drag him down to its level. No man ever found himself in worse political company than does President Roosevelt in this year of grace. He is in the hands of the Republican Philistines, and they will bind him with their withes.

In every State in the Union it is a felony to get property of any sort—or to attempt to get it by false pretenses.

If the same rule applied to the getting of offices or to attempts to get them, the Republican platform makers would be in imminent danger of imprisonment.

One of their false pretenses—the one on which they harp the most this year—is that the Democratic party is in favor of free trade. The charge is utterly false—a fiction made of whole cloth. There are individual Democrats who are free traders just as there are individual Republicans who are atheists, but it would be precisely as true and fair to denounce the Republican party as the party of atheism as to denominate the Democratic party as the party of free trade.

It never was a free trade party and is not now. The man who charges that it is does so because of his ignorance or because of his mendacity.

Democrats favor the cutting down of exorbitant tariff rates to a reasonable basis. They believe that in many schedules of the present law the rates are too high; those that are too high we are in favor of cutting down.

"We favor any modification of the tariff schedules that may be required to prevent them becoming a shelter for monopoly."

I wonder if Mr. Secretary Shaw, the Republican orator-in-chief, ever heard those words before? They were taken verbatim from the Iowa Republican platform of 1901. The Secretary whooped it up at a great rate for Governor A. B. Cummins and others nominated on that platform. He scornfully denounces it now as "the dead Iowa issue." But it was a righteous declaration borrowed from Democrats and is not dead—not even dying.

#### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICANS.

Where tariff rates are so high that they enable American manufacturers to sell their wares abroad cheaper than they do to Americans here at home, we say they ought to be reduced. Is this anarchy or treason? If so, make the most of it. \* [Applause.]

Let Republican spellbinders and editors explain why an American farmer should pay from a third to one-half more for an American plow than his competitor in farming pays for it in Australia or South America or the ends of the earth. Democrats say it is wrong and they stand by the American farmer. Republicans say it is right and they stand by the Australian or South American farmer. Choose ye between us in November!

Not quite all Republican statesmen believe it right. Once in a while a ray of light breaks in on the benighted intellect of a Republican. For example, a year or two ago the Hon. J. W. Babcock, of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, had a lucid interval and advocated in several interviews the cutting down of tariff rates when they are so

high as to encourage the formation of trusts, and when they enable the manufacturer to sell his wares cheaper abroad than at home.

He went further and introduced bills to that effect, but the Republican leaders got hold of Mr. Babcock and by coaxing, bullying, or other means, checked his ardor as a tariff reformer, and he has been as dumb as an oyster ever since.

I am citing Babcock's performance in his moment of lucidity to show that to advocate the cutting down of outrageous tariff rates in the foregoing cases does not prove that a man is the enemy of his country as the "stand patters" would have you believe.

The "stand pat" organs and speakers claim that only antiquated sorts of our manufactured articles are sold abroad cheaper than to Americans at home. That theory is very ingenious, but, unfortunately, it is not true; for American steel rails are sold abroad at \$8 a ton less than they are sold at home, and the fashions in steel rails remain the same, or substantially so.

Will he or some other "stand patter" explain why Americans should be made to pay one-third more for American steel rails than the citizens of other nations pay for them?

He may answer as did Mr. Representative Olmstead, of Pennsylvania, that the railroad companies pay for the steel rails, and that it is the business of nobody else how much they pay for them, but Olmstead had more courage than information, for everybody with two ideas above a Hottentot knows that everybody that travels on a railroad, everybody that ships anything on one, everybody that uses anything so shipped, helps pay for the steel rails. The railroad companies foot the bills in the first instance, and then make their customers repay them with interest—at the highest rate the traffic will bear.

#### DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN TARIFFS.

Another unwarranted statement in the Republican platform is this:

"A Democratic tariff has always been followed by business adversity; a Republican tariff by business prosperity."

Over against this preposterous statement I place the plain facts of history. The Walker tariff, passed in 1846, was the first distinctively Democratic tariff. It gave such perfect satisfaction, under its operation the country so prospered, during its entire existence, that nobody dreamed of making the tariff an issue in 1852 or 1856. In 1857 some slight modifications were made in the Walker tariff. It is true that in 1857 there was a brief period of hard times, but as this condition existed throughout all of the civilized world, no man of intelligence will attribute the depression to the operation of the Walker tariff.

In 1873, when the Republicans had possession of all branches of the Federal Government, and had held them for twelve years; when the Morrill high tariff law had been in force for the same period of time; when General Grant was beginning his second term in the White House and there was a Republican majority of more than two-thirds in each branch of Congress, there came a panic which swept the country from sea to sea and destroyed one-half the property values in the land. Most assuredly that awful catastrophe cannot be charged to Democrats or to Democratic tariff measures, which is a flat contradiction, a complete refutation of the statement that a Republican tariff has always been followed by business prosperity.

In 1890 the McKinley tariff bill became a law. Under it and not under the Wilson bill, as is so often charged, came the destructive panic of 1893.

During the last months of Harrison's administration his last Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Charles Foster, of Ohio, acknowledged a deficiency of the revenues and recommended to Congress an issuance of bonds with which to raise money to run the Government. He went so far as to order the preparation of the plates from which to print the bonds. To say that the Wilson tariff bill, which went into effect in August, 1894, created the panic which began in the Fall of 1892, is exactly as just, reasonable and true as to say that the Mexican War, which began in 1846, was caused by the Civil War, which began in 1861. Nobody will be deceived by such bold assertions except those who want to be deceived. [Applause.]

Another misleading statement in the Republican platform is this:

“ We replaced a Democratic tariff law based on free trade principles—” meaning thereby the Wilson tariff bill.

To call the Wilson tariff law a free trade measure, is, to use the politest language possible under the circumstances, a palpable misnomer. The facts are these: The McKinley bill carried an average tariff tax of about forty-seven per cent. on about four thousand articles of every-day consumption. The Wilson bill carried an average tariff tax of about thirty-nine per cent. on about the same list of articles. The Dingley bill raised the tariff tax to about fifty-seven per cent. on about the same articles. So that, to denounce the Wilson tariff law as a free trade measure is clearly an attempt to carry the election by false pretenses. I do not believe the intelligent voters of the United States can be deceived by these claims, which are as baseless as the fabric of a dream. [Applause.]

#### AMERICAN INDUSTRIES SAFE.

Of a piece with the foregoing false pretenses is that other one that Democrats would destroy American industries. There is not a syllable of truth in it. Why should they desire to destroy industries? They are vitally interested in maintaining them, and they wish to see them all prosper by giving to them all an equal chance, and not by fostering some at the expense of others.

The true Democratic position on the tariff is this: Recognizing the fact that a large portion of our revenue has always been raised from customs duties or taxes, Democrats divide all imports into three classes—necessaries, comforts, and luxuries—and contend that the tariff taxes should be highest on luxuries, lower on comforts, and lowest or none at all on the necessaries. They, furthermore, say that taxes should be uniform on all articles belonging to one class.

That is the Democratic party's position, from which it will not be driven or coaxed or bullied. No amount of misrepresentation will cause it to budge from that position. We say furthermore that not one dollar more in the shape of tariff taxes

or any other sort of taxes should be taken from the people than is necessary to pay the expenses of a Government economically administered. On these propositions we believe we are right, and on them we confidently rely in our appeal to the American people in November.

#### OUR MERCHANT MARINE.

When Napoleon signed the title deeds to this vast country west of the Mississippi he turned to the American Commissioners and said: "Now I have given England a maritime rival," and so he had until insatiable greed and criminal maladministration banished the starry banner of the Republic from the high seas and abdicated the rich domain of the ocean. In 1860 we had the second largest merchant marine in the world—our sails whitened every harbor, and our flag floated in every breeze under the heavens.

How sadly all this has changed after thirty-five years of Republican misrule! Last year, of all the merchantmen that went through the Suez Canal not a single vessel, great or small, except battleships, bore the American flag at its masthead, and our flag is seen in foreign waters only when flying over a man-of-war.

Worse than this—more humiliating than this—a few years ago when Congress appropriated a large sum of money to buy corn and wheat and meat to send to the famine-stricken East Indians, we could not send it in an American ship, for the all sufficient reason that there was none to send it in, but to our great humiliation had to hire a foreign ship in which to send over charity to our starving fellow-men.

When an American goes abroad he must sail under a foreign flag, on a foreign ship, under a foreign officer.

Why have things come to this shameful, this pitiful, complexion in a country that has the finest material for ships and sailors in the world? Because our exorbitant tariff system has made it impossible for an American to build a ship in competition with the British ship builders on the river Clyde.

Yet the Republican party has the infinite gall to prate about its patriotism.



Our boys are rushing off to face death in search of gold in the Klondike region, when the oceans of the world contain a million Klondikes, if the Republican party would only permit them to work the watery main. [Applause.]

#### THE TRUST QUESTION.

Republicans claim in public to be the great and only trust busters, notwithstanding the fact that under Republican misrule trusts have sprung up like mushrooms in a damp cellar, and have become plentiful as berries in June.

It is said that "straws show which way the wind blows." Here is a "straw" which indicates that the trusts have nothing to fear from Republican trust busters. It is the appointment of Attorney-General Philander C. Knox, Republican trust buster, par excellence, to succeed the late Matthew Stanley Quay, of Pennsylvania, in the Senate of the United States. There would have been nothing strange or suspicious about that performance were it not for the influences which secured the appointment of Mr. Knox. There can be no question about his intellectual qualifications for the position. The same can be said truly of some other Pennsylvania Republicans—Congressman John Dalzell and Joseph C. Sibley, for instance.

People will open their eyes in astonishment and begin to inquire as to the why and wherefore of his appointment, when they learn that the transfer of Mr. Knox from the Attorney-Generalship to the Senate was procured by the earnest and successful efforts of Mr. Frick, Mr. Cassatt and Mr. Donald Cameron to induce United States Senator Penrose, the new Republican boss of Pennsylvania, to permit Mr. Knox to be Senator—for Governor Pennypacker, who nominally made the appointment, does not appear to have been considered at all in the premises.

The amazement of the people will grow like Jonah's gourd vine when they learn that Mr. Frick is the heaviest stockholder in the Steel Trust; that Mr. Cassatt is President of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, which is one of the defendants in the Coal Trust case now pending, and that Mr. Cameron represented the Standard Oil Trust and Wall Street interests in per-

suading Boss Penrose to let Mr. Knox go to the Senate.

Here we have the strange spectacle—the mystifying anomaly of three of the chief trust magnates in the land securing the appointment to the Senate of Attorney-General Philander C. Knox, who has been exploited far and wide as the greatest trust buster on terra firma.

Folks who still dare to think will be forced to one of two conclusions—(1) either that Mr. Knox is the only lawyer in America capable of conducting a suit against a trust—which is absolutely preposterous, for there are hundreds of lawyers as able as he is—and that the trusts were anxious to get him out of the Attorney-General's office, because they fear him more than they do any other human being; or, (2) that the Knox anti-crusade has been a bunko game from the beginning and that Messrs. Frick, Cassatt and Cameron, together with those whom they represent, procured for him the Senator's reward for favors already rendered the trusts secretly while in the Cabinet, and to be hereafter rendered in the Senate.

According to the press reports President Roosevelt stood by consenting to the transfer of Knox from the Cabinet to the Senate just as Paul stood by consenting to the stoning of Stephen.

One paper says:

“The President is greatly pleased that Mr. Knox will accept the position”—which looks like he is glad to be rid of him.

Here is another straw: It has been told in Gath and proclaimed on the streets of Askelon by the Roosevelt shouters for lo! these many months, that the trust magnates—especially those whose lair is Wall Street—are bitterly opposed to the President.

A change appears to have come over the spirit of their dream, if the Hon. Francis B. Loomis, Assistant Secretary of State, can be believed. That illustrious public functionary recently “swung around the circle” in New York, and elsewhere, to “survey the situation.” Upon his return to Washington he delivered himself of an interview in which *inter alia* he says:

“While in New York, I spent two days in Wall Street, chat-

ting with many representatives of the financial interests, and I find that there is no longer any disposition to make a fight. And in accepting the situation, the feeling toward Mr. Roosevelt seems to have undergone a change, and I heard many friendly comments. I confess I was surprised at the extent of this change."

Yes, indeed, "the feeling toward Mr. Roosevelt seems to have undergone a change"—among the Wall Street trust magnates, and Brother Loomis "heard many friendly comments"—by the aforesaid trust magnates.

Mr. Loomis does not vouchsafe to an eager and inquisitive world the reasons why Wall Street feeling has undergone such a change as to cause Wall Street magnates who were esthwhile abusing the President as a menace to the Republic to make "many friendly comments" upon him now.

Has the President changed his views or have the trust magnates changed theirs?

Plain people cannot be blamed for being bewildered by all this kaleidoscopic performance.

They cannot be censured because by an old process they figure it out that two and two make four and that the transfer of Mr. Knox from Cabinet to Senate at the behest of Messrs. Frick, Cassatt and Cameron, taken in connection with the change of feeling in Wall Street in favor of the President, has a sinister meaning.

The trust magnates who secured the Senatorial toga for Mr. Knox, since they have established the entente cordiale with that famous trust buster, ought to compel the young ruffianly scions of great trust houses who some time ago insulted and assaulted Mr. Knox in a public restaurant to go on their knees and make to him the amende honorable. Then all will be lovely—between the trust and the trust buster.

#### THE SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR.

There are other assertions made in the Republican platform which have no foundation in fact. Here is one:

"We"—that is to say, the Republicans—"we fought a quick and victorious war with Spain." That statement is

unfair, unjust, untrue and un-American. That was an American war, inaugurated by the plain people of America, without any respect to politics whatever. Democrats and Republicans alike voted for it in Congress; Democrats and Republicans alike and in about equal numbers enlisted in the army; Democrats and Republicans alike and side by side did what fighting there was to do; the glory thereof belongs to the entire American people and not to any party.

#### IRRIGATION.

Again, the Republican platform says:

“We have passed laws which will bring the arid lands of the United States within the area of cultivation.”

The truth is that Democrats and Republicans alike voted for the measure, and that the most active, persistent and intelligent advocates of the scheme were Senator Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, and Representatives John C. Bell and John F. Shafroth, of Colorado, all three Democrats.

There are numerous other misstatements in the Republican platform. The Republicans evidently believe in Mark Twain's dictum, “Blessed is the man who bloweth his own horn, lest it be not blown.” [Laughter.]

In all the questions I have named and in those left unnamed from lack of time, we appeal to the records of the two great parties. By these records we are willing to be judged: on these records we expect to achieve such a victory in November that it will give us a long lease of power.

As far as concerns my rulings in this Convention, they shall be fair. If we so conduct ourselves that all of the various elements of public opinion which are opposed to the Roosevelt administration are brought together, we will mop the Republicans off the face of the earth from sea to sea in the coming election. [Applause.]

#### THANKS TO THE TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN.

MR. JAMES KERR, of Pennsylvania: I move that this Convention extend to the Hon. John S. Williams, who has just retired as Temporary Chairman, the thanks of one and all for

the able, fearless and comprehensive manner in which he has presided over the temporary deliberations of this great body. And I ask you, sir, that those thanks be expressed by a rising vote of the delegates of this Convention.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: All those in favor of thanking the Hon. John S. Williams for the manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of this Convention will stand up. [All the delegates rose to their feet.]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The motion is unanimously carried. Mr. Williams is unanimously thanked. What is the pleasure of the Convention?

### ADJOURNMENT.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: I move that the Convention do now adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

MR. W. D. VANDIVER, of Missouri: I move as a substitute that we take a recess until 8.30 this evening.

MR. THOMAS F. GRADY, of New York: There will be no business ready for the Convention to-night.

MR. THOMAS E. BARKWORTH, of Michigan: As a member of the Committee on Resolutions, I desire to state that the full Committee is scheduled to meet at 8 o'clock to-night to consider the report of the sub-committee, which has not yet been made.

MR. VANDIVER: In view of that statement, I withdraw my motion.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Campau) that the Convention adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to and (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Convention adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, July 8, 1904, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## THIRD DAY.

---

THE COLISEUM, ST. LOUIS, MO.,

Friday, July 8, 1904.

The Convention met at 10 o'clock a. m.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Convention will be opened with prayer by Rabbi Samuel Sale, of this city.

### PRAYER OF RABBI SAMUEL SALE.

Rabbi Samuel Sale, of St. Louis, offered the following prayer:

All merciful and most gracious Father, we seek Thy presence in this vast assembly of Thy people, and humbly we ask Thy guidance in the councils of the leaders of Thy people. Thou rulest in the destinies of nations; Thou art enthroned in the hearts of Thy worshipers; and we serve Thee best whose lives are devoted to the cause of the just, the right and the true; who give themselves consciously in Thy name to the cause of liberty and of justice. O, do Thou inspire those who are gathered here that they may deliberate with each other in the spirit of wisdom and understanding, in the spirit of knowledge, and in the spirit of council, so that through their counsels our people may go from strength to strength and our land may remain what Thou hast destined it to be, the foundation of human right and human liberty. O, inspire us as Thou didst the fathers of our country, with a patriotism pure and unselfish, and teach us that we serve Thee in serving the commonwealth and in safeguarding those liberties which Thou hast spread abroad.

Let not the glory of this our day be less than that of our

great past, and inspire every one of Thy children, from the least even unto the greatest, with love and zeal for the imperishable treasures which Thou hast entrusted to the keeping of our land for the well being of all mankind. As in its great past this country has been the refuge and the asylum of all Thy children, without regard to creed, or clime, or race, or condition, so do Thou inspire us with a love of Thy greatest good, religious freedom and liberty, that it still may be the hope and refuge of mankind.

O, may the ark of Freedom's foundation not be held by the worship of an idol of material things, to the detriment and hurt of those greatest treasures which alone can inspire a love of Thee and of liberty, and safeguard our country. Let it sail on, that it may reach the haven which Thou hast destined for it and for mankind, the haven of law and of liberty.

And thus, O God, do Thou guide those who are here gathered in Thy service and in the service of the people. "And let the beauty of the Lord, our God, be upon us: and establish Thou the work of our hands upon us; yea, the work of our hands establish Thou it." Amen.

#### DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

**THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN:** The roll of States, etc., will be called, and the Chairman of each delegation will announce the National Committeeman from his State.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

**MR. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,** of Oregon (when the State of Oregon was called): Oregon asks that she be passed for the present.

**THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN:** Oregon will be passed for the present.

The Secretary concluded the calling of the roll.

**THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN:** Is Oregon ready to report?

**MR. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,** of Oregon: Oregon is not ready to report.

**MR. JOHN POWER,** of Michigan: I move that the selections

by the States, etc., of National Committeemen be confirmed by the Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

The Democratic National Committee as finally constituted is as follows: \*

*Alabama*—H. D. Clayton, Eufaula.  
*Arkansas*—William H. Martin, Hot Springs.  
*California*—M. F. Tarpey, Alameda.  
*Colorado*—John I. Mullins, Denver.  
*Connecticut*—Homer S. Cummings, Stamford.  
*Delaware*—Richard R. Kenney, Dover.  
*Florida*—Jefferson B. Browne, Key West.  
*Georgia*—Clark Howell, Atlanta.  
*Idaho*—Simon P. Donnelly, Lakeview.  
*Illinois*—Roger C. Sullivan, Chicago.  
*Indiana*—Thomas Taggart, Indianapolis.  
*Iowa*—Charles A. Walsh, Ottumwa.  
*Kansas*—John H. Atwood, Leavenworth.  
*Kentucky*—Urey Woodson, Owensboro.  
*Louisiana*—Newton C. Blanchard, Baton Rouge.  
*Maine*—George E. Hughes, Bath.  
*Maryland*—Lewis Victor Baughman, Frederick City.  
*Massachusetts*—William A. Gaston, Boston.  
*Michigan*—Daniel J. Campau, Detroit.  
*Minnesota*—T. T. Hudson, Duluth.  
*Mississippi*—C. H. Williams, Yazoo City.  
*Missouri*—W. A. Rothwell, Moberly.  
*Montana*—Chas. W. Hoffman, Bozeman.  
*Nebraska*—James C. Dahlman, Omaha.  
*Nevada*—John H. Dennis, Reno.  
*New Hampshire*—True L. Norris, Portsmouth.  
*New Jersey*—William B. Gourley, Paterson.  
*New York*—Norman E. Mack, Buffalo.  
*North Carolina*—Josephus Daniels, Raleigh.  
*North Dakota*—H. D. Allert, Langdon.

---

\* See action taken near the close of the last night's session with respect to the Democratic National Committee.



*Ohio*—John R. McLean, Cincinnati.  
*Oregon*—Frederick V. Holman, Portland.  
*Pennsylvania*—J. M. Guffey, Pittsburg.  
*Rhode Island*—George W. Greene, Woonsocket.  
*South Carolina*—B. R. Tillman, Trenton.  
*South Dakota*—E. S. Johnson, Armour.  
*Tennessee*—R. E. L. Mountcastle, Knoxville.  
*Texas*—R. M. Johnston, Houston.  
*Utah*—D. H. Peery, Salt Lake City.  
*Vermont*—Bradley B. Smalley, Burlington.  
*Virginia*—J. Taylor Ellyson, Richmond.  
*Washington*—John Y. Terry, Seattle.  
*West Virginia*—John T. McGraw, Grafton.  
*Wisconsin*—Timothy E. Ryan, Waukesha.  
*Wyoming*—John E. Osborne, Rawlins.  
*Alaska*—Arthur K. Dalany, Juneau.  
*Arizona*—Ben. M. Crawford, Clifton.  
*District of Columbia*—James L. Norris, Washington.  
*Hawaii*—Palmer P. Woods, Mahukona.  
*Indian Territory*—R. L. Williams, Durant.  
*New Mexico*—H. B. Ferguson, Albuquerque.  
*Oklahoma*—Richard A. Billups, Cordell.  
*Porto Rico*—D. M. Field, Guayama.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The new National Committee will meet at the Committee rooms in the Jefferson Hotel as soon as the National Convention has adjourned *sine die*.

#### COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee on Resolutions ready to report?

MR. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Chair appoint a committee to wait upon the Committee on Resolutions, and ascertain how long it will be before they will be able to make their report to the Convention.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair appoints as the

committee to wait upon the Committee on Resolutions, Mr. Ollie M. James, of Kentucky; Mr. Henry D. Clayton, of Alabama, and Mr. Thomas H. Ball, of Texas.

WILLIAM BOURKE COCKRAN.

MR. JOHN C. SHEPPARD, of South Carolina: While the Convention is awaiting the Committee on Resolutions, there are thousands of persons in this audience who would like to hear from one of the world's greatest orators, the Honorable William Bourke Cockran, of New York. [Applause.]

MR. THOMAS F. GRADY, of New York: Mr. Cockran is not here. He is in the Committee on Resolutions.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair is informed that Mr. Cockran is not in the hall.

CHARLES A. TOWNE.

MR. ALVA ADAMS, of Colorado: If Mr. Cockran can not come, let us hear from that Democratic Cicero, Mr. C. A. Towne. [Applause.]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Word is sent to the Chair that Mr. Towne declines to speak at this time.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS OF THE  
CONVENTION.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The roll of States, etc., will be called, and the Chairman of each delegation will announce the Honorary Vice-President.

The list of Honorary Vice-Presidents of the Convention is as follows:

- Alabama—Wm. Richardson.
- Arkansas—Oscar L. Miles.
- California—Joseph Simons.
- Colorado—Jacob H. Robeson.
- Connecticut—Nathaniel B. Stevens.
- Delaware—R. R. Kennedy.
- Florida—A. P. Jordan.

Georgia—Robert T. Daniel.  
Idaho—James W. Ballentine.  
Illinois—James H. Lewis.  
Indiana—Daniel W. Simms.  
Iowa—S. M. Hamilton.  
Kansas—Hugh P. Farrelly.  
Kentucky—Chas. M. Frasier.  
Louisiana—Robert F. Broussard.  
Maine—H. J. Hathaway.  
Maryland—Buchanan Schley.  
Massachusetts—W. L. Douglas.  
Michigan—Francis F. Palms.  
Minnesota—S. J. Mealey.  
Mississippi—Charles E. Hooker.  
Missouri—Patrick R. Fitzgibbons.  
Montana—Jos. K. Toole.  
Nebraska—W. H. DeFrance.  
Nevada—S. W. Gregory.  
New Hampshire—Joseph P. Chatel.  
New Jersey—John R. Hardin.  
New York—John Fox.  
North Carolina—Edward J. Hale.  
North Dakota—M. F. Murphy.  
Ohio—Lewis Brucker.  
Oregon—Sam M. Garland.  
Pennsylvania—H. H. North, Sr.  
Rhode Island—Samuel E. Daubney.  
South Carolina—J. C. Sheppard.  
South Dakota—E. F. Gross.  
Tennessee—W. A. Percy.  
Texas—John H. Reagan.  
Utah—Joseph Monson.  
Vermont—Oscar C. Miller.  
Virginia—A. J. Montague.  
Washington—Edward C. Cheasty.  
West Virginia—Johnson N. Camden.  
Wisconsin—H. W. Sawyer.  
Wyoming—George T. Beck.

Alaska—A. P. Swineford.  
 Arizona—Wm. Gillespie.  
 District of Columbia—Thos. J. Moore.  
 Indian Territory—E. M. Haley.  
 Hawaii—C. J. McCarthy.  
 New Mexico—Antonio Lucero.  
 Oklahoma—French Joshua Gentry.  
 Porto Rico—A. H. Molina.

MR. G. W. PRATT, of Alabama: Mr. Chairman, while the Convention is waiting for the report of the Committee on Resolutions, I move that we hear from Captain Richmond Pearson Hobson.

The motion was carried.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: I introduce to this Convention Captain Richmond Pearson Hobson.

Mr. Hobson thereupon addressed the Convention.

#### COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: I introduce to you the Honorable Ollie M. James, of Kentucky, Chairman of the Committee that waited on the Committee on Resolutions.

MR. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky: Mr. Chairman, your Committee appointed to wait upon the Committee on Resolutions report that they have discharged that duty. The Committee on Resolutions informed your Committee that they would be unable to report to this Convention until 8 o'clock to-night, at which time they will bring to you a unanimous report signed by every member of that Committee. New York and Nebraska, Virginia and Wisconsin, have all joined hands and will bring you a platform that will carry us to a glorious victory in November. [Applause.]

#### RECESS.

Mr. Chairman, I move that this Convention take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock meridian) the Convention took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

## AFTER RECESS.

At the expiration of the recess the Convention resumed its session.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, the next business in order is the report of the Committee on Resolutions.

MR. JOHN W. DANIEL, of Virginia. Mr. Chairman—

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

MR. JOHN W. DANIEL, of Virginia: Mr. Chairman, as the Chairman of your Committee on Resolutions, I am instructed to make to the Convention a unanimous report of that Committee.

Mr. Daniel then read the report, which is as follows:

The Democratic party of the United States, in National Convention assembled, declares its devotion to the essential principles of the Democratic faith which bring us together in party communion.

Under these principles local self-government and National unity and prosperity were alike established. They underlaid our independence, the structure of our free Republic, and every Democratic expansion from Louisiana to California, and Texas to Oregon, which preserved faithfully in all the States the tie between taxation and representation. They yet inspire the masses of our people, guarding jealously their rights and liberties, and cherishing their fraternity, peace and orderly development. They remind us of our duties and responsibilities as citizens and impress upon us, particularly at this time, the necessity of reform and the rescue of the administration of Government from the headstrong, arbitrary and spasmodic methods which distract business by uncertainty, and pervade the public mind with dread, distrust and perturbation.

## FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES.

The application of these fundamental principles to the living issues of the day constitutes the first step toward the assured peace, safety and progress of our nation. Freedom of the press, of conscience, and of speech; equality before the law of all citizens; right of trial by jury; freedom of the person defended by the Writ of Habeas Corpus; liberty of personal contract untrammelled by sumptuary laws; supremacy of the civil over military authority; a well-disciplined militia; separation of Church and State; economy in expenditures; low taxes, that labor may be lightly burdened; prompt and sacred fulfilment of public and private obligations; fidelity to treaties; peace and friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none; absolute acquiescence in the will of the majority, the vital principle of Republics—these are doctrines which Democracy has established as proverbs of the Nation, and they should be constantly invoked, and enforced.

## ECONOMY OF ADMINISTRATION.

Large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the Government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service, and we shall insist upon the strictest economy and frugality compatible with vigorous and efficient civil, military and naval administration as a right of the people, too clear to be denied or withheld.

## HONESTY IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

We favor the enforcement of honesty in the public service, and to that end a thorough legislative investigation of those executive departments of the Government already known to teem with corruption, as well as other departments suspected of harboring corruption, and the punishment of ascertained corruptionists without fear or favor or regard to persons. The persistent and deliberate refusal of both the Senate and House of Representatives to permit such investigation to be made demonstrates that only by a change in the executive and in the legislative departments can complete exposure, punishment and correction be obtained.

## FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS WITH TRUSTS.

We condemn the action of the Republican party in Congress in refusing to prohibit an executive department from entering into contracts with convicted trusts or unlawful combinations in restraint of interstate trade. We believe that one of the best methods of procuring economy and honesty in the public service is to have public officials, from the occupant of the White House down to the lowest of them, return, as nearly as may be, to Jeffersonian simplicity of living.

## EXECUTIVE USURPATION.

We favor the nomination and election of a President imbued with the principles of the Constitution, who will set his face sternly against executive usurpation of legislative and judicial functions, whether that usurpation be veiled under the guise of executive construction of existing laws, or whether it take refuge in the tyrant's plea of necessity or superior wisdom.

## IMPERIALISM.

We favor the preservation, so far as we can, of an open door for the world's commerce in the Orient without unnecessary entanglement in Oriental and European affairs, and without arbitrary, unlimited, irresponsible and absolute government anywhere within our jurisdiction. We oppose, as fervently as did George Washington, an indefinite, irresponsible, discretionary and vague absolutism and a policy of colonial exploitation, no matter where or by whom invoked or exercised. We believe with Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, that no Government has a right to make one set of laws for those "at home" and another and a different set of laws, absolute in their character, for those "in the colonies." All men under the American flag are entitled to the protection of the institutions whose emblem the flag is; if they are inherently unfit for those institutions, then they are inherently unfit to be members of the American body politic. Wherever there may exist a people incapable of being governed under American laws, in consonance with the American Constitution, the territory of that people ought not to be part of the American domain.

We insist that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have done already for the Cubans, and it is our duty to make that promise now, and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal to set the Filipino people upon their feet, free and independent, to work out their own destiny.

The endeavor of the Secretary of War, by pledging the Government's endorsement for "promoters" in the Philippine Islands to make the United States a partner in speculative exploitation of the archipelago, which was only temporarily held up by the opposition of Democratic Senators in the last session, will, if successful, lead to entanglements from which it will be difficult to escape.

#### TARIFF.

The Democratic party has been, and will continue to be, the consistent opponent of that class of tariff legislation by which certain interests have been permitted, through Congressional favor, to draw a heavy tribute from the American people. This monstrous perversion of those equal opportunities which our political institutions were established to secure, has caused what may once have been infant industries to become the greatest combinations of capital that the world has ever known. These special favorites of the Government have, through trust methods, been converted into monopolies, thus bringing to an end domestic competition, which was the only alleged check upon the extravagant profits made possible by the protective system. These industrial combinations, by the financial assistance they can give, now control the policy of the Republican party.

We denounce protectionism as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the Government economically, effectively and constitutionally administered and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class or section, to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and its discriminations,



keeping in view the ultimate end of "equality of burdens and equality of opportunities," and the constitutional purpose of raising a revenue by taxation, to wit: the support of the Federal Government in all its integrity and virility, but in simplicity.

#### TRUSTS AND UNLAWFUL COMBINATIONS.

We recognize that the gigantic trusts and combinations designed to enable capital to secure more than its just share of the joint product of capital and labor, and which have been fostered and promoted under Republican rule, are a menace to beneficial competition and an obstacle to permanent business prosperity.

A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable.

Individual equality of opportunity and free competition are essential to a healthy and permanent commercial prosperity; and any trust, combination or monopoly tending to destroy these by controlling production, restricting competition or fixing prices and wages, should be prohibited and punished by law. We especially denounce rebates and discriminations by transportation companies as the most potent agency in promoting and strengthening these unlawful conspiracies against trade.

We demand an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the end that the traveling public and shippers of this country may have prompt and adequate relief from the abuses to which they are subjected in the matter of transportation. We demand a strict enforcement of existing civil and criminal statutes against all such trusts, combinations and monopolies; and we demand the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary effectually to suppress them.

Any trust or unlawful combination engaged in interstate commerce which is monopolizing any branch of business or production, should not be permitted to transact business outside of the State of its origin, whenever it shall be established in any court of competent jurisdiction that such monopolization exists. Such prohibition should be enforced through comprehensive laws to be enacted on the subject.

## CAPITAL AND LABOR.

We favor the enactment and administration of laws giving labor and capital impartially their just rights. Capital and labor ought not to be enemies. Each is necessary to the other. Each has its rights, but the rights of labor are certainly no less "vested," no less "sacred" and no less "inalienable" than the rights of capital.

We favor arbitration of differences between corporate employers and their employees and a strict enforcement of the eight-hour law on all Government work.

We approve the measure which passed the United States Senate in 1896, but which a Republican Congress has ever since refused to enact, relating to contempts in Federal courts and providing for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt.

## CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTIES.

Constitutional guaranties are violated whenever any citizen is denied the right to labor, acquire and enjoy property or reside where interest or inclination may determine. Any denial thereof by individuals, organizations or governments should be summarily rebuked and punished.

We deny the right of any executive to disregard or suspend any constitutional privilege or limitation. Obedience to the laws and respect for their requirements are alike the supreme duty of the citizen and the official.

The military should be used only to support and maintain the law. We unqualifiedly condemn its employment for the summary banishment of citizens without trial, or for the control of elections.

## WATERWAYS.

We favor liberal appropriations for the care and improvement of the waterways of the country. When any waterway like the Mississippi River is of sufficient importance to demand the special aid of the Government, such aid should be extended with a definite plan of continuous work until permanent improvement is secured.

We oppose the Republican policy of starving home development in order to feed the greed for conquest and the appetite for national "prestige" and display of strength.

#### RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS AND DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENT.

We congratulate our Western citizens upon the passage of the measure known as the Newlands Irrigation Act for the irrigation and reclamation of the arid lands of the West—a measure framed by a Democrat, passed in the Senate by a non-partisan vote, and passed in the House against the opposition of almost all the Republican leaders by a vote the majority of which was Democratic. We call attention to this great Democratic measure, broad and comprehensive as it is, working automatically throughout all time without further action of Congress, until the reclamation of all the lands in the arid West capable of reclamation is accomplished, reserving the lands reclaimed for homeseekers in small tracts and rigidly guarding against land monopoly, as an evidence of the policy of domestic development contemplated by the Democratic party, should it be placed in power.

#### THE ISTHMIAN CANAL.

The Democracy when entrusted with power will construct the Panama Canal speedily, honestly and economically, thereby giving to our people what Democrats have always contended for—a great inter-oceanic canal, furnishing shorter and cheaper lines of transportation, and broader and less trammelled trade relations with the other peoples of the world.

#### AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

We pledge ourselves to insist upon the just and lawful protection of our citizens at home and abroad, and to use all proper measures to secure for them, whether native born or naturalized, and without distinction of race or creed, the equal protection of laws and the enjoyment of all rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties of friendship and commerce; and if under existing treaties the right of travel and sojourn is denied to American citizens or recognition is

withheld from American passports by any countries on the ground of race or creed, we favor the beginning of negotiations with the governments of such countries to secure by new treaties the removal of these unjust discriminations.

We demand that all over the world a duly authenticated passport issued by the Government of the United States to an American citizen shall be proof of the fact that he is an American citizen and shall entitle him to the treatment due him as such.

#### ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

We favor the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people.

#### STATEHOOD FOR TERRITORIES.

We favor the admission of the Territory of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory. We also favor the immediate admission of Arizona and New Mexico, as separate States, and territorial governments for Alaska and Porto Rico.

We hold that the officials appointed to administer the government of any Territory, as well as the District of Alaska, should be bona fide residents at the time of their appointment of the Territory or district in which their duties are to be performed.

#### CONDEMNATION OF POLYGAMY.

We demand the extermination of polygamy within the jurisdiction of the United States, and the complete separation of Church and State in political affairs.

#### MERCHANT MARINE.

We denounce the ship subsidy bill recently passed by the United States Senate as an iniquitous appropriation of public funds for private purposes and a wasteful, illogical and useless attempt to overcome by subsidy the obstructions raised by Republican legislation to the growth and development of American commerce on the sea.

We favor the upbuilding of a merchant marine without new or additional burdens upon the people and without bounties from the public treasury.

## RECIPROCITY.

We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada, and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining or commerce.

## MONROE DOCTRINE.

We favor the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine in its full integrity.

## ARMY.

We favor the reduction of the Army and of Army expenditures to the point historically demonstrated to be safe and sufficient.

## PENSIONS. OUR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

The Democracy would secure to the surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents generous pensions, not by an arbitrary executive order, but by legislation which a grateful people stand ready to enact.

Our soldiers and sailors who defend with their lives the Constitution and the laws have a sacred interest in their just administration. They must, therefore, share with us the humiliation with which we have witnessed the exaltation of court favorites, without distinguished service, over the scarred heroes of many battles, or aggrandizement by executive appropriations out of the treasuries of prostrate peoples in violation of the act of Congress which fixes the compensation of allowances of the military officers.

## CIVIL SERVICE.

The Democratic party stands committed to the principles of civil service reform, and we demand their honest, just and impartial enforcement.

We denounce the Republican party for its continuous and sinister encroachments upon the spirit and operation of civil service rules, whereby it has arbitrarily dispensed with examinations for office in the interest of favorites, and employed all manner of devices to overreach and set aside the principles upon which the Civil Service is based.

## SECTIONAL AND RACE AGITATION.

The race question has brought countless woes to this country. The calm wisdom of the American people should see to it that it brings no more.

To revive the dead and hateful race and sectional animosities in any part of our common country means confusion, distraction of business, and the reopening of wounds now happily healed. North, South, East and West have but recently stood together in line of battle from the walls of Peking to the hills of Santiago, and as sharers of a common glory and a common destiny, we should share fraternally the common burdens.

We therefore deprecate and condemn the Bourbon-like selfish, and narrow spirit of the recent Republican Convention at Chicago which sought to kindle anew the embers of racial and sectional strife, and we appeal from it to the sober common sense and patriotic spirit of the American people.

## THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION.

The existing Republican administration has been spasmodic, erratic, sensational, spectacular and arbitrary. It has made itself a satire upon the Congress, courts, and upon the settled practices and usages of national and international law.

It summoned the Congress in hasty and futile extra session and virtually adjourned it, leaving behind in its flight from Washington uncalled calendars and unaccomplished tasks.

It made war, which is the sole power of Congress, without its authority, thereby usurping one of its fundamental prerogatives. It violated a plain statute of the United States as well as plain treaty obligations, international usages and constitutional law; and has done so under pretense of executing a great public policy which could have been more easily effected lawfully, constitutionally and with honor.

It forced strained and unnatural constructions upon statutes, usurping judicial interpretation, and substituting for congressional enactment executive decree.

It withdrew from the Congress its customary duties of investigation which have heretofore made the representatives of the people and the States the terror of evildoers.

It conducted a secretive investigation of its own, and boasting of a few sample convicts, it threw a broad coverlet over the bureaus which had been their chosen field of operative abuses, and kept in power the superior officers under whose administration the crimes had been committed.

It ordered assault upon some monopolies, but paralyzed by a first victory, it flung out the flag of truce and cried out that it would not "run amuck;" leaving its future purposes beclouded by its vacillations.

#### APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE.

Conducting the campaign upon this declaration of our principles and purposes, we invoke for our candidates the support not only of our great and time honored organization, but also the active assistance of all of our fellow citizens who, disregarding past differences, desire the perpetuation of our constitutional Government as framed and established by the fathers of the Republic.

MR. JOHN W. DANIEL, of Virginia: Mr. Chairman, I am instructed by your Committee on Resolutions, which has unanimously reported to you the platform which I have read, to move you to put to the Convention the previous question upon its adoption; and I now make that motion.

The previous question was ordered.

MR. DANIEL: I now move the adoption by the Convention of the resolutions reported by your committee.

The report was agreed to.

## NOMINATION OF CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT.

---

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will now call the roll of States, etc., for the nomination of candidates for President.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. E. L. RUSSELL, of Alabama, (when the State of Alabama was called): Alabama yields to the Empire State, New York.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Alabama yields to the State of New York. The Honorable Martin W. Littleton will speak for New York.

## NOMINATING SPEECH OF MARTIN W. LITTLETON.

*Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Convention:*

We do not expect here that stupid peace which smells of chloroform.

We do not wish that unctuous unanimity which springs from the unconflicting emotions of a solitary man. We would not have our harmony in a single harness. We, too, love the stir of a strenuous life; but we believe in equal strenuousness for all and special strenuousness for none. [Applause.] We do not derive our power from the seats of the mighty, but from the souls of the humble. We do not ask for inane agreement springing from faithless fear; but rather outbursts of dissension issuing from robust freedom. We are not in executive session, but rather in the committee of the whole. We were sent here by the people to select a candidate. We were not sent here by the candidate to notify the people. [Applause.] Our adversaries, by dwelling tenderly on the sim-



plicity of the lamented McKinley, managed to endure for three days the strenuosity of Roosevelt. By recounting in affectionate terms the achievements of the one they evoked an enthusiasm which they immediately credited to the other. Through tears that were shed for the noble dead they saw a larger outline of the living. Driven by lash and lured by luck they called on all the sacred dust to keep their spirits up. Set to run for three full days the pendulum petered out, the hands stuck fast, and only a strenuous shake could make the wheels go 'round. Spiritless in the sullen task, they worked uphill against the grain and gravity of the hour. Without the master whom they had learned to love they lingered listless under the whip of one whom they have learned to fear. [Applause.] Stripped of premeditated pomp and shorn of soothing phrase the occasion meant no more or less than an era of boots and spurs. [Applause.] Take away the tribute to the dead and all that is left is a horseman on the slopes of San Juan. Remove the reverend black that tells of a nation's grief and underneath is a khaki uniform. Withhold the record made by hands and hearts now still and all that is left is usurpation's bold account. [Applause.] Pull off the mask that wears the kindly smile of peace and see the grim and firm set teeth of war. It was the change from sure and certain ways to the shifting, eddying currents of the wild unknown. It was a leap in the gathering darkness of Republican eclipse and four years hence will find them vainly looking for the light. It marks the place where a party, rich in years of service, forsook the beaten path and went on a winding way of untraveled roads. It makes the gap between the era of the conservative and the radical. It looks good now because they do not see where the old force ends and the new begins. But as they drift away to sea the ever widening span 'twixt craft and land will set many a lifeboat toward the shore.

There is much talk of twisting tendons in the race of life; of running out of breath toward the open grave. The old and honored way is still the best: be not so strenuous as to strain yourself, nor yet so simple as to fall asleep. [Applause.] There is much said by those who sit on cushioned chairs about cow-

ards and weaklings in the nation's life. The sun-burnt farmer is just as brave as the star-crowned soldier. The man of natural peace is a hero a hundred times to where the man of artificial war is hero once. [Applause.] Somehow of late the atmosphere of our national life is filled with a spray of blood; somehow the march of progress sounds of hammered steel; somehow, although the sunlight of peace is all about us, there is now and then the gleam of bayonets in its radiant fire, and a flash of swords as in its silver air; somehow, although the Constitution is still in force, there is a sense of failing power and growing disrespect, which makes us feel that the venerable old man—so to speak—is halt and blind with years, and burdens the strenuous household of his grandchildren. Somehow, at times, there runs a sort of shock right down to the foundations of this republic which makes the structure tremble, and all the country pauses and listens, and then returns to work. Somehow, although the future welcomes us, it does so with a mailed hand; somehow, although you cannot put your finger on the cause, there is a universal fear; the mother watching while her children sleep, nods, and then she hears the bugle call, the tramp of soldiers, and, staring in the darkness of a dream, she sees the "rigid upturned face." The toiler, turning all his time and sinew to gain which others get, begins to doubt that the government is just. The man of means, who puts it out in the active currents of the tide and sees the peril of this doubt, and the government's compromise with both, begins to feel that it is better hoarded than employed.

The North, and South, each in honor wearing scars that tell of war, almost forgiven and forgot, feel the fear again that a problem which only time can settle right, will be forced upon them wrong. [Applause.] Behind these fears and doubts and startled dreams and vague misgivings is many a hidden cause. But over them is one at least revealed. For Lincoln said in the sadness of his great soul, "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with faith in the right as God gives us the wisdom to see it." And Roosevelt said, in the glory of his self-contemplation, "Tread softly and carry a big stick."

[Applause.] And between these, the beginning and the end of Republican growth, in time and temper, is all their wild, descending flight. With all they know and feel of the country's question of their course, the Republican party yet claim every fruit of soil and sun, of brain and soul. They say that by a wise administration of nature's laws they brought abundant harvest from the soil. They say that by careful direction of scientific search they added untold volumes to the store of common knowledge. They say that invention, under their control, has lifted loads of labor from mankind. They say that religion's long sleep was broken by the stimulus of Republican virtue, and they point with pride to the churches all over the land. They say that education was unpopular until they took it up, and that now almost everyone is willing to be educated. They say that while population was increasing some, there was never any steady, advancing, general increase until the Republican party came into power. When attention is called to the economic, industrial and administrative vices resulting from their incompetency, they say that after all there are some things which all wise Providence insists upon doing without giving any particular reason for it. So, on the whole, we may conclude that whatever the good Lord does in administering this good universe that turns out to be good they credit to themselves; and whatever the Republicans do in administering the government that turns out bad they charge up to the Lord.

Gentlemen of the Convention, beyond the exciting passions of war and the distracting panics of peace; beyond the reach of Disaster's dread appeal and the dead past's dying wail, we meet in the clear and rational calm of seasoned, common sense, to reason together for the well-being of our country and our party. [Applause.] No man here can have his exact way. No leader can take us along the narrow ledge of his unquestioned logic. No section should swerve us from the course that leads to union and fellowship. No faction can divide us into weakened parts and leave us on the field of battle in front of the enemy. No man is greater than his party and no party is greater than its principles. There is no principle which does

not rest upon a condition, and there is no condition which may not change. There is no creed set down in black and white to which we are forever strapped, as to a corpse. There is no platform which can last forever, unless it be made of abstract things incapable of demonstration. [Applause.] The world is moving in its majestic course and every dreary detail of its toil works out some mighty change. Civilization is night and day working with its countless hands and its influence runs ahead to where we cannot see or hear. A political party is an agency in the hands of these material and multiplied forces, and if it ceases to interpret events with intelligence it will be deserted. The recent past is filled with a record of our disagreements. Many of us would change that past if it were within our power—most of us would not—but whether we would or not, the point is it is past. If we intend to settle here the question as to who was right and who was wrong, then we are foredoomed to failure. For if we did not settle it then, how can we succeed now? If you tell me I was wrong and I tell you you were wrong and we halt there to thrash it out, that is the end. But if you tell me, right or wrong, we meet again, after a short, sharp separation at the Democratic altar and that we must clasp hands in a natural alliance of Democratic faith and find some common ground upon which we each may stand with honor, I say it does not matter who was wrong—the point is, we are together again. The science of sensible government is founded on compromise. The integrity of party existence rests on the homely rule of meeting each other half way. A platform is not a photograph of party faith—it is a composite sketch of party compromise. A policy is an approximation, not a precise plan. It is better to give up some untimely doctrine and occasionally succeed, than to hold them all faithfully and always fail, for if we could become master of a few things, we might become ruler over many. To plan success in disregard of principle is mere intrigue; to plan failure by holding to an outlawed issue is mere folly. Winning is not wicked, strategy is not a sin. It is far better for the country to relight the fires of Democratic hope

This page in the original text is blank.



Copyright, 1904, by Davis & Sanford, N. Y.

*Alton D. Parker*

This page in the original text is blank.



*H. Essin*



This page in the original text is blank.

by success coming from concession than it is to put out what is left, by failure fastened to a formula.

Gentlemen of the Convention, we come together in the historic valley of the Mississippi, at a time when uncounted millions are making a patriotic pilgrimage to a shrine erected by Democratic wisdom and foresight. [Applause.] Surely, as you gather here, with the present breaking upon your enraptured vision and the past filling your hearts with songs of praise and joy; surely, as you contemplate the commonwealths filled with happy homes that stretch out in bewildering succession to the southern seas, and recall with unaffected pride that your party gave this kingdom of wealth and courage to the world's advancing reach; surely, here, close to the quickened pulse of the great Southwestern giant as he comes to strike hands across the years with the spirit of the Old Dominion; here, swept by the thrilling and ennobling memories of the long ago, and inspired by a spectacle which makes these memories dearer and nobler still, surely you are urged by every impulse and entreated by every recollection to forever sink the differences that distract and the causes that confuse and gathering afresh from this exhaustless headwater of our hope the spirit of fifty years of ascending party faith, resolve to restore our party to its place of power and pride in the hearts and affections of our countrymen. [Applause.]

The State of New York, hearkening to the demand from every quarter of the country, comes to you united upon one who will bring peace into our council, patriotism and power into our campaign and success to our contest. [Applause.] I say New York is united, and in saying so I deny the charge that has been spread broadcast over the country that there is dissension. In the Convention, whose instructions we delight to obey, there were two resolutions offered, and each of these invites the country to consider the fitness and character of our candidate. The first was, "The Democrats of New York favor the nomination for President of the United States of that distinguished Democrat and eminent jurist of our own State—Alton Brooks Parker; and the delegates selected by this Convention are hereby instructed to present and support such nomination at the

approaching National Convention; and said delegates are hereby further instructed to vote and act as a unit in all matters pertaining to said Convention, in accordance with the will of the majority of said delegates." And this was adopted: The other resolution was, "Realizing that the electoral votes of New York are absolutely essential to Democratic success, we submit to our brethren throughout the country that Alton B. Parker, a Democrat in the prime of life, has been elected by a majority of over 60,000 to the chief position in the judicial system of this State, and for over six years has discharged the duties of his high office with such unvarying dignity, shining ability and scrupulous fidelity that if his term were to expire this year he would undoubtedly be chosen to succeed himself by the concurring votes of all his fellow citizens." [Applause.]

Therefore, I repeat, that this is the unanimous voice of New York inviting the country to consider the fitness, ability and availability of our candidate. The country, anxious to win in this great crisis, called upon New York as the battleground. New York answers with a candidate who carried the State by sixty thousand majority. [Applause.] The country called upon New York for the best of its brain and blood, and New York answers with a man who cut his way through poverty and toil until he found the highest peak of power and honor in the State. [Applause.] The country called upon New York for a Democrat, and New York answers with a man who learned the simple lessons of Democratic faith in the furrowed field, who took them with increasing strength to the bar and finally honored them by his exalted station on the bench—a man who, throughout his career from poverty to power, never in fair weather or foul forsook the standards of his party faith or deserted the colors of his command. [Applause.] As my brilliant and amiable and distinguished friend, Senator Daniel, of Virginia, says, a Democrat who never scratched the ticket in all his life. [Applause.] The country called upon New York for a Democrat free from factional dispute, and New York answers with a man friendly to all factions, but a favorite, or afraid of none; a man who will take counsel and courage of both, but who will take the bitterness of neither—a man who

will not stir the hatred of the past nor share the acrimony of the present, but who will lead us up toward the future into a cloudless atmosphere of party peace. [Applause.] The country called upon New York for a man who measured up to the stature of this lofty place, and New York answers with a candidate who grew from youth to man in the humble walks of life; who lived and learned what all our common folk must live and learn; a man who ripened with advancing years in the rich attainments of the law until he went, by choice of those who knew him best, to hold the heavy scale of justice at the highest point of our great judicial system, where, with the masters who moulded State and Nation, and the men who drive commerce o'er the wheel of Time, he surveyed to the very ground every inch of this great Republic and saw with expanding vision the material growth and glory of his State. [Applause.]

The country called upon New York for a man to fit this, the critical hour and place in our national life, and New York answers with a man who puts against the strenuous sword play of a swaggering administration, a simple faith in all the perfect power of the Constitution; [applause] a man who puts against an executive republic the virtue of a constitutional republic; a man who puts against executive usurpation a knowledge of and a deep love for the poise and balance of its three great powers; a man who puts against the stealthy hunt "with the big stick" a faithful observance of constitutional restraints. The country called upon New York for a man of stainless character in private and public life, and New York answers with a man whose path leads from the sweet and simple fireside of his country home where he enjoys the gentle society of his family, to his place of labor and honor at the head of one of the greatest courts of Christendom. And nowhere through his active and useful life has aught but honest praise found utterance on the lips of those who know him best. [Applause.] If you ask me why he has been silent, I tell you it is because he does not claim to be the master of the Democratic party, but is content to be its servant. [Applause.] If you ask me why he has not outlined a policy for this Convention, I tell you that he does not believe that policies should be dictated, but that the sovereignty of the

party is in the untrammelled judgment and wisdom of its members; [applause] if you ask me what his policy will be, if elected, I tell you that it will be that policy which finds expression in the platform of his party.

With these, as some of the claims upon your conscience and judgment, New York comes to you, flushed with hope and pride. We appeal to the South, whose unclouded vision and iron courage saw and fought the way for half a century; whose Jefferson awoke the dumb defiance of development into a voice that cried out to the world a curse upon the rule of kings and a blessing upon a new-born republic; whose Madison translated the logic of events and the law of progress into the Constitution of the country; whose Jackson reclaimed the lost places of the far South and democratized the politics of the nation; and whose soldiers showed the wondering world the finest fruits of brain and nerve and heart that ripen in her temperate sun, and who, through all the sons she lost, and all the sons she saved and all the tears she shed amid the sorrowful ruins of war—and through all the patient loyalty and labor of after years so wrought for human happiness that all the world exclaims, "Her greatness in peace is greater than her valor in war." We appeal to you of the Old South and the New to join with us in this contest for the supremacy of our party. We appeal to the West, whose frontier struggles carried our civilization to the Pacific slopes, whose courage conquered the plain and forest, and whose faithful labor has built beautiful cities clear through to the Rocky Mountains. We appeal to you, as he did follow your leadership through eight long years of controversy you turn and follow him now when victory awaits us in November. We appeal to New England, faithful sentinel among her historic hills, in the name of all her unfaltering and brilliant Democrats, living and dead, to join us in our labor for success. [Applause.]

We appeal to every Democrat from everywhere to forget the bitter warfare of the past; forget the strife and anger of the older, other days; abandon all the grudge and rancor of party discontent, and, recalling with ever increasing pride, the triumphs of our fifty years of a constitutional government of Liberty and Peace—here and now resolve to make the future

record that resplendent reach of time in which Liberty and Peace went up and down the nations of the earth, building their kingdom in the hearts of men and gathering the harvest of genius and toil; in which reason struck from the hand of force the sword of hate and plucked from the heart of war the germ of greed; in which conscience smote the thoughts of wrong and filled the mind with mercy's sweet restraint; in which power grew in the human brain, but refused the shelter of a glittering crown; in which the people of all lands and tongues, awakened to hope by the inspiration of our example, turned their faces toward the light of our advancing civilization and followed with the march of years the luminous pathway leading to a destiny beyond the reach of vision and within the providence of God. In this spirit New York nominates for President of the United States Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF E. W. CARMACK.

MR. JAMES P. CLARKE, of Arkansas (when the State of Arkansas was called): Arkansas yields to Tennessee.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Arkansas having been called, yields to the State of Tennessee. The Chair presents Senator Carmack, of Tennessee.

MR. E. W. CARMACK, of Tennessee: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, I speak for a State which holds in her bosom the ashes of Old Hickory and among whose people his spirit is abroad.

In few words and simple fashion I shall discharge the duty imposed upon me by my delegation and by the unanimous voice of the Democracy of Tennessee.

One of the largest and most representative State Conventions that ever assembled, with unparalleled enthusiasm and without one dissenting voice, instructed us to cast the vote of Tennessee for that profound jurist, that unfaltering Democrat, that stainless gentleman, Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

This was not done in haste, but after mature deliberation, in which the character and qualities of every possible nominee

were carefully weighed in the balance. Nor did we fail to consider all the criticisms and accusations that have been made against him with the result that, in our judgment, the character of our candidate stands out clean and clear, unspotted by the reckless defamation that has raged around it. I should not longer detain this Convention, but that some of these criticisms seem to demand a passing notice. The fact that Judge Parker is being supported by men who are blessed with a larger amount of this world's goods than most of us have been able to assemble is being strangely urged as an objection to his nomination. Sir, I deny that the Democratic party is a party of the poor men alone. [Applause.]

It is the party for every rich man who respects the rights of the poor, and it is the party of every poor man who wants to be rich. [Applause.] It is the party of every man who loves his liberty, and it is also the party of every man who loves the dollar he has honestly earned and the security of the property that is rightfully his. [Applause.] No man is barred because he is poor. No man is barred because he is rich. I believe it was a Democratic Convention of which it was written: "The rich and the poor meet together; the Lord is the maker of them all."

Another objection is that Judge Parker has not taken upon himself the office of this Convention to declare the will and purpose of the Democratic party. Mr. Chairman, I trust it will be long before the Democratic party will repeat the spectacle recently presented by its adversary, of a great Convention assembled merely to record one man's opinion and to execute one man's will. Sir, this Convention has assembled not to receive, but to give instruction to its nominee. [Applause.]

It may be, sir, that our candidate is not as voluble and vociferous as some would have him, but I have yet to learn that laryngeal activity is the supreme test of statesmanship. [Laughter and applause.] I have yet to learn that the width of a man's mouth is commensurate with the breadth of his understanding, or that the length of his tongue measures the depth of his wisdom. [Applause.]

When the Almighty wanted a leader to conduct the children

of Israel out of the house of bondage Moses objected to his own selection on the ground that he lacked the gift of ready eloquence, and he suggested his brother Aaron as a fit leader of the people. But the Almighty preferred the silent wisdom of the great lawyer to the voluble unwisdom of the great orator to lead the Democratic party in that campaign.

And he did not forget Aaron either. He found a place for him. And, Mr. Chairman, while the Democratic party prefers its Moses in this campaign [applause], it wants the help of its Aaron, too. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we enter this campaign under such conditions as never before confronted the American people. Never before has the personal character of the candidate been so important to the country as in this campaign. The Republican party, the party that was once proud to be called the party of Lincoln, has become a helpless slave to every caprice of one freakish and irresponsible mind. It has been subdued to the lawless will of one man, who bestrides it like a colossus, while its petty leaders in Congress peep about between his huge legs to find themselves dishonorable graves.

When could they say till now that talked of Rome that her wide walls encompassed but one man? The will of this one man is not directed by wisdom and patriotism, but is characterized by an impatience of all legal and constitutional restraints, by desire to thrust his own militant figure into the foreground of every picture, by a passion for sensationalism and excitement. [Applause.]

The course of the present Administration has justly alarmed all conservative citizens who feel that the peace as well as the prosperity of the country demands the defeat of the present occupant of the White House. [Applause.]

The Democracy of Tennessee has declared that in this crisis the party should present a candidate of judicial temper, one imbued with a deep reverence for the Constitution, with a respect for law, with a just regard for established precedents and traditions, with a sane conception of the duties and responsibilities of his office, a candidate, in short, whose whole life and character will be in vivid contrast with the recklessness, the



lawlessness, the epileptic and convulsive strenuosity of this Administration. [Applause.]

We believe that we have such a man in the distinguished jurist from New York. [Applause.]

The fact that he has always supported the nominees of his party shows his fidelity to the party organization. The fact that he was elected by a majority of 60,000 as a member of the highest court in New York shows his popularity in that important State. His record on the bench demonstrates his great ability. His opinions in cases where the rights of labor and the power of unlawful combinations were involved show that he has never bowed to the power of wealth. The fact that throughout a long official career he has remained poor shows that he has never been touched by greed for gain. His political enemies testify to the purity of his life and the incorruptible integrity of his character. [Applause.]

Choose this man for your leader and the clans of Democracy will throng to his standard filled with hope and the inspiration of victory, assured that the party which follows his stainless banner will never know dishonor and never taste defeat. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the Convention, in the name of the Andrew Jackson Democracy of Tennessee I second the nomination of Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF D. M. DELMAS.

MR. M. F. TARPEY, of California (when California was called): California presents as her spokesman, Hon. D. M. Delmas.

MR. D. M. DELMAS, of California: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, for the first time in history, California presents as a candidate for the great office of Chief Executive of the Republic, one born and reared upon her soil. She bespeaks your indulgence while she sets forth the motives which animate her hopes and the claims which justify the aspirations of her son. [Applause.]

Do you want as your nominee a man whose past political

career stands as an assurance of victory in the future? [Applause.]

California's candidate is no stranger to public life. He is to-day the Representative in the Congress of the imperial State which is now his home. To the realization of your hopes the vote of that State is indispensable. Without New York it is confessedly idle to look for victory next November. Can he carry New York? Let the experience of the past answer. Less than two years ago, he ran for Congress in a district which, the year before, had given the Democratic nominee for Mayor of Greater New York a majority of only eighteen hundred. That district he carried by more than sixteen thousand. [Applause.] Such a majority exceeds by over two thousand that given in the same district, but a few years before, to the learned and distinguished Democratic jurist who was then elected chief justice of the State; and it is greater by nearly five thousand than that given, a year later, to the Democratic candidate for Mayor, though he threw into the contest the weight which posterity accords to an honored and historic name. That majority represented seventy-two out of every one hundred votes cast.

Was such a percentage ever before equalled? Was such a majority ever before attained? Was a triumph so complete ever before achieved in any Congressional district of New York? Never. If, instead of running in a mere district, he who won this unprecedented victory had been a candidate in the whole municipality, he would, according to this ratio, have carried the city of New York by a majority of two hundred and thirty thousand. [Applause.] Had he been running in the State at large—even conceding to his adversary the preponderance customarily claimed by the Republicans in the rural districts—he would have carried the State by a majority of one hundred and thirty thousand.

Gentlemen, if it be true that the State of New York is indispensable to your success, who is the man that affords equal guarantees of his ability to carry it? Will you find him in a stranger to that State, or will you find him in either of the men whose majorities our candidate has thus already eclipsed at the polls. [Applause.]

Do you want a nominee of proved and unquestioned fidelity to your party?

Where will you find one whose fealty can claim superiority to his? In hours which tried men's souls, others have deserted the ship; in the days when idolatrous allurements were spread forth, others have forsworn the faith of their fathers and have prostrated themselves before the golden calf. His allegiance has known no wavering; his devotion has been marred by no schism. In prosperity and in adversity, in sunshine and in storm, through good and through evil repute, his Democracy has remained steadfast and

"Constant as the Northern star,  
Of whose true, fixed, and resting quality  
There is no fellow in the firmament."

During the five Presidential elections which took place since he reached manhood's estate, he has ever abandoned personal preferences, surrendered individual opinions and ungrudgingly acquiesced, as soon as the party's choice has been made and its creed proclaimed. [Applause.] Three times did he support Grover Cleveland, and twice him who yonder sits, and who, untouched by ephemeral obloquy, misrepresentation and slander, will bequeath to posterity a name as pure, a character as lofty and a fame as bright as any recorded in the annals of Democracy. [Applause.]

Nor does the fealty of our candidate belong to the past alone. [Applause.] It exists to-day in amplitude as complete, in devotion as absolute as of yore. Though aspiring to this nomination, yet, if your assembled wisdom shall deem another worthier, he will not be found a discontented grumbler sulking in his tent; still less will he be found organizing fellow deserters into marauding bands of hostile malcontents, and above all will he not be found working for the party's defeat and exulting in its overthrow. No. Even though disappointed in his aspirations, he will remain at his post, ready, as of old, to battle for the cause, and, if not chosen to lead as a commander, fighting as a private in the ranks. [Applause.]

Do you want for your nominee a man of truly Democratic impulses, one ever in sympathy with distress, ever ready to stretch out a succoring hand to suffering humanity?

Not here the place to recount the numberless instances in which these traits of our candidate's nature and disposition have been displayed. Time would not permit even the enumeration of countless acts of benefaction—of asylums founded, hospitals established, universities endowed, of private distress relieved, of the thousands nightly assisted, fed and sheltered during the long and bitter winters of the great metropolis. [Applause.]

Indulge me, then, in one single illustration, and even of that I need not in person speak.

To you who sit under the constellation of the Lone Star, to you, representatives of that great State whose imperial bounds embrace the vast territory stretching between the Rio Grande and the Caribbean sea, to you I turn and bid you speak for me. When, on that never-to-be-forgotten night of four years ago, the breath of the hurricane swept over the Southern coast, and the waters of the deep, defying the laws of gravitation, stood like ridges of fluid mountains threatening to deluge a continent, when, in a few brief hours, the metropolis of the Gulf was made a scene of desolation, when human sympathy was stricken dumb and human energy stood paralyzed, in the presence of the countless dead and the spectacle of universal havoc, who was the first to succor the ruined city? Under whose inspiration was it that from New York and from Chicago and from San Francisco, simultaneous trains bearing stores of food and of clothing, of medicines and of medical stores, of nurses and physicians and surgeons, sped, like a trinity of ministering angels, flying on wings of mercy, to the relief of afflicted humanity? [Applause.] Tell us, ye gallant sons of Texas, for you know?

Men of the South, you upon whose soil American Democracy first saw the light, you the hereditary custodians of its purest traditions, you whose political importance, if not political life, is bound up with its fate, you in whose annals the events of this day may mark an epoch more fateful than any which has gone by since the war—men of the South, to you next I speak.

Do you want as your nominee a man whose descent, whose past career, and whose present attitude afford irrefragable guarantees of sympathy, and give proof of accord upon the great questions with which the very existence of your people as a race is involved? If you want such a nominee, what lacks the candidate of California to command your confidence and enlist your support? [Applause.]

Upon the momentous questions which affect you, every sentiment of his heart is by the sheer force of heredity with you. The same blood that flows through your veins courses through his. Like yours, his parents and his forefathers belong to the South. On the maternal side he comes from Virginia. On the paternal, through a genealogy which parallels that of her Jacksons and of her Calhouns, South Carolina claims him as hers. The one act of his life which his honored father loved to cherish was the vote which he rose from a dying bed to give, and, in his place in the Senate of the United States, cast against that measure of Republican tyranny, fittingly called the "Force Bill." [Applause.]

Nor are his views and sentiments a secret. Speaking through the agency of a public voice heard daily by millions in every nook and corner of the country, his thoughts have been given utterance. You know where he stands. You know him as one who, whilst insisting upon justice for the black man, has set a face of flint against all attempts of Republican schemers to clothe him with authority or to impose him as an official over a people in whose memories the humiliation, the horrors and the untold agonies of reconstruction measures are still fresh. You know him as one who considers that the problem which, amid fields devastated and homes made desolate by the hand of war, has come to you as a dread legacy of the past, is a problem with which you alone are competent to deal, and that, in dealing with it, the Government should let the South alone. You know him as one who, by unceasing appeals to their judgment and sense of justice, has obtained from the best men of the North that sympathy for the South which the ever-to-be-lamented Grady had pleaded for in vain in the very heart of enlightened Massachusetts.

Gentlemen of the Convention, men of the North and of the South, of the East and of the West, accredited representatives of the Democracy, to you in fine, I say: Should your nominee be a man whose views upon public questions are known, a man whose attitude upon the issue which, at this time, confronts the American people, accords with the principles of your party?

If he should, where will there be found one equal to him whose cause we are here to advocate?

It has been said, and truly said, that no campaign ever decides more than one issue. What, then, is the issue which divides the Democratic and Republican parties? What is the fundamental principle upon which they are in opposition? What is the essential thing which Democracy stands for and which Republicanism antagonizes? Is it a question of tariffs or of tariff revision? A question of standards of money? A question of regulating the currency or controlling the banks? A question of expansion or of imperialism? No. Important as these are, the question is greater than any or all of these. It includes them all, it is true, but it includes much more. It is a question which touches the very foundations of our institutions and strikes at the very existence of our Government. Let euphemistic babblers gloss it over as they may; let trimmers, who shift their sail to every political breeze that blows, evade it as they can; let time-servers, who usurp the name of Democracy, affect to sneer at it as they will, still the question which confronts the American people to-day—which has confronted them with ever-growing insistence since the Civil War—is whether this Government shall be carried on for the benefit of the people, and of the whole people, or whether it shall be manipulated for the benefit of a privileged class; whether its great departments, legislative, executive and judicial, shall be perpetuated for the protection of the equal rights of all, or whether they shall be perverted into the plastic instruments of syndicated capital. [Applause.]

Gentlemen of the Convention, if this is not the paramount issue of this campaign, what is the issue? If this is not the fundamental question upon which the two parties differ, in

what do they differ? If the Republican party does not stand to-day as the party of the privileged classes and as the exponent of the money power, for what does it stand? And if the Democratic party does not represent the antithesis of all this, what does it represent? If the cause of the people—of the plain people—of the unnumbered multitudes who each morn implore Heaven to give them their daily bread, and who by daily toil earn the right to the fulfilment of their prayer, is not the cause of Democracy, what is its cause? [Applause.] If its mission is not to defend the equal rights of those who constitute the countless hosts of labor—not of labor in a narrow and restricted sense, not of labor confined to those only who receive a daily wage, not of labor organized in guilds or unions alone, but of labor in its broad, and catholic sense—of labor which includes all those who work with hand or brain, whether in fields of waving grain, in the glare of the forge, in the smoke of the furnace, amid the whirr of ever-restless wheels, in the depths of mines, in the mephitic air of collieries, upon the decks of floating crafts, at the desk of the counting house, in the chemist's laboratory, among the books of the lawyer's library, in the merchant's shops, or where else soever upon the earth may be found those who fulfil the great Creator's law that man shall eat his bread in the sweat of his brow,—if, I say, to defend the equal rights of these, the unprivileged and the less favored, be not the mission of Democracy, what mission has it? [Applause.] If to protect them from the schemes of spoliation and plunder of syndicated wealth is not the justification for its existence, what justification has it to exist? Aye, gentlemen, if the cause of the plain people is not the cause to which you are pledged, devoted, consecrated by the very name you bear, by what title do you call yourselves Democrats? By what right do you usurp the name of him whose memory you profess to venerate, whose precepts you approve in your platforms, whose example you claim to emulate? By what right do you style yourselves followers of him who said: "I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our moneyed corporations, which dare already to challenge our Government to a trial of strength and bid

defiance to the laws of our country;” of him whose cardinal maxim was “Equal rights for all; special privilege for none;” of him whose whole life was one incessant battle waged against the oppression of the many for the benefit of the few? [Applause.]

I repeat it, sirs, if the cause of the unprivileged and the less favored be not your cause, if to secure to them equal rights be not your mission, if to protect them against the oppression of syndicated capital be not the justification of your existence as a party, aye, sirs, if you are here to-day bent upon outdoing Republicans in truculent subserviency to the money oligarchs of Wall Street, if you are here tremulous with apprehension for fear of giving them offense, if you are here cherishing the hope of placating their antagonism, winning their favor by subserviency and regaining office and place by the aid of their influence and the corrupting power of their gold—if the party has sunk so low, if it has reached this depth of contemptible degeneracy, rise from thy grave, immortal spirit that sleepest under the sod of Monticello, rise and rebuke the recreant Democracy, which with hypocrisy in its heart and a lie upon its lips dares usurp the name of Jefferson. [Applause.]

Not among these shall our candidate be found. Not to this class does his Democracy belong. His political practise and political creed find fitting expression in his address accepting his nomination for Congress, where in words that Jefferson might have uttered, he said:

“I have always devoted my energies and abilities, whatever they may be, to the cause of the plain people, and I shall continue to do so. The laws must now be applied, and where necessary must be strengthened, to protect the people against that powerful and unscrupulous criminal combination known as a trust.”

Unswerving in his devotion to these principles, constant as the needle to the pole in this purpose, he stands before the American people to-day. And as surely as, in spite of the opposition of the monarchical followers of Hamilton, as surely as, in spite of the enmity of the United States Bank, Fame has inscribed upon the roll of the Chief Magistrates of the



Republic the names of Jefferson and Jackson, so surely, in spite of the obstruction of syndicated capital, will it there inscribe the name of—beneficent and undying genius of Democracy, thou that hast ever ruled the destinies of mankind, speak it thou! From thy home, there, where dwell the unnumbered hosts of labor, speak! Speak, till the valleys and the plains shall ring again! Speak, till every mountain peak shall find a tongue to proclaim, even to the uttermost confines of the Republic, the name of the unconquered antagonist of all schemes by which man, trampling right and justice under foot, builds his eminence upon oppression and wrong, the name of the foremost living advocate of the equality of man, to which the fathers of old consecrated their lives upon the blood-stained fields of the revolution, the name of the champion of the rights of toil, the foe of privilege and monopoly, the friend of all who labor and are heavy-laden—the name of Hearst—William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

The State of Colorado having been called, the Presiding Officer (Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of Texas, in the Chair), said:

The Chair presents Honorable T. J. O'Donnell, who will speak for the State of Colorado.

#### SPEECH OF T. J. O'DONNELL.

MR. T. J. O'DONNELL, of Colorado: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, the State of Colorado does not propose because of past disappointments, to sit supine or sullen and let events march past her. When silver was stricken, she looked for gold, and lo! as if by stroke of an enchanter's wand, the stream of white was turned to yellow and she became the greatest gold producing State.

With pick and drill and hard brown muscle our people delved into the unknown, and explored places in the hills, and there discovered some of the secret sources of that stream of gold which has floated the caravels of commerce off the shoals of panic and borne them high and proud upon its bosom, every sail set and filled with favoring breezes. [Ap-

plause.] Our people have opened the doors of unnumbered vaults in that great Treasure House where was stored the dowry of Eve, presented to her by her Almighty Father on her wedding morning, and locked in the entail of the rocks that it might be preserved to her children in their greatest need.

When you are seeking the fountains of prosperity, do not let your languishing glances rest only on Klondike and South Africa, but observe the fair maiden among the sisterhood whose hand I hold—Colorado—whose arms are silver, whose tresses are shining yellow, whose very breasts are tipped with gold. [Applause.]

No State represented in this Imperial Congress has been more loyal to Democratic principles as proclaimed in two great National Conventions than the State of Colorado. White as a filigree of her own silver, pure as the disembosomed gold of her mountains, thrice refined is the loyalty she bestowed upon the great leader of two campaigns, a leader she still admires and still reveres. [Applause.]

I come from a State which cast ninety per cent. of its vote for William J. Byran in 1896, and gave him an overwhelming majority in 1900.

We need make no protestations of loyalty to the two platforms last past—we helped to build them. [Applause.]

Every member of our delegation stood by the leader's side wherever the battle raged fiercest and some of us were scarred veterans before he was chosen Chief Commander. But events move and men must move with them.

Colorado stands upon the ridge pole of the world; her eyes look out with equal ease on either ocean. From her position above the clouds of past discord, she looks forward, not backward.

A gentleman said yesterday he was willing that those who left us in 1896 and 1900 should come back. I say I am glad they have come back [applause], and if any of them have not yet come back, but are still eating the husks of Republicanism, let us invite them to return to their father's house and assure them that none of the good sons of Democracy who stayed at home and toiled while they were rioting will be jealous or

make them afraid. [Applause.] We want all kinds of Democrats in this campaign.

I am here to second the nomination of one who needs neither baptism nor the laying on of hands to make him a true and loyal Democrat. I know and others in Colorado know Judge Alton B. Parker, and I assure my friends of the West that he has ever been loyal.

He has visited among us, and those of us who know him could not love him better if his eyes had first beheld the light of our own azure and cloudless sky. Some have criticized his silence. We believe silence is golden, and we would not have him speak until this Convention has spoken.

Colorado once again joins hands with New York. Across the vast delta in the Metropolis of which we are assembled, the Rockies speak to the Alleghanies and the Adirondacks which echo back "Parker, popular rights, and victory." [Applause.]

The State of Connecticut having been called, the Presiding Officer said:

The Chair presents Honorable Homer S. Cummings, of Connecticut, who will speak for that State.

#### SPEECH OF HOMER S. CUMMINGS.

MR. HOMER S. CUMMINGS, of Connecticut: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Convention: The Democracy of Connecticut, which I have upon this occasion the great honor of representing, has a vital interest in the result of the coming campaign. I, therefore, crave, at the hands of this great Convention, the privilege of a few moments in which briefly to set forth the wishes of the Democrats of that doubtful and essential State.

It is our wish, our hope and our purpose to present to the Democracy of the Nation the seven electoral votes of the old constitutional State of Connecticut. We appeal to this assemblage of Democrats for the invaluable assistance of a wise presidential nomination. The Democrats of Connecticut realize that aside from the great questions of public policy so

ably set forth in the platform just adopted and upon which any candidate selected by this Convention will squarely stand, the people of this country are to pass upon the bizarre personality and the political peculiarities of the present Chief Executive. Thoughtful people have begun to weary of his eccentric advertising methods. They are alternately amused and alarmed by his strenuous and untimely impetuosity. They decline to accept him in his favorite role of a mighty military captain. True, he has taken great pains to assure them that he has charged up San Juan Hill, but they have come to the conclusion that he has shed more ink and less blood than any warrior since Sancho Panza. [Laughter.] They realize that his chief hold upon a doubtful fame for military activity depends upon such glory as he managed to achieve by impertinencies and insults to Miles and Dewey and Schley. They are uneasy in the knowledge that he is painfully lacking in poise and balance and so constitutionally reckless that he is likely, at any time, to involve our country in difficulties at home and abroad. They have witnessed with infinite regret his efforts to stir up sectionalism and, for selfish purposes, to undo the work of patriots by resurrecting the infamous issue of the bloody shirt. [Applause.]

They have witnessed his burlesque assaults upon the criminal monopolies and have found that his warfare against the trusts consists in the use of extravagant language and the assumption of terrifying facial contortions. They have come to know him because of his extravagance, his arrogance, his disregard for constitutional limitations and his efforts to develop the executive powers at the expense of the legislative branch of the government. They are eager for a real American statesman of American size and animated by American constitutional ideals. [Applause.]

If you want to secure the seven electoral votes of Connecticut; if you wish to strengthen and inspire her Democracy; if you desire to heed the wishes of one of the doubtful States that must be carried in order that the National Democracy may come into her own; then you must name as the choice of this great Convention, a candidate who appeals to

both the regular Democrat and the independent voter and who is the very antithesis of the Republican nominee.

Fortunately, there is such a candidate now before this assemblage for its consideration. He is a man of sound Democratic principles, tried executive ability, great personal popularity, wide learning in the law, profound respect for justice and the Constitution, undoubted party regularity, a clean record and a judicial reputation for dealing in a large way with large problems. [Applause.] He is a man of dignity and self-control and from his high and honorable position upon the bench has handed down leading decisions upon many vexed and pertinent questions affecting labor and capital. From his character, his attainments and his experience, it is clear that both the party and the country have in him a man who can be trusted to meet every question as it arises, to guide the affairs of state in a safe and proper course and at all times and in every way to measure up to the highest standard of public service. We can place the insignia of the party in his hands, secure in the faith that he will carry it through this contest even with the fidelity with which the Black Douglas carried the sacred casket that contained the heart of Bruce. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, Connecticut unites her voice with that of her sister States, New York, New Jersey and Indiana, doubtful States every one, and asks this splendid assemblage of Democrats to nominate for President of the United States, Judge Alton Brooks Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

The State of Delaware having been called, the Presiding Officer said:

The Chair presents the Honorable L. Irving Handy, of Delaware, who will speak for that State.

#### SPEECH OF L. IRVING HANDY.

MR. L. IRVING HANDY, of Delaware: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Delaware offers to you her bravest, noblest and best. Ours is a small State, and it would be idle to invite you to come to Delaware for a Presidential candidate merely to win our electoral vote. But this is not a

competition between States to determine which is largest or which is greatest. You are about to nominate not a State, but a man [applause], and I submit that it is better to take a great man from a little State than a little man from a great State. [Applause.]

Not because he is a Delawarean, although we exult in the knowledge that with us he has spent his life, but because he is great and good and true, we present George Gray for your consideration and decision. [Applause.] We present him as a citizen of the United States, for not one of all the States lies outside the boundaries of his patriotism and affection.

Make him President and all of the States which lie within the four corners of our continental domain will find that this man, who merely happens to be a resident of Delaware, is in truth as broad as the continent in his sympathies and outlook.

New York can find in him a candidate close to the hearts of her Democratic voters and yet free from all factional bitterness and party division. His election to the Presidency would be the triumph of no particular part of our party in that great commonwealth, but victory for the whole Democracy in the Empire State.

Nebraska might well be content to see him take our banner from the hands of her heroic son, who has twice gallantly carried it in the great fight, and rejoices to see that old banner in these new hands, on a kinder day and fairer field, carried to complete and lasting victory—content because the Delawarean like the Nebraskan is a man of principle, not merely a man of policy, a man whose hope and faith and aspiration are in the great masses of the common people, and as President his concern would be first to protect the rights and conserve the interests of the people whom God made instead of using the Government to promote unduly the persons created by act of legislature commonly called corporations. [Applause.]

The Southern States might well rejoice to see him in the Presidential chair. He is blood of their blood and bone of their bone. In mighty debate in the United States Senate it was his true blade that slew outright once and forever the proposition to fetter by a force bill the Southern people who

were struggling face to face with the most threatening conditions that men ever confronted under free institutions. [Applause.] He does not live too far South to be elected to the Presidency at this time but he is far enough South to understand and appreciate the conditions which obtain in that broad, fair and hopeful portion of our common country. [Applause.] As I may say to the North, to the East and to the West, that with this citizen of the United States in the Presidential office they will each have a man of their own, in like manner and with manifest truth I say to you of the Southern States that with him you, too, will have a man of your own once more in the White House. [Applause.] He is a Southern gentleman, and God speed the day when we may have once more a Southern gentleman in the White House.

Not only the States which have the right to cast electoral votes would be blessed by such a President, but the islands of the sea would learn to bless his name. He believes in the rights of man. He believes in home rule. He has a passion for human liberty. [Applause.] He wants to see all men given an opportunity for self government. Make him President and he will find a way by which every interest of this country will be protected and safeguarded, and law and order insured, and yet the little brown men of the distant islands will be permitted to taste at last the sweets of human liberty and home rule. [Applause.] They will know oppressors no more, and oppression itself will become in the Philippines like an evil dream which has passed. [Applause.]

All the nations of the earth will learn to hold him in honor because he will walk in the paths of peace. No rough-rider he! His ideal is of a happy, prosperous, contented people. He would seek no bloody glory, in which quest treasure is poured out, young lives cut short, and public conscience blunted. The truest symbol of our glory in his eyes would be a freeman beneath his own vine and fig tree, with his family about him, after the toil of the day, with none to molest or make him afraid, and with no predatory trust licensed to take from him a part of his daily wage. [Applause.] To realize such an ideal requires no great standing army, and the pur-

suit of it will lead to no international disputes or foreign wars. It requires but honor and friendship abroad; justice and equality at home.

I do not intend to tell of the personal fitness of George Gray for the great office of President. You know it. The country knows it. He has lived in the white light of publicity for twenty years. His public services have been distinguished and known of all men. [Applause.]

For fourteen years he was in the Senate, elected by Delaware, but serving the whole United States. That service was the steady, calm, convincing service of a lofty patriot and true Democrat. With an intellect of the first order, guided by a judgment calm and sure-footed, he won the admiration and confidence of our country.

He served on the Commission which made peace with Spain, and we all know now that it would have been well for our country if his patriotic advice concerning the terms of that treaty, so earnestly and eloquently urged, had been heeded by the Government [applause], for he spoke on that Commission against taking the Philippine Islands in whole or in part.

Upon the bench, Judge Gray, as lawyers know, has taken rank equal to any of the illustrious men who adorn the Federal judiciary.

Who shall measure the service he rendered the people of this whole land in settling the great anthracite coal strike as Chairman of the Commission of Arbitration? Organized labor knew him and organized capital knew him, and when his work was done they united in the cry: "Behold a just and fearless man!" [Applause.]

Gentlemen, the whole country knows him as you know him. His character is not concealed. His opinions are wrapped in no mystery. Silence does not hedge him round about. His fitness is like a city set upon a hill which cannot be hid.

His neighbors know him even better than the country, and among them there is but one voice. His private life is as pure as a spring on the mountain side with clear water gushing from the living rock. With courage as keen as the Damascus blade, with heart of pure gold, with life dedicated to the public



good, power cannot overawe him nor wealth corrupt him. Trained and seasoned by experience and service in lofty public station, yet in the full vigor and power of magnificent manhood, he stands ready to your hand to make a great and moderate President.

With all his other qualities to win approval, he has the winning trait of modesty. He is not ambitious. He does not seek or desire the Presidency. He would prefer others to himself. We name him here as a candidate for President not because he longs for that place or desires to wield its mighty power, but because Democracy needs him and the country needs him.

George Gray is a name entwined with victory. Inscribe that name upon your banners and faction will hush, dissension cease. [Applause.] His nomination here means your triumph in November.

Delaware has been called the Diamond State. We know not why unless it be in compliment to some of the public men who have adorned and bejewelled her history. We offer you to be set in the glorious crown of Democracy a diamond of the purest ray, flashing in every direction the precious creed of equal rights. We offer you a man of dauntless courage, uncompromising Democracy, and faultless patriotism.

“ The elements  
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, ' This is a man! ' ”

Gentlemen of the Convention, Delaware nominates the Honorable George Gray. [Applause.]

MR. JOHN S. BEARD, of Florida (when the State of Florida was called): Mr. Chairman —

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman from Florida.

MR. W. J. HILLMAN, of Florida: Mr. Chairman —

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair has already recognized a gentleman from Florida.

MR. BEARD: I represent Florida, and am only over here in this seat temporarily.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: Does the other gentleman likewise represent the State of Florida?

MR. HILLMAN: I represent a part of the Florida delegation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Hillman) who is in his proper place.

MR. HILLMAN: Mr. Chairman, representing a majority of the Florida Democracy, I desire to second the nomination of Judge Alton B. Parker.

#### SPEECH OF JOHN S. BEARD.

MR. JOHN S. BEARD, of Florida: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: Representing four of the delegates from the State of Florida, who in my judgment represent the overwhelming Democratic sentiment of that State, I second the nomination of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.] I want to say for the Democracy of the State of Florida that they believe the trust question will be the paramount issue in this campaign. If not specifically named as the paramount issue in the platform, yet it is a question of far vaster magnitude than any other which will confront the American people in the coming campaign, and William Randolph Hearst, if elected, will be an aggressive opponent of the trusts and of the evils and the oppressions and the extortions of the trusts. We believe that William Randolph Hearst is the only man who can carry the pivotal States of New York, Indiana and Illinois, which are so necessary to Democratic success, and Democratic success is essential to rescue the South from the threatened evils of Rooseveltism and negroism. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, we are told that the distinguished gentleman from New York, Judge Parker, is the only man who can carry New York, but it is well for this Convention to bear in mind that the leaders of that coterie who now tell us that Judge Parker and Judge Parker alone can carry New York, were in Chicago in 1892, and proclaimed as vociferously and predicted as confidently that if Cleveland were nominated he could not carry New York. [Applause.] It is probable that these gentlemen may be as badly mistaken in their prediction to-day as they were in their prediction in 1892. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen of the Convention, William Randolph

Hearst has been true to the principles of the party when some who are to-day attempting to dictate platforms and dictate nominations were sulking in their tents or openly opposing the Democratic ticket. [Applause.]

I second the nomination of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

MR. MOSES WRIGHT, of Georgia (when the State of Georgia was called): Mr. Chairman—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, who will speak for that State.

### SPEECH OF MOSES WRIGHT.

MR. MOSES WRIGHT, of Georgia: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: I hail to-night from a State which is not a doubtful State. [Applause.] I hail from a State which comes not with a divided delegation. [Applause.]

On yesterday, before the battle of the banners began, Georgia, in her earnestness, her eagerness, and her enthusiasm, unfurled her banners where there appeared in letters of gold that which expressed her sentiments then, expresses them now, and will continue to express them as long as there is balloting on the floor of this Convention. [Applause.]

It was claimed in a recent National Convention that Georgia blood coursed in the veins of the nominee of the Republican party. This may be true, but with Georgians, Democracy is thicker than blood. We bring to you to-day the message that from among the old red hills of Georgia there will come later tidings of Democratic victory for 1904, surpassing all its glorious achievements in the past.

In striking contrast with the solemn occasion when our Republican friends met and "stood pat" is the genuine enthusiasm of this great gathering. The spirit which gives birth to this enthusiasm is the spirit of victory. The smiles of contentment which we wear to-night are in contemplation of the political harvest which we expect to reap in the Fall. [Applause.] As for our Republican friends, the frost seemed to fall in their early Summer Convention and their prophecies were blighted ere the Autumn hours.

As an excuse for the solemnity of that occasion is contrasted with the boundless enthusiasm of the Democracy, the Presiding Officer of their gathering declared that the old hen with the big brood of chickens never made so much noise as the hen who had one chicken. I wonder if our Republican friends on that occasion ever heard of the old hen who thought she was hatching chickens and hatched something else? [Laughter.] There was a hatching at the Republican Convention, but if the old Republican hen ever gets near the waters of discord and uncertainty, she will see that her little chicks will take to the turbulent waters like ducks. [Applause.]

On the other hand, we shall demonstrate to those who have predicted discord, that ours will be a united party, joined in a harmonious fight against the enemy. [Applause.]

We present to the American people a platform which declares the will of the party, fearlessly and with no uncertainty; which boldly attacks the injustice and unfairness of the Republican policy and offers a remedy therefor; a platform we offer which strikes a death blow to the unlawful trusts and to the unjust tariff which fosters and protects them.

We go to the people with a policy which knows no discrimination, North, South, East or West, but is tender in its consideration of the rights of every section under the American flag.

Realizing the bright prospects of victory in 1904, the South began early the solution of the problem of selecting the strongest leader for Democracy's standard bearer.

We believe that we have selected wisely and well. We looked for a leader with a clean life, possessed of a wise conservatism and a broad statesmanship—one who stood by Democracy in sunshine and shadow, was equally loyal to the party in stormy hours of defeat and in the brighter days of victory.

We found such a leader. Georgia claims the honor. The Empire State of the North, with her favorite son, shall reap the fruit of this Convention, but it was the County of Lincoln, in the State of Georgia, which first instructed a delegate to vote first, last and all the time for Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.] This instructed Georgia delegate was the begin-

ning of the tidal wave which has swept the States and insures to-day the nomination of the great New Yorker.

Georgia is glad to-day to second the nomination, of one whose strength of character and simplicity of life have endeared him to the American people; a learned jurist who glories in the recreation of his rural home where on his farm he finds delight in the honest pursuits, followed by the great mass of the American people; a man whose name has become the synonym of victory; one whom the people have tried and approved; whose honesty, ability and statesmanship have stood the test and who seems to meet the emergency of the hour, to fill all the requirements of an ideal leader of a great party.

No one can doubt that the vast majority of the people will turn from the restlessness and uncertainty of the present administration toward Alton B. Parker, with a feeling of restfulness and hope.

Let us remember to-day that we are gathered together to carry out the will of the people, that their voice is sovereign, that they are the final tribunal. What is the will of the people? Certainly, if delegates ever knew the man whom the rank and file of the Democratic party wanted them to nominate, they know to-day. No organized movement was ever behind the candidacy of Judge Parker. The people, having learned of him, trusted him and felt an unbounded confidence in him.

Across the continent, from the woods of Maine to the peach-covered hills of Georgia, where the ripening elbertas are being kissed into golden color by the sunlight, there is a trusting, confiding people confidently awaiting the tidings of Judge Parker's nomination. [Applause.]

Let us meet in a spirit of fraternity and carry out the will of the people.

Let us place again in favor the Democratic party in which we have planted our faith.

The Empire State of the South, Mr. Chairman, greets the Empire State of the North, seconds the nomination of her favorite son, and prophesies victory in November with Alton B. Parker as the standard bearer. [Applause.]

MR. HENRY HEITFELD, of Idaho (when the State of Idaho was called): Idaho seconds the nomination of William Randolph Hearst.

MR. JOHN P. HOPKINS, of Illinois (when the State of Illinois was called): Mr. Chairman, the Illinois delegation have selected the Honorable Free P. Morris to represent them.

MR. FREE P. MORRIS, of Illinois: I desire to thank the Illinois delegation, and with its consent, request that the distinguished orator, Clarence S. Darrow, be permitted to take the stand.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair presents the Honorable Clarence S. Darrow, who will speak for the State of Illinois.

#### SPEECH OF CLARENCE S. DARROW.

MR. CLARENCE S. DARROW, of Illinois: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, on behalf of the solid delegation of the State of Illinois, instructed by the great majority of her Democratic votes, I rise to second the nomination of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.] It is scarcely possible that any words I could say to-night would change the opinion, or, rather, the determination of the delegates assembled here. It seems to have been decreed by fate that the men who scuttled the Democratic ship shall once more be placed in charge.

Even at this late hour, it is well for us to pause. All the Democratic party is not gathered together beneath this roof, much less in these delegates' seats. Outside of this Convention are that great mass of loyal Democrats who in the midst of darkness, danger and despair have still kept the torch of Democracy burning to guide the wandering feet of men. And let me say that though you may forget the platforms of the party and the traditions—aye, the glorious traditions of the great party that we represent—when you go out to the Democratic people of the United States you will find that the Democracy of Jefferson, the Democracy of Bryan, and the Democracy of that other great Democrat, the peer of any Democrat living and of any Democrat dead, John P. Altgeld, of Illinois—you will find that the Democracy of these men and of the Demo-

cratic party will live longer than all the schemes and devices of cunning men. [Applause.] All of us believe in a safe and sane Democracy. [Applause.] But the safe and sane Democracy, the Democracy of our fathers will not pass by the broad and fertile plains of the United States and forget that there is anything of the United States except the narrow, crooked lane which men call Wall street. [Applause.] These safe and sane Democrats, Democrats who know the meaning of the word, will not exchange votes at the ballot box for campaign subscriptions from Wall street. [Applause.] You may write a platform and ignore the platforms and the traditions of the past if you will, but outside are the people with whom we must reckon. [Applause.] Outside are those six million loyal Democrats and true, who followed their great peerless leader to defeat [Applause], and who believe and understand that there can be no victory which sacrifices principle [applause], and no lasting defeat where honor is maintained. [Applause.]

If it remains for this Convention to nominate a man who is safe and sane, in the language of the street, then why not turn this great Convention into a ratification meeting and endorse the Chicago platform of last week and Theodore Roosevelt for President of the United States? There, gentlemen, is a President who is at least safe if not sane. [Laughter.] But the Democratic party is wishing for success. I ask you if success is possible if we turn our backs upon all those men who have been true to the Democratic cause?

The Democratic party is the party of the common people. [Applause.] It has never ridden into power by either the votes or the gold of the banker or the monopolist, and it never will. [Applause.] Remove from the Democratic party the toiling masses who eat their bread in the sweat of their face, and no Democratic party will be left. [Applause.] And let me say to you gentlemen of this Convention, that from one end of the United States to the other, aye, from the blackened plains of the far-off islands and the bull-pens of Colorado, from the jails filled with workingmen sent there without a trial by jury [applause], from every spot where men toil and produce instead of traffic and trade, the eyes of the common man are turned on

William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.] They are turned to him because for the first time in the history of the world a man with talents and wealth and ability has devoted these to the cause of the oppressed and the poor. [Applause.] Nominate William Randolph Hearst, and that great army of toilers, that great industrial army, the real army of the civilized world to-day, will look forward with gladness and hope to a victory which will mean something when it comes. [Applause.] But, if this Convention is determined to forget its traditions, if it loves the golden God and the flesh-pots of Egypt, the time will come, when the fever of commercialism shall have passed away, when the Democratic party will come back once more to the common people that it served so long. [Applause.]

MR. JOHN E. LAMB, of Indiana (when the State of Indiana was called): The Honorable John W. Kern, on behalf of the State of Indiana, will second the nomination of Judge Alton B. Parker.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair presents the Honorable John W. Kern, who will speak for Indiana.

### SPEECH OF JOHN W. KERN.

MR. JOHN W. KERN, of Indiana: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: The Indiana Democracy is not accustomed to political work after the hour of twelve midnight, save on extraordinary occasion when a great emergency exists.

I have been commissioned by the delegation from my State, to convey to this Convention an expression of the sentiment of the great Democracy of Indiana regarding the Presidential nomination, as manifested at the greatest State Convention ever assembled in that commonwealth.

Quite naturally, I am proud of the great body of men for whom I speak in this splendid presence.

It is the grandest army of free men that ever waged battle for constitutional principles. Right valiantly has it borne its full part in the fiercest political conflicts seen in the last half century, under the leadership of such field marshals as Thomas



A. Hendricks, Daniel W. Voorhees, Joseph E. McDonald and David Turpie. [Applause.]

It has been so trained and disciplined and its rank and file have such an abiding faith in the fundamental and essential principles of their party, that they are ready in every campaign to prove their devotion to the Democratic party by voting the Democratic ticket. And so in 1896, when in other States party discipline was so lax, that the Democratic columns wavered and were panic stricken, in Indiana, the earth was fairly trembling beneath the march of the Democratic hosts; and in November of that year, a greater vote was polled for that splendid representative of the American Democracy, William J. Bryan, than had ever before been cast for a Democratic candidate [applause]; and that vote was again increased in 1900.

And I may truthfully add that no man save Thomas A. Hendricks ever held a higher place in the affection of the Democracy of Indiana than William J. Bryan. While they may not agree with him in his estimates of public men, they recognize in him one of the ablest, truest, and most fearless champions of the rights of the people that has ever led the Democratic hosts to battle. [Applause.] And no Democrat understands better than those of us of the Middle West how great an obligation the Democratic party here is under to Mr. Bryan for his statesmanlike efforts to-day in behalf of Democratic harmony and Democratic victory in November.

I should like to have the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Darrow) who has just taken his seat, understand that the Democracy of Indiana never scuttled a Democratic ship and never will. [Applause.] I would have him understand further that the three hundred and fifteen thousand Indiana Democrats who voted for Mr. Bryan in 1896 and in 1900 will most likely be satisfied with the platform adopted here to-night, which has Mr. Bryan's approval.

When our State Convention met a few weeks ago, it was composed of more than fifteen hundred delegates, representing the Democrats of whom I have spoken.

It was not a Convention of so-called reactionaries or reorganizers, but was made up of those sturdy, invincible, and un-

conquerable Democrats who had followed the leadership of Hendricks, and with equal valor and loyalty, the banner of Bryan.

It was such a Convention as I have described, that deliberated upon the question: "What shall we do to be saved; what policy should be pursued to bring about a restoration of the fundamental principles of the party as formulated by Jefferson?"

It was the sentiment of that Convention that the year 1904, when the great Jefferson Exposition was being held, when the name of Jefferson and the mighty service he had rendered the Republic were upon every tongue, was the time, and the city of St. Louis, which owed its origin as an American city to his statesmanship, the place, where all Democrats who believed in the fundamental principles of Democracy, should assemble, and, receiving a fresh baptism of patriotic fire, lay aside personal ambition, sink out of sight personal feeling, forever sheath their swords as against their brethren, only to draw them forth again against the common enemy, and united once more, march forward to the conflict, and as the crowning event of this great Jefferson year, win an old-fashioned Jeffersonian Democratic victory. [Applause.]

May not Indiana, that great central State of the Union, appeal to her sisters on either side, to know each other better, as we know them all, to the end, which will surely follow, that they may love one another.

Oh Democrats of every section, in this supreme hour, when the shadow of Imperialism hovers darkly over the land, when the Constitution of the country, that ark of the covenant, is being despoiled; when the principles of the Declaration of Independence, for which our fathers shed their blood, are being mocked at and set at naught; when gigantic monopolies are being multiplied in every State, and, in defiance of law, are plundering the people of their earnings; when autocratic power and the spirit of militarism are breeding contempt for every form of law—oh, in such a time as this, is it not possible for us to rise out of and away above the miasma of party strife, into the pure, wholesome atmosphere of patriotism, and finding

common ground once more on the essential fundamental basic principles of Democracy, ignore all minor differences for the time being and go out from here a united invincible host, with the patriotic mission before us of saving this country from despoiling hands and reestablishing once more the supremacy of the Constitution? [Applause.]

All being agreed as to the duty of the hour—that we should find the common ground upon which all of us may stand, and for the present allow contention over temporary issues to cease—the remaining question for solution is as to the party leadership in the present campaign.

That question was seriously considered and fully discussed by the Indiana Democracy. We overlooked the claims of no candidate. We remembered gratefully the services rendered in past campaigns by the great newspapers owned and controlled by that gallant young Democrat from California, who bears the honored Democratic name of Hearst.

The name of McClellan had likewise a pleasing sound to the Democracy of Indiana. Olney, Wall, Cockrell, Harmon, Miles, Gorman and George Gray, of Delaware, were the names of other honored leaders whose availability was discussed.

But to the minds of the Indiana Democracy, the ideal candidate was a man of mature years and ripened judgment, of experience in public affairs, a student of, and believer in, the American Constitution as expounded by Jefferson, a man of blameless life, and without stain or spot upon his official ermine, one who had not been involved in the unfortunate contentions which rent the party during past campaigns and who, therefore, could have no antagonisms—a man of dignity and equable temperament, and also a man who had at all times, in sunshine and in storm, in prosperity and adversity, unflinchingly and loyally supported the nominees of his party. [Applause.]

We found the ideal candidate in the person of a man who, in a high degree, possessed all these qualities. In the very prime of life, strong enough for the great work which will be imposed upon the next Democratic President, mature in judgment, so conservative in all his tendencies as to command the confidence of all the legitimate business interests of the coun-

try, born upon the farm, living a country life up to the period of manhood, knowing what it is to work for a livelihood, and since entering manhood's estate, having lived a life so blameless that no word of criticism as to his private or public record has ever escaped the lips of his bitterest political adversary. [Applause.]

Elevated to the highest judicial position in the great Empire State of the Union in 1897, he has discharged the duties of that exalted position with such a high order of ability, and such unquestioned integrity, as to command the respect and admiration of the American Bar without respect to party. [Applause.]

By his judicial decisions he has emphasized the proposition that the rights of labor and of capital are entitled to equal consideration before the law; that the rights of the individual and the rights of property must be jealously guarded; and that the Constitution of the Republic of a State is the paramount law, the mandates of which are to be respected and obeyed by the most powerful magnate and the humblest citizen alike.

He is a Democrat. The cardinal tenet of his political faith is "equal and exact justice to all; special privileges to none." He stands for the largest measure of liberty to the individual consistent with the public weal; for the lightest burden of taxation upon the people, consistent with public necessities and the dignity of a great Republic; for the protection of the masses against the plundering of unlawful combinations. [Applause.]

He is a Democrat who votes the Democratic ticket. [Applause.]

That grand old son of New York, Horatio Seymour, did not subscribe to the declaration in the National Platform of 1868 in favor of the payment of the public debt in greenbacks. Yet he that year right gallantly bore the party standard, because he was a Democrat and believed in its fundamental principles.

That prince amongst Democrats, Samuel J. Randall, in 1880, did not agree with the platform declaration in favor of a tariff for revenue only, but no voice in all the land sounded a truer Democratic note than his, and no man made stronger or

more earnest effort to bring about the election of that peerless Democratic soldier, General Hancock.

And so in 1896 and 1900, this distinguished jurist of New York, whether or not he agreed with the platform declarations of those years upon minor questions, found in those platforms the cardinal principles of the party of Jefferson, and as a private in the Democratic ranks, bowed in submission to the party's will as expressed in its National Conventions, and cast his ballot for the gallant leader of those campaigns who carried the banner to defeats so honorable as to be well nigh glorious, and from the standpoint of an Indiana Democrat, honored himself by casting such a ballot. [Applause.]

He is the only Democrat who has carried New York since 1892. He has not disappointed the people, and he will carry it again. He has been criticized because of his silence on political subjects. Having a correct conception of the exalted judicial position conferred upon him by the voters of the great State of New York, he has refused to come down from the bench to engage in political discussions to the end that his personal fortunes might be advanced. [Applause.]

He would rather go down to defeat a thousand times than to lower the dignity of the great office he holds by inviting criticism which might in any degree bring the slightest stain of reproach upon the ermine which he has so worthily worn. [Applause.]

He is known throughout the country as a disciple of Thomas Jefferson who has attested his devotion to his party at every election since his majority, by voting for his party's nominees. [Applause.]

His life is an open book and he who runs may read. [Applause.]

Surely he may well afford to be silent, and trust to his past record as affording full and ample proof of his Democracy. [Applause.]

Silence! When our candidate takes possession of the White House on March 4, 1905, how comforting and reassuring it will be to the American people to have even a brief period of silence, after the never-ending stream of talk poured from those pre-

cincts during the past three years—talk of war, talk of wild cats, talk of bear-fights, of fencing, of boxing, of athletic contests, of babies and lots of them. After all the startling performances of the present Executive, from Panama diplomacy to breakfast-table chat with the colored man and brother, how blissful, oh how restful and reposeful will be the silence—at least the comparative silence—which will surely follow his exit from public life.

Such is Indiana's candidate. Such is the candidate soon to be named by this Convention—able, honest, fearless, patriotic, a friend of the people, the foe of lawless monopoly, an upholder of the Constitution, a consistent defender of the principles of the immortal Jefferson, a thoroughbred Democrat, and a never-failing winner. His name is already upon your lips; you are only waiting the opportunity to nominate him—Alton Brooks Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

MR. GEORGE F. REINHART, of Iowa (when the State of Iowa was called): I do not desire to detain the Convention longer than to state that Iowa seconds the nomination of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF SAM S. WRIGHT.

MR. SAM S. WRIGHT, of Iowa: On behalf of the unbought and the unpurchaseable Democrats of Iowa—

The speaker got no further when he was interrupted by other members of his own delegation and forced to his seat. The Arkansas delegates offered him a place in their quarters from which to address the Convention, but in the disorder that followed the speaker was unable to proceed. Finally he was assisted to the platform.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman from Iowa has been recognized.

MR. SAM S. WRIGHT, of Iowa: Gentlemen of the Convention: I am proud of the fact that the great party to which I belong ordinarily believes in free speech. [Applause.] In be-

half of that section of Iowa which sends Democrats to Congress, and in behalf of Iowa Democrats who did not receive their political education in Coin's Financial School, I second the nomination of Judge Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF GEORGE F. RINEHART.

MR. GEORGE F. RINEHART, of Iowa: Gentlemen of the Convention, the gentleman who just left the platform took occasion to reflect upon the integrity of the Iowa delegation to this Convention. We are here under instructions to do all we can honorably for the nomination of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.] I do not raise the question that the gentleman may not vote according to his instructions, but I do hurl back into his teeth the insinuation that the Iowa delegation was bought. [Applause.] I am here to-night as the first editor in the United States who flaunted the banner of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.] And by the eternal I will be the last man to forsake him in this Convention. [Applause.] I defy any man to show where I have ever, directly or indirectly, received one single solitary dollar. [Applause.] The gentleman who left the platform comes from that part of Iowa whose citizens ride to our State Conventions on railroad passes.

We are here to-night to present to the country a winning issue and a winning candidate. Issues cannot be made to order by passing resolutions in a political convention. Issues exist before conventions assemble, and they will continue to exist after conventions adjourn. It is one thing to nominate a candidate, and quite another to nominate a man who will carry out the principles of the platform. The people demand not only promise but fulfilment. They demand a man whose record is both a pledge and a guarantee. [Applause.] They demand a man who can see upon the horizon of the future the resplendent light of a new economic day. They have little use for a candidate who has no platform until a political convention makes one for him.

The dominant issue in this campaign is the same issue that has been dominant in every campaign of history; an issue that is as old as creation itself; an issue that formed the first plank

in the first platform of the Almighty when he said "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread;" an issue that was later reaffirmed when He said "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work;" an issue that had for its first champion no less a leader than the great and tender Christ who said, "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

In behalf of the millions of people in this country who earn their bread in the sweat of their faces, I second the nomination of a man who embodies all of the potentialities that make a great leader of the common people, the faithful and efficient servant of the average man. I second the nomination of a man who is great enough to know the issue and courageous enough to meet it. In behalf of the two hundred and twenty-five thousand Democrats of Iowa who vote the Democratic ticket year after year through sheer principle, I second the nomination of that great commoner, William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (when the State of Kansas was called): The Chair presents the Honorable J. G. Johnson, who will speak for the State of Kansas. [Applause.]

### SPEECH OF J. G. JOHNSON.

MR. J. G. JOHNSON, of Kansas: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: The State Convention in Kansas which accredited delegates to this gathering, by a unanimous vote adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That in William Randolph Hearst we recognize one of the foremost Democrats of this nation. He uses his great opportunities and powers in all cases in behalf of the common people without counting the cost to himself. His single handed contest with the coal trust, just successfully concluded in the Supreme Court, is the most signal triumph of Democratic principles since the trusts seized the business of the country. We indorse the work he is doing in the interest of his party and his country, and commend his example to good Democrats everywhere."

Those Kansas delegates who endorse that sentiment and



favor the candidacy of Mr. Hearst have asked me to voice their sentiments in this Convention by seconding his nomination. It is my conviction that in performing this duty I not only voice the sentiment of all the opposition to the Republican party in the State of Kansas, but in the great Northwest as well. [Applause.]

Considering, however, the lateness of the hour and the extraordinary circumstances under which we are proceeding, I think I can do my candidate a favor and you a kindness by saying that I endorse every word that has been said in his behalf from this rostrum, and that those I represent believe there is but one banner which can lead the Democracy of the nation to victory this Fall, and upon that banner is inscribed the name of William Randolph Hearst, of California. [Applause.]

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF DAVID OVERMEYER.

MR. DAVID OVERMEYER, of Kansas: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: On behalf of a part of the Kansas delegation, I rise to nominate for President a son of Massachusetts. He is also an adopted son of the Republic, and a friend of mankind. A man of great ability, of great attainments, and of great achievements. A soldier, a statesman, and a publicist. A faithful servant, who has served his country long and well; who has fought for his country, who has bled for his country, and who, through long years periled his life for his country; and has earned the wreath of fame with which I ask you to deck his noble brow.

Sprung from that nursery of American nobility, the American farm; descended from a long line of devoted and heroic patriots; born to an inheritance of lofty chivalry at his country's call, he bounded to the battlefield, a flaming young Hercules.

Without a regular military education, at first rejected as too young to be a captain; in three years thereafter he was a major-general. [Applause.]

A citizen warrior, he proved a hero, against whose stern, unyielding front of steel and flame the flower of a foe as brave

as ever bore arms was hurled, again and again, in vain. Wounded at Fair Oaks, severely wounded at Fredericksburg, desperately and apparently mortally wounded at Chancellorsville; borne from the field as if dead, with crimson laurels thick upon him, he survived to fight on still more bloody fields, and to receive the praises of every great Captain of the Civil War.

“The stars,” said Meaghre, “that blaze upon his shoulders were called down from the skies by the magnetism of his sword:” and the great Grant has declared in his Memoirs, that this boyish chieftain was equal to the part performed by himself. [Applause.]

At the close of the Civil War, the whole plain, for hundreds of miles east of the Rocky Mountains, was covered with hostile Indians: marauding, murdering, torturing, carrying devastation and despair in all directions, and making the settlement and development of that region impossible. The man I present was sent against them. With sleepless vigilance, with tireless energy, with consummate strategy, with relentless purpose, with fortitude unsurpassed in the annals of time, with courage that faced death at every step; on mountain wilds and through waterless wastes, where men famishing did taste their own blood to quench the awful thirst; through southern sands and northern snows; through storms that rocked the earth and hid the sky; he and his men pursued and overthrew the fierce Cheyenne, the terrible Sioux, and the bloody Apache—driving their broken remnants beyond the boundaries of the United States; hurling Sitting Bull into British America and Geronimo into Mexico, and capturing him there; thus, breaking forever the power of the barbarian, clearing the plains of the cruel, implacable, beleaguering savage, and opening their vast areas to the peaceful millions who now inhabit them, and the unnumbered millions who shall follow. For this great service he received the thanks of Arizona, New Mexico, Montana and Kansas. [Applause.]

Cicero has said: “Grecian nations give the honors of the gods to those men who have slain tyrants;” and shall we hesitate to crown with the chaplet he has won, him who slew the

dragons of the wilderness, and conquered the demons of the desert? [Applause.]

Having pacified the plains, he rose through merit alone to the head of the army. To him the armies of Spain surrendered. He liberated Cuba, and carried glad tidings of peace and liberty to Porto Rico. [Applause.]

Having opened the desert to civilization, with the eye of a prophet and the wisdom of a statesman, he pointed out the way to remove from its parched and desolate face, the old despair, and cause it to answer the touch of the tiller with glorious bloom, with ample verdure, and smiling plenty. While others were dreaming and wondering, he told them how Egypt, Assyria, Persia, India, China, and Japan sustained enormous populations by a judicious control of the natural supply of water. And he has told us recently that the money squandered in mis-government of the so-called colonies, would water all of our arid lands, or build highways for the whole country.

A lover of Nature, he pleads for trees, and fields, and fruits and harvests.

In his solicitude for his fellow-man; in his anxiety for the welfare of the whole people, there is profound affection for the human race, and undying devotion to those institutions which protect and shelter the weak and the poor from cruelty, avarice and ambition. [Applause.]

Filial and fraternal, he pleads for hearth and home, and all the blessed ties of family and friendship, and all the sacred sentiments, and tender sympathies, and exalted and reverend virtues of domestic life.

The hero of a hundred battles, he emerges from a lifetime of military service the Nation's greatest champion of peace. War has not blunted his sensibilities, perverted his sentiments, or hardened his heart; but it has developed in his great heart, pity and mercy, compassion and consideration. [Applause.]

At the command of his country, he stood before kings; he has circled the globe and visited, officially, every civilized nation beneath the sun, and witnessed the mighty pageants of earth. Yet neither the splendors of royalty, nor the magni-

ficence of imperial power could tempt his fealty to free institutions, or lure him from the path of Democracy.

With unshaken faith in human nature, he cherishes the ideals of his youth, and the traditions of the fathers of the Republic.

Though he has traveled every land and sailed on every sea, yet, "loves the while this free cosmopolite, old friends, old themes, and keeps his boyhood dreams in sight."

Time has not staled him; years have not chilled him; experience has not soured him; the toils, the struggles, the trials of life have neither weakened nor wearied him.

He is known to the country and to the world. He is famous. He is renowned. He is admired and loved by his countrymen.

Strong, yet cheerful; firm, yet kind; affable, yet dignified; stern, yet tender; possessed of a comprehensive mind and wide information; accustomed to deep reflection; of gentle manners and engaging, fascinating and noble presence, he bears the stamp of an extraordinary man, whose splendid equipment and towering personality mark him for the gravest duties, the noblest services and the highest honors. [Applause.]

Born and reared in the East, his long service brought him in contact with the West for more than a quarter of a century. No man knows more of the West, its needs, its sympathies and its aspirations; and no man knows the whole country any better than he.

A born Democrat, he is in full sympathy with the Democratic Party and its principles. An anti-imperialist, an anti-monopolist, devoted to the Constitution, a heroic patriot, he stands forth the peer of any man of this age.

He believes that there can be no just taxation without representation; that the people of the Philippine Islands should govern themselves. "That they who deny liberty to others, do not deserve it for themselves, and, under a just God, will not long retain it." That the great Republic cannot hold millions of people permanently in bondage, without losing first, its political character, and ultimately its political life.

That we should renounce, at once and forever, the danger-

ous and deadly doctrine of Imperialism, and that two hundred days is sufficient time in which to set the Filipinos free. [Applause.]

He believes that the Constitution follows the flag; that the rights guaranteed by the Constitution are inviolable wherever the flag symbolizes the civil power of the United States, and that the right of trial by jury is sacred wherever the United States maintains civil government. [Applause.]

He believes that the military should be kept in strict subordination to the civil power. That an injury to one is the concern of all; that military despotism in Colorado menaces the rights of every American citizen, and is ominous of a reaction which may blot out the liberties of all men.

He believes that we should have a navy sufficient to defend our extensive coasts, and protect the rights of our people and of our country everywhere; but he believes also that on every ship should be written, "Millions for Defense, but Not One Cent for Conquest." [Applause.]

He believes in the economic doctrines of the Democratic party. He believes that there should be no tax, except for a public purpose. He believes that the industry and substance of the people should not be exploited by criminal combinations; that the laws against conspiracies in restraint of trade should be enforced, and that offenders should be punished. [Applause.]

He believes that labor is the base of the social system; that the base is not to be despised; that the laborers and producers are the salt of the earth; that their broad shoulders and strong arms support the whole fabric of civilization; that they constitute the great body of the people, and must never be enslaved. [Applause.]

That property has rights also, but that the maintenance of these rights does not require that a limited, and constantly diminishing number of persons shall be permitted to monopolize all of the property of the country; or that a pampered banditti shall be permitted to defy the laws, absorb all wealth, and enslave the people.

He believes, with the immortal Washington, that the mission of the Republic is peace, justice and liberty. That we

must teach peace by being peaceful; that we must teach justice by being just; that we must teach liberty by maintaining our own liberties, and by never denying liberty to any people. [Applause.]

He believes that this nation has been a world power since its birth; that it was a world power when that old bell rang out from Independence Hall, Liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof.

That it was a world power when, by the force of its example, it caused Republics to take the place of Monarchies in all South America, Central America and Mexico.

That it was a world power when, by the force of its example, it caused the great French Revolution, shattered Absolutism, and gave to Continental Europe, except Russia, Constitutional Government.

That it was a world power when it inspired Japan, glorious Japan! to cast away the cruel bauble of autocracy and adopt a free constitution, based upon the principles of Democracy. [Applause.]

That for more than a hundred years it has been such a great world power, its light has so shone in the world, that it has attracted to these shores the oppressed of all nations, drawn to this country by the justice of its laws and the magnanimity of its character. But it has not been an Imperial world power, and only the enemies of liberty would have it so. It has been a Democratic world power, a Republican world power; the mother of Republics, the fountain of Democracy, and the home of "Liberty Enlightening the World." [Applause.]

Our candidate must be a man against whom no faction will wage war; he must be a man whose eminence, experience and ability are a guarantee of his fitness for the Presidency.

A man whose personality and whose career will arrest the attention and challenge the admiration of the people. If we nominate an unknown or prosaic candidate, titled mediocrity and counterfeit greatness will continue to call forth the applause of the multitude.

A man who fills in full measure the requirements of the hour is General Nelson A. Miles. [Applause.] If nominated

he will be the candidate of no faction, but of the whole Democratic party, and of all patriots. He will receive the vote of every Democrat in the United States. He will receive the independent vote; the anti-imperialist peace vote, and the good-citizen vote.

He will receive the votes of all those (and they are legion) who resent the attempt of the acting President to degrade and dishonor him; and to degrade and dishonor other illustrious men who have earned the praise and lasting gratitude of their countrymen. [Applause.]

His name will warm the heart and stir the blood of every comrade of the Civil War. They will recognize in his candidacy their last opportunity to vote for one of their own for the great office of President. His candidacy will arouse the generous chivalric spirit of every man who wore the gray. [Applause.]

With such a man as Senator Harris for Vice-President, the ticket would mark an epoch in our history.

United in that wider comradeship of American valor, now the proud heritage of the whole American people, the survivors of that great struggle, both North and South, would rally to the Democratic standard, almost to a man.

The one man whom the Republicans fear is Miles. The one man whom the White House fears is Miles. They fear him because the envious shaft aimed at his heart by the acting President fell harmless at his feet, and they fear its rebound, if he is nominated. They fear him because of his record, because of his personality, because the splendor of his career, and the grandeur of his character would so outshine the acting President, as to pale his boasted exploits into utter insignificance. [Applause.]

Any honest Democrat can carry the South. Miles can carry not only New York and New Jersey, but Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Hampshire. He can carry Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin. He can carry the Pacific States and the Mountain States. He can carry Nebraska, and he can carry Kansas.

The people want for their President a man clean hearted

and high souled; a man upright and honest of purpose, with ability of a high order. They don't want a mad man! They don't want a wild man! They don't want a man possessed of illusions or possessed by illusions. They don't want a man whose vaulting ambition would burst all bounds and sunder all restraints, and plunge the Nation into needless dangers, and inflict upon the people needless sufferings and sacrifices. [Applause.]

They want a man whom they can love and trust and admire for his manhood, for his judgment, for his humanity, for his integrity, for his stainless life, for his great career, for his kind heart, for his sound head, for his Democratic instincts, and for his love of liberty.

A man who will restore the Constitution, revive the old veracity, enforce the laws, reestablish justice, sever the head of monopoly and privilege, and break the chain and set the captive free, and proclaim once more, "Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." [Applause.]

I nominate for President that peerless patriot, soldier and statesman, that noble, that incorruptible, that illustrious citizen, General Nelson A. Miles. [Applause.]

#### LIMITATION ON SECONDING SPEECHES.

MR. LEONARD R. ROSING, of Minnesota: I move that all seconding speeches be limited to one minute each.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all speeches seconding the nomination of any candidate be limited to one minute each.

MR. A. M. DOCKERY, of Missouri: I move to amend by substituting five minutes. [There were cries of "No," "No."] Then I will suggest ten minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota, that seconding speeches be limited to five minutes each.



The amendment was rejected.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER:** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota that seconding speeches be limited to one minute each.

**MR. THOMAS F. GRADY, of New York:** I submit to this Convention that it is most unfair, after the State of Alabama and the State of Arkansas were permitted to yield their positions to New York, which has not yet been reached, so that unlimited time might be given for the presentation of the claims of other candidates, now to limit the time to one minute. I suggest as a matter of common decency, that any man who has anything to say to this Convention should be allowed at least five minutes in which to say it. We have patiently listened to all that has been said of candidates already placed in nomination. Let us have the decency to listen for five minutes to anyone seconding a nomination yet to be made. I move as an amendment that seconding speeches be limited to four minutes.

**MR. C. A. CULBERSON, of Texas:** I rise to a point of order.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER:** The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

**MR. CULBERSON:** The Convention having proceeded to call the roll of States without limitation, I ask if the pending motion is not now out of order.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER:** The Chair thinks the Convention must still retain the power to limit the length of speeches.

**MR. LEONARD A. ROSING, of Minnesota:** I think we will gain time by accepting the amendment of the gentleman from New York to make it four minutes. I am, therefore, willing to accept the compromise.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER:** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota, as amended, that all speeches seconding any nomination for the Presidency be limited to four minutes.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

**MR. J. W. ORR, of Kansas:** Inasmuch as several delegates have spoken on behalf of Kansas, I desire, on the part of six of the twenty delegates of the State of Kansas, to second the

nomination of Alton B. Parker, of New York. There will be several others from Kansas to speak, seconding other nominations, before the Convention closes.

MR. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky (when the State of Kentucky was called): The State of Kentucky yields to the State of Texas.

MR. C. A. CULBERSON, of Texas: The State of Texas desires to be heard by one of her delegates, Mr. Thomas H. Ball.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair recognizes Honorable Thomas H. Ball, of Texas.

### SPEECH OF THOMAS H. BALL.

MR. THOMAS H. BALL, of Texas: Mr Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Voicing the will of the Democratic party of Texas, representing the instructions of her State Convention by a unanimous vote and the individual preferences of all the Texas delegates to this Convention, I desire in behalf of the organized, united and militant Democracy of Texas to second the nomination of Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

Texas is for Parker because she believes that upon him, incomparably above all others, every Democrat who loves his country can unite for victory in November next. [Applause.] He is a Democrat for whom all Democrats can vote without apology or explanation. The two hundred and four thousand Democratic majority which voted for that splendid Democrat, William J. Bryan, of Nebraska, stand ready to give that vote to that great constitutional lawyer, respecter of property rights and friend of every legitimate interest of labor, Alton B. Parker, of New York. Around his standard all lovers of constitutional liberty and Government can unite.

Judge Parker stands for a democratic Republic. Theodore Roosevelt stands for a republican Empire. Our candidate has not sought this nomination, but the wisdom of thoughtful Democrats from every section of this country of ours has united upon him as the one man who can lead us to victory. [Applause.]

Theodore Roosevelt, after reducing the Republican party leaders to involuntary servitude, had his dominant, ambitious, restless spirit hovering over the Convention at Chicago, dictating its every step. Four years more of Roosevelt means a Republic in name only; grasping at the shadow while the substance has fled. Elect Judge Parker as President, and you will have from that healthful country estate where he lives close to nature and to the people, as did Washington, Jefferson and Madison, a man who will be a successor to those illustrious patriots, and who will measure up to the best expectations of the American people. [Applause.]

MR. E. B. KRUTTSCHNITT, of Louisiana (when the State of Louisiana was called): Louisiana seconds the nomination of Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. W. H. McLELLAN, of Maine (when the State of Maine was called): The State of Maine yields its time to the Honorable Champ Clark, of Missouri.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair recognizes the Honorable Champ Clark, who will speak on behalf of Missouri.

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF CHAMP CLARK.

MR. CLARK, of Missouri (Mr. Joseph W. Bailey in the chair): Mr Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Yells do not nominate Presidents. The waving of banners does not nominate Presidents. You men have yelled; you have waved your banners. I am going to name the next president of the United States. [Applause.]

I speak for sixteen States, although I am commissioned to speak for only one. I speak for 30,000,000 people, although commissioned to speak for but three millions and a half.

This is a great historical Convention. [Applause] I am about to make a great historical speech. [Laughter.] I intend to say what I want my children and the posterity of every Southern man here to-night to remember. Sixteen Southern States have one hundred and forty-nine Representatives in Congress, nearly all Democrats, thank God [laughter]; thirty-two United States Senators, and all but four are Democrats

[applause]; and one hundred and eighty-one electoral votes that we can deliver. [Applause.] And here we are and have been for fifty years the citizens of sixteen American States, as completely disfranchised as to the Presidency as though we were inhabitants of the Fiji Islands. [Laughter.]

It makes me very tired to see the men, Democrats who cannot be anything else, with spyglasses glued to their eyes, looking to the East and to the North for a candidate for the Presidency, when we have scores of them among ourselves. [Applause.]

I do not have to get off this little stage to find half a dozen men each of whom would make a great President. [Applause and cries of "name him."]

My lion-hearted friend from Texas, Senator Joseph Weldon Bailey [applause]; the veteran of the Texas Democracy, John H. Reagan [applause]; Governor Benton McMillin, of Tennessee; Senator John W. Daniel, of Virginia, lovingly called by Virginians "The Lame Lion of Lynchburg; Henry D. Clayton, of Alabama, and John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. A Missouri Democrat is *ex-officio* fit to be President of the United States. [Laughter.]

What is the sense then of looking elsewhere? Are we to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the National Democracy forever? Are our public men less capable than yours? No man will dare to assert it. Are we less courageous? You accuse us of fighting too much. Or are we less patriotic? We furnished the majority of the heroes in the Spanish War. [Applause.] The first American to die for his country in that war was a North Carolina Democrat.

Are we less faithful to Democracy? We vote the ticket in season and out; and we, the people of the sixteen Southern States, are not only the flower of the Democracy in the United States, but sometimes we have been nearly the whole thing. [Laughter.]

Missouri is the most populous State in the Union, which invariably and under all circumstances votes the Democratic ticket. Texas comes next in population among the reliably Democratic States.

I submit to you, men of the North and East, that we have

followed your candidates for more than half a century, and it is not fair, it is not right—it is preposterous—that we should continue to do so forever. [Applause.] Are Missouri, Texas, Mississippi and the rest of these sixteen States to be punished because we are faithful to Democracy? That is precisely what it amounts to—punishment for being loyal Democrats—when all the citizens of these Southern States are habitually excluded from consideration as Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates. No citizen of any of these States has been nominated by one of the great parties, when united, since General Taylor, of Louisiana, was nominated in 1848 and none for Vice-President since B. Gratz Brown was Horace Greeley's running mate in 1872.

This state of affairs is most anomalous, unnatural and unhealthy. It should be remedied at once for the good of this mighty Republic, which we all adore and which is the last hope of Constitutional Government on the face of the earth.

Speaking particularly for imperial Missouri in this grand conclave of Democracy, I would not detract in the estimation of a hair from the just fame of any of the illustrious men whose names have been or may be presented here; but Missourians are weary of being under the ban and we want the most eminent living Missourian nominated by this convention for the most exalted political position which the world has to bestow.

The performances in this Convention to-night demonstrate the fact that you had better select a candidate against whom nothing can be said. [Applause.]

We present to you a man who can be supported cheerfully by every lover of liberty in the land; who belongs to no faction and knows no faction; a Democrat whose Democracy, like Kentucky whiskey, needs no certificate of its quality [applause]; a man who for thirty years in the Senate of the United States has fought the battles of the men who are quarrelling among themselves here to-night; a man for whom you do not have to state that he never scratched a Democratic ticket; he does not know how.

He is the ideal American citizen. His one rule in public life is faithfulness to his duty. He is diligent in the people's work.

As Thomas Jefferson said of James Monroe so say I of the man for whom I speak: "He is so pure that you might turn his soul inside out and you would not find a blot upon it." He possesses splendid talents. He has rendered the country most valuable services. He is not puffed up by the high honors which loving Missourians have showered upon him. He is plain as an old shoe, honest as the day is long, energetic as a steam engine and tireless as the force of gravitation.

It is whispered that he has passed the age limit. As a matter of fact he is not old at all. He is sixty-nine years young.

It is said that he was a Confederate soldier. Of course he was—a good one, too. Who shall say in this era of good feeling that a Confederate soldier is unfit to be President?

We are told that President Roosevelt is a man of large and varied experience in Governmental affairs—which I freely grant; but the great Missourian knows every department like a book and could successfully perform the duties of any office, elective or appointive.

A brave man? They talk about Colonel Roosevelt's bravery, but old Cockrell is as brave as he.

[This statement brought forth a long demonstration.]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN pro tempore: The Chair announces that Mr. Clark desires to conclude his remarks.

MR. CLARK: Fellow Democrats, the Committee on Resolutions unanimously reported a platform which gives great encouragement to every Democrat in the Convention. Now give us General Francis Marion Cockrell, on whom the Parker men, the Hearst men and all other men can unite, and we will sweep the country from sea to sea. [Applause.]

MR. MURRAY VANDIVER, of Maryland (when the State of Maryland was called): Mr. Chairman, the Honorable Buchanan Schley, on behalf of Maryland, will second the nomination of Judge Alton B. Parker.

#### REMARKS OF BUCHANAN SCHLEY.

MR. BUCHANAN SCHLEY, of Maryland: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, I had prepared a most eloquent

speech for this occasion, but the time limit completely cuts me out, as I would not have gotten fully under way inside of an hour and a half. [Laughter.] In order to preserve the good feeling of this audience and to retain my popularity with this people, I simply rise now to second the nomination of that pure, clear-headed, strong-handed, honest man. Maryland, conservative Democratic Maryland, is not only honored but takes pleasure in seconding the nomination of New York's favorite son, the Honorable Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF PATRICK A. COLLINS.

MR. PATRICK A. COLLINS, of Massachusetts (when the State of Massachusetts was called): Brother Democrats, after the splendid and enthusiastic and sincere demonstration for candidates whom no Democrat in this Convention is here to belittle or disparage, pray hear a modest word from a modest State and for a modest man.

Massachusetts has the honor to present to this great Convention representing the united and therefore invincible Democracy of the Union the name of her most distinguished son, her most eminent statesman, her foremost Democrat, Richard Olney. [Applause.]

We do not present the name of our candidate as that of a mere citizen of Massachusetts. He is a citizen of the United States of America. [Applause.] We do not claim him as exclusively our own, because our candidate is a fighting soldier in the ranks of the militant Democracy of the Union. [Applause.] While it is true that the surveyor's line divides our territory, for convenience or administrative propriety, into different sections, no surveyor's line divides the Democratic party into sections, and the man who is a Democrat in Massachusetts is at home in Texas, in Oregon, in Missouri. [Applause.] We hold ourselves in Massachusetts to be as good Democrats as the best that can be found anywhere. I am perfectly aware that the tradition, the contention, and the claim have been maintained that only those States are tolerated to present candidates which

are certain to deliver electoral votes, but the time has come when the Democrats of the Union are entitled to select for their candidate the best man in the party, wherever he hangs up his hat or wherever his cradle was rocked [applause], and the citizens of the United States are entitled, regardless of his domicile, to select their tallest man as men did in primitive times, in hours of danger, to be their chief.

Richard Olney requires no introduction to this audience, to this country, to the world. [Applause.] He is to-day intellectually the tallest man in the Democratic party in the United States, if not in the whole country. His name is engraven imperishably in the history of this country, and no history of international relations can ever be written with truth unless it has a shining page for Richard Olney.

We, therefore, offer him to this convention, and ask you to break the tradition and come to Massachusetts, if you believe we have the tallest man in the file. If nominated, he will be elected President of the United States. He will steer the Ship of State with a steady hand to the safe anchorage of the Constitution. He will, moreover, write his name upon that small scroll which holds only the names of men who have been supremely useful to the Republic, and have advanced the cause of a free people sanely, wisely and successfully. [Applause.]

MR. D. J. CAMPAU, of Michigan (when the State of Michigan was called): The State of Michigan desires to be passed.

MR. CHARLES D'AUTREMONT, of Minnesota (when the State of Minnesota was called): On behalf of a majority of the delegates from Minnesota, I second the nomination of Mr. Hearst. [Applause.]

MR. LEONARD A. ROSING, of Minnesota. Minnesota is here, Mr. Chairman, with a divided delegation, and on behalf of the handsomest part of that delegation, I second the nomination of Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF JAMES K. VARDAMAN.

MR. JAMES K. VARDAMAN, of Mississippi (when the State of Mississippi was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of



the Convention: It has been said that every election is a crisis in the history of this Republic. The people of this magnificent Republic are confronted to-day with a condition of affairs unparalleled in its history. They move beneath the shadow of a great peril. That hell-born accident which placed William McKinley in his grave and Theodore Roosevelt in the President's chair, brought upon this country a condition of things which I warn you, my countrymen, to consider with care and deliberation.

I come from a State which gave in the two last campaigns every precinct to that peerless leader from Nebraska. [Applause.] But, my countrymen, the people of Mississippi, in common with the people of every other section of this Republic, are to-day looking to the man who can lead us to victory against that political spasm who to-day by the accident of death occupies the Presidential chair. [Applause.] And in behalf of the united Democracy of Mississippi, it affords me pleasure to second the nomination of Judge Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF W. A. HARRIS.

MR. A. M. DOCKERY, of Missouri (when the State of Missouri was called): The State of Missouri yields to Senator W. A. Harris, of the State of Kansas.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair presents the Honorable William A. Harris, of Kansas.

MR. W. A. HARRIS, of Kansas. Mr Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Long and glorious is the roll of names which imperial Missouri has written in the pages of our Nation's history. [Applause.] Great and illustrious names from other States as well shine in the records of that great body, the Senate of the United States. Men who have been brave and fearless in battle, men who have been wise and sagacious in the councils of the Nation, men who have been patriotic and devoted and incorruptible in public duty, men who have been pure and tender and loyal in every relation of private life, but among them all few and far between are those who have com-

bined in themselves all of these glorious virtues. [Applause.] In the discharge of every duty and the performance of every public work, in every relation of life, Francis Marion Cockrell stands preeminent as an embodiment of all these virtues. [Applause.]

In the great War Committee of the Senate, even during the time of war, when men were hurried and excited by ardent passion, he was cool and collected, and from his profound experience and intimate knowledge of all that concerned the military history and affairs of the country, he guided, directed and determined the scope and extent of every great measure concerning the military organization of the United States.

The Republican Administration may boast of what has been accomplished in conducting the war, and in the reorganization of the Army of the United States, but every colleague of Senator Cockrell on that Committee will testify that whatever measure may have been enacted into law, all that is best in it, and most effective for good, is due to the wide experience, great knowledge, and profound and patriotic devotion to the best interest of the country, of Senator Cockrell. [Applause.]

In matters of general legislation, whether in Committee or on the floor of the Senate, Senators of both the great parties alike learned to rely upon his vigilance, his knowledge of public affairs, and his incorruptibility. [Applause.] He seemed to have the power of knowing the character of every measure which obtained a place upon the Calendar. And his vigilance never relaxed, nor could any objectionable measure ever escape his protest. [Applause.]

In all the beneficent processes of nature which produce the teeming harvests, which support mankind, and which render existence possible, she moves quietly in obedience to law, and without noise or demonstration.

It is only in the malefic and harmful aspects which Nature assumes at times, that she becomes spectacular, sensational, or exceeds the orderly current of divine law. So it is in human nature and in the affairs of men. Men of great merit and true worth are always patient and modest. They seek quietly and

without ostentatious bluster or noisy vehemence to discharge their duties and to serve their fellow men. [Applause.]

The country is weary of strenuosity which is designed to attract attention, of meddling, which only muddles, of demonstration which only distracts. [Applause.] The people long for a return to the better, purer, simpler forms and traditions of true Democracy in the White House, and in the administration of the Government. Vulgar display, brute force and headlong usurpation of power, shock and disgust the citizen and invite the contempt and hate of the world.

Francis Marion Cockrell is the antipodes of all these vices. He is the incarnation of all the virtues of a true Democrat.

Genius has been defined to be an extraordinary capacity for work. He has this genius in the highest degree. He has the genius of friendship, the genius of the true and patriotic citizen, the genius of the wise and sagacious statesman. [Applause.]

Under his administration of affairs, the country will have a living example of all that is best in American statesmanship: [Applause.] They will return to the doctrines of Jefferson; they will follow the advice of Washington. They will be led in the true path of peace and devotion to duty which leads to the uplifting of the human race. It is, therefore, with profound pleasure that I have the honor to second the nomination of a man without fear and without reproach, Francis Marion Cockrell, of the State of Missouri, as the nominee of this Convention for President of the United States. [Applause.]

MR. W. A. CLARK, of Montana (when the State of Montana was called): Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the Montana delegation, and in behalf of the Democracy of the State of Montana, I desire to second the nomination of Judge Parker, of the State of New York, as the Presidential candidate. [Applause.]

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF DAVID S. ROSE.

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska (when the State of Nebraska was called): Mr. Chairman, Wisconsin

has a candidate to present, and Nebraska exchanges places with Wisconsin. Wisconsin will take our turn, and Nebraska will take Wisconsin's place.

MR. DAVID S. ROSE, of Wisconsin: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: That old Democratic gladiator, my old Democratic brother, Champ Clark, of Missouri, announced that he represented the electoral votes of sixteen Democratic States. In God's name, Brother Champ, annex Wisconsin, and make it seventeen, and give us poor devils up there a chance. [Applause.]

I do not come to you, my brother Democrats, with polished periods, or with beautiful word pictures to appeal to your fancy; but I come to you to appeal to your Democracy and to express to you a few Democratic truths.

I cannot say with my brother from Georgia (Mr. Wright) that I come from a State which can always be relied on to give a Democratic majority. On the contrary, my State, under ordinary circumstances, may be relied upon to give a Republican majority. You Democrats of Georgia, you Democrats of Texas, aye, you Democrats of Missouri, you do not know what it means to be a Democrat. [Applause.] I want to say to you Democrats of the South who are only called upon to do skirmish duty in a political campaign, that one good Democrat on the firing line is worth a dozen pot-rustlers in the sutler's tent. [Applause.]

The Democracy of Wisconsin comes here not for the purpose of presenting a favorite son because he is a favorite son. We come here as we may at this season, which reaches us once every four years, to adopt a platform which shall declare the Democratic faith, and to nominate a Democratic ticket.

In coming to the discharge of the duty which devolves upon me by the instructions of the Convention that has sent me here, my greatest gratification and satisfaction are that I can bring with me a record, a lifelong record, of devotion and fidelity to the platforms and candidates of my party. [Applause.]

Wisconsin calls upon the Democracy of this nation to halt and consider. You, my brother Clark, say you can give us the electoral votes of sixteen States, but you cannot give us

enough to elect a Democratic President. Would to God you could. You men of New York say if we nominate the candidate whom you have presented, you will give us the electoral vote of your State. But add that to the vote of the Democratic South and we cannot elect a President. Add to it the votes of New Jersey and Delaware and Connecticut, if you will, and a Republican President will be elected—God forbid. [Applause.] I say to you, asserting a fact which all must concede, that in order to elect a Democratic President you must break into that bunch of States which lies East of the Mississippi River and North of the Ohio River. The Democrats of Wisconsin understanding better the conditions which exist there to-day than can those who live outside our borders, can give to this Democratic Convention the assurance that if our candidate shall be nominated Wisconsin will wheel into line as she did in 1892, when she gave her electoral votes to Grover Cleveland for President of these United States. [Applause.]

You tell me that the nominee must come from New York. Answer me, Democrats of New York: If we present to you a candidate who possesses the ability, whose record has been one of unswerving fidelity, whose loyalty and allegiance to party it will not be necessary to prove by affidavits, will you give him your electoral votes? Do you propose to tell me that the candidate of a faction of the Democracy of that State will be stronger with the people than the candidate who represents the entity?

I am not here to disparage the claims of any Democrat. While I have remained loyal to my party, doing and rendering the little service I might to aid our cause, yet in my country I have always been recognized as of the conservative school. I say to you, Democrats of New York, when you come to this Convention, a Convention of the Democratic party of this nation, why do you not come with a united front? [Applause.]

I was a delegate in the National Convention twenty years ago which nominated Cleveland, and you came into that Convention as you come here now, with a divided party. Do you ask the Democracy of this nation to recognize one faction or the other? In behalf of the Democrats of my State, I say to

you, you have brought your soiled linen to the wrong laundry. [Applause.] We understand that the New York delegation comes here under instructions to vote as a unit, and we understand that a very respectable minority of that delegation would never vote with the majority were it not for the instructions of the Convention. [Applause.] Pardon me, my Democratic friends, if I call things by their right names. [Applause.]

Every Democrat in this nation, either in person or by his representative here, has the right to give expression to his views and his judgment. [Applause.] The moment that this Convention shall take action and nominate its ticket, as it has adopted its platform, that ticket and that platform will have no more earnest, active, energetic, fearless supporter than I. [Applause.]

We know you Democrats of New York. We know that while you are professing unity, the majority of your State convention, which now dominates your delegation, was elected from a territory which gives ninety-five thousand Republican majority. [Applause.] We know, and the fact cannot be disguised, that the minority of your delegation represents that portion of the territory of your State which gives a Democratic majority of eighty-two thousand.

The gentleman who presented your candidate to this Convention referred to the fact that your candidate had carried the State of New York in 1897 by a majority of sixty thousand, but he neglected to state that in the year 1900 that State gave one hundred and twenty-three thousand more votes to William Jennings Bryan than it gave to Judge Parker. [Applause.]

I have been told by Democrats that they hesitated to make a nomination from Wisconsin for fear it might frighten the Republicans there into harmony. I say to you Democrats, and I speak advisedly, for I have carried a butcher's cleaver under my coat-tails for thirty years to chop into those fellows, and I know every drop of blood that courses through their veins, that there is no power this side of Heaven which can bring about reconciliation in those Republican factions.

Oh, it would do you Democrats of the South good, you

Democrats of Iowa and Ohio, up there in that Republican country where the political sun never rises till eleven o'clock in the morning and goes down at half past one in the afternoon, if you could only stand aside and see those Republican gladiators clawing each other's eyes out; and now that the thieves are falling out, honest men will get their dues.

Gentlemen of the Convention, speaking sincerely and honestly, with full knowledge of every fact to which I give utterance, if you give us the candidate we want, we will guarantee to you the electoral votes of Wisconsin. [Applause.] I am going to say more than that to you, and I say this as a conservative Democrat. This Convention should not, aye, if this Convention desires to nominate a candidate who can be elected you dare not, nominate a man who did not stand loyally by our party organization in 1896 and 1900. [Applause.] Democrats of this nation, I want to call your attention to one fact. Six millions and a half of loyal, true-hearted, unfaltering men, refusing to be frightened or subsidized, stood loyally shoulder to shoulder as one great fighting phalanx in those memorable and historical campaigns. [Applause.] And when you delegates of this Convention shall leave the city of St. Louis upon the adjournment of this Convention, do not forget that you have to go back and give an accounting to the men who have been loyal. [Applause.]

Who are the men who stand behind the New York candidate? Have they always been true? The gentleman who presented his name has said that the nation has called repeatedly upon New York. Aye, the nation calls upon New York now. We have been calling for days, we have been calling for weeks, we have been calling for months upon your candidate to tell us what his policy will be if he shall be chosen. [Applause.] He refuses to speak. He has justly earned the title of the New York sphinx. He speaks only through the lips of others; and what do they say? They go before the Committee on Resolutions of this Convention and attempt to get that committee to engraft upon our platform a plank in favor of the single gold standard. Do they ask us to set aside the verdict of six and a half millions of people who went on record upon

that proposition in 1896 and 1900? That question, it is conceded, is not an issue in this campaign. We Democrats believed in bimetallism then. [Applause.] Some of us disagreed upon the question of ratio; and I was one of those who disagreed. But, as I said to you, six and a half million strong-hearted Democrats have placed themselves upon record on that proposition.

And, men of New York, aye, men of this nation, you cannot go to the men who stood true and ask them to stultify themselves by backing water on the old platforms upon that question. [Applause.] When the gentleman who presented the claims of the New York candidate was speaking of the record of the past, why was he not honest enough to tell us that he had assisted in the attempt to scuttle the old Democratic ship, and was an elector upon the Palmer and Buckner ticket in 1896. I want to say to you, my Democratic friends, that I am tired ——

MR. OSCAR L. MILES, of Arkansas: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman from Arkansas submits a point of order. Will the gentleman kindly state the point of order?

MR. MILES: The gentleman is not speaking to the nomination of any candidate, but is making a general arraignment of the Democratic party in Convention assembled.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair decides that it is not within its province to judge the propriety of any speech in nominating a candidate, and therefore overrules the point of order.

MR. ROSE: My Democratic friends, I do not wish to stir up discord in our party. [Hoots.] We have heard the cries of the tiger before. But I assume to have the right, when discussing candidates and conditions, to refer to the record of our party.

MR. ALBERT J. BARR, of Pennsylvania: But you have no right to speak ——



THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not in order, and will resume his seat.

MR. ROSE: When I said to you that Wisconsin could give her electoral votes to the candidate she presents, I knew I would be held to give a reason for the statement.

In 1890 the gentleman whom we present was chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of our State. That campaign was fought upon a local issue, it is true; the same character of an issue that gave us the State of Illinois. It was an issue that threatened with extinction the parochial schools of Wisconsin, and those people who, in their open-handed charity and patriotism, had built, established and maintained those educational institutions, rallied around that chairman, supported him; and now the same force that gave us Wisconsin in 1890 and 1892 pledges itself that in the event of the nomination of our candidate, it will give him its support in 1904. That is the reason for our faith.

The Democracy of Wisconsin places party above the personal ambition of any man in our party. Did we not feel sincerely and deeply that by nominating this candidate victory would crown our banner, we would present him only as a favorite son and support the one we considered to be strongest. But that is not the condition in Wisconsin. I present to you, fellow Democrats, in a spirit of good fellowship, animated by the desire to see nominated the strongest candidate possible, the name of Hon. Edward C. Wall, of Wisconsin. [Applause.]

He is a native of my city. There he was born, and there his whole lifetime has been spent. A Democrat always, an active, aggressive, earnest, effective worker. He possesses the ability, he possesses the integrity; and he enjoys the confidence of our people. He is broad in his Democracy. Though he supported the Chicago platform and the Kansas City platform, he announced publicly that he disagreed upon the money question, but that he regarded it his duty above every other duty to stand by the organization with which he had always been identified, and to which he had always been devoted. [Applause.]

He is a believer in the old fashioned Democratic doctrine of tariff for revenue only. He is a believer in the old Democratic policy of the income tax, notwithstanding the Supreme Court has decided it to be unconstitutional, by an opinion one way when the justices went to bed and another when they got up in the morning. He believes that if it is necessary to adopt a constitutional amendment to give us this Democratic policy, the Constitution should be amended.

I ask you gentlemen of the South if we can give you a man such as this, will he not carry every State that my friend Clark has mentioned? I ask you Democrats of New York if we give you such a man as this, who has never been identified with your factional differences, will he not be stronger with the people than one who represents a faction only? These are the questions that address themselves to the Democrats in this Convention.

I say to you Democrats of this Convention, if you give us Edward C. Wall as our candidate, we will give to the Democratic party a President. The great Middle West from which you must draw if you will gain success furnishes in Wisconsin the only logical and legitimate battlefield.

I thank you, gentlemen of the Convention, and you, gentlemen of Tammany, for your courteous consideration. [Applause.]

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL, of Nevada (when the State of Nevada was called): Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the Nevada delegation and the Democratic State of Nevada I rise to second the nomination of that native son of the Golden West, William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

MR. JOHN M. MITCHELL, of New Hampshire (when the State of New Hampshire was called): New Hampshire seconds the nomination of Judge Parker. [Applause.]

#### REMARKS OF JAMES SMITH, JR.

MR. JAMES SMITH, JR., of New Jersey (when the State of New Jersey was called): Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats: New Jersey has no favorite son who desires his name

presented to this Convention. I am authorized by the delegation from New Jersey to second the nomination of the candidate presented by our sister State, New York—Judge Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. EDWARD MURPHY, JR., of New York (when the State of New York was called): New York has already been heard.

MR. JULIAN S. CARR, of North Carolina (when the State of North Carolina was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: North Carolina, the home of American liberty, North Carolina, whose Democracy is all wool and a yard wide, where the Democratic faith and principles as handed down by the fathers are kept pure and unadulterated and uncontaminated; the old Tar-heel State, who always takes her Democracy straight—North Carolina, by the unanimous voice of her twenty-four delegates, desires to second the nomination of that pure, able, distinguished Democrat without guile, Judge Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF E. E. COLE.

MR. E. E. COLE, of North Dakota (when the State of North Dakota was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Strange as it may seem, North Dakota has a candidate to present to the delegates of this Convention whose name has not been before the Convention to-night as a nominee. [Cries of "Name him."] I will name him, and when I name him every Democratic heart in this house that has a heart string within its breast will vibrate to the praises of that undaunted Democrat who is the peer of any man and the superior of almost any Democrat in the United States.

North Dakota has eight delegates here; eight tried and true Democrats that labored through all the territorial days buffet-  
ing against the rocks and the breakers. And now after fifteen years of statehood days, they are still out in the cold. We have not one sinecure in our delegation. We have not one man in our delegation who expects or asks for an office. Our fields are so fertile it is no trouble for us to make a living.

[Applause.] Our atmosphere is so pure, it is no trouble for us to be virtuous. I have talked with my friends from every part of this nation who have congregated here about the candidate whom we wish to present to you, and the only objection they have to him is that he comes from too far South. We have only one candidate from that State in the far South, and I wish to nominate him.

What is there about the Atlantic ocean that purifies a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States that is not synonymous with the Gulf of Mexico? I will say to you gentlemen from California, if this logic is to be carried to its legitimate conclusion, from this time on you had better stay at home, because you are disqualified; you are too far West. I will say to Minnesota that you had better stay at home because you are too far North, and you settled by an unsalted sea. I will say to North Dakota that she has no place in a Democratic Convention because she is too near Canada. The same logic will apply all the way through.

Have you gentlemen forgotten the four great history makers in this Union? Have you forgotten where they came from? Washington came from the South, Jefferson came from the South, Jackson came from the South, and Abraham Lincoln came from the South; and they are the four great history makers of this United States. [Applause.]

Gentlemen have said to me, "Why are you so previous as to launch a candidate upon the field of this Democratic Convention? When will North Dakota furnish any Democratic electors to the Electoral College?" I will tell you just when North Dakota will send some Democratic electors to the electoral college. It will be at the same time that that portion of New York lying north of the Harlem bridge sends some there—right then and there.

The frigid North wants to shake hands with the sunny South, and we desire to place in nomination the peer of all Democrats, the pride of all, the man respected by the Republican members of Congress as well as the Democrats, the man who can ask for unanimous consent to suspend the rules and

get it oftener than any other man in Congress; and that gentleman you need not be surprised to hear is John Sharp Williams. [Applause.]

MR. W. S. THOMAS, of Ohio (when the State of Ohio was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Ohio has no candidate to present.

#### SPEECH OF MICHAEL J. RYAN.

MR. JAMES M. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania (when the State of Pennsylvania was called): Mr. Michael J. Ryan will speak for Pennsylvania.

MR. MICHAEL J. RYAN, of Pennsylvania: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in the name of Pennsylvania, but giving voice as my colleagues believe to the desires of the Democracy of the ocean-bounded Union, I rise to second the nomination of the candidate presented to this Convention by the magnificent Commonwealth that deservedly wears the crown of empire.

He comes with the endorsement of that State whose electoral vote is absolutely needful for success.

Other candidates may have special claims. State pride and personal attachment move men to endeavor to win the shining glory of the Presidency for their localities, or personal favorites. Pennsylvania believes that no unkind word should be spoken against any candidate. Pennsylvania will bring no votes to the Electoral College, but one-twelfth of all the men who voted the national ticket in 1900 are within the borders of Pennsylvania. [Applause.]

Now that a harmonious platform has been adopted, as trustees not only for the Democracy, but for an endangered Republic, our duty is to set aside personal ambitions, forget old antagonisms, and on the common ground of a reunited Democracy, with eyes to the future, seek to name that man who shall with most certainty promise to redeem the Republic and make it again the land of liberty and law. [Applause.]

The candidate presented by New York—springing from an ancestry which battled that freedom might here have a home—personifies the holiest and best traditions of our compos-

ite race. A type of what Lincoln phrased as the "plain people," born and reared in that atmosphere of humble life which is alike the glory and the hope of our Republic, acknowledging no master, with no favor of fortune or position, his university a struggling world, his strict integrity, his firmness of purpose, his indomitable will, his dauntless courage, enabled him to leap into the confidence of men and possess himself of their respect and their esteem. [Applause.]

His neighbors, those among whom his life has been spent, love and honor him. Time and again has he challenged the public favor, and whether as the candidate or as marshal of his party's forces, his banner has never gone down in defeat. [Applause.]

As judge of his county court and as chief justice of the highest court of the greatest State in all our glorious cluster, he has ever held in equal poise the scales, and without fear or favor, unawed by power, unswayed by prejudice, blind to the fickle favor of banded wealth, and deaf to the clamor of the mob, his every judgment has been rendered in righteousness. [Applause.]

The universal testimony of all New York is that so faithful has he been in the high office he now holds, that irrespective of party, were he to be a candidate to-morrow, he would be chosen unanimously to succeed himself as chief justice; and who that divests himself of prejudice can doubt that in the present temper of the American people, yearning as they do for the restoration of a reign of law, he is the most formidable candidate we can present and the man above all others whose quiet, simple life of usefulness and honor best guarantees the return of the supremacy of the people and the maintenance of the Republic as the land of equality of opportunity. [Applause.]

Platform! The man—himself the antithesis of the autocrat of the White House—is in himself a platform, and every American, be he tiller of the field, toiler in the mine, worker in the city, soldier or captain of industry alike, will feel that with him as President no sister Republic shall be despoiled, no fraud shall go unwhipped of justice, the honor of the nation shall

not be tarnished, special privileges shall not be granted to the favored few; the law shall be impartially enforced; every pledge he makes will be faithfully lived up to, and every plank in the platform you this day adopted was built in for use and to be kept.

With his legal training, his self poise, his habits of listening before deciding, his conservative courage, his obedience to and respect for law, his spotless honor, he will make again of the Presidency not only the greatest office in the gift of a free people, but the executive, not of the incumbent's, but of a sovereign people's will. [Applause.]

As such, the founders of the Republic intended it. They limited its tenure so that the occupant, if even but an accident, should never forget that though power for a time was his, the people were his master, and that his every act was subject to their scrutiny and judgment. [Applause.]

They divided the Departments of Government, and they wisely intended that though they were co-ordinate, they should be independent. But the present incumbent has arrogated to himself every function of Government he could seize, and seeks to break down every barrier to his imperious will. [Applause.]

The establishment of our Government was an experiment in statecraft. Its founders based its institutions upon the then new doctrine that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed, and that all men are entitled to the same full measure of civil and religious liberty.

To secure its enduring triumph, they clothed with like responsibility those who have and those who need, those who think and those who feel; and the humblest and the mightiest at the ballot box, as the gates of God, stood equal. [Applause.]

To the people all power was given. The doors of the nation were thrown open and the oppressed of the earth here found shelter. The doctrine of man's equality before the law and the right of the people to rule, spread from out this continent and girdled the earth. The world throbbed with new hope. The minds of men awakened to new power.

Nature began to unfold her secrets and science to lay bare

her mysteries. The finger of liberty with its touch seemed to have ennobled men, and the wisdom of the fathers was vindicated, for everywhere spread the beneficent influence of our institutions; and with leaps and bounds to a prosperity unparalleled in the annals of men, our land pressed onward; liberty and law together ruled this Republic, and sheltered the freest and the mightiest people that the sun of Heaven ever shone upon.

Our greatness, our material prosperity, our influence abroad, our freedom at home were due to the faithful adhesion of our people to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, their love of liberty for all men, and their cheerful obedience to the Constitution. [Applause.]

But with the continued power of the Republican party, and as the price of its rule, the reins of the Government have passed into the hands of influences which regard individual liberty as but a phrase, and equality of opportunity as a thing to be scoffed at.

To restore the rule of the people, to insure their welfare, their happiness, their prosperity, "giving equal rights to all and special privileges to none," as Jefferson summarized the battle for humanity, to make and keep our land a republic of law, and that law a people's will, to win allegiance to its institutions from other peoples and extend its power, not at the cannon's mouth, but by the agreement of its principle and policies with the noblest ambitions of mankind, is the mission of the Democratic party. [Applause.] And to insure its success in the present hour of the nation's peril, Pennsylvania appeals to you to name to-day Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF JOHN J. FITZGERALD.

MR. JOHN J. FITZGERALD, of Rhode Island (when the State of Rhode Island was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: As a delegate from the State of Rhode Island selected by the majority of the delegates elected in that State to this Convention, I desire to second the nomination of Honor-



able William Randolph Hearst, of New York. [Applause.]

I wish to say to the honorable gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Clark) that although Missouri may be large, although Texas may be large, there are more Democrats in Rhode Island to the square foot than there are in Texas or Missouri.

I suppose you gentlemen feel that in this contest the State of Rhode Island does not matter much; but I wish to tell you that way off in that desert of Republicanism we have a Democratic State. Under present circumstances, Rhode Island, as small as she is, is very apt to give more electoral votes to the Democratic ticket than is the great Empire State of New York.

I desire to tell you, gentlemen of the Convention, the reason why Rhode Island is Democratic to-day—Rhode Island, which has elected two Democratic governors in succession. The reason is because the Rhode Island Democracy is true to the principles of Democracy, and because the candidates of the Rhode Island Democracy have kept their faith with the people.

In Rhode Island, as in the rest of the North, there are large manufacturing or industrial centers, and the people in those industrial centers are not bound to the Democratic party by any tie other than that of the pure principle; and when the Democratic party is true to its principles and when the Democratic party nominates candidates whom the people believe will follow those principles, you will succeed in electing Democrats in the East. [Applause.]

Because we Democrats in Rhode Island believe that of all the candidates who have been placed in nomination there is one who truly represents the principles of the Democracy, one who has fought the battle of the people versus the trusts, the battle of democracy against plutocracy, I desire, on behalf of Rhode Island to second the nomination of the honorable gentleman from New York, Mr. William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN.

MR. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN, of South Carolina (when the State of South Carolina was called): Mr. Chairman, having been last night fourteen hours in the Committee on Resolutions,

and having up to this time seen six or seven hours given to speechmaking, to me much, or most of it, wasted, I feel that I owe you an apology for even coming here to occupy four minutes, which you have decided shall be the limit of any speech by one who attempts to second a nomination. I would not come if I did not feel that the crisis in the affairs of this country and of this party demands that some plain truths should be spoken.

I have heard Democrats to-night in this hall speak words of abuse and opprobrium of other men whom they want to get to vote for the ticket. I thought that after we had fought it out in the Committee on Resolutions and sent in here a unanimous report on the platform, it was time for those of us who have been sticking each other with bayonets and daggers to turn our united forces upon the Republican party instead of our Democratic comrades. [Applause.]

I have not changed one iota in my opinion as to the Chicago or the Kansas City platform [applause], but I recognize that we never could get enough votes on those platforms to elect a candidate. [Applause.] Now, then, what is the sensible thing to do?

To stand on the platform that all of us have agreed upon and quit this abuse of one another. [Applause.] If we expect to have success, let us bury the hatchet among Democrats; forget that some of you went off, as we thought, and betrayed the party; forget those things which have brought about a condition of affairs in the party that only encouraged our enemies and left no hope for us. We need every man who ever was a Democrat. [Applause.] And we need some Republicans, too, and if we can take into the party a Republican fresh from his sin, in the name of God why can we not let an erring brother return in peace? [Applause.]

Therefore, my countrymen, in this crisis, when we are threatened not only with Imperialism, but an emperor, not in name, but in fact, I would have been glad if the platform had been so short that a schoolboy could memorize it in fifteen minutes, and we would have gone to the country upon the single cry: "Down with Rooseveltism and up with the Constitution."

There is a difference of opinion as to candidates. Some people have charged that the man whom we from our State are going to support is unworthy, that he is a coward, that he is not fit to lead, that he will not open his mouth. But we know the character of the man. Silence is golden sometimes.

Having said these words of pleading with you, that we let bygones be bygones, and come together as a band of brothers to make our nominee the next President in name and in fact rather than a candidate for the Presidency, I announce to you that under the lights we now have, the South Carolina delegation will cast eighteen votes for Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. R. F. PETTIGREW, of South Dakota (when the State of South Dakota was called): South Dakota seconds the nomination of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

#### STATEMENT OF JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS.

MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

While I was temporarily out of the hall I am informed the delegation from North Dakota did me the exceeding high honor, which I very much appreciate, of placing my name in nomination.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I do not consider myself fit for the high office, and regardless of whether I am or not, I request the North Dakota delegation to vote for somebody who is in the race, and if they really do want to delight my soul, they will cast their votes for that magnificent gentleman whom we all love, Judge Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. N. H. WHITE, of Tennessee (when the State of Tennessee was called): Tennessee seconds the nomination of Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. CHARLES A. CULBERSON, of Texas (when the State of Texas was called): Mr. Chairman, the State of Kentucky was kind enough to yield to the State of Texas, and that State, in the person of Thomas H. Ball, has already seconded the nomination of Judge Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

MR. JOSEPH MONSON, of Utah (when the State of Utah was called): Alaska will speak in the turn of Utah, and Utah will be heard in Alaska's time.

MR. V. A. BULLARD, of Vermont (when the State of Vermont was called): Vermont desires to second the nomination of Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

MR. THOMAS S. MARTIN, of Virginia (when the State of Virginia was called): Virginia seconds the nomination of Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. L. C. GILMAN, of Washington (when the State of Washington was called): Washington asks to be passed.

MR. C. WARREN HAYS, of West Virginia (when the State of West Virginia was called): On behalf of the delegation from West Virginia, I desire to second the nomination of the Honorable William Randolph Hearst, of New York.

#### REMARKS OF W. A. MAC CORKLE.

MR. W. A. MACCORKLE, of West Virginia: Mr. Chairman, I do not want West Virginia to be misunderstood. There are only two delegates here who will vote for Mr. Hearst.

While I am on my feet, sir, I wish to say that I am tired of hearing New York criticized so bitterly as she has been in this Convention to-night. I want to say to the men of the South that when they marched to the polls between rows of bayonets and hordes of negroes, it was to the imperial State of New York that they turned their faces, and when they heard her step, headed by Horatio Seymour and Samuel Tilden, they were reassured. [Applause.]

Fellow countrymen, I am here to say that it is toward the imperial State of New York that the Democracy turns her eyes. I live in the State of West Virginia, the only State which to-day is in the control of the Republicans and the negroes, and here to-night I appeal to the Democracy of this splendid Convention, I appeal to the patriotism of this splendid assembly of Democrats, to ratify this platform in the November election, and that this Convention to-night will stand fearlessly and honestly by New York.

Whenever the Democracy has needed a shining sword, whenever liberty has needed a knight, whenever pure government and the rule of the people have needed a friend, there we have found old New York. God bless her to-night. [Applause.]

MR. DAVID S. ROSE, of Wisconsin (when the State of Wisconsin was called): Under the arrangement heretofore announced, Wisconsin yields to Nebraska.

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska, obtained the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman from Nebraska rises to second a nomination. The Chair has been asked to submit to the Convention a request that the time limit be suspended in his case. In the absence of objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears none.

#### SPEECH OF WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN.

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Two nights without sleep and a cold make it difficult for me to make myself heard. I trust that my voice will improve in a moment, but as I desire to speak to the delegates rather than to the galleries, I hope they at least will be able to hear.

Eight years ago a Democratic National Convention placed in my hands the standard of the party and commissioned me as its candidate. Four years later that commission was renewed. I come to-night to this Democratic National Convention to return the commission. You may dispute whether I have fought a good fight, you may dispute whether I have finished my course, but you cannot deny that I have kept the faith. [Applause.]

As your candidate I did all that I could to bring success to the party; as a private citizen I feel more interested in Democratic success to-day than I ever did when I was a candidate. [Applause.]

The reasons that made the election of a Democrat desirable were stronger in 1900 than in 1896, and the reasons that make

the election of a Democrat desirable are stronger now than they were in 1900. [Applause.]

The gentleman who presented New York's candidate dwelt upon the dangers of militarism, and he did not overstate those dangers. Let me quote the most remarkable passage ever found in a speech nominating a candidate for the Presidency.

Governor Black, of New York, in presenting the name of Theodore Roosevelt to the Republican Convention, used these words:

"The fate of nations is still decided by their wars. You may talk of orderly tribunals and learned referees; you may sing in your schools the gentle praises of the quiet life; you may strike from your books the last note of every martial anthem, and yet out in the smoke and thunder will always be the tramp of horses and the silent, rigid, upturned face. Men may prophesy and women pray, but peace will come here to abide forever on this earth only when the dreams of childhood are the accepted charts to guide the destinies of men.

"Events are numberless and mighty, and no man can tell which wire runs around the world. The nation basking to-day in the quiet of contentment and repose may still be on the deadly circuit and to-morrow writhing in the toils of war. This is the time when great figures must be kept in front. If the pressure is great the material to resist it must be granite and iron."

This is a eulogy of war. This is a declaration that the hoped for, prayed for, era of perpetual peace will never come. This is an exalting of the doctrine of brute force; it darkens the hopes of the race. [Applause.] This Republican President, a candidate for reëlection, is presented as the embodiment of the warlike spirit, as "the granite and iron" that represents the modern militarism.

Do you, men of the East, desire to defeat the military idea? Friends of the South, are you anxious to defeat the military idea? Let me assure you that not one of you North, East, or South, fears more than I do the triumph of that idea. If this is the doctrine that our nation is to stand for, it is retrogression, not progress. It is a lowering of the ideals of the nation. It is a turning backward to the age of violence. More than that,

it is nothing less than a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world. [Applause.]

Some twenty-six hundred years ago a prophet foretold the coming of One who was to be called the Prince of Peace. Nearly two thousand years ago He came upon the earth, and the song that was sung at His birth was "Peace on earth, good will toward men." [Applause.] For almost twenty centuries this doctrine of peace has been growing; it has been taking hold upon the hearts of men. For this doctrine of peace, millions have gladly given their lives; for this doctrine of peace, thousands have crossed oceans and labored in distant lands, ave. even among savage tribes. This doctrine of peace, the foundation of Christian civilization, has been the growing hope and inspiration of the world. And now, an ex-Governor of the largest State in the Union presents for the office of President of the greatest republic of all history, a man who is described as "granite and iron," as one who represents, not the doctrine of peace and arbitration, but the doctrine that the destinies of nations must still be settled by their wars. [Applause.] Will you Democrats of New York present a graver indictment against President Roosevelt than that? Can you of the South present a more serious accusation? I do not ask concerning the character of the President. He may have every virtue; his life may be exemplary in every way; but if he shares the views of the man who placed him in nomination, if he believes with his sponsor that wars must settle the destinies of nations; that peace is but an idle, childish dream, that women may pray for it; that men may prophesy about it; but that all this talk of "orderly tribunals and learned referees" is but an empty sound—if he believes these things he is a dangerous man for our country and for the world. [Applause.] I believe he ought to be defeated; I believe he can be defeated; and if the Democratic party does what it ought to do, I believe he will be defeated. [Applause.]

How can he be defeated? As your candidate I tried to defeat the Republican party. I failed, you say? Yes, I failed. I received a million more votes than any Democrat had ever received before, and yet I failed. Why did I fail? Because some who had affiliated with the Democratic party thought my elec-

tion would be injurious to the country, and they left the party and helped to elect my opponent. That is why I failed. I have no words of criticism for them. [Applause.] I have always believed, I believe to-night, I shall ever believe, I hope, that a man's duty to his country is higher than his duty to his party. [Applause.] I hope that men of all parties will have the moral courage to leave their parties when they believe that to stay with their parties would injure their country. The success of our Government depends upon the independence and the moral courage of its citizens. [Applause.]

But, my friends, if I, with six million and a half votes, failed to defeat the Republican party, can those who defeated me succeed in defeating the Republican party? If under the leadership of those who were loyal in 1896 we failed, shall we succeed under the leadership of those who were not loyal in 1896? [Applause.]

If we are going to have some other god besides this modern Mars, presented to us by Governor Black, what kind of a god is it to be? Must we choose between a god of war and a god of gold? [Applause.] If there is anything that compares in hatefulness with militarism, it is plutocracy, and I insist that the Democratic party ought not to be compelled to choose between militarism on the one side and plutocracy on the other. [Applause.]

We have agreed upon a platform, after a session of sixteen hours. We entered the committee room at eight last evening and left it at twelve to-day. But I never employed sixteen hours to better advantage in my life. [Applause.] I helped to bring the party together. The report was unanimous and we can go before the country with a united party. [Applause.]

How did we reach an agreement? The platform is not all that we of the West desired; it is not all that our Eastern Democrats desired. We had to consent to the omission of some things that we wanted in the platform. They had to consent to the omission of some things they wanted in the platform. But by mutual concession we agreed upon a platform, and we will stand on that platform in this campaign. [Applause.]



But, my friends, we need more than a platform. [Applause.] We must nominate a ticket, and that is the work now before this Convention. Had a majority of you come to this Convention instructed for any man I not only would not ask you to disregard your instructions; I would not, if I could prevent it, permit you to disregard your instructions. [Applause.]

I believe in the right of the people to rule. I believe in the right of the people to instruct their delegates, and when a delegate is instructed, the instruction is binding upon him. But no candidate comes with a majority instructed for him. That means that you, the delegates, are left to select a candidate upon your own responsibility—and a grave responsibility it is. Grave, indeed, is the responsibility resting upon the delegates assembled in this Convention.

I have not come to ask anything of this Convention. Nebraska asks nothing but to be permitted to fight the battles of Democracy; that is all. [Applause.] Some of you call me a dictator. It is false. You know it is false. [Applause.] How have I tried to dictate? I have said that I thought certain things ought to be done. Have you not exercised the same privilege? Why have I not a right to suggest? [Applause.] Because I was your candidate, have I forfeited forever the right to make suggestions? Sirs, if that condition was attached to a nomination for the Presidency no man worthy to be President would ever accept a nomination [applause], for the right of a man to have an opinion and to express it is more important and more sacred than the holding of any office however high.

I expressed my opinion in regard to the platform; I made my suggestions. Not all of them were adopted. I should like to have seen the Kansas City platform reaffirmed. [Applause.] I am not ashamed of that platform. I believe in it now, as I believed in it when I was running upon it as your candidate, but the delegates do not agree with me, and their will is supreme in the making of the platform. When they veto my suggestions, I must submit; there is no other court to which I can appeal.

Neither have I attempted to dictate in regard to candidates. I have not asked the Democrats of this Nation to nominate any particular man. I have said and repeat that there are men in

every State qualified for the Presidency; I have said and repeat that out of the six and a half millions who voted for me in both campaigns, we ought to be able to find at least one man fit to be President. [Applause.] I have made these suggestions, but they are only suggestions. I am here to-night as a delegate from Nebraska. I have not confidence enough in my own judgment to tell you that I can pick out a man and say, "This man must be nominated or we shall lose." I have, I think, a reasonable faith in my own opinions; at least I would rather stand by my opinion if I believe it right than to accept the opinion of anyone else if I believe that opinion to be wrong. [Applause.] But Nebraska is not here asking for the nomination of any particular man. We have a platform on which we all can stand. [Applause.] Now give us a ticket behind which all of us can stand. [Applause.] Go into any State you please for a candidate. I have not as much faith as some have in the value of locality. I have never believed much in nominating candidates from doubtful States on the theory that their personal popularity would elect them.

I have so much confidence in Democratic principles that I think a Democrat ought to vote for a good man from any other State rather than vote for a bad man from his own State. [Applause.] The State pride argument is often given too much weight. I have found that when people come with a candidate and tell us, first, that we must carry a certain State, and, second, that their man is the only one who can carry that State, they do not put up a bond to deliver the votes. [Applause.] And then, anyhow, a State which is so uncertain that only one Democrat in the Nation can carry it, cannot be relied upon in a great crisis. [Applause.]

Select a candidate. If it is the wish of this Convention that the standard shall be placed in the hand of the gentleman presented by California, a man who, though he has money, pleads the cause of the poor [applause]; the man who is the best beloved, I think I can safely say, among laboring men, of all the candidates proposed; the man who more than any other represents opposition to the trusts—if you want to place the standard

in his hand and make Mr. Hearst the candidate of this Convention, Nebraska will be with you in the fight. [Applause.]

If you think that the gentleman from Wisconsin who, though faithful in both campaigns, was not with us on the money question—if you think that Mr. Wall, who agrees with the East on the gold question and with the West on other questions, would draw the party together, place the standard in his hand, and Nebraska will be with you and contribute her part. [Applause.]

If you prefer an Eastern man and can find some one who will give both elements of the party something to believe in, something to trust in, something to hope for, we are willing to join you in selecting him as the standard bearer.

Not all of the available men have been mentioned. There is in the State of Pennsylvania a man whom I desire to suggest, and I do it without consulting his delegation and without the consent of the man himself. He is an Eastern man, who voted with us in both campaigns, although against us on the money question; but, I believe, he is in sympathy with the people; a man twice governor of a great State; a man who only two years ago when again a candidate carried the State of Pennsylvania, outside of the two great cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburg. [Applause.]

If you Eastern Democrats, who insist that your objection to me is that I believe in free silver, are willing to take ex-Governor Pattison, a gold man, I am willing to let you have your way on that question, for I will trust his honesty on all questions. [Applause.] But I only mention these candidates by way of illustration.

I desire to second the nomination of a man whose name has already been presented, and I second his nomination, not because I can assert to you that he is more available than any other person who might be named, but because I love the man and because on the platform we have adopted there is no good reason why any Democrat in the East should vote against him. I desire to second the nomination of Senator Cockrell, of Missouri. [Applause.]

He is the Nestor of the Senate; he is experienced in public

affairs. He is known; he has a record, and can be measured by it. I would be willing to write my endorsement on his back and guarantee everything he did. [Applause.]

It is said that he comes from the South. What if he does? I do not share the feeling that some have that the Democratic party cannot take a candidate from the South. It is said he was in the Confederate army. What if he was? I do not share the belief of those who say that we cannot afford to nominate an ex-Confederate. [Applause.] That war, that cruel war, occurred forty years ago. Its issues are settled; its wounds are healed, and the participants are friends. We have another war on now, and those who know what the war between democracy and plutocracy means, will not ask where the candidate stood forty years ago; they will ask where he stands to-day—on which side he is fighting in the present conflict.

The great issue in this country to-day is "Democracy versus Plutocracy." I have been accused of having but one idea—silver. Awhile back it was said that I had only one, but then it was tariff reform. But there is an issue greater than the silver issue, the tariff issue, or the trust issue. It is the issue between democracy and plutocracy—whether this is to be a government of the people administered by officers chosen by the people, and administered in behalf of the people, or a government by the moneyed element of the country in the interest of predatory wealth. This issue is growing.

I ask you to help us meet this issue. You tell me that the Republican candidate stands for militarism. Yes, but he also stands for plutocracy. You tell me that he delights in war. Yes, but there is another objection to him, and that is that he does not enforce the law against a big criminal as he does against a little criminal. The laws are being violated to-day, and those laws must be enforced. The government must be administered according to the maxim: "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." [Applause.]

We have had the debauchment of elections. It was stated the other day that into the little State of Delaware, two hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars were sent at one time just before the election of 1896. Some say that our party must have a

great campaign fund and bid against the Republicans. Let me warn you that if the Democratic party is to save this nation, it must save it, not by purchase, but by principle. [Applause.] That is the only way to save it. Every time we resort to purchase, we encourage the spirit of barter. Under such a system the price will constantly increase, and the elections will go to the highest bidder. If the Democratic party is to save this country, it must appeal to the conscience of the country. It must point out the dangers to the Republic, and if the party will nominate a man, I care not from what part of the country he comes, who is not the candidate of a faction, who is not the candidate of an element, but the candidate of the party, the party will stand by him and will drive the Republican party from power. [Applause.]

You could, I believe, take a man from any Southern State—a man who would appeal to all Democrats who love Democratic principles, and to those Republicans who begin to fear for their nation's welfare—and he would poll a million more votes than the candidate of any faction whose selection would be regarded as a triumph of a part of the party over the rest of the party. [Applause.]

I simply submit these suggestions for your consideration. I am here to discharge a duty that I owe to the party. I knew before coming to this Convention that a majority of the delegates would not agree with me in regard to the financial plank. I knew that there would be among the delegates many who voted against me when I sorely needed their help. I am not objecting to the majority against me, nor to the presence of those who left us in 1896 and have since returned, but I am here, not because I enjoy being in the minority, but because I owe a duty to the more than six million brave and loyal men who sacrificed for the ticket in recent campaigns. [Applause.] I came to get them as good a platform as I could; I have helped to get them a good platform. [Applause.] I came to help to get as good a candidate as possible, and I hope that he will be one who can draw the factions together; one who will give to us who believe in positive, aggressive, Democratic reform, something to hope for, something to fight for—one who will

also give to those who have differed from us on the money question something to hope for, something to fight for. And I close with an appeal from my heart to the hearts of those who hear me: Give us a pilot who will guide the Democratic ship away from the Scylla of militarism without wrecking her upon the Charybdis of commercialism. [Applause.]

MR. O. N. STICKNEY, of Wyoming (when the State of Wyoming was called): Mr. Chairmen, in behalf of the delegates from the State of Wyoming and in accordance with the desire of the State Convention of Wyoming, I second the nomination of William Randolph Hearst. [Applause.]

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (when Alaska was called): Alaska yielded her place to Utah, and the Chair now recognizes Mr. Cannon, of Utah.

#### REMARKS OF FRANK J. CANNON.

MR. FRANK J. CANNON, of Utah (when the State of Utah was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Eight years ago in the city of St. Louis, I left a Republican National Convention to join my lot with the Democratic party of the United States and to follow the peerless leader, William J. Bryan. [Applause.] I am one of the six millions of men of whom he so often speaks with grateful tongue and grateful heart, who made sacrifices to follow him in the political battle. [Applause.]

I wish now to second the nomination of another man of those six millions who made greater sacrifices than I did in 1896 and greater sacrifices than I in 1900, and whom Mr. Bryan seems to have forgotten to-night—the Honorable Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

It was no sacrifice of immediate fellowship for a man from a silver producing State in the inter-mountain West to follow Bryan. He was our choice, our standard bearer. But it took a mighty courage, a superb party devotion in 1896 and 1900 for a man in New York political life to follow Mr. Bryan of Nebraska. [Applause.]

My dear friends, it is not the money issue this year. I followed Mr. Bryan under that superb rainbow in 1896, hop-

ing to find a pot of silver at the end, and found it, according to the old adage, gold; and then, in 1900, I went in the other direction, and I still found it gold.

There is no money issue nor is there so much an issue of plutocracy in the United States to-day as there is an issue for the preservation of the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. That is the issue, and on it I second the nomination of Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.]

MR. CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona (when the Territory of Arizona was called): On behalf of the Territory of Arizona, recognizing in him a true and loyal friend, I second the nomination of William Randolph Hearst.

MR. JAMES L. NORRIS, of the District of Columbia (when the District of Columbia was called): The District of Columbia, in which is located the seat of government of this great nation, seconds the nomination of that distinguished jurist and sterling Democrat, Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. W. S. NOBLITT, of Hawaii (when the Territory of Hawaii was called): Gentlemen of the Convention, Hawaii has come five thousand miles to vote for and second the nomination of that sterling Democrat of New York, William Randolph Hearst.

Gentlemen of the Convention, if you want to please the Democratic people of the United States, nominate William R. Hearst. If you want to please the Republicans, and especially one hundred per cent. of the Republican press, nominate Parker. [Applause.]

MR. S. M. RUTHERFORD, of Indian Territory (when the Indian Territory was called): The Indian Territory desires to second the nomination of Honorable Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

#### VOTE FOR CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: Gentlemen of the Convention, the call of the States having been completed for nominations, it is now in order to call the roll of States for the nomination of a President. The Clerk will call the roll of States. As each State is called its vote will be announced.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll and the following votes were cast:

- Alabama—22 for Parker.
- Arkansas—18 for Parker .
- California—20 for Hearst.
- Colorado—4 for Parker; 5 for Hearst; 1 for McClellan.
- Connecticut—14 for Parker.
- Delaware—6 for Gray.
- Florida—6 for Parker; 4 for Hearst.
- Georgia—26 for Parker.
- Idaho—6 for Hearst.
- Illinois—54 for Hearst.
- Indiana—30 for Parker.
- Iowa—26 for Hearst.
- Kansas—7 for Parker; 10 for Hearst; 1 for Cockrell; 2 for Miles.
- Kentucky—26 for Parker.
- Louisiana—18 for Parker.
- Maine—7 for Parker; 1 for Hearst; 4 for Olney.
- Maryland—16 for Parker.
- Massachusetts—32 for Olney.
- Michigan—28 for Parker.
- Minnesota—9 for Parker; 9 for Hearst; 1 for Gray; 1 for Cockrell; 2 for Towne.
- Mississippi—20 for Parker.
- Missouri—36 for Cockrell.
- Montana—6 for Parker.
- Nebraska—4 for Hearst; 4 for Cockrell; 4 for Pattison; 1 for Miles; 1 for Wall; 1 for Gray; 1 for Olney.
- Nevada—6 for Hearst.
- New Hampshire—8 for Parker.
- New Jersey—24 for Parker.
- New York—78 for Parker.
- North Carolina—24 for Parker.
- North Dakota—8 for John Sharp Williams.
- Ohio—46 for Parker.

MR. THOMAS MCNAMARA, of Ohio (when the vote of Ohio was announced): I demand that the Ohio delegation be polled.



THE PRESIDING OFFICER: Does the gentleman question the correctness of the figures?

MR. McNAMARA: I do.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: Then the gentleman from Ohio is entitled to a poll of the delegation.

The delegation was polled and the result was announced Parker 28, Hearst 6, McClellan 9, Cockrell 2, Olney 1.

MR. E. H. MOORE, of Ohio: I rise to a point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman will state his point of order.

MR. MOORE: I desire the ruling of the Chair upon the question whether or not the vote of Ohio can be cast as a unit. The district delegates in Ohio are chosen, not as they are in New York or Indiana, by delegates elected to the State Convention, but by Congressional Conventions held prior to the time of the holding of the State Convention. My point is that the State Convention therefore had no right to instruct these delegates.

Second, the rule, as the Chair will observe, is a modified one. It does not impose upon the delegates the necessity of voting as a unit.

I desire the ruling of the Chair. The district delegates receive their credentials at the District Conventions, held at separate times, by delegates separately chosen, and in no wise hold their credentials from the State Convention. Therefore, our contention is that the State Convention had no power to impose the unit rule upon them.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair overrules the point of order. By express rule of the Democratic Convention, the delegates come from a State and not from districts. Under the call for delegates to this Convention, each State is allowed as many delegates as it has Senators and Representatives, multiplied by two; and those delegates are the delegates of the State and not the delegates of the districts, no matter how chosen. And even if the call itself did not determine the point of order, the express rule of Democratic National Conventions does determine.

The point of order is overruled, and the poll of the Ohio delegation showing that Parker has received twenty-eight of the forty-six votes to which that State is entitled in this Con-

vention, the vote of Ohio will stand as announced by the Chairman of that delegation. [Applause.]

The roll call was resumed, and the following votes were cast:

Oregon—4 for Parker; 2 for Hearst; 1 for McClellan; 1 for Bird S. Coler.

Pennsylvania—68 for Parker.

Rhode Island—2 for Parker; 6 for Hearst.

South Carolina—18 for Parker.

South Dakota—8 for Hearst.

Tennessee—24 for Parker.

Texas—36 for Parker.

Utah—6 for Parker.

Vermont—8 for Parker.

Virginia—24 for Parker.

Washington—10 for Hearst.

West Virginia—10 for Parker; 2 for Hearst; 2 for Gorman.

Wisconsin—26 for Wall.

Wyoming—6 for Hearst.

Alaska—6 for Parker.

Arizona—6 for Hearst.

District of Columbia—6 for Parker.

Indian Territory—5 for Parker; 1 for Hearst.

Hawaii—6 for Hearst.

New Mexico—6 for Hearst.

Oklahoma—2 for Parker; 2 for Hearst; 1 for Olney; 1 for McClellan.

Porto Rico—2 for Parker; 4 for Gray.

The roll call was concluded.

MR. FRED T. DUBOIS, of Idaho: Idaho changes her six votes from Hearst to Parker.

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL, of Nevada: Nevada changes two votes from Hearst to Parker.

West Virginia changed her vote from ten for Parker, two for Hearst, and two for Gorman, to thirteen for Parker and one for Hearst.

MR. GILMAN, of Washington: Washington desires to change her ten votes from Hearst to Parker.

The result of the vote is as follows:

	Total vote.	Parker.	Hearst.	Gray.	Miles.	Cockrell.	Olney.	Wall.	Lowne.	Pattison.	Williams.	Coler.
Alabama.....	22	22	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arkansas.....	18	18	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
California.....	20	..	20	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Colorado.....	10	4	5	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..
Connecticut.....	14	14	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Delaware.....	6	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Florida.....	10	6	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Georgia.....	26	26	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Idaho.....	6	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Illinois.....	54	..	54	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Indiana.....	30	30	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iowa.....	26	..	26	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kansas.....	20	7	10	..	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kentucky.....	26	26	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Louisiana.....	18	18	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Maine.....	12	7	1	..	..	..	4	..	..	..	..	..
Maryland.....	16	16	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Massachusetts.....	32	..	..	..	..	32	..	..	..	..	..	..
Michigan.....	28	28	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Minnesota.....	22	9	9	1	..	1	..	..	2	..	..	..
Mississippi.....	20	20	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Missouri.....	36	..	..	..	..	36	..	..	..	..	..	..
Montana.....	6	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Nebraska.....	16	..	4	1	1	4	1	1	..	4	..	..
Nevada.....	6	2	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
New Hampshire.....	8	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
New Jersey.....	24	24	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
New York.....	78	78	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
North Carolina.....	24	24	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
North Dakota.....	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8	..
Ohio.....	46	46	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Oregon.....	8	4	2	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	1
Pennsylvania.....	68	68	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rhode Island.....	8	2	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
South Carolina.....	18	18	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
South Dakota.....	8	..	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Tennessee.....	24	24	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Texas.....	36	36	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Utah.....	6	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Vermont.....	8	8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Virginia.....	24	24	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Washington.....	10	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
West Virginia.....	14	13	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Wisconsin.....	26	..	..	..	..	..	26	..	..	..	..	..
Wyoming.....	6	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Alaska.....	6	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arizona.....	6	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
District of Columbia.....	6	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Indian Territory.....	6	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Hawaii.....	6	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
New Mexico.....	6	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Oklahoma.....	6	2	2	..	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	..
Porto Rico.....	6	2	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals.....		679	181	12	3	42	38	27	3	2	4	8

Total vote cast, 1,000. Necessary to choice, 667.

MR. JAMES H. ECKLES, of Illinois: Will the Chair recognize me to make the nomination unanimous?

MR. A. M. DOCKERY, of Missouri: By direction of Missouri's great Senator and her delegation on this floor, I desire to move to make the nomination of Judge Alton B. Parker unanimous.

MR. PATRICK A. COLLINS, of Massachusetts: I desire to ask the privilege of seconding that motion.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable Patrick A. Collins.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to second the motion of my distinguished friend from Missouri, that the nomination of Alton B. Parker be made unanimous.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair declares the Honorable Alton B. Parker the unanimous choice of this Convention for candidate for President of the United States.

MR. W. F. SHEEHAN, of New York (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes a. m., Saturday, July 9, 1904): I move that the Convention do now adjourn until this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m., Saturday, July 9th), the Convention adjourned until 2 o'clock p. m.

## FOURTH DAY.

---

THE COLISEUM, ST. LOUIS, MO.,

Saturday, July 9, 1904.

The Convention met at 2 o'clock p. m.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN (Mr. Champ Clark, of Missouri) : The Convention will be opened with prayer by the Reverend Doctor Johnston, of the Delmar Avenue Baptist Church, of this city.

REV. JOHN T. M. JOHNSTON, D.D., of St. Louis, offered the following prayer :

### PRAYER OF REV. JOHN T. M. JOHNSTON, D.D.

Lord God of our fathers, may we draw near to Thee at this hour. May we rejoice in the mercies which Thou art granting unto us, both in the days gone by, and in the days through which we are passing. We thank Thee that Thou didst move our fathers to the founding of this Government. Thy hand has been seen and felt in all our national history.

Thou, O Jehovah, hast led this nation in the choosing of her Presidents. We thank Thee for these men of God who have set an example to the ages in virtue and wise administration. We rejoice in the wide flowing beneficence which has followed their leadership. Thy mercies have gone on from generation to generation dispelling darkness and overcoming obstacles.

Though we have stumbled and fallen into many transgressions and have received at Thy hand punishment for our sins, yet in the midst of wrath Thou didst remember mercy, and Thou hast brought us out of confusion and peril and hast held

together this mighty nation which only the omnipotent God could have welded.

Lord God of our salvation; Lord God of our nation; Lord God of our fathers we commend ourselves to Thy thought now, asking that wisdom may be sent down from above.

Thou hast led this Convention to the choice of a leader whose patriotism and piety are unquestioned. Grant wisdom now in the selection of a man worthy of the high honor of the Vice-Presidency.

Spirit of the mighty God still lead this people. Spread abroad the light of intelligence, that this land may be filled with knowledge and virtue and piety. We ask it, not because we are worthy, but in the name of the Lord, Jesus.

MR. A. M. DOCKERY, of Missouri: Mr. Chairman, I desire but a moment of the time of the Convention to read a telegram just received from Senator Cockrell:

TELEGRAM FROM FRANCIS MARION COCKRELL.

WARRENSBURG, Mo., July 9.

*Hon. A. M. Dockery, Chairman Missouri Delegation, St. Louis:*

I am sincerely grateful to the Democracy of Missouri for their unsolicited endorsement of me for the nomination to the highest office in the gift of the American people, and to the delegates appointed by the Joplin Convention to present my name to the National Democratic Convention. They have done their whole duty faithfully and sincerely; have discharged every trust imposed by the Joplin Convention, and have done all possible to be done. I heartily approve their actions. The Convention has acted wisely in nominating Judge Parker, a loyal Democrat who voted for Colonel Bryan in 1896 and 1900, and is an able jurist and a clean man in all relations of life.

F. M. COCKRELL.

[Applause.]

MR. JOHN P. HOPKINS, of Illinois: Mr. Chairman, Illinois craves the indulgence of the Convention for a very few moments and requests that the Honorable A. M. Lawrence be per-

mitted to read from the platform a telegram which Illinois believes this Convention will be pleased to hear.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

MR. A. M. LAWRENCE: Gentlemen of the Convention, I come to you as a messenger from one of those candidates whose name was balloted for last night. I will read the telegram:

#### TELEGRAM FROM WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

CHICAGO, July 9.

*A. M. Lawrence, St. Louis:*

I wish to thank my friends for their unfaltering support. I think I can best express my appreciation of their loyalty by continued devotion to the principles of true Democracy, for which we have fought, and by loyal support of the man chosen by the Convention to lead the Democratic party.

W. R. HEARST.

[Applause.]

#### DEATH OF HON. JACOB P. BIRDER.

MR. SIVER SERUMGARD, of North Dakota, offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously agreed to:

“WHEREAS, Honorable Jacob P. Birder, of Park River, North Dakota, on the evening of July 3, 1904, at Litchfield, Illinois, lost his life while responding to the call of his party as a delegate to this Convention, now, therefore, be it

“*Resolved*, That by his death the Democratic party has lost a loyal member, his State and nation a patriotic citizen, and his family a kind and loving husband and father. And be it further

“*Resolved*, That we tender his bereaved wife and fatherless children our sympathy and condolence in this their hour of grief; that this resolution be spread upon our minutes; that a copy be given the press, and that it be forwarded to his family by the secretary of this Convention.”

## RECESS.

MR. E. L. RUSSELL, of Alabama: In view of the sad news conveyed in the resolution just adopted, and to give the delegates an opportunity to confer with each other, I move that we now take a recess until twenty minutes after five.

MR. JAMES M. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania: May I ask the gentleman to withdraw his motion for the time being?

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Alabama that a recess be taken until five twenty this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Convention took a recess until 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

## AFTER RECESS.

At the expiration of the recess the Convention resumed its session.

## LIMITATION ON SPEECHES.

MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: Mr. Chairman, I understand the next order of business is the nomination of a candidate for Vice-President. I move, sir, that nominating speeches be limited to fifteen minutes, and that speeches seconding nominations be limited to five minutes, and that not over four speeches seconding a nomination be permitted to any one nomination.

MR. THOMAS H. BALL, of Texas: I send to the desk a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Texas offers a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That nominating speeches for candidates for Vice-President be limited to ten minutes; seconding speeches to five minutes, and not more than three speeches be allowed in seconding the nomination of any one candidate."



MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: I withdraw the original motion, and shall favor the adoption of the substitute.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas, the original motion having been withdrawn.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### NOMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Clerk will call the roll of States for the nomination of candidates for Vice-President.

MR. E. L. RUSSELL, of Alabama (when the State of Alabama was called): Alabama yields to the State of Illinois.

MR. SAMUEL ALSCHULER, of Illinois: On behalf of the delegation from Illinois, I desire to state that Colonel Free P. Morris will present the name of a candidate from Illinois.

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF FREE P. MORRIS.

MR. FREE P. MORRIS, of Illinois: Mr. Chairman, Illinois, through her delegates, desires to express her deep sense of gratitude to the State of Alabama for the courteous magnanimity in yielding to the commonwealth I have the honor to represent to place in nomination a candidate for Vice-President. [Applause.]

This great office demands one of unquestioned honesty, and one who possesses the highest attributes of an ideal candidate. He should be so firm in Democratic faith that all the legions of his country's enemies cannot drive him from his post of duty. [Applause.] He should be a man of invincible logic. He should be a man whose character is as fair as the noon-day sun. He should be baptized in the Jordan of Democracy, and his heart and soul and brain and energies should be dedicated to that cause whose fundamental thought is liberty and equality. He should be a man who believes that every individual should stand upon his own resources, and every business should be

dependent upon the natural advantages arising out of free and unrestrained competition.

He knows full well that under this rule the country progressed; everybody was contented; the people were employed; capital was returning fair profits from its investments, and the star of the republic was in the ascendant, shining with all the brilliancy of the gems of the ocean. [Applause.]

He should know that the great question is not, how shall the Government protect the strong, but how shall it relieve the poor and protect the needy. [Applause.] The candidate whom I shall name believes that the present tariff law is unjust taxation and oppression to those who feed and clothe the nation, and a discrimination against the man who tills the soil and the army that wields the hammer. He should know that any law which favors the creation and the maintaining and upholding and fostering of monopolies is an edict against the unwritten law that man is entitled to the fruits of his labor.

He has declared that criminal trusts and toil cannot go hand in hand through this land of ours any more than despotism and human liberty can unite in the bonds of peace and concord. [Applause.] There is a tide in the affairs of nations as well as of men, which, taken at the flood, will lead to success. On such a flood sea is the Democratic cause afloat and her devotees must take advantage of the opportunity when the current serves, or lose their venture. [Applause.]

The Democratic party stands to-day for patriotism, as it did when Jefferson blazed the way. It stands the guardian of the rights of the people, as it did when Jackson was at the helm. It should stand and does stand to-day for the eternal principles of justice.

I have the honor to nominate a candidate in whom are combined these highest types of Democratic creed—one of a character that commands the respect of his fellow men; a man who served twelve years in the National Congress; who was always loyal to the line of duty; who never betrayed a trust. I say to you, nominate this man—and the conditions in Illinois, in my judgment, are not dissimilar from what they were in 1892 when we gave the electoral vote to the Democratic candidate

[applause]—let New York join with Illinois, two States united as they are in great commercial pursuits; their interests are alike; and this man can carry Illinois if New York can be carried.

I have the honor on behalf of the United Democracy of Illinois to nominate that invincible champion of human rights, James Robert Williams, of Illinois. [Applause.] Name him, and it will be told how a great party, crowned with the highest honor a citizen because he was always true to his convictions and loyal to the interests of his country, and to his fellow man. [Applause.]

MR. JEFFERSON DAVIS, of Arkansas (when the State of Arkansas was called): Arkansas has no candidate, but she has votes which in November she will deliver to the nominee of this Convention.

MR. T. J. O'DONNELL, of Colorado (when the State of Colorado was called): The State of Colorado yields the floor to the State of Washington.

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF F. C. ROBERTSON.

MR. F. C. ROBERTSON, of Washington: Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Convention: I have viewed with pride the magnificent enthusiasm that has pervaded your councils under our eloquent Presiding Officer, who, according to his own statement, has made the best speech ever heard in a Democratic Convention [laughter]; and I wish to say it is the general idea of the Democracy of the nation that he is right in the modest eulogy of himself. [Applause.]

Looking back but a few short days ago, we behold the Republican Convention and there see Uncle Joseph Cannon, with piping voice, leading the hallelujahs of the Republican party, until he announced that he had contracted malaria in the Republican Convention, and had been advised by his physician to take a voyage on salt water. If he will wait until the sixth day of next November, I trust he may have the entire Republican party with him. [Laughter.] We see the strange anomaly of

a President, who had no opposition, revising the speeches that would place him in nomination, but he was not, like Napoleon, wrapped in the solitude of his own genius, for did not Mark Twain demand the right to revise epitaphs written while he was yet alive? [Applause.]

In this campaign will be presented before the people the most important issues ever tried in the forum of the conscience before the citizenship of America. We are to determine whether this Republic shall endure, or whether we will permit its foundations to crumble, and militarism and despotism to resist the pleadings of freedom. [Applause.]

There is to-day in the White House the most dangerous exponent of theories tending to render unsafe the liberties of the people, and threatening alike labor and capital with an uncertain and impulsive policy which acts without deliberation, leaving the Nation in the quicksands of uncertainty. To combat such policies and such a Republican candidate, the Democracy must place before the Nation the highest type of her statesmen, the purest and brainiest of her men.

Roosevelt prates of party bosses; yet he has roped the Republican maverick, put his brand upon it and placed it in a corral in charge of Mr. Cleveland's former stenographer, who rattles in the shoes of Marcus A. Hanna like a mustard seed in a gourd. [Applause.]

Roosevelt claims to be the exponent of law and order; yet he has thrown the flaming brand of racial discord into the fair fields of the South, placing in the Republican platform a plank declaring that the provision of the constitution of every Southern State controlling the right of suffrage in a manner within the power of the State and upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States, is in violation of the Federal Constitution. This was done to give excuse for denying the South national representation; to make the black race dominant in Southern politics; to cater to the colored votes, and to pave the way for the theft of the Presidency in the electoral college. To Roosevelt a platform declaration is law, and the bayonet and martial rule the means of its enforcement. Capital stands aghast at his vagaries; industries tremble lest he destroy them. Labor, stricken

by the hands of despotism, cries in vain to him for protection; and the South girds on its armor. Its men again hear the prayers of its women and children to protect them from negro domination. Men of the Nation, strike with the ballot, lest he destroy—yea, even with the sword. [Applause.]

You whose ears are close to the stock ticker in New York, and whose voices control this Convention, come with me across the continent to the peaceful Pacific, and listen to the heart throb of the Nation, and hear the voice of the men of the West. You of the South have the hallowed past, the example of your heroic statesmen, baptizing you in the font of Democracy. You of the East see the history of your States filled with the examples of Jefferson, Jackson and their followers, sure lamps to lead you out of darkness into Democracy. But we of the great West are but building the temple, have hardly laid its foundation, and are engaging the Republican hosts hand to hand. We bring to you, hewn with perfect workmanship, a keystone for the arch, a tower of strength to the cause. Washington presents for Vice-President her matchless son—George Turner. [Applause.]

The West is the battleground of this campaign, and we should influence its voters into the Democratic fold, for in a few short years this section will be dominant in American politics. Build well for the future by honoring her foremost statesman. [Applause.] The thundering tread of progress is awakening her industries. She is the treasure vault of the world. [Applause.]

At Cape Flattery, the westernmost point of the Nation, Uncle Sam stands and points across the waters. Here lies Japan, greater than England; Russia, greater than Germany; while the uncounted millions of China are beginning to burst the ties of ignorance and conservatism. These people are thirsting for our commerce, and on the Pacific, the market place of the Nation, is growing a trade in which the Nation is interested. On the shores of the Pacific meet the railroad and the steamship, keel meets steel, and the dawn of a mighty day is here. Alaska, rich in furs and fisheries, has furnished enough

gold to enrich our Nation and to outlaw the crime of '73. [Applause.]

Call the roll of States and see the representation that speaks for our nominee. From the State where rolls the mighty Columbia, entwining in its embrace Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana, comes Governor Chamberlain, who has in part rescued his State from Republican rule; and he speaks for Oregon. From Idaho comes the voice of the Democracy, and Fred T. Dubois, her Democratic Senator, a champion of this Western Democracy, speaks for his friend, the friend of his State, that you may hearer. Then comes Montana, and Senator Clark, a man who by brain and grit has become the foremost business man of the Nation, with more men—union men—in his employ, than any other man, who has no labor disputes, who meets his men with peace rather than powder, and he and his State ask the East to heed the pleadings of the West.

But why continue. Come to Washington. The Pacific Ocean has laid its arm upon the bosom of our State, and holds the pulsing heart of its commerce at Seattle and Tacoma in the palm of its hand, where timber grows the tallest and men develop best; and there where our candidate is best known, he is most beloved. [Applause.]

A native of the State of Missouri, as a boy he went to Alabama, studied law, and practised till 1876, when he was appointed United States marshal by President Grant. This was four years after Alabama was Democratic in all departments of State Government. In 1884 he was appointed United States judge for Washington Territory by President Arthur, after being endorsed by both of Alabama's Democratic Senators, Pugh and Morgan, as an honest and able man and one who would grace the Federal bench.

He favored by a bill introduced by him the exclusion of the Chinese, and demanded that all aliens be required to possess educational qualifications as a prerequisite to admission to this country. He led the fight of Democracy for six years as a Senator of the United States. He has denied the right of the President of the Senate of the United States, for a mere infrac-

tion of the rules of the Senate, to deprive the State of South Carolina of the sovereign right of representation.

On the Philippine question he made a constitutional argument in which he demonstrated with great learning that under the Constitution of this Nation we could not justly, even though for commercial advantage, treat the people of the Philippine Islands as subjects and govern that territory by a despotic form of government, such as that to escape from which the Declaration of Independence was penned by that immortal Democrat, Thomas Jefferson. [Applause.] He demanded that the Nation keep faith with Cuba. He is a constitutional lawyer and statesman of the highest rank. [Applause.]

But further review of his career in the Senate is unnecessary. Go to this great body of statesmen, his former associates—to its Democratic members, the ablest men of the Nation; to Bailey and Culberson, of Texas; to Foster and McEnery, of Louisiana; to Mallory, of Florida; to Pettus and Morgan, of Alabama; to Cockrell and Stone, of Missouri; yea, call the roll of the Senate, and ask one by one if there is aught to say against the man I nominate. Their public utterances answer for them. He is a matchless statesman and one of the ablest men contributed by the West to the services of the Nation. [Applause.]

In 1896 he came into the Democratic party as a leader among us. He came when other men faltered. He came as a man highly honored in his own party, and led the battle of the Democracy of the West, when men in the East hesitated and faltered. When our other leaders faltered as to the proper policy of the party, hand in hand with William Jennings Bryan and Charles A. Towne he fought the battle of the Democracy in the West.

When the Alaska Boundary Commission was about to be appointed, to consist of two Republicans and one Democrat, it was the voice of those Democratic Senators and the great Senators on the Republican side, who with one accord, and without knowledge on the part of George Turner, caused the President of the United States to tender him a position on that important Commission with the two most able members of the Republican party, Elihu Root and Henry Cabot Lodge. His

service upon that Commission was eminently satisfactory to the people of this country, and although the Canadian representatives protested, largely by his ability as an international lawyer and a jurist, the American Commissioners succeeded in impressing upon Lord Alverstone the justice of the demands of America, and procured the fee simple title to the richest portion of our Northwest possessions. [Applause.]

Before Bryan had declared against or Cleveland for Judge Parker, with keen judgment George Turner canvassed the situation, and came to the conclusion that there was a man in the State of New York in whose fidelity the Democratic party trusted, and who, having been true in every Democratic campaign, was entitled to count upon the support of every faction of the party. [Applause.] When he announced in the State of Washington that silver should no longer be urged as a platform plank of the Democratic party, he also urged that the leader, not of a reorganized, but of a reunited Democratic party, should be Alton B. Parker, of New York. [Applause.] His candidacy comes not from his urging, but is the spontaneous outburst of approval coming from men who recognize in him a great diplomat, lawyer, statesman and Democrat. [Applause.]

Hearken to the West. Let the two oceans meet in the race for Democratic success. [Applause.] You have Alton B. Parker, for President; give us George Turner for Vice-President, and victory is assured. [Applause.]

MR. JOHN J. WALSH, of Connecticut (when the State of Connecticut was called): Connecticut has no candidate of her own, and extends the courtesy of the floor to Indiana.

#### SPEECH OF JOHN W. SPENCER.

MR. JOHN W. SPENCER, of Indiana: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the State of Connecticut having yielded to the State of Indiana, as a delegate from that State, and on behalf of a Democracy which never has learned to define the word "compromise," I desire to second the nomination of a gentleman who lives just across the line [applause], who, we feel, is blood of



our blood and bone of our bone; who was brought up and educated in our State; who matriculated at the great University of Indiana.

On behalf of the united Democracy of the State of Indiana, I desire to second the nomination of that great commoner, "Bob" Williams, of Illinois. [Applause.]

Delaware having yielded to West Virginia, the Permanent Chairman said: The Chair recognizes Honorable John D. Alderson, of West Virginia.

MR. JOHN D. ALDERSON, of West Virginia: I beg of this Convention that it will give me its attention for a few moments. I suffered so much last night from heat, and from oratory which I did not hear, that I feel this morning I should not inflict any spell-binding qualities of mine on this audience.

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF JOHN D. ALDERSON.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, I congratulate you, fellow Democrats, that your work is so nearly ended and that the portion of it accomplished has been so well done. I congratulate you that we are now a happy and reunited family.

Fellow Democrats, let us now finish the good work already partly accomplished. Let us give to our gallant and able standard bearer a running mate who will carry strength to the ticket.

West Virginia, from the sample before you, fellow Democrats, you will know, produces great men physically as well as mentally. God bless Virginia—Old Virginia; God bless Virginians. I hail from the youngest daughter of that grand old commonwealth, torn from her bowels in the midst of revolution; and West Virginia mountaineers would be the happiest men on the face of God's green earth would this Convention aid us to redeem ourselves and have our young virgin stand alongside of her old mother and her sister States of the South, Democratic at heart, Democratic in principle, Democratic always and forevermore.

You can aid us, fellow Democrats, to accomplish this result.

I beg of you to do so. We West Virginia Democrats come to you pleading that you do us this small favor. We come to you saying that as West Virginia goes, so goes the country. That may be a broad assertion, but our little mountain State has been the battleground for the last thirty years in the political arena. When you have lost West Virginia, you have lost the country.

I promised you that I would not detain you. You want a good candidate. You want a proper candidate. You want a strong man. We have such a man in our State, and my delegation has instructed me to present his name to you for your suffrages in this Convention. We have there a man who has had experience for twelve long years—honorable experience—in the Senate of the United States. They say he is too old. I wish I was as young a man as is Henry G. Davis. [Applause.] I wish I was as strong a man, I wish I was as true a man, I wish I was as good a man, I wish I was as able a man and as experienced as is that noble old Democratic war horse who assisted in striking the shackles from my father's arms and limbs when I was a boy. I should like to appeal to the gentlemen here, the descendants of men who fought for what they believed to be right in the sixties—I would like to appeal to the descendants of those men who went out and fought and lost and accepted the situation in good faith, to assist me in naming for Vice-President this candidate whose name I have mentioned.

He was a Union man, and for that reason he was able to assist us. When I went through the State of West Virginia in 1896 and 1900, along with our gallant standard bearer, the matchless Bryan, we found Henry G. Davis, although he had worked his way up from an humble station by an honest life to a position of confidence among the people, assisting us, his shoulder to the wheel always. It is no reflection upon a man, I take it, in a Democratic Convention to say that he not only never scratched a Democratic ticket, but he never dreamed of doing so.

He is a man of integrity, of capacity, of experience. He will assist us from one end of the Union to the other. Go to the men who served with him in the Congress of the United

States and ask them about the character, the life and the Democracy of Henry G. Davis, and they will tell you, what I say to you in conclusion, that he is a man without blot or blemish; that his record as a Democrat, and as a citizen has never been criticised. He will give strength, I tell you, my fellow Democrats, to this ticket. Give us Henry G. Davis as the running mate with our Presidential candidate, and we promise to sweep the Republicans off the face of the earth, not only in West Virginia, but in Maryland and the whole country. [Applause.]

#### SPEECH OF FRED T. DUBOIS.

MR. FRED T. DUBOIS, of Idaho (when the State of Idaho was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, almost all the Democratic Senators of the United States are in this Convention, and I state (and when my statement shall have been made I will pause for a contradiction) that George Turner, of Washington, is the peer of any Senator of the United States during their term of service or mine. [Applause.] You heard yesterday from your Chairman, Mr. Clark, in laudation of the representation in Congress from the South. But all the Democratic representation in Congress is not from the South. You have six Democratic United States Senators outside of the South, and they all come from the Northwest, and the States behind all of those six United States Senators, and all the Northwest, are for George Turner for Vice-President on our ticket. [Applause.]

I say to you in addition, that we in the Northwest have a chance to carry more electoral votes than you will carry in Illinois or Indiana. We in the Northwest are not contending for postoffices or other jobs. We want affirmative legislation to stop the wild extravagance of our Government, and the debauchery of the public conscience as exemplified by Hanna and accepted by Roosevelt. We can do nothing for affirmative legislation without Representatives and Senators. For Senators you must depend on the Northwest. The election of a President will be futile so far as affirmative legislation is concerned.

We want, the country wants, affirmative legislation, or it does not desire a change from existing conditions.

I wish to make my appeal to the South, as it seems to be the ruling power in this Convention, next to New York, and to say to its Representatives that the Northwest Senators defeated the Force Bill by their votes. There never has been a time when the Northwest has not been the true and tried friend of the South in their battle for white supremacy. You have never had better friends during all times than the Northwest Senators.

If it is an offense that the candidate whom I name supported William Jennings Bryan twice, I cannot help it. I offer no apology for that. Neither he nor I have cause to explain.

The entire Northwest, where your winning electoral votes must come from, and whence your Senators, outside of those from the South, now come and will come, unite in presenting to this Convention George Turner, of Washington, as their candidate for the Vice-Presidency. [Applause.]

MR. E. M. CARR, of Iowa (when the State of Iowa was called): Iowa does not wish to be heard.

#### NOMINATING SPEECH OF DAVID OVERMEYER.

MR. DAVID OVERMEYER, of Kansas (when the State of Kansas was called): Mr. Chairman, your candidate for President is an Eastern man. Your candidate for Vice-President ought to be a Western man. The State of Kansas presents to you a man of high character, who has become distinguished in the councils of the Nation. Born in Virginia, he emigrated to Kansas, and so established himself in the affection and confidence of that great young commonwealth, that twice he has met and overthrown the Republican party in that stronghold of Republicanism. He was elected by the people of the whole State to the House of Representatives. He was elected by the Legislature to the Senate; served a full term in that body, and established himself as one of the greatest of the great men of that great body. He is known to the whole country and respected by the whole country. His experience in the Senate

eminently qualifies him for the high office of Vice-President, and if by chance the power of the Presidency should devolve upon him, it would be found in capable, patriotic and able hands. He would administer the Government with wisdom, integrity, patriotism and power. I have the honor to place in nomination ex-Senator William A. Harris, of Kansas. [Applause.]

MR. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky (when the State of Kentucky was called): Let Kentucky be passed.

MR. E. B. KRUTTSCHNITT, of Louisiana (when the State of Louisiana was called): Louisiana desires to be passed.

### SPEECH OF JOHN PRENTISS POE.

MR. JOHN PRENTISS POE, of Maryland (when the State of Maryland was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: Intoxicated by the possession for eight years of absolute power in the Executive Department and in both Houses of Congress, and secure for four years more in their majority in the Senate, the Republicans, with vainglorious arrogance, have fallen into the habit of mocking at our disasters and heaping upon us the irritating taunt that the Democracy has no issues and no men. The platform which, amidst tumultuous enthusiasm, seldom witnessed, and which brought together all the heretofore disunited and discordant elements of our party into brotherly reunion, amply refutes the first part of that offensive reproach. The stirring scenes that moved the souls of the vast throng which witnessed the nomination of New York's distinguished son as our candidate for President silence forever the other branch of that equally offensive imputation.

Gentlemen of the Convention, let us still further put an end to this taunt of the Republicans by giving to Judge Parker a colleague worthy to stand side by side with him upon the admirable platform which announces the principles and declares the purposes of the Democracy, with which we expect to march in November to a great and inspiring victory. [Applause.]

If there be anything in stainless integrity of life, if there

be any merit in vast and diversified experience, if there be any power in an accurate knowledge of the minutest details of governmental affairs, combined with rare executive ability, a winning and courageous personality, a marvelous self control, and all these crowned by an unfaltering fidelity and devotion amidst fierce temptations to apostasy and desertion, and added to these an influence and a popularity that will give us the electoral votes of his native State, then the Maryland delegation point with pride and satisfaction to West Virginia's favorite son, the Honorable Henry G. Davis [applause]; and, pointing to him, we say, behold the man who presents, in symmetrical power and grace, this admirable combination of all the qualifications needed in the incumbent of this high office. Place him upon the ticket, and my word for it, we will have side by side with the electoral votes of the imperial State the electoral votes of West Virginia, and, reinforced by the great power of an awakened and an aroused Democracy, instinct with life and full of hopeful aspirations for the future, we will have a ticket which, in November next, will lead our army to a great and ever memorable political regeneration. [Applause.]

MR. D. J. CAMPAU, of Michigan (when the State of Michigan was called): Michigan has no nomination to make.

MR. A. M. DOCKERY, of Missouri (when the State of Missouri was called): Under existing conditions Missouri desires to be passed.

#### SPEECH OF W. A. CLARK.

MR. W. A. CLARK, of Montana (when the State of Montana was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Democratic Convention: The great work which was accomplished here last night and this morning, resulting in the selection of a prominent New Yorker for the highest office in the gift of the people of this nation, is now to be supplemented by the selection of a man for that other very high position, Vice-President of the United States. In view of recent history, it becomes absolutely necessary that, in the selection of this man, the same

earnest care should be manifested, and we should select a man endowed with all the qualifications required of a President.

In doing this, we should not ignore the matter of geographical location. When the wise men came from the East to this Convention, and proposed a man for that high position, we found there was division in their number, and I wish to say to you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, that it was the delegations from the Northwestern and Rocky Mountain States which made it possible for you, gentlemen, to select the candidate who was nominated on the first ballot.

Now we ask you, in behalf of the Democracy of the West, not to turn your backs upon us. Let the East, with magnanimity, stretch out its hand over the broad prairies of the West, to that great chain of mountains in which is hidden hundreds of billions of untold wealth, and say to us, "We recognize you as factors in this great nation, and we leave it to you to select a man for the position of Vice-President."

Gentlemen, many of you know nothing about the West. Many of you are ignorant that, beyond the Missouri River and extending out to the Pacific Ocean, is a grand area of country that is pouring hundreds of thousands of millions into the lap of the world's commerce every year. You have heard of the Louisiana Purchase, fresh in our memories by reason of the Exposition which is held here to celebrate it. The Louisiana Purchase constitutes only a small area of that great Western empire. Do you want to know about that country? You have but to go here in your own city, you people of St. Louis, and you visitors, and witness that great exposition which excels and transcends everything of the kind that has ever been held in the world, and there you will find an exposition of the great riches of the West.

Another consideration, and that is, when the election comes on this fall you will want some electoral votes from the West. You may carry, as I hope you will, the States of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Indiana, but you will not have enough to elect your President. You can not secure electoral votes by giving the nomination of Vice-President to any of the Eastern States, but, by conferring it on the West, you can

secure in the Northwestern and Rocky Mountain States probably fifteen to twenty electoral votes, which will come in very handy.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, we offer you a man in every way worthy of your support in the person of the Hon. George Turner, ex-Senator of the United States from the State of Washington, whose claims I am here in part to present and to urge. [Applause.] He is a man of the highest eminence in learning. He is a man who has not a superior in all this country as a lawyer. In the Senate of the United States he commanded the respect, the admiration, the esteem and the confidence of every one of the Senators, regardless of politics, and when the Alaskan Commission was selected, the President of the United States recognized the eminent ability of this man, and he was sent to London as one of our commissioners, and there, amongst the greatest men of the nation and of our nation, he deported himself and distinguished himself as a man in every way worthy of that high honor. He will represent you and the party thoroughly and well; and I come to you urging you, for the considerations which I have briefly mentioned, to give your support to this man. Therefore, with great pleasure and great enthusiasm in my own heart, I second the nomination of the Honorable George Turner for the high office of Vice-President of the United States. [Applause.]

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL, of Nevada (when the State of Nevada was called): Nevada seconds the nomination of Turner, of Washington. [Applause.]

MR. M. A. DAUGHERTY, of Ohio (when the State of Ohio was called): Ohio has no candidate.

MR. F. V. HOLMAN, of Oregon (when the State of Oregon was called): Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, by the nomination of Turner, of Washington, it is believed that the Republicans will not carry Montana, Idaho and Washington, and that the Democrats may carry one or all of them. Oregon, therefore, seconds the nomination of George Turner, of Washington. [Applause.]

MR. C. L. WOOD, of South Dakota (when the State of



South Dakota was called) : South Dakota seconds the nomination of Williams, of Illinois.

MR. W. A. PERCY, of Tennessee (when the State of Tennessee was called) : Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, on behalf of the Democracy of Tennessee in Convention assembled, I desire to state that the delegates from Tennessee were instructed to present for nomination for the Vice-Presidency in this Convention that idol of the rampant and militant Democracy of the State of Tennessee, its brilliant junior Senator, the Honorable Edward W. Carmack. [Applause.] But, Mr. Chairman, Senator Carmack has positively and unqualifiedly refused to permit his name to go before this Convention. The State of Tennessee, therefore, passes.

MR. JAMES L. NORRIS, of the District of Columbia (when the District of Columbia was called) : The District of Columbia seconds the nomination of Henry G. Davis, of West Virginia.

New Mexico seconded the nomination of Mr. Turner, of Washington.

The roll call was concluded.

MR. J. C. SOUTH, of Arkansas: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there are certain rumors which seem to affect the Convention, I move that we take a recess until eight o'clock. [Cries of "No!" "No!"]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair announces that, if any State which was passed in the call desires to present a name for Vice-President, it can do so now.

MR. CHARLES D'AUTREMONT, of Minnesota: Minnesota desires to second the nomination of Mr. Turner.

MR. W. J. HILLMAN, of Florida: Florida seconds the nomination of Davis, of West Virginia.

MR. A. L. LOVEY, of Utah: Utah seconds the nomination of Senator George W. Turner, of Washington.

MR. GEORGE MURPHY, of Alaska: On behalf of Alaska I wish to second the nomination of Senator George Turner, of Washington.

MR. W. C. ROGERS, of the Indian Territory: The Indian Territory seconds the nomination of J. R. Williams, of Illinois.

**THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN:** The Secretary will call the roll of States for a vote on nominating a candidate for Vice-President.

RECESS.

**MR. CHARLES A. CULBERSON,** of Texas: Mr. Chairman, for reasons which are obvious to all the delegates here, it seems to me we ought not to proceed to nominate a candidate for Vice-President at this time. I therefore move that the Convention take a recess. [Cries of "Why?"] I think the delegates understand what I mean. And I repeat that, in the present exigency confronting the Convention, it ought not to proceed to the nomination of a candidate for Vice-President. We want to know, before a candidate for Vice-President is nominated who will be the nominee of this Convention for President. I, therefore, move that the Convention take a recess until 8.30 o'clock to-night.

**MR. G. V. MENZIES,** of Indiana: Inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas made a speech preceding his motion to take a recess, I think those of the opposite opinion ought to be heard.

**THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN:** The motion is not debatable.

**MR. MENZIES:** I know, but the Chair permitted the gentleman from Texas to be heard.

**THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN:** The gentleman is out of order. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Culberson) that the Convention take a recess until 8.30 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes P. M.) the Convention took a recess until 8.30 o'clock P. M.

AFTER RECESS.

At the expiration of the recess, the Convention resumed its session.

## TELEGRAM FROM PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE.

MR. JAMES K. VARDAMAN, of Mississippi: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, I understand that the order of business is the nomination of a candidate for Vice-President. It seems that the publication of a telegram, which was said to have been received by a member of this Convention, and the subsequent rumor which spread throughout this body that such a message had been received by a member of this Convention from the Democratic nominee for President, have spread consternation throughout this Convention. [Cries of "Oh, no!"] Just a moment, please. I am not going to say anything you do not want me to say, I hope.

It seems, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention, that there is doubt. No one seems to know exactly what that telegram meant or what it contained. If information as to what it contains is necessary before the Convention shall proceed with its work, I suggest that the member of the New York delegation to whom the telegram was addressed should give it to the clerk and have it read for the information of the Convention. [Applause.]

MR. FRED T. DUBOIS, of Idaho: Mr. Chairman——

MR. VARDAMAN: Just one moment and I will be through, gentlemen of the Convention.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman from Idaho rise?

MR. FRED T. DUBOIS, of Idaho: The gentleman from Idaho rises to call for the regular order.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The regular order is the speech of the delegate from Mississippi.

MR. DUBOIS: I thought he had concluded.

MR. VARDAMAN: We are here for the purpose of acting for the Democratic party of this nation, and I want to say to you, and I believe I shall voice the sentiment of every member of this Convention when I say it, that we have not deliberated at all since we have been here. [Applause.] The noise and the confusion of the mob and the rabble have characterized every hour of the sitting of this Convention.

The time has come, my countrymen, when you should think about what you are doing, when you should weigh carefully and deliberately the great questions which you are called upon here to consider. It is not a question as to whether this man or that man or any other man may be nominated for the Presidency or for Vice-President, but it is a question whether or not you will be able to select a man who will be sufficiently strong at the polls in November to defeat that national peril, Theodore Roosevelt. [Applause.]

Now, let us get down to business. We have worn the wiry edge off, and let us go to work; let us find out what is this rumor which, as I said a moment ago, has seemed to create almost disorder in this hall. Let the gentleman from New York, to whom the telegram was addressed, if it is a matter which this Convention should consider and which affects this Convention—read the telegram; let the truth be known; and then let us proceed to business. [Applause.]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: It is suggested that the New York delegation, or the member of that delegation who has a telegram which has been bruited about this city, if he has such a one, produce it and read it to the Convention.

MR. GEORGE RAINES, of New York: Mr. Chairman, in the absence from the Convention of the Chairman of the New York delegation, I suggest a few minutes delay in acting upon the suggestion, in order that the Chairman of the delegation who speaks for New York may present this matter fully to the Convention, as will undoubtedly be done upon his arrival on the floor.

I ask, as a courtesy to New York, such delay as will enable the Chairman of the delegation to reach the Convention hall.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: How much time do you want?

MR. RAINES: I can not tell you. I am informed that the Chairman of the delegation is on his way to the Convention hall.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: I am advised that the Chairman of the New York delegation will be here in a few moments.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair requests the gen-

tleman from Mississippi (Mr. Vardaman) to withhold his motion for a few moments, until the arrival of the Chairman of the New York delegation.

MR. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, of Alabama: Mr. Chairman, while we are considering the propriety of the gentleman from the State of New York making known the telegram he has received, we find this evening in the public press a telegram about which we should like to make some inquiry. I read from the paper:

“The following telegram has just been sprung on the Convention:

“Senator E. W. Carmack, Tennessee delegation: The gold standard is established by law, and I cannot accept the nomination unless that plank is contained in the platform.”

ALTON B. PARKER.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has ever received any such telegram, he would gladly make it known to the gentlemen of this convention. I ask Senator Carmack, in order to satisfy the delegates of this Convention, whether he has received any such telegram, and that he go to the platform and make the facts in the matter known.

[There were cries of “Carmack.”]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, this is the gravest matter which has come before this body, and we want the information straight from the fountain head. [Applause.] I am assured that it will be here in a very few minutes, and we do not want any information at second hand.

At nine o'clock and fifty minutes p. m., Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, Representative Williams, of Mississippi, and Governor Vardaman, of Mississippi, went upon the platform.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Convention, I wish to announce in advance that in this grave and important matter every man shall have a fair hearing. [Applause.] I now introduce to this Convention the Honorable John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi. [Applause.]

MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: All of us this afternoon were very much perturbed and excited, to use no stronger words, at what purported to be copies of telegrams which had been sent by our nominee to Mr. Carmack and others in this city. I want to tell you that but one such telegram has been received. Mr. Carmack not only received to-day no telegram of the character that was published, but he never received a telegram from Mr. Parker in all his life. [Applause.] And nobody received a telegram containing the language found in that infamous volunteer newspaper production. [Applause.] However, there has come from Mr. Parker to Mr. Sheehan, a telegram which I shall read in a moment; and it is so important that you should know what it is, that I shall hand it to my friend, the Governor of my State, Mr. Vardaman, and have him read it to you. When you shall have heard it you will note that there is not in it one word about "requiring" or "demanding" or asking or requesting, that anything shall be placed in the Democratic platform. [Applause.] You will also note that if there is any error in it at all, it is an error of judgment only, proceeding from a too sensitive spirit of honor [applause], a too sensitive determination not to be misunderstood, or to be placed in a false or in a double position. I shall now ask Governor Vardaman to read the telegram to you. [Applause.]

MR. J. K. VARDAMAN, of Mississippi, read as follows:

ESOPUS, N. Y., July 9, 1904.

*Honorable W. F. Sheehan,*

*Hotel Jefferson, St. Louis, Mo.:*

I regard the gold standard as firmly and irrevocably established, and shall act accordingly if the action of the Convention to-day shall be ratified by the people. As the platform is silent on the subject, my view should be made known to the Convention, and if it is proved to be unsatisfactory to the majority, I request you to decline the nomination for me at once, so that another may be nominated before adjournment.

ALTON B. PARKER.

MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: Mr. Chairman: I think you will bear me out in what I have said and in what I am about to say. This is the first time in the history of the United States that a man already nominated for the greatest office on the surface of this earth has been so supersensitive about a matter of personal rectitude and honor and mutual understanding as to send a telegram to a friend asking him to decline the nomination for him, if, as he seems to have been informed, there is something in the platform which is not in accord with his opinion. [Applause.]

My friends, we purposely left the platform silent on the question of the monetary standard. We left it silent because we all agreed that that question was not an issue in this campaign [applause]; and we all agreed furthermore that nothing should be placed in the platform which was not a campaign issue. The consequence was that in the Resolutions Committee motions were made to table, and those motions were carried, every resolution on both sides which tended to bring up as an issue in this campaign the question of the monetary standard.

Now, my friends, Judge Parker merely expresses his opinion on this subject for fear somebody might think you did not already know it. There was not in all this vast assembly a single, solitary man who did not already know that Judge Parker is a gold standard man. [Applause.] I have been one of the most consistent, persistent and perhaps radical free silver men in the United States, and I knew that he was a gold standard man. He had never made any attempt to conceal it from anybody. He had supported our candidates and had said that, although he did not agree with us upon the money plank, he was still a Democrat. [Applause.]

Having now had the telegram read to you, I wish to ask permission of the Convention that Mr. Sheehan may send back the following answer:

“The platform adopted by this Convention is silent upon the question of the monetary standard, because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign, and only campaign issues are mentioned in the platform. Therefore there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram

just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform." [Applause.]

My friends, in a campaign which is to be fought against the excessive extortions and discriminations of the tariff, against trusts, against ranting imperialism, against executive usurpation, and against the reagitation of the race question, we purposely made a platform, so far as the monetary standard is concerned, upon which W. J. Bryan could have stood, or Grover Cleveland could have stood, or anybody else, who is with us on these and other pending live, pressing campaign issues could have stood. [Applause.]

I shall ask my friend, Senator Tillman, to read again what we have requested permission to send back as an answer to the telegram, because he has a voice much stronger and clearer and further carrying than mine.

MR. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN, of South Carolina: Mr. Chairman: As I understand, this is a proposed answer to a telegram to ex-Lieutenant-Governor Sheehan, and is to be sent by the Chairman of this Convention:

"The platform adopted by this Convention is silent upon the question of the monetary standard, because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign, and only campaign issues are mentioned in the platform. Therefore there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform."

MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to move that the Chairman of this Convention be authorized to send those words as a telegram in answer to this telegram which was read to you a little while ago, and with that I yield the floor.

MR. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN, of South Carolina, obtained the floor.

MR. WILLIAM RICHARDSON of Alabama: Mr. Chairman—

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?



MR. RICHARDSON: I rise for the purpose of dispassionately discussing the message that it is proposed to send to Judge Parker as approved by this Convention.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Senator Tillman has already been recognized for that purpose. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama later on. Senator Tillman will proceed.

MR. BENJAMIN R. TILLMAN, of South Carolina: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: As I entered the hall to-night, passing among some gentlemen whom I knew, I was caught by the arm by one of them, a distinguished Democrat from Missouri, who, looking me in the eye, said: "Tillman, we are depending on you to see that there is no trickery or hocus pocus here to-night." [Applause.]

In answer to that challenge or expression of confidence, for I took it as something of both, I looked him in the eye and responded: "Upon my honor, I am going to tell you the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and I will allow no man to trifle with you in this case." [Applause.]

Now, what is involved in this situation? We have been laboring here for four days, many of us more than that, having been on the ground before the Convention assembled, and some of us have been in positions which permitted no sleep for at least two nights and very little in the day. I am among those unfortunates. We have wrestled with one another. We have exchanged opinions. We have battled with one another, at least in the Committee on Resolutions, for I was in that Committee in its session of fifteen or sixteen hours of continuous work, and I know with how much of travail, how much of anger the platform which has been adopted by this Convention was framed.

It was necessary in that Committee for us to give and take. There were pronounced views antagonistic, which had to be reconciled, and as the result of the long and laborious work of that Committee, we succeeded in bringing about what I thought at various times in its deliberations was an impossibility—we succeeded in bringing to you a platform adopted unanimously by your Committee on Resolutions. [Applause.]

General Grant once said that the Democratic party might always be relied upon to commit some fatal blunder when conditions pointed to the defeat of the Republicans, and thus save them from the result of their errors or sins. I am quoting the substance rather than the exact language. To-night, when I became acquainted with the fact that a telegram had been sent here, which seemed to be an insult and an attempt to dictate, I sought the gentleman to whom it was addressed; I read it hastily, and I confess, fellow Democrats, that that anger in me, which is often too quick to rise, surged up in a flame, and I took it to be the idea of any man who has any respect for himself and has been a free silverite, that an indignity was being put upon us and that someone was attempting to trifle with us, and I swore by the Almighty God that I for one would not endure it. [Applause.]

I asked a conference with some of the gentlemen who are leaders on both sides. We went into the hall. We conferred first as to what we ought to try to do, what was our duty, both to ourselves and to our constituents at home and to the people of the country at large. It looked like an almost hopeless situation, that Grant's prediction had come true, but after we adjourned the Convention and the few who could be reached hurriedly got together, met in conference at one of the hotels, considering the telegram, considering the condition in which we found ourselves, it was determined that this proposed action was the proper, the sane, the safe, and, probably, the only way by which we could escape from some great disaster to the party.

Now let me review for a moment the conditions. Judge Parker had been nominated on the first ballot, showing that, with the lights before us, he was the choice of an overwhelming majority of this Convention. He received enough votes and accessions on the first ballot to give him the nomination on that ballot. We were proceeding to complete the ticket, and by this time, had expected to have happily concluded our labors and to be quietly at sleep somewhere, because most of us have had very little sleep. This disturbing element or firebrand, as it promised once to be, being thrown in our ranks, there have since

been all manner of rumors, all manner of statements, all kinds of propositions, angry discussions, and you, my friends, are probably in no condition of mind calmly to consider, and may not upon the first blush be ready to accept, the solution of the trouble which has been reached by those of us who have had the time and opportunity to confer.

Judge Parker's act has been characterized by Mr. Williams as probably injudicious. I think myself it was entirely unnecessary; and while my friend from Mississippi—and I am ready to accept his interpretation—has interpreted it as the result of a highly honorable and sensitive nature, unwilling to sail under false colors, I was ready once to deny that, and to denounce this man as having attempted to repeat what was done at Kansas City four years ago—an attempt to dictate to the party what should be its plan of battle. I once thought it might be said of this man that he was attempting to enlarge our platform and to take the liberty to write into it something that was not already in it after we ourselves had completed it.

But if you calmly consider what is actually involved in those words, I believe you will reach the same conclusion that I have reached, that Judge Parker, possibly under the stress of the clamor around him and in the New York newspapers, and by telegrams, has felt that he must make his position plain, whether we have made our platform plain or not, and therefore he sent this telegram. Giving him the benefit of the doubt, as I myself would want you to give it to me, I say that I have reached the conclusion that the man's action in sending these words in a dispatch was meant to give us the opportunity, if we found that his views were so contrary to our own, to put up somebody else.

Now, let us see if there is anything here which we did not already know. I think it has been generally understood—I know I have heard no one who has contended otherwise—that Judge Parker was a gold man. I do not believe——

MR. R. F. PETTIGREW, of South Dakota: Mr. Chairman: I should like to ask the gentleman a question, if he will yield for that purpose.

MR. TILLMAN: I will yield, sir.

MR. PETTIGREW: Is it not a fact that in the Committee to frame the platform I asked Senator Hill the views of his candidate, Mr. Parker, on this subject, and he replied that he did not know?

MR. TILLMAN: I want to state that the words which have been repeated by the gentleman from South Dakota were asked and answered just as he has stated.

But let us see if there was anything of moment in that. How many men are there in New York with whom Governor Hill associates with respect to whom he thinks it necessary to find out by particular questions whether they are gold men or not? [Applause.] Therefore, I take it that Governor Hill merely told the solemn truth when he said he did not know, because he had never discussed the question with Mr. Parker. Therefore the attempt, as I take it, of the gentleman who asked this question to bring about in the minds of some here a distrust, has no real foundation, and is not worthy of consideration.

I say that in the Committee on Resolutions which framed this platform there was not a solitary man who thought otherwise than that our candidate, if we nominated Judge Parker, was a gold standard man. Every man on the Committee and at least nine-tenths of the Convention, if not ten-tenths, have known or believed that Judge Parker was a gold standard man, and the action of the Committee in declining or refusing by the overwhelming vote of thirty-five to fifteen to put a gold standard plank in its platform grew out of the fact that we all recognized existing conditions. We knew that the law had made gold the standard. We knew that the Republicans will have the Senate of the United States for four years under any and all circumstances, and that therefore the putting into the platform of any allusion to the monetary standard would simply be the means of possibly reopening the old fight or at least of giving our enemies the opportunity to charge us either with cowardice in omitting it or putting it in or reiterating or repeating or doing something.

In the interest of harmony, after we had defeated those who advocated that proposition, other propositions to deal with the currency, with national banks and so on, were all kept out. We

said among ourselves, as we believe you all recognize and know, that the standard was gold, and that the money question for four years at least, if not forever, was *res adjudicata*, and as we want live issues, we have tried to put nothing in the platform that has not a bearing on existing conditions or the future problems of reform. We were not looking for any eggs in last year's bird's nest. We are hoping to hatch a new egg with a Presidential candidate and a President himself in it. [Applause.]

We have a platform. We have a candidate. He is a gold man, and he has been manly enough in this hour of his nomination to send us word that he is for gold; that as President, if elected, he will follow that policy, and he has said: "If the Convention does not want me, after I have announced myself in this plain and unmistakable way, it is its right and privilege to take me down and put up somebody else." [Applause.] Therefore when we know what we already knew, and that this telegram involves nothing but the repetition of a fact which had been previously recognized, the only thing that can be said here is that Mr. Parker is trifling with us, or that he is super-sensitive, or that he was bulldozed by the New York press. Now, that is as much as anybody can say. If anybody has got to abuse Mr. Parker, I would rather do it myself, because I am going to tell the truth, while the other fellow is going to tell a lie. I mean of course those who are going to fight Mr. Parker in this campaign. We have Democrats who dislike Mr. Parker; we have Democrats who distrust Mr. Parker; we have Democrats who would rather have had somebody else than Mr. Parker; but the national Democracy has spoken. It has put this man on a platform which was reported unanimously. His telegram has not altered conditions one iota. We knew all that before.

What is there here to quarrel about? What is there to alarm anybody? What is there to create a furore and to get up a disintegration and a demoralization? There is nothing of the kind.

The Democrats who have acted with the lights before them have spoken. We have our candidate. We have our platform.

He stands where he stood before we nominated him, and has not changed his status one iota. Are we going to change our platform? [Cries of "No! No! No!"] [Applause.]

Gentlemen, I thank you. I have tried to cover the ground. I do not know whether I have succeeded, but if I have not, I have done the best I could, and the angels can do no more. [Applause.]

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: I do not know whether I can make myself heard by you. I was informed that some action was being taken here and I came over.

I understand that you have received a telegram from the candidate, which has been read to you, and which I have read, and that a motion has been made to send back a reply, and that the question now is on the resolution directing the sending of this reply.

I wish to state the facts in this matter and then to make a suggestion.

We had a protracted session of the Committee on Resolutions. For sixteen hours we were in session the last time. When the platform was reported from the sub-committee it contained the gold standard plank of which you know. It was discussed in Committee. It was stated by members that it would be unfortunate to insert the plank, and finally, by vote of thirty-five to fifteen the gold plank was excluded. I then introduced some separate resolutions. I had previously introduced a resolution reaffirming the Kansas City platform. That was voted down. When we refused to declare in favor of the gold standard and refused to reaffirm the Kansas City platform, we left the question open as to the monetary standard.

I called attention to the fact that there were certain questions before Congress upon which we ought to express an opinion. I called attention to the fact that a bill had been reported by a committee authorizing the melting of silver dollars into subsidiary coin at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. I pointed out that the purpose of the bill was gradually to melt up the silver dollars and recoin them into subsidiary coin of limited legal tender. I pointed out

that the purpose of the bill was to decrease the amount of standard money just to the extent of the melting of the coin. But the Committee refused to adopt it, saying that, as we had left the gold and silver question out entirely, we ought not by any suggestion to bring any phase of the money question into the campaign.

I introduced a resolution declaring our opposition to any contraction of the currency by the melting or retirement of any of the silver dollars. They objected that that brought in the question. I scratched out "silver dollars" and made it read that we objected to the contraction of the volume of metallic money. They said that the words "metallic money" might bring in the silver question. I scratched out "metallic money" and put in "standard money"—that we were opposed to the contraction of the volume of standard money; but they said: "We do not want to bring the money question in at all."

I then proposed a resolution condemning the asset currency, and called attention to the fact that it had no connection with the silver question, but they said that if we touched on any phase of the money question, it would bring in all of it.

I called attention to the fact that we had to meet this issue; that we had to have either a perpetual debt or an asset currency, if we had the national banks of issue. But they were so anxious to get harmony and bring the party together that we might fight this battle as a unit, that they were not even willing to declare against an asset currency and branch banks.

I then proposed a resolution declaring that the United States notes furnished a better money than the national bank notes. I was trying to get a declaration on that principle which has no connection with the silver question, but has a connection with a vital, living, throbbing question. But they said, "In the interest of harmony we must leave that out," and thus every proposition on our side was voted down, and they put it on the ground that as the gold proposition on their side had been voted down, no phase of the question should be touched.

When we came to read over the final draft I found that, inadvertently, a phrase had been used in the last paragraph which might raise this question. Here is the paragraph:

“ But also the active assistance of all of our fellow citizens, who, disregarding past differences upon questions no longer in issue,” etc.

I moved to strike out “ upon questions no longer in issue,” on the ground that it was a declaration that the money question was settled, and substantially a declaration for the gold standard. On motion in that Committee it was stricken out, and here [exhibiting] is the official draft of the platform with those words stricken out. I find that copies had been given out to the newspapers before this correction was made, and as the platform appears in the papers those words (the words stricken out) are in it.

The Committee took every precaution to keep this question out, and now I understand it is proposed that we shall make a declaration in this telegram that—

“ The platform adopted by this Convention is silent upon the question of the monetary standard because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign, and only campaign issues are mentioned in the platform. Therefore there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform.”

In the Committee I asked Senator Hill if he knew Mr. Parker's views on the gold standard. He said he did not; that he had never talked with him on that subject, and that he did not know his views upon it. Now, my friends, if you send this telegram and say that this question is no longer an issue, you simply say it is settled on the gold standard side; and I insist that if you are going to declare for the gold standard, you should be honest and manly and say so in the platform. [Applause.]

Senator Tillman has said that we all know where Mr. Parker stands; that we all knew in the Committee. How did we know? Only by his silence. That was the only way. Judging by his silence, I believed he was for the gold standard, and I have insisted for months that he ought to state his position, so that the American people could sit in judgment upon it and not enter a Convention blindfolded on this subject. [Applause.]



If this Convention will adopt a plank declaring that the gold standard has been established in this country and is accepted, I shall offer no objection to the plank except to vote against it. [Applause.] But I appeal to you to be candid with the voters of this country. [Applause.] I appeal to you to take them into your confidence.

If there is any objection to our saying this plainly, why should we say it by inference; and if you say that you are willing to say this in regard to the gold standard because it is settled, then I insist, that having entered upon the money question, you shall say in the platform whether or not the party favors the melting up of the silver dollars, whether it favors the asset currency, the branch banks, and the national bank currency. [Applause.] And if the Convention does not want to do this, if it wants simply to send this telegram, then I insist that if we are going to tell Mr. Parker that his views are unimportant on this question, because it is not an issue, we shall tell him that his views are important on these other phases of the financial question which are before the country. [Applause.]

MR. R. F. PETTIGREW, of South Dakota: May I ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question?

MR. BRYAN: Certainly.

MR. PETTIGREW: As I recollect the telegram of Judge Parker, it practically says that the gold standard is irrevocably established and he would veto any bill that sought to disturb it. I want to know if his language would admit of any other interpretation.

MR. BRYAN: The words "firmly and irrevocably" may mean that there is no——

MR. PETTIGREW: He says he will act accordingly if he is elected.

MR. BRYAN: Yes—"irrevocably established, and [I] shall act accordingly." If he means that it is established beyond the power of the American people to change it, I would deny it, for the American people have the right to fix their standard and to change it whenever they please. [Applause.] If, however, he simply means that, so far as he is concerned, he is opposed to

any change, and that he wants to go into the office with the understanding that all the influence of the Executive will be used to prevent any change in the standard, then I understand it to mean that if President, and having the veto power, which enables him to override anything less than two-thirds of both Houses, he will use that power even if the majority of the people want to change the standard. [Applause.]

I am sorry that this question ever arose. I joined in the report of the Platform Committee because I wanted harmony. I joined in it because I wanted to put a united party back of our candidate. I think it is a manly thing for a man to express his opinion before the Convention adjourns; but it would have been manlier to have expressed it before the Convention met. [Applause.] It is a manly thing to express his opinion before the delegates act finally upon his position, but it would have been a manlier thing had he expressed his opinion before the voters throughout the country went to their caucuses and their primaries and sent instructed delegates here. [Applause.]

We cannot be blamed for the injection of this question at this time. It is the Judge's fault that he did not speak sooner, and not our fault. He has been invited to speak on numerous and sundry occasions. It is not our fault that this question was ever raised. His friends brought the gold plank into the Committee and tried to make it a part of the platform; but, having been offered and having been stricken out and the Convention having acted, I am not willing to send this naked statement to him, and thereby write into our platform a plank that we intended to leave out of the platform. [Applause.]

I shall, therefore, oppose this telegram, or possibly as amendments must be acted on first, I will propose some amendments to the telegram, and then if the motion to send the telegram is defeated, you can propose your gold standard plank and let the Convention vote upon it. If the gold standard is right, why run from it? [Applause.] If it is good, why be afraid of it? and if it is bad enough to scare you out of putting it in your platform, it is bad enough to leave out, either directly or indirectly. [Applause.]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Conven-

tion, I introduce to you Senator John W. Daniel, of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

MR. JOHN W. DANIEL, of Virginia: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, most of the members of this Convention know something of my record as a Democrat. There is no man in this Convention to-day who, while the battle was on, was more conscientiously or more earnestly an advocate of bimetallism and the silver dollar than myself. Indeed, for ten years before it became the predominant issue in American politics, I was preaching on its side. In two campaigns I had the honor to stand by the side of, and to advocate the doctrine of, bimetallism which was so ably advocated by the distinguished delegate from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan).

On the back of one of the volumes which contain the Democratic platform and the Democratic creeds which we stood for, there was written a text from the words of Thomas Jefferson, and that text read thus: "Absolute acquiescence in the will of a majority is the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force." After eight years of as stern a contest as was ever made amongst the conflicting opinions of the American people, a majority of our countrymen, with an overwhelming voice, which they repeated in their utterance, declared that the gold standard should be the law of our country.

In furtherance of their declared will, the Congress of the United States, in which you and I were represented as much as anyone else, did write into the statute law of this land a gold standard, and the requisition that all forms of our money be maintained at parity therewith. That standard doth now exist, and, as a law-abiding citizen of the Republic who loves its Constitution and proposes to stand by its laws, I bow to the majesty of the American people, and am nowhere afraid to declare my sentiment that the Democratic party should do likewise. [Applause.]

Is not that straight? Is not that honorable? Is not that right? Gentlemen, if for eight years the silver cause has defeated the gold cause; if, by an overwhelming majority of the American people, twice repeated, silver and gold together

in bimetallism had been by them declared to be their will to compose the currency of our country, and if, in execution of that will, you had gone to the Congress of the United States and written it into our statutes, would you not have thought that the gold men were a little overzealous and disobedient to the great principle which the captain of Democracy taught us, that acquiescence in the will of the people was a Democratic principle? And is it not a little ungracious, after preaching that doctrine ourselves in our campaign books, that we should go back upon it to deny history, to deny law, and to utter a protest against existing fact? Now, gentlemen, I will not discuss any collateral topic.

We did not put our acquiescence in the gold standard in plain and unmistakable language in our platform, although it was my wish and hope and vote in the sub-committee, and the full committee as well, that we should do so. I think we should have done so but for the fact that some of the delegates in your platform committee thought that the whole country realized the fact, and that it was useless to name a dead issue when we were going forth to grapple with living ones.

It seems that, for the purpose of having the public in the United States understand so, it has been proposed to send this telegram to Judge Parker. Whatever may be said about the circumstances which now surround us, no one can read the manly, open and plain words of that honorable and high-minded judge without perceiving and recognizing that they came from the hands, and were inspired by the heart, of a man who wishes to act in the open, and who would not be tempted by the highest prize in the gift of the American people to receive any other than an honest, plain and straightforward support. [Applause.] And whatever else some people may think of Judge Parker, I think of him that he is a foot taller to-day than he was on yesterday, when we nominated him [applause], and that the whole American people will say of him, "Behold a man worthy to bear the standard of the brave and unterrified Democracy of this land." [Applause.]

Gentlemen, our platform has been made up. I think the Democratic party is already suffering, and has suffered enough,

from too much platform. [Applause.] I would rather have an honorable and true Democratic man in the White House, like Jefferson, like Madison, like Monroe, and like a half dozen others whom I might mention, without any platform, than to have a platform as long as from one end of this hall to the other, with a man whose character was questionable and whose record was open to suspicion. [Applause.] Character and history are a platform. Judge Parker has both. In this vast nation of eighty million people, with its diversified interests too numerous to mention, a platform that goes into the details of all public questions would beat a Webster's Unabridged all hollow, and be worse to read than a New York Sunday newspaper.

Judge Parker has sent a message to us stating his interpretation of our situation. Let me say further that the gold standard is so universally recognized in this country that it was not even mentioned in the Democratic Convention in New York, in which Judge Parker was nominated, and the New York delegation here instructed to vote for him. I do not wonder that Governor Hill, of New York, has not talked with Judge Parker about the gold standard, because in that State the issue has been so long dead that nobody thinks of it or introduces it as a subject of conversation, unless in a campaign in which suggestions are made that the Democratic party is unwilling to recognize the law of the land and to say so.

Now, then, it seems to me but right and just that we should send back to Judge Parker the greeting of this body, which, in my judgment, knows the fact that the gold standard is existing, just as well as people in New York know it.

There is the fact also that, although this Convention is largely composed of men who have been the advocates of free silver at 16 to 1, not a single man here of all this host of a thousand men, nay, not one, be he from Virginia, come he from the Lone Star State, live he in Missouri or Colorado, or come he from Nebraska, who has proposed here that we make any opposition whatsoever to the gold standard, and the only contention here is that we shall not say that which we do mean. [Applause.]

Now, Judge Parker has correctly read the meaning of this Convention, but lest there be misunderstanding, so scrupulous is he in his sensibility, so desirous that all who run may read, and may see in his attitude the open, frank spirit of an honorable and a brave man, that before he has accepted your nomination, he has simply taken the liberty which propriety to him seemed to suggest to tell you how he regarded the matter, and to leave it to you to say whether or not he regarded it rightly. That he does regard it rightly, although perhaps there may be some grammatical or verbal criticism here or there as to the exact shade of the meaning of his words, that he is right in his interpretation of the meaning of this Convention, I hardly think could be successfully denied.

It is said that it would have been perhaps more manly for him to have spoken before the Convention met than now. I respectfully submit that upon this subject there may justly be room for an opposite opinion. In the State of New York, where Judge Parker lives, no man had raised the question. In the Convention which nominated him, nothing was said upon the subject. In the State of Virginia, which I have the honor to represent in part upon this floor, while so far as I know and so far as I believe, there is an absolute acquiescence in the will of a majority of the American people, which you have a right to expect in those who were raised within the shadow of Monticello, if there be opposition to it I am not aware of it, and in our Virginia Convention no one discussed the subject and no one offered any platform plank upon the subject.

So it seems to me, in conclusion, that it is the wise and the just thing, that it is the appropriate and the becoming thing for those Democrats here who do earnestly desire that this Convention speak plainly, and that a Democrat shall be President of the United States, to respond to our noble and our chosen chief sufficiently clearly to show that we understand this matter as he does, and are ready, with him in our lead, to form ranks and move forward to send a Democratic administration to the city of Washington.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: I now introduce to you,

gentlemen of the Convention, General James B. Weaver, of Iowa.

MR. CALVIN RAYBURN, of Pennsylvania: I should like to know what motion is pending before the Convention.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

MR. RAYBURN: I rise to a point of order. I wish to know what is before the Convention. If there is a motion pending before the Convention, I desire to have it stated.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The question before the Convention is whether or not this body is going to send to Judge Parker the telegram which has been read.

MR. CHARLES D'AUTREMONT, Jr., of Minnesota: Mr. Chairman—

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

MR. D'AUTREMONT: I wish to ask the indulgence of this Convention for one minute only to express the views of Minnesota.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: After Mr. Weaver has his say, he having been first recognized by the Chair.

MR. JAMES B. WEAVER, of Iowa: Mr. Chairman, I wish to talk for a few minutes on this question.

I was a member of the Committee on Platform. We had a very strenuous session. This question was, in substance, before the Committee and before the Sub-Committee. We tried our best to ascertain how Judge Parker stood on this very question. We were told by his chief sponsor, Senator Hill, of New York, that he did not know, and by a vote of fifteen in favor of inserting a gold standard plank in the platform to thirty-five opposed to it, that plank was rejected by the full Committee. That action was brought to this Convention, and this Convention endorsed the action of the Committee.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Daniel) says that Judge Parker is a foot higher than he was on yesterday. I want to say, in reply to my distinguished friend, that that is an optical illusion. [Applause.] He merely appears to be a

foot higher, because the Convention is three feet lower than it was on yesterday. [Applause.]

It was the intention of the Committee, and the intention of this Convention, to keep that question out of the campaign, and, after the Committee had agreed, we had a love feast in the Committee Room, and we have had one ever since on the floor of this Convention until this discordant note was projected into our deliberations by the nominee of this Convention. It is an attempt to bring that question in issue in the campaign in the most pronounced and the most offensive manner.

It has already gone to the uttermost limits of the Republic that Judge Parker dictates to this Convention that "unless you put this plank in the platform you need not make me the nominee." Now, if we send this telegram to him, it is equivalent to saying, "All right, Judge; anything you want, without regard to whether we endorse it or not" [applause], and it puts the question in the campaign in the most pronounced manner possible.

I desire to say now, Mr. Chairman, that when the vote is taken on this question, I reserve the right, and will not be denied it, because it is my right under parliamentary law, to demand a call of the States, that the nation may know who built our platform, whether the Convention or whether Judge Parker constructed it. [Applause.]

Let me read this telegram from Judge Parker. It is dated from a place spelled E-s-o-p-u-s. Some people pronounce it Es-o-pus, but I ask this Convention if it does not think it ought to be pronounced E-so-pus. Judge Parker says:

"I regard the gold standard as firmly and irrevocably established."

Very well. Your Committee and this Convention have not said so, and we refused so to state. Mr. Parker continues:

"And shall act accordingly if the action of the Convention to-day shall be ratified by the people."

It strikes me that this is the most pronounced gold standard platform that could possibly be adopted by this Convention, because he notifies you in advance that, without regard to change of circumstances or the will of Congress or the will of the



people, he intends to act upon his present convictions that the establishment of the gold standard is irrevocable. You could not have it in a more offensive form than that.

Here is the manly part of the telegram:

"As the platform is silent on the subject, my view should be made known to the Convention, and if it is proved to be unsatisfactory to the majority, I request you to decline the nomination for me at once, so that another may be nominated before adjournment."

Now, I want to call attention to a little history. On the way to this Convention, Senator Hill and Mr. Sheehan, so the papers report, announced that they intended to ask that a gold standard plank should be inserted in the platform. We were astonished to find that they kept their word when they got into the Committee, but now imagine our further disappointment and astonishment when we find that, after the Committee has acted, and after the Convention has acted, they are here now in a most dictatorial manner attempting, with a message from the mouth of their own candidate, to force onto the consideration of this Convention the gold standard.

I will state to you what I said to Senator Daniel during the progress of the debate in the Committee. I said, "Senator, the mere fact that the friends of Judge Parker have seriously asked the Committee to report that plank has already done infinite injury to your candidate, and the best thing you can possibly do is to get it out of the Committee, withdraw it, and let the statement go out to the country that no such serious attempt is being made."

But now, the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions reappears here on this platform and reargues the case that was settled by the Committee against him, and, by his advocacy, brings it anew before this Convention for adoption. I say it is a disappointment to me. Gentlemen, you can not make this kind of a platform now, under the circumstances, without giving offence to the self-respect of this Convention and to the American people. [Applause.]

MR. CHARLES S. HAMLIN, of Massachusetts: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: The American people

admire frankness, sincerity and courage in public life, and I should be false to Massachusetts—the old Bay State—if I did not pay my personal tribute, as well as that of my State, to this expression of these qualities just given by our nominee for President. The courage he has shown is the courage that elects Presidents of the United States.

My friends, I shall take but one moment of your time. The distinguished Democratic leader of the House, Mr. Williams, has told you that in Committee we voted down every kind of a financial plank because we wished to keep the monetary standard out as an issue; that we thought it had no place in this campaign.

This is true, so far as concerns a majority of the Resolutions Committee; but to prevent any misapprehension, I want to say that we of the minority believed there should be a positive declaration for the gold standard, and we did not cease our efforts until hours after the gold resolution, after long, weary debate, had been defeated by a vote of thirty-five to fifteen. As a result of that vote there has arisen some misapprehension throughout the United States. I am frank enough to say here that I think that apprehension, unexplained as to the facts, in some respects may not be without justification.

On being defeated on that resolution, as the representative of Massachusetts, I felt it my duty to file a minority report, and I am going to tell you why I did not do so. It was because I feared that a minority report might not be accepted by this Convention, and that such a result would seriously affect us in the coming campaign. Why? Not because we do not all acknowledge that the gold standard is a fact—undisputed and uncontested, the law of the land—but because the delegates might say, "Being not an issue, being a dead issue, we do not want it in a platform devoted to live issues, and therefore we will keep it out." I feared the people of the country might misunderstand such action, if taken, and I relied with certainty upon a declaration from the candidate, whomsoever he might be, to remove any possible doubt of his or the Party's position upon this matter.

I therefore filed no minority report.

Our nominee, however, by his manly telegram, has made known his views, and we must reply in no uncertain terms. If there is any hesitation now, the Democratic party is lost. If, however, we rise to our feet and take advantage of our opportunity, we shall find that the American people, admiring courage, truth and honor, will rally to our standard, and we will enter on a lasting career of pure Democracy, the Democracy of the people.

I appeal to you, our friends in the South. You know what danger is overhanging you. You know what the Republican platform means. It means future Force bills. The people of Massachusetts do not fear Force bills. We never would submit to be interfered with in our just rights of voting. But, my friends, when the Force bill was introduced in 1890, the South called to us for help. We rallied to the polls; we challenged the Republicans to debate that measure under the shadow of Bunker Hill, and we buried it by our votes as deeply beneath the ground as Bunker Hill monument rises proudly above it.

Let us show the courage of our convictions. Let us vote to send this telegram to this great leader, and we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that the response from the people will be immediate and sure. Let us not fear to be courageous. The people admire courage. Let us say what we mean. Let us tell our standard bearer that we understand his views, and that they are not objectionable to the Party.

The gentleman who nominated him yesterday uttered a noteworthy sentiment. He said: "He is content to be the servant, not the master, of the Democratic Convention." Those were true words, as true to-day as yesterday. But, my friends, in this respect the master in that platform has not spoken, and the servant, with a sense of honor worthy of emulation, has frankly revealed to the master his opinion, and asks that that opinion be recorded.

My friends, we have the opportunity of a lifetime. We have the opportunity to re-establish a government of laws in place of the government of men now at Washington. Let us not cast it away. Let us send out this message, and I make the predic-

tion that when the votes are counted on election day, we will find that the country has declared overwhelmingly for that upright Judge, that worthy citizen, yes, that proved statesman—Alton B. Parker. [Applause.]

MR. E. W. CARMACK, of Tennessee: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: As a member of the Committee on Resolutions I am somewhat familiar with the discussion of this question and of the issue that was raised in that Committee. From what has been said here to-night, one would suppose that the silver question has again become the paramount issue. As a matter of fact, it was recognized by every member of that Committee, including the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan), that the great issue of 1896 was no longer an issue in this campaign.

Mr. Chairman, there was presented there the question of making a declaration in plain and emphatic language to the effect that existing conditions had removed that issue, a declaration in favor of maintaining the existing gold standard. That plank to the platform was voted down, and all agreed to report the platform to this Convention with no plank whatever upon the money question. It was a unanimous report of that Committee, and the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, who never compromises a question of principle, appeared before this Convention to say that he was ready to stand upon and to defend that platform.

Mr. Chairman, I say that when he, with all the other members of the Committee, agreed to report a platform which did not call in question the existing standard of money in this country, which make no attack upon existing law, which was absolutely silent with reference to the great issue of 1896, he consented that that was a dead issue. If he had not thought it a dead issue he would have made his separate report and he would have made a determined fight for a free silver plank in that platform, as he did in 1896, as he did in 1900, when he refused to accept the nomination without a specific declaration in favor of 16 to 1.

But in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, as gentlemen have been talking about what occurred in that Committee, I will say

that I presented a resolution in that Committee, a part of which reads as follows:

“We recognize that the great and unlooked for increase in the production of gold has relieved the stringency caused by the scarcity of metallic money, and that because of that fact the money question as presented in the last two Presidential campaigns is not acute, and does not require legislative relief.”

And the gentleman from Nebraska promptly declared that he was in favor of that plank to the platform. [Applause.] There was a plain declaration, Mr. Chairman, that the money question was in such condition, with the gold standard existing and established, that we did not need any further legislation; and the gentleman from Nebraska, if I am not mistaken, said he would accept that.

MR. BRYAN, of Nebraska: I will not only admit it, but I will go further than that when I speak.

MR. CARMACK: That now is beyond question. The gentleman from Nebraska says he does admit it. He said it then in the Committee. He says now he admits that we do not need any legislation against the gold standard. He is willing to let it alone; he is willing to let it stand where it is; and he says he will go further than that when he speaks. I do not know how much further he will go.

Mr. Chairman, the question presented by this telegram is a very simple matter after all. I regret that that telegram was sent. I think it was unnecessary. The gentleman from Nebraska before the Committee asserted that the nomination of Judge Parker would be platform enough on the money question.

MR. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman: I beg pardon. I never said that—never.

MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: The gentleman and Mr. Hill were having some interlocutory remarks, and the gentleman said: “Do you not think that your candidate would be platform enough on that question?”

MR. CARMACK: Mr. Chairman: I will accept the modified statement made by my friend, Mr. Williams, of Mississippi.

MR. BRYAN: I will not accept it.

MR. CARMACK: Two of us remember it the same way, and my recollection is very distinct. The gentleman from Nebraska said some very heated things that night. He said some very angry things—things that I think he afterward regretted—and I do not know that his recollection as to what he did say in the Committee is as clear as that of some of the rest of us who were keeping very cool. But our recollection is that he propounded the question, "Do you not think the nomination of your candidate is platform enough upon the question of silver?" We did think so, and we did not say anything on the question.

Mr. Chairman, I have understood that the gentleman from Nebraska was willing to nominate men for President of the United States who are known to be open gold standard men. I have understood that he was willing to nominate Mr. Pattison, of Pennsylvania, and Judge Parker could not go any further in favor of the gold standard than he. Why, then, this attack on Judge Parker as a gold standard man?

The gentleman from Nebraska is a very sincere man. No man is willing more thoroughly to accord to him that quality than I am. But he has become worked up a little too much on the question of New York and he thinks that no good thing can come out of that Nazareth; that if a man comes from New York he is bound to be everything that is wicked.

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, this matter comes up after all in a very simple form. The platform was adopted. It was published in the papers. The statement had been published before that we were going to adopt what was known as the gold standard plank, a plank recognizing the existing standard, and the New York papers were assailing us and Judge Parker, and the papers here in St. Louis were doing the same. All over the country they were trying to create the impression that we and our candidate were trying to back water on that question.

Like an honest man Judge Parker wanted this Convention to know beyond any doubt how he stood upon this matter after it had been called in question, and after the action of the Committee had been assailed. He is not trying to dictate to this Convention. He simply says to you: "Now that you have not said anything on this question, and now that the matter has

needlessly been brought into discussion; now that the silver question which was dead has been revived, I want you to understand where I am. Do not take me as your standard bearer under any misunderstanding. I am a gold standard man. I believe that the gold standard should be maintained. You have not said one thing or the other upon the question, but before you adjourn, before you send me out with your standard in my hands, know how I stand on the question."

It was the act of an honest man, but, gentlemen of the Convention, I do not think the people of this country have ever been deceived on that matter. It was needless to send the telegram.

I supported Judge Parker in my State, and I assumed all the time that he was a gold standard man, and I said so to my people. But I believe we have other and greater issues. The people in my part of the country, for whom my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan), has uttered no word in the discussion of this platform, are threatened with an attack upon their very civilization, which, if carried out, will bring ruin and desolation to the South, and we are willing on that account to leave some things out of this platform, in order to save ourselves and our country.

We believe that the question of imperialism, which was the paramount issue of the campaign in 1900, is the paramount issue now; at least I do. I am opposed to imperialism. I am opposed to militarism. I am opposed to the tyranny of the present Chief Executive, and if we can elect a Democrat and place the Democratic party in power and relieve the people of all these dangers, can we not postpone for a little while the discussion of 16 to 1?

Some criticism has been made upon Judge Parker's telegram, because he says the gold standard is irrevocably established. If elected, he will act upon that theory during the four years in which he is in office; but, gentlemen of the Convention, if the question should again become acute, if we should need to restore the coinage of silver, the people of the United States can revive that issue or it will revive itself.

But for the present why should we seek to disturb the unity of the Democratic party? Why should we seek, because some

men here do not happen to like a particular candidate, to deliver the country into the hands of Theodore Roosevelt and the Republican party for four years more, while we resolve the Democratic party into a cat fight and adjourn? I appeal to you all in the name of Democracy, in the name of the issues upon which we are all agreed, which were unanimously reported in the platform presented to this Convention, to lay aside these other questions and send our message to Judge Parker:

“You may not agree with all of us on all questions, but we know that you are an honest and an incorruptible man and we will make no quarrel with you because you have an opinion upon a question which is not an issue and which will not be an issue in this campaign.” [Applause.] I thank you.

Mr. William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska, obtained the floor.

MR. CARMACK: Will the gentleman from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

MR. BRYAN: Certainly.

MR. CARMACK: There is one thing I forgot to say. It has been printed in a newspaper and circulated all over this Convention, that I have received a certain telegram from Judge Parker, declaring that he would not accept the nomination unless we inserted a gold standard plank, or something of that sort. I simply desire to say to you that that is absolutely false. I have received no telegram or other communication from Judge Parker since this Convention met, and I never did receive one from him in my life. [Applause.]

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Convention: I will first read the amendment which I propose to the telegram, and then I desire to submit a few remarks in answer to some things which have been said. Here is the amendment:

“But as you will, if elected, be called upon to act on certain phases of the money question, we desire to know whether you favor reducing the volume of silver dollars, whether you favor an asset currency and branch national banks, and whether you prefer national bank currency to United States notes.”



I wish to take up several matters, and I will take them up in order. I was willing in the Committee to do everything possible in the interest of harmony, and I want you gentlemen to know that if there is discord in this Convention, you cannot lay it at my door. [Applause.] I have been the harmonizer. When they voted down my proposition to reaffirm the Kansas City platform, I did not present a minority report, and when we voted down their proposition for the gold standard and they did not present a minority report, we supposed that settled the matter. And my point now is that after we have done our part, after in the interest of harmony we have given up our contentions, they should not force upon us something worse even than their original proposition. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Carmack) says he proposed a resolution, and I was willing to accept it. He read you part of it; let me read you *all* of it:

“We recognize that the great and unlooked for increase in the production of gold has relieved the stringency caused by the scarcity of metallic money, and that because of that fact the money question as presented in the last two Presidential campaigns is not now acute and does not require legislative relief. But it has at the same time vindicated the demands of the Democratic party in the past for an increased volume of metallic money, that demand not being for silver as silver or for gold as gold, but for a sufficient quantity of standard money to maintain the level of prices and transact the business of the country.” [Applause.]

That was proposed by Senator Carmack as a substitute for the gold standard resolution offered by Senator Hill, and Senator Hill refused to accept it. I told him I would be satisfied with it if he would accept it. [Applause.] So in the interest of harmony—

MR. E. W. CARMACK, of Tennessee: If the gentleman will permit me, that is not exactly correct. The Hill plank—

[At this point there was much disorder.]

MR. BRYAN: Do not interrupt the gentleman.

MR. CARMACK (to Mr. Bryan): You need not do that.

MR. BRYAN: If I make any mistake, I want to be corrected.

MR. CARMACK: I am much obliged to the gentleman, but I will say to him that he need not trouble himself to cause his friends to keep order while I address the Convention. I will try to do that in one way or another.

The correction I want to make in the gentleman's statement is that the Hill plank had already been voted down by the Committee, and I offered this as an independent resolution and he accepted it.

MR. BRYAN: My recollection, although I may be mistaken, because this covered several hours, is that when Senator Hill was speaking of the necessity of having something in the platform on that subject, this was proposed to meet the case, and I was willing to accept it; but Senator Hill refused to accept it. That resolution not only stated that it was not now acute and did not need relief, but it stated the principle for which we contended in two campaigns. And I wanted it in the platform. [Applause.] So much for that.

Something was said about my saying that Mr. Parker ought to be accepted as a platform. We were discussing platforms and several other things, and I suggested that we might not need any platform if we had a candidate whose record was known. I think it was in that connection that I suggested that the proper thing to do, if that was their plan, was to nominate Grover Cleveland, for he had such a record that he would not need any platform. [Applause.]

But, my friends, I think my recollection on the subject is corroborated by my question to Senator Hill and his answer that he did not know the opinion of Judge Parker. I think that verifies my position, for if Senator Hill did not know Mr. Parker's opinion, I would hardly say Parker himself ought to be accepted as a platform.

But I desire to refer to two or three arguments that have been made. It is said first that we ought to recognize the gold standard as the established law, that it is the established law. Why not then recognize it? My answer is if it is the law, then why say anything about it? Shall we put in our platform a recognition of all the laws we have? If this is law, if we, there-

fore, ought not to object to it, then why is it necessary to state it?

Senator Daniel says that we have been defeated twice on the silver issue, and that we ought to acquiesce in the will of the majority. We have been defeated twice on the tariff issue. Why not acquiesce in the will of the majority there? [Applause.] Why resist the will of the majority? Why shall we array ourselves against "a settled public opinion" on the tariff question? This is not logic. And if it is true that we ought to accept the gold standard as established merely because we have been defeated on the issue in two campaigns, then by the same logic, we have no right to contest the protective tariff. [Applause.]

It is said that Judge Parker did not discuss this question and that nobody asked his opinion, because this question is so settled in New York that nobody ever thinks of mentioning it. If that is true, then how did anybody discover that it was not in the platform? [Laughter and applause.] If it is so well settled that they never think of it, that they never ask about it, that they never talk about it, then why are they so quick to discover its omission from the platform? [Applause.] It is not logical, my friends.

But, sirs, there is another question, and I speak of it with some emphasis. My friend from Massachusetts (Mr. Hamlin) holds out before you people of the South the danger of black domination, and you are virtually threatened that, if you do not accept the gold standard, if you do not admit that it is irrevocably established, never to be interfered with, the people down East will let you suffer from your black peril. In 1896, when, as the candidate of the party, I had all the South behind me, and was speaking for things in which the South believed, my friend (Mr. Hamlin) did not feel it necessary—and I do not speak it in censure—to join with us in order to help you out. [Applause.] Nor is he willing to admit now that the people of Massachusetts will join with you to save you from this peril unless you bow before their golden idol. [Applause.] I did better than his people will do. I told you that while I believed in the doctrine I have been preaching, I would support a gold

standard man to help you out. I was willing to waive my position on that subject. [Applause.]

You were asked what difference it makes whether or not the man believes in the gold standard; whether or not his opinion is known, if he believes in it. The gentleman reminds you that I said I would support Governor Pattison, who is a gold man. I said I would. I told you he was a gold man. But, my friends, if we had nominated on that platform a man known to be a gold man, people could have gone and voted as I would have gone and voted—voted knowing that he was a gold man, but trusting him on the other questions. But now our candidate comes and injects into the platform this question, and makes it not merely a gold standard plank, but, as has been suggested, makes it an irrevocable gold standard proposition, denying us even the right to oppose it at a future time. The Republican platform is not so strong on this subject as this telegram would make our platform.

There may be one advantage in having this brought out now; yes, two. One is that having nominated the candidate, it is very embarrassing to do anything that he objects to, and all of this feeling of embarrassment will help to fasten the gold standard on the party. That is one advantage in bringing it up now.

But, my friends, my objection to having this fight made in favor of the gold standard was that it would jeopardize the success of our campaign. I want us to win in this campaign. [Applause.] I want us to defeat the Republican party; and I think it is infinitely embarrassing that this question should come in. I was rejoicing yesterday, I was exceedingly glad, that a difference which I feared we might not be able to reconcile, had been reconciled, and it is distressing to me that this opposition must be met. But if the question is presented, what else can we do? Will you drive us home like cowards and tell the people there that we did not dare to express ourselves? [Applause.] We have our people's interest to represent; we have their welfare to guard.

You have been told that it is to the East to which you must look. Some reference has been made to the Force Bill. I think,

if my memory serves me aright, that when the Force Bill was before the Senate, the South and the North and the East did not furnish Democrats enough; they had to come West to get enough Senators to save the South from the Force Bill. [Applause.] We now have some Senators from the Northwest, and when the gold standard plank was before the Committee and the question was asked, "Would its adoption do any harm," gentlemen rose not only from all the Northwestern States, but from States north of the Ohio, and from States south of the Ohio, and declared that that plank would jeopardize success in those States.

We did not want this issue presented; we did not want this subject touched; but the action of the candidate has brought the subject in. I know but two ways of getting it out. One is so to amend this telegram to Mr. Parker as to state our side, not on dead issues, but on living ones; and the other is to amend your platform and put in a plank that will meet the case. If you want to amend your platform, I will agree now to Senator Carmack's plank. Will the friends of Judge Parker accept that as a sufficient declaration on the subject? [Applause.]

I insist that the question having been raised, you ought to meet it; you ought to meet it candidly; you ought to meet it fairly; you ought to meet it honestly. It is my candid opinion that an open, frank declaration will not lose you any more votes than an attempt to dodge this issue and to ignore it, now that it has been raised. [Applause.] And if the question of money is to be in the campaign, we should know the candidate's position on several questions. If this attempt to contract the currency by melting silver dollars is successful the administration can, by melting silver dollars, rob this nation of \$578,000,000 of its standard money, and thus take away from the people almost all the benefit that has come from the increased production of gold.

If the money question is in the campaign and we are to know that Judge Parker will put his veto to any attempt to interfere with the gold standard, we ought to know whether he is going to sign a bill which will give us an asset currency

and make it so that we cannot tell from day to day what is behind the dollars we carry in our pockets. [Applause.]

We ought to know whether he is going to put his signature to a bill which will give us a branch bank system and fasten upon this country a money monopoly like that which Jackson destroyed, and by destroying which made himself immortal in Democratic history. [Applause.] These things we ought to know. We ought to know whether in this contest between Government money and bank money our candidate stands on the side of the bank or on the side of the people. [Applause.]

If he had kept his views to himself on the gold standard question, we might have been willing to take our chances on the others, but now that you have him sure on your side on that subject, it is a little unfair to leave us uncertain as to his position on these other questions. [Applause.]

MR. JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi: Mr. Chairman: Queer indeed to me is that sort of harmony which consists in a twenty minutes attack upon your own candidate and your own platform. [Applause.] The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. Bryan) says that he had hoped to see no discord in this Convention, but I say to you that the only note of discord which has been heard since we assembled here down to this good time has been his. [Applause.] What think you? After midnight, the great historic party of America, assembled to nominate a candidate for the highest office in the world, and a man stands here pretending to be a Democrat—and a man who is a Democrat, too, for that matter, Democratic fundamentally, Democratic at heart—and offers as an amendment to this telegram which we propose to send to Mr. Parker, which he but a moment ago read, a lot of foolish questions about little things. [Applause.]

It is easy in this world, if you have a great big voice and a great, immense, deep chest, to talk in such a manner as to get people's minds off of the issue before them. Now, what is the issue? Let me get rid of all this rubbish and get back to that which is the actual issue.

This telegram was received. Let us read it. The gentleman has been getting very much mixed. He has mixed up the

platform with Mr. Parker's telegram. He has mixed up our proposed reply with Mr. Parker's telegram. He seems to think that everything in Mr. Parker's telegram to us becomes a part of the Democratic platform. Nothing could be more absurd. Not even our telegram to him becomes a part of the Democratic platform.

What is the telegram, and what shall be the answer? Those are the two questions. Here is the telegram:

"I regard the gold standard as firmly and irrevocably established."

That is Parker's opinion. That is not my opinion, so far as the word "irrevocably" is concerned. I think he is wrong about it. It is not the Democratic party's opinion. It is not the opinion of this platform. That the gold standard is established and "firmly" established, nobody but an idiot would deny. And, by the way, the main difference between a man of tolerably good sense and an idiot is that a man of tolerably good sense knows an accomplished fact when he kicks it up in the middle of the road, and an idiot does not. [Laughter.]

Let me proceed with the reading of Parker's telegram:

"And shall act accordingly if the action of the Convention to-day shall be ratified by the people."

That is, if he is elected President. Suppose it had been Mr. Bryan whom we had nominated to-day upon this exact platform.

Suppose it had been Mr. Bryan. I have seen him nominated twice, and I have voted for him with gladness and in honor. Suppose it had been he, and suppose we had said nothing upon the money plank. Suppose Mr. Bryan had wired us and said: "For fear you may be deceived, or somebody may be deceived, I want to tell you, since the platform is silent upon that question, what my opinion is. I am in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1." Suppose that had happened; what answer would we have sent back to that telegram? We would have sent back this reply: "Our platform is silent upon that issue, because we do not regard it as a campaign issue now, and we have put nothing but

campaign issues in our platform. Therefore, you can believe that all you please, and it is not in the slightest degree inconsistent with your accepting a nomination upon this platform."

And then the gentleman would turn around and tell us, if he argued as he has argued to-night, that because we had answered his wire in that way—oh, the infinite folly of it; the infinite silliness of it—we ourselves as a party had pronounced for the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at 16 to 1, although in the very message sent back we told him we had been silent on that subject and had been silent on purpose, because it was not an issue, and could not be made one, and had, therefore, not enunciated our views on the subject.

Let me finish the telegram. Mr. Parker goes on:

"As the platform is silent on the subject, my views should be made known to the Convention."

It may have been unnecessary to say this; but is it not honest, is it not brave, is it not true, is it not right, is it not candid and frank? It is.

By the way, why was the telegram made necessary at all, if at all? Perhaps because the newspapers were saying that the gentleman from Nebraska himself and others were pretending at least not to know what Mr. Parker thought upon that subject. I knew, and I am no better informed than most people.

"And if it is proved to be unsatisfactory to the majority, I request you to decline the nomination for me."

Why? So that the Democratic Convention, before it adjourned, could nominate somebody else in his stead. It is the only time, at least in the history of America, that anybody ever declined such a nomination after he had it.

Now, what is the answer? But before I go to that, I wish to say right here and now that there is not a man in this audience so absolutely ignorant as not to know that the silver question neither is, nor can be, made to be an issue in this campaign; and not being an issue in this campaign, it is a matter of no importance, as far as the party and the platform are concerned, what are a man's views upon the subject. The question of carrying slavery into the Territories is not an issue in this



campaign, and it makes no difference what you think about it. And, my friends, when a man tells me that he does not know that the silver issue is either a sleeping issue or a dead issue, one or the other, I tell you that man is either not sincere or that man has not good sense. There is no escape from that. [Applause.]

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Did you not in the Committee vote against Mr. Hill's plank?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I did, and I first voted against yours, declaring for free silver by endorsing the Kansas City platform. I voted against both of them for the very reason that I stated a moment ago—so that when we put up a good man as our standard bearer, regardless of his views on the silver question, those resolutions would not stand in his way and embarrass him in fighting for live issues. [Applause.] I did it, and I said in the Committee that I did it for the reason that the issue was either sleeping or dead, and that if it was in a trance, it would wake itself up when the proper conditions came about, and if it was dead I did not want the corpse in my parlor. [Applause.]

Here is the answer we propose to send Mr. Parker. See if there is a word in it that is not true:

“The platform adopted by this Convention is silent upon the question of the monetary standard.”

Well, is it not? Will Mr. Bryan say that it is not?

And then it goes on to tell why—

“Because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign.”

Now, to show how true that is, if in this body of intelligent delegates and alternates there be one man who will say it is regarded by him as a possible issue in this campaign, let him rise in his seat. [A pause.] None. Is there anybody on the platform who will rise? [A pause.] No; not one. [Applause.]

“Because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign, and only campaign issues are mentioned in the platform.”

Not every campaign issue, because we would have a plat-

form from here to the Southern Hotel, but the things that are mentioned are all campaign issues, and only campaign issues are mentioned. What follows as the conclusion?

“Therefore, there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform.”

If the man had believed that there ought to be free and unlimited coinage of copper at two to one, or free and unlimited coinage of lead buttons at six to one, or if he had believed what I believe has been feasible and possible, but what may not soon become again feasible and possible, not in the immediate future, not in four years, or eight years, or ten years, or twenty, namely, that you could hold the two precious metals together by the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1—if the man had held any of these views I could still have said to him: “The views expressed by you are such that they do not prevent or preclude the man who entertains them from accepting a nomination on this platform.”

Oh, my friends, I wish to God that I had a loud voice and a deep chest this one night in my life. My friends, here we are, surrounded by all these great and serious issues, these palpable menaces to peace, good government, republicanism, civilization itself. Then on the side over there is either a sleeping or a dead issue, call it what you please, and here is a gentleman who “would not mar any harmony,” but who wants to prevent us from marching on in solid phalanx like brave political soldiers, charging the breastworks of imperialism and the bulwarks of trusts and of the tariff and the fortifications of special privileges, charging up to the very White House itself, where Executive usurpation is the order of the day—here is a man who would forbid us from marching on to victory by preventing us from settling this occurrence in this natural, reasonable, true and right way, because, forsooth, he cannot let “the sleeping issue’s” trance continue, or because he wants to rub the dead issue’s corpse. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of moving the previous question upon the resolution and all amendments thereto.

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Allow me a word.

MR. WILLIAMS: No, sir.

MR. BRYAN: I merely want to withdraw my amendment.

MR. WILLIAMS: I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska for the purpose of withdrawing his amendment.

MR. G. V. MENZIES, of Indiana: Mr. Chairman—

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

MR. MENZIES: In view of the fact that it is getting on to 1 o'clock, that the session has been prolonged and the delegates are tired and worn out, I think, sir, a motion to adjourn would be in order.

MR. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, of Nebraska: Mr. Chairman: I am going to withdraw the amendment I offered. Our delegation is going to vote for New York's candidate for Vice-President. We are not going to do anything that can by any possibility mar our chances for success, and if you think a record vote on this question would do that, I will withdraw the amendment. [Applause.]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The question is, shall the previous question be ordered on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. Williams).

The previous question was ordered.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Now, in order that every man may know how to vote, I will ask the Clerk to read the telegram which it is proposed to send to the Honorable Alton B. Parker.

The Clerk read as follows:

"The platform adopted by this Convention is silent upon the question of the monetary standard, because it is not regarded by us as a possible issue in this campaign, and only campaign issues are mentioned in the platform. Therefore, there is nothing in the views expressed by you in the telegram just received which would preclude a man entertaining them from accepting a nomination on said platform."

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion to send the telegram which has just been read.

MR. D. A. BALL, of Missouri: On that question I demand that the roll of States be called.

The roll call was ordered. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

MR. JOHN N. WHEELER, of Arkansas (when the vote of Arkansas was announced): We vote under the unit rule. There are eighteen votes in the Arkansas delegation, but only eleven delegates are in their seats.

MR. J. C. SOUTH, of Arkansas: There are some gentlemen who want a record, and therefore ask a poll of our delegation.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Why do you want it polled?

MR. J. B. BAKER, of Arkansas: We ask, sir, that the delegation be polled.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: For what purpose?

MR. BAKER: That we may ascertain how the delegation stands on this question.

MR. WHEELER: We have already ascertained.

MR. BAKER: I wish to say we have not, because——

MR. CARROLL D. WOOD: I am the alternate for Senator Berry, who is absent, and I wish to vote.

MR. J. C. SOUTH: Whom do you represent? You are fourth on the list.

MR. WOOD: I am Carroll D. Wood——

MR. SOUTH: Mr. Pace is alternate for Senator Berry.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Arkansas delegation will be polled.

The Secretary proceeded to poll the delegation, and when the name of James P. Clarke was called there was a response in the negative.

MR. WHEELER: Senator Clarke is absent.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair announces that the Arkansas delegation will be passed until its members can agree upon their votes.

MR. FRED T. DUBOIS, of Idaho (when the State of Idaho was called): On this question, acting under the unit rule, Idaho votes six "nays."

MR. JOHN P. HOPKINS, of Illinois (when the State of Illinois was called): Acting under the unit rule Illinois casts fifty-four votes "yea."

MR. JOHN E. LAMB, of Indiana (when the State of Indiana was called): I have been requested by nine members of the delegation to state that they would vote "nay," but, under the unit rule, I cast the thirty votes of Indiana "yea."

Iowa, acting under the unit rule, voted twenty-six "nays," although there were six delegates who favored the sending of the telegram.

MR. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky (when the State of Kentucky was called): Acting under the unit rule Kentucky casts twenty-six votes "yea."

Massachusetts, acting under the unit rule, cast thirty-two votes "yea," although there were six delegates who were opposed to sending the telegram.

Missouri, acting under the unit rule, cast thirty-six "nays," although there were seven delegates in favor of sending the telegram.

MR. S. W. DOOLEY, of Missouri: I desire a poll of the delegation. (Cries of "No, no.") I withdraw the demand.

Washington, under the unit rule, cast ten "yeas," although there were three delegates opposed to the sending of the telegram.

The roll call was concluded.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: Is Arkansas prepared to vote?

MR. JOHN N. WHEELER, of Arkansas: Arkansas casts eighteen votes "yea."

MR. J. B. BAKER, of Arkansas: I decline to have my vote cast "yea." The Chairman can not cast it.

MR. WHEELER: I have already cast it under the unit rule.

MR. BAKER: There are but fifteen delegates present. The others are absent. I should like to know by what authority the

gentleman assumes to cast the votes of delegates who are not present. They are not here, nor are they represented by alternates.

MR. WHEELER: It is under the unit rule, Mr. Chairman.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: How many members of your delegation are present?

MR. WHEELER: Nine and four—thirteen. Is not a State allowed as many votes as twice the number of its Senators and Representatives, even if there were but one man here to cast them?

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The gentleman is entitled to cast the entire vote of his delegation.

MR. WHEELER: Arkansas, acting under the unit rule, casts eighteen votes "yea."

The result was announced: Total vote cast, 985. Yeas, 794; nays, 191, as follows:

	Total Vote.	Yeas.	Nays.
Alabama .....	22	22	..
Arkansas .....	18	18	..
California .....	20	16	4
Colorado .....	10	4	6
Connecticut .....	14	14	..
Delaware .....	6	6	..
Florida .....	10	6	4
Georgia .....	26	26	..
Idaho .....	6	..	6
Illinois .....	54	54	..
Indiana .....	30	30	..
Iowa .....	26	..	26
Kansas .....	20	..	20
Kentucky .....	26	26	..
Louisiana .....	18	18	..
Maine .....	12	7	2
Maryland .....	16	16	..
Massachusetts .....	32	32	..
Michigan .....	28	28	..
Minnesota .....	22	9	13

	Total Vote.	Yeas.	Nays
Mississippi .....	20	20	..
Missouri .....	36	..	36
Montana .....	6	..	6
Nebraska .....	16	..	16
Nevada .....	6	2	4
New Hampshire .....	8	8	..
New Jersey .....	24	24	..
New York .....	78	78	..
North Carolina .....	24	24	..
North Dakota .....	8	..	8
Ohio .....	46	31	6
Oregon .....	8	4	4
Pennsylvania .....	68	68	..
Rhode Island .....	8	2	5
South Carolina .....	18	18	..
South Dakota .....	8	..	8
Tennessee .....	24	24	..
Texas .....	36	36	..
Utah .....	6	6	..
Vermont .....	8	8	..
Virginia .....	24	24	..
Washington .....	10	10	..
West Virginia .....	14	14	..
Wisconsin .....	26	26	..
Wyoming .....	6	2	2
Alaska .....	6	6	..
Arizona .....	6	..	6
District of Columbia .....	6	6	..
Indian Territory .....	6	5	1
Hawaii .....	6	2	4
New Mexico .....	6	6	..
Oklahoma .....	6	2	4
Porto Rico .....	6	6	..
	—	—	—
		794	191

Total vote cast, 985.

So the motion of Mr. Williams, of Mississippi, was agreed to.

### NOMINATION OF CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

MR. HOWARD CARROW, of New Jersey: I move that the Convention proceed with the regular order of business.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The roll will now be called for the purpose of nominating a candidate for Vice-President.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

MR. C. B. TERRELL, of Kentucky: I move that we commence on the call where we left off this evening.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: That is exactly what is about to be done.

MR. TERRELL: Then, do we call Alabama any more.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: This is a call for votes, and not for nominating speeches.

MR. JOHN P. HOPKINS, of Illinois: Who are the candidates?

MR. TERRELL, of Kentucky: You did not pass beyond Vermont this afternoon. Please state who are the candidates before this Convention.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Chair desires to announce that the following names have been placed in nomination: Mr. Davis, of West Virginia; Mr. Turner, of Washington; Mr. Harris, of Kansas; and Mr. Williams, of Illinois. The Clerk will call the roll.

MR. OLLIE M. JAMES, of Kentucky (when the State of Kentucky was called): The Kentucky delegation unanimously instructed me to cast its vote for its peerless and brilliant governor, Mr. Beckham, but at the request of the Governor I shall not do so. I cast the twenty-six votes of Kentucky for Davis, of West Virginia.

The roll call was concluded, resulting, Davis, 654; Williams, 165; Turner, 100; Harris, 58, as follows:



	Total vote.	Henry G. Davis.	Robert Williams.	George Turner.	Wm. A. Harris.
Alabama .....	22	22	..	..	..
Arkansas .....	18	18	..	..	..
California .....	20	20	..	..	..
Colorado .....	10	..	3	7	..
Connecticut .....	14	14	..	..	..
Delaware .....	6	3	..	3	..
Florida .....	10	10	..	..	..
Georgia .....	26	26	..	..	..
Idaho .....	6	..	..	6	..
Illinois .....	54	..	54	..	..
Indiana .....	30	..	30	..	..
Iowa .....	26	..	..	..	..
Kansas .....	20	..	..	..	20
Kentucky .....	26	26	..	..	..
Louisiana .....	18	18	..	..	..
Maine .....	12	9	..	..	..
Maryland .....	16	16	..	..	..
Massachusetts .....	32	32	..	..	..
Michigan .....	28	28	..	..	..
Minnesota .....	22	..	..	22	..
Mississippi .....	20	..	20	..	..
Missouri .....	36	..	..	..	36
Montana .....	6	..	..	6	..
Nebraska .....	16	16	..	..	..
Nevada .....	6	..	..	6	..
New Hampshire ..	8	8	..	..	..
New Jersey .....	24	24	..	..	..
New York .....	78	78	..	..	..
North Carolina ...	24	..	24	..	..
North Dakota ....	8	8	..	..	..
Ohio .....	46	46	..	..	..
Oregon .....	8	..	..	8	..
Pennsylvania .....	68	68	..	..	..
Rhode Island .....	8	..	8	..	..
South Carolina ...	18	..	18	..	..
South Dakota ....	8	8	..	..	..

	Total vote.	Henry G. Davis.	Robert Williams.	George Turner.	Wm. A. Harris.
Tennessee .....	24	24	..	..	..
Texas .....	36	36	..	..	..
Utah .....	6	..	..	6	..
Vermont .....	8	8	..	..	..
Virginia .....	24	24	..	..	..
Washington .....	10	..	..	10	..
West Virginia ....	14	14	..	..	..
Wisconsin .....	26	26	..	..	..
Wyoming .....	6	6	..	..	..
Alaska .....	6	..	..	6	..
Arizona .....	6	..	..	6	..
Dist. of Columbia.	6	6	..	..	..
Indian Territory ..	6	..	6	..	..
Hawaii .....	6	..	..	6	..
New Mexico .....	6	..	..	6	..
Oklahoma .....	6	..	2	2	2
Porto Rico .....	6	2	..	..	..
	—	—	—	—	—
		654	165	100	58

Total vote cast, 977.

Necessary to choice, 667.

MR. C. B. HILL, of Kentucky: It being evident that the Honorable Henry G. Davis is nominated, I move to make his nomination unanimous.

MR. L. C. GILMAN, of Washington: On behalf of Senator Turner I second the motion.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: It only remains for the Chair to announce that the Honorable Henry G. Davis, of West Virginia, is the unanimous choice of this Convention as its candidate for Vice-President. [Applause.]

THE PERMANENT CHAIRMAN: The Committees to notify the candidates for President and Vice-President of their nomination by this Convention will now be announced.

The Committees as finally constituted are as follows:

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY CANDIDATE FOR  
PRESIDENT.

CHAMP CLARK, OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN.

Alabama—T. C. McClelland.  
Arkansas—Jefferson Davis.  
California—R. H. DeWitt.  
Colorado—George E. West.  
Connecticut—P. H. Harriman.  
Delaware—Willard Saulsbury.  
Florida—F. G. Renshaw.  
Georgia—C. R. Pendleton.  
Idaho—Timothy Regan.  
Illinois—Samuel Woolner, Jr.  
Indiana—Wm. H. O'Brien.  
Iowa—Samuel S. Wright.  
Kansas—James W. Orr.  
Kentucky—John W. Collier.  
Louisiana—C. W. Bolton.  
Maine—Melvin P. Frank.  
Maryland—Frank A. Furst.  
Massachusetts—Guy W. Currier.  
Michigan—James W. Dempsey.  
Minnesota—W. W. Mayo.  
Mississippi—Clarence L. Sivley.  
Missouri—H. B. Hawes.  
Montana—H. A. Gallway.  
Nebraska—John A. Creighton.  
Nevada—Peter C. Weber.  
New Hampshire—Joseph Warren.  
New Jersey—De Witt C. Flannagan.  
New York—George Raines.  
North Carolina—John E. Woodard.  
North Dakota—John B. Fried.  
Ohio—John H. Clarke.  
Oregon—Thomas R. Sheridan.  
Pennsylvania—J. K. P. Hall.  
Rhode Island—Thomas H. Connolly.

South Carolina—D. D. McColl, Jr.  
 South Dakota—J. A. Stranskey.  
 Tennessee—N. G. Robertson.  
 Texas—Clarence N. Ousley.  
 Utah—Samuel A. King.  
 Vermont—J. D. Hanrahan.  
 Virginia—A. C. Braxton.  
 Washington—Frank B. Cole.  
 West Virginia—Wm. A. MacCorkle.  
 Wisconsin—George G. Sutherland.  
 Wyoming—George T. Beck.  
 Alaska—S. B. Agnew.  
 Arizona—John Lawler.  
 District of Columbia—J. Fred Kelley.  
 Indian Territory—Robert Reed.  
 Hawaii—C. A. Galbraith.  
 New Mexico—N. B. Laughlin.  
 Oklahoma—Wm. Tilghman.  
 Porto Rico—H. E. Shaffer.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT.

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, OF MISSISSIPPI, CHAIRMAN.

Alabama—G. W. Pratt.  
 Arkansas—Harry Woods.  
 California—Edward I. Coffey.  
 Colorado—W. P. Seeds.  
 Connecticut—Edward Mullan.  
 Delaware—Richard R. Kenney.  
 Florida—J. E. T. Bowden.  
 Georgia—I. P. Cocke.  
 Idaho—Henry Heitfeld.  
 Illinois—Silas A. Rathbun.  
 Indiana—Jerome Herff.  
 Iowa—W. I. Branagan.  
 Kansas—S. I. Hale.  
 Kentucky—M. L. Downs.  
 Louisiana—L. H. Marrero.

Maine—H. J. Hatheway.  
Maryland—Francis E. Yewell.  
Massachusetts—James H. Vahey.  
Michigan—George W. McCabe.  
Minnesota—C. d'Autremont.  
Mississippi—R. T. Hilton.  
Missouri—T. M. Bresnehan.  
Montana—John D. Losecamp.  
Nebraska—C. P. Fall.  
Nevada—S. W. Gregory.  
New Hampshire—John J. McGovern.  
New Jersey—O. C. Bogardus.  
New York—Perry Belmont.  
North Carolina—Robert L. Holt.  
North Dakota—Frank C. Myrick.  
Ohio—M. M. Padgett.  
Oregon—J. D. Matlock.  
Pennsylvania—George W. Guthrie.  
Rhode Island—Andrew Farrell.  
South Carolina—LeRoy Springs.  
South Dakota—Henry S. Volkmar.  
Tennessee—T. Leigh Thompson.  
Texas—Geo. C. O'Brien.  
Utah—Joseph Monson.  
Vermont—H. J. Volholm.  
Virginia—Roy B. Smith.  
Washington—Frank P. Hogan.  
West Virginia—C. H. Taney.  
Wisconsin—Wm. R. McCaul.  
Wyoming—George T. Beck.  
Alaska—W. E. Crews.  
Arizona—Isaac Barth.  
District of Columbia—John G. Campbell.  
Indian Territory—L. M. Poe.  
Hawaii—J. C. Easton.  
New Mexico—Antonio Lucero.  
Oklahoma—D. B. Welty.  
Porto Rico—H. P. Leake.

## COMMITTEES TO NOTIFY NOMINEES.

MR. CHARLES A. WALSH, of Iowa, offered the following resolution, which was unanimously agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Permanent Chairman of this Convention, Honorable Champ Clark, be appointed Chairman of the Committee to notify Honorable Alton B. Parker of his nomination for President; and that the Temporary Chairman, Honorable John Sharp Williams, be appointed Chairman of the Committee to notify Honorable Henry G. Davis of his nomination for Vice-President.

MEETING OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL  
COMMITTEE.

MR. W. F. SHEEHAN, of New York: I move that the Democratic National Committee be called to meet by the Honorable James K. Jones, in the City of New York, at such time as he may designate, to take action on such matters as may come before that Committee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. J. B. McCreary, of Kentucky, in the chair): The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the gentleman from New York, which is that the present Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. Jones, call the new Committee to meet in New York, giving proper notice, at such time as may be designated by Senator Jones.

The motion was agreed to.

## VACANCIES ON NATIONAL TICKET.

MR. JOHN E. LAMB, of Indiana, offered the following resolution, which was agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Democratic National Committee is hereby authorized and directed to fill any and all vacancies that may occur on the ticket nominated by this Convention or on the said National Committee in such manner and at such time as the Committee may see fit.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
NEXT NATIONAL CONVENTION.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan, offered the following resolution, which was agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Democratic National Committee is hereby empowered and directed to fix the time and place for holding the next National Convention, and that the representation therein be the same as fixed for this Convention; and in its discretion to select as its Chairman and Secretary and members of the Executive and other Committees persons either within or without the membership of said National Committee.

THANKS TO CONVENTION OFFICERS.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: I offer a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The gentleman from Michigan submits a resolution, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention are hereby tendered to the Honorable John Sharp Williams, the Temporary Chairman; the Honorable Champ Clark, the Permanent Chairman; the Secretary and the Assistant Secretaries, and all other officers of the Convention for their efficient services.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the gentleman from Michigan.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

THANKS TO CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL  
COMMITTEE:

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan, submitted the following resolution, which was unanimously agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention are due and are hereby tendered to the Honorable James K. Jones, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and his associates on the outgoing Committee, for the able and impartial manner in which they have discharged their duties.

## THANKS TO THE PEOPLE OF ST. LOUIS.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan, offered the following resolution, which was unanimously agreed to :

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Convention be expressed to the people of St. Louis for courtesies and entertainment extended to the Convention through the Business Men's League of St. Louis.

## PUBLICATION OF CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan, offered the following resolution, which was agreed to :

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Democratic National Committee is hereby directed to have prepared and published a full and complete report of the official proceedings of this Convention, under the direction of the National Committee, and that the National Committee authorize a sufficient number of copies to be distributed to the officers of and delegates to this Convention and to such other persons as may be entitled to receive them.

## NATIONAL COMMITTEEMEN FROM OREGON AND INDIANA.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair directs the reading of a certificate which has been sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows :

We hereby certify that Frederick V. Holman, of Portland, Oregon, has this day been duly chosen by the delegates from Oregon to the Democratic National Convention (held at St. Louis, Mo., beginning July 6, 1904) as National Committeeman for Oregon.

GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN, *Chairman*.

T. R. SHARIDAN, *Secretary*.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 9, 1904.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The question is on ratifying the selection thus made.

The selection was ratified.



MR. SAMUEL L. RALSTON, of Indiana: I move that the selection of the Honorable Thomas Taggart, as member of the National Committee from Indiana, be ratified.

The motion was agreed to.

#### THANKS TO LOUISIANA PURCHASE EXPOSITION MANAGEMENT.

MR. CLARENCE MARTIN, of Texas: On behalf of the Texas delegation, I move that the special thanks of this Convention be expressed to the World's Fair management for their courteous invitation to this Convention to visit the Fair in St. Louis.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

#### MEETING OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair is requested to announce that there will be a meeting of the new Democratic National Committee at the Jefferson Hotel, in the City of St. Louis, immediately after the adjournment of the Convention.

MR. W. F. SHEEHAN, of New York: Mr. Chairman: I suggest that the last announcement be recalled. It is inconsistent with the motion which I made, that the new National Committee be called to meet in New York, by Mr. Jones.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: The Chair is requested to state that, as the National Committee will meet in New York, on the call of Senator Jones, it will not be necessary for the Committee to meet to-night at the Jefferson Hotel.

#### THANKS TO HON. JOSEPH W. BAILEY.

MR. W. F. SHEEHAN, of New York: On behalf of the New York delegation, I move that the thanks of this Convention be extended to Senator Bailey, of Texas, for the able manner in which he presided over the Convention yesterday.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: It is moved that the thanks of the Convention be extended to the Honorable Joseph W. Bailey

for the admirable and able manner in which he temporarily presided over its deliberations.

The motion was unanimously agreed to.

#### FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

MR. A. L. McLEOD, of Alabama: I move that the Convention do now adjourn *sine die*.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER: If there is no other business, the motion of the gentleman from Alabama is now in order; and the question is on agreeing to it.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m., Sunday, July 10, 1904) the Presiding Officer declared the Convention adjourned without day.

# MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

---

SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

---

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

January 12, 1904.

The Committee met at 12 o'clock m.

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. James K. Jones, Arkansas): The Committee will come to order. The Secretary will read the copy of the notice sent to the members of the Committee calling this meeting.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY (Mr. Edwin Sefton of the District of Columbia) read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 9, 1903.

DEAR SIR:

There will be a meeting of the Democratic National Committee at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington City on Tuesday, the 12th day of January, 1904, at 12 m., to fix the time and place of holding the Democratic National Convention for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President of the United States, and for such other business as may come before the committee.

Very truly yours,

JAMES K. JONES,  
Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will call the roll of the Committee.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

MR. J. R. JACOBS of Oklahoma (when the District of Co-

lumbia. was called) : Mr. Chairman, I challenge the appointment of the member for the District of Columbia, and I wish to ask that the Special Committee's report on the contest be laid before this Committee.

The Secretary concluded the calling of the roll. The following members and proxies responded to their names:

Alabama—Henry D. Clayton.

Arkansas—James P. Clarke.

California—Edward J. Livernash, proxy James H. Budd

Colorado—John F. Shafroth, proxy for Adair Wilson.

Connecticut—Homer S. Cummings.

Delaware—R. R. Kenney.

Florida—Stephen M. Sparkman, proxy for George P. Raney.

Georgia—J. K. Ohl, proxy for Clark Howell.

Idaho—Fred T. Dubois, proxy for E. M. Wolfe.

Illinois—Thomas Gahan.

Indiana—Thomas Taggart

Iowa—C. A. Walsh.

Kansas—J. G. Johnson.

Kentucky—Urey Woodson.

Louisiana—Adolph Meyer, proxy for N. C. Blanchard.

Maine—George E. Hughes.

Maryland—Arthur P. Gorman.

Massachusetts—George Fred Williams.

Michigan—Daniel J. Campau.

Minnesota—T. T. Hudson, proxy for Thomas D. O'Brien.

Mississippi—Wallace McLaurin.

Missouri—William J. Stone.

Montana—John S. M. Neill.

Nebraska—James C. Dahlman.

Nevada—Willis J. Abbott, proxy for Joseph R. Ryan.

New Hampshire—True L. Norris.

New Jersey—W. B. Gourley.

New York—Norman E. Mack.

North Carolina—Josephus Daniels.

North Dakota—J. B. Eaton.

Ohio—John R. McLean.

- Oregon—Jefferson Myers, proxy for M. A. Miller.  
Pennsylvania—J. M. Guffey.  
Rhode Island—George W. Green.  
South Carolina—Benjamin R. Tillman.  
South Dakota—James K. Jones, proxy for Maris Taylor.  
Tennessee—James M. Head.  
Texas—R. M. Johnston.  
Utah—Thomas Taggart, proxy for D. C. Dunbar.  
Vermont—Arthur P. Gorman, proxy for John H. Senter.  
Virginia—J. Taylor Ellyson.  
Washington—C. G. Heifner, proxy for W. H. Dunphy.  
West Virginia—John T. McGraw.  
Wisconsin—T. E. Ryan.  
Wyoming—John E. Osborne.  
Alaska—Allen V. Cockrell, proxy for Louis L. Williams.  
Arizona—Norton Chase, proxy for J. A. Breathitt.  
Oklahoma—J. R. Jacobs.  
Indian Territory—H. B. Spaulding.  
New Mexico—Henry D. Clayton, proxy for Harvey B. Ferguson.  
District of Columbia—Edwin Sefton.  
Hawaii.

THE CHAIRMAN: A quorum is present. I have just received a cablegram from a number of gentlemen in Hawaii, who sign themselves as members of the Central Committee, expressing a desire that Mr. Palmer Woods should be appointed member of the National Committee for Hawaii.

Since the last meeting of the committee the following deaths have occurred among the members: Arthur Sewall, of Maine; A. J. Russell, of Mississippi; Peter J. Otey, of Virginia; W. H. Cornwell, of Hawaii.

The cablegram to which I have referred relates to the filling of the vacancy occasioned by the death of Mr. Cornwell. Other vacancies have occurred. Mr. M. F. Tarpey, of California, resigned, and acting under the authority vested, as I understand, in the Chairman by the action of the Committee itself and by the usage of the Committee I, as Chairman, appointed ex-Governor Budd in his place.

Mr. Russell, of Mississippi, died, and I appointed Mr. Wallace McLaurin, of Mississippi, in his place. Mr. Arthur Sewall, of Maine, died, and Mr. George E. Hughes, of Maine, was appointed by me in his place. Mr. Otey, of Virginia, died, and Mr. J. Taylor Ellyson was appointed in his place.

There were three original vacancies in the committee when the National Convention organized the Committee. It left vacancies from Oklahoma, the Indian Territory and the District of Columbia, and referred the matter to the National Committee. The National Committee, at a meeting in Kansas City, on motion of Mr. Blanchard, adopted a resolution directing the appointment of a Special Committee, as follows:

“On motion of Mr. Blanchard the Chairman is authorized to appoint a Special Committee, of which the Chair should be *ex officio* chairman, to whom should be referred the matter of vacancies from the Indian Territory, the Territory of Oklahoma and the District of Columbia, with full charge of the whole matter, their report to be submitted at the next meeting of the National Committee.”

I appointed on that Special Committee some gentlemen whose names I do not now distinctly recall. I remember some of them, but I am not absolutely positive about the entire membership of the Special Committee. My recollection is, and it is as clear as my recollection ever was about any circumstance in my life, that I called the Special Committee to meet at the notification meeting which took place on the 8th of August in Indianapolis. The Special Committee met at Indianapolis and adopted a resolution directing the chairman to take up this matter and act for the Special Committee.

When the doors were opened and the parties interested came into the room, I stated to those present who were interested that the Special Committee had taken the action it had taken, and that I was not inclined to take part in any Democratic wrangle; that until the Democrats of Oklahoma, the Indian Territory and the District of Columbia could get together, I was not disposed to take sides or to take part in any wrangle that might exist between different factions of the Democracy; and that I would not appoint any man who came

there as the representative of a faction as against the representatives of other factions. Each side, of course, claimed that it represented the entire vote or the better part of the vote.

Mr. Norris, from the District of Columbia, was present, and made a considerable speech in opposition to the action taken by me. There was no objection, so far as I heard, from the Indian Territory or Oklahoma.

Subsequent to that the Democrats in the Indian Territory organized a new committee. The difficulties in Oklahoma were adjusted, and the Democrats of Oklahoma adopted a resolution recommending the appointment of Mr. Jacobs, and those of the Indian Territory recommended the appointment of Mr. Spaulding, both of whom I appointed in accordance with the recommendations.

It has been my unvarying practice, wherever a vacancy has occurred, when I was undertaking to fill the vacancy in the absence of the National Committee, to appoint a man selected by the representative Democrats in the locality. Wherever I have been able to find out what the Democrats of a locality wanted, I have followed their recommendation.

In the case of the District of Columbia, I followed the same course, and did not undertake to fill the vacancy or to settle the matter, hoping that the two factions of Democrats here would get together and that there would be an amicable adjustment of the situation by which peace and harmony would result.

When I was thinking of calling this Committee to meet to-day, I talked with some Democrats about it, and amongst others with the member of the Committee from Maryland (Mr. Gorman), who asked me in the course of the conversation if I did not propose to settle this District business, whatever it was, or words to that effect. It occurred to me at the time that it was an unseemly thing that a vacancy should exist in the District of Columbia when the Committee was meeting here; that it would be a proper thing to have the Committee full if possible; and that I ought, if possible, to adjust the matter in some way.

It was perfectly obvious to my mind that with the factions warring with each other constantly for six or eight years, each claiming to represent the great body of the Democracy and each

claiming that the other did not represent anything, there was not much chance to do anything with them. So I endeavored to select, if possible, a man not connected with any faction, a reputable man, a man of character, and to appoint him a member of the committee, which I did in the person of Mr. Edwin Sefton.

He had been my secretary a good long time, and the only reason I hesitated about appointing him was the personal relation he had occupied to me. However, for a year past he has had no personal connection with me. He has been practicing law here. He was born and raised in the District of Columbia, and has always been connected with the District. Hoping and believing that the result of his appointment would be to bring about harmony in the District, I made the appointment.

Yesterday morning I learned for the first time that an effort was being made to disapprove of my action in what had been done, and a member of the Committee showed me a paper which had been sent out by a gentleman who was opposed to my action. I did not have time to read it, and I have never had it in my hand until this morning and I have not yet had time to read it. I had no notice of what was going on. The consequence was I did not understand just the situation until now.

The resolution adopted by the National Committee providing for a Special Committee seemed to me to be broad and emphatic in its language.

The resolution says the report of the Special Committee shall be submitted at the next meeting of the National Committee. I understood that that gave them authority to act and that they were required to report their action, whatever it might be, to the next meeting of the National Committee. When the Special Committee met at Indianapolis and took the action it did, referring this whole matter to me, I believed that I was fully authorized by its action and by this resolution to fill these vacancies. It had always been the custom of the Chairman of the National Committee, in recess of the Committee, to fill whatever vacancies occurred, and I had uniformly acted upon that custom. The powers that were given to the Chairman in



1896 were reaffirmed by this Committee, and there was no question, in my mind, of my having the authority to do it.

If there is any question of my authority, if the fact that this Special Committee was appointed and the fact that it had not reported to the National Committee made it impossible for me to fill the vacancy in the District of Columbia, I did not have the authority to appoint the gentleman from Oklahoma or the gentleman from the Indian Territory, for they all stand exactly alike. Those cases were likewise referred to the Special Committee and nothing could be done in the one case that could not and ought not to have been done in all three.

I have appointed the three gentlemen named. I have acted for what I believe to be the best interest of the Democratic party in doing so, and I, of course, submit my action to the Committee for whatever action it chooses to take. What is the pleasure of the Committee?

MR. EDWIN SEFTON, of the District of Columbia: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, if my remaining a member of the National Committee is calculated to create disturbance in the national party, I will not hesitate to resign immediately any rights I may have under the appointment of Senator Jones, and then the Committee can take such action as it may see fit in the way of selecting my successor. I resign my position as a member of the National Committee.

MR. CLAYTON: I move that the Committee now proceed to fill the vacancy existing in the Committee from the District of Columbia, by the election of a member therefrom, and that the roll be called, each man voting for his choice.

The motion was seconded.

MR. JOHNSON: I move that the motion be laid upon the table, to be taken up at the next regular session of the National Committee.

MR. HEIFNER: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kansas. (Putting the question.) The "ayes" appear to have it.

The yeas and nays were called for.

MR. TILLMAN: A division will do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Shall there be a division or a call of the roll?

MR. STONE and others: Call the roll.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

MR. HOMER R. CUMMINGS, of Connecticut: Will the Chair kindly state the parliamentary situation, so that there may be no misunderstanding about it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clayton, of Alabama, moved that the Committee proceed to the election of a member of the National Committee to fill the vacancy existing from the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. Johnson) then submitted a motion. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Kansas to restate his motion.

MR. JOHNSON: It was that that motion lie on the table to be taken up at the next regular session of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion of the gentleman from Kansas is that the previous motion lie on the table, to be taken up at the next regular meeting of the Committee.

MR. JACOBS: I rise to a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Oklahoma will state his point of order.

MR. JACOBS: It is that it is a double barreled motion. The gentleman may make a motion to table, but I do not believe he can make a motion to table and then do something in addition.

MR. HEIFNER: Debate is not in order.

MR. JOHNSON: I believe it is parliamentary procedure to move that the matter be laid on the table until a specified time.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is the same as if a motion had been made to postpone. The Chair will hold that it is equivalent to a motion to postpone. The Secretary will call the roll on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas to postpone this matter until the next regular meeting of the Committee.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

MR. FRED T. DUBOIS (when the name of Idaho was called): I am not a member of the Committee and I desire to state to the Committee that the only instruction which the member of the Committee from my State gave me was to vote for Mr. Norris. I, therefore, vote "nay."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced: Yeas 22, nays 26, as follows:

Yeas—California, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Alaska and Arizona.—22.

Nays—Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Oklahoma, Indian Territory and New Mexico.—26.

So Mr. Johnson's motion was rejected.

MR. CLAYTON: I now call for the yeas and nays on my motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Is there any other nomination?

MR. CLAYTON: None that I know of. I have nominated Mr. James L. Norris for member of the Committee from the District of Columbia.

The motion was seconded.

MR. CLAYTON: I demand the call of the roll, if there are no other nominations.

MR. JOHN E. OSBORNE, of Wyoming: I nominate for Committeeman from the District of Columbia Mr. Edwin Sefton.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there further nominations? If not the Secretary will call the roll.

MR. CAMPAU: In view of the present situation, I move that the whole matter be referred to the Special Committee appointed by the National Committee.

The motion was seconded.

MR. B. R. TILLMAN, of South Carolina: I wish to suggest that the Chairman be authorized to appoint a new committee, for the simple reason that nobody seems to know who constitutes the present committee. I hope the gentleman from Michigan will accept an amendment that it be referred to a committee to be now appointed by the Chair.

MR. CAMPAU: I accept the suggestion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Campau) as modified by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Tillman).

MR. CLAYTON: On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered and being taken resulted: Yeas 28, nays 21, as follows:

Yeas—California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Alaska, Arizona and the Indian Territory.—28.

Nays—Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Oklahoma and New Mexico.—21.

So Mr. Campau's motion as modified was agreed to.

MR. CLAYTON: An inquiry. When will this Committee report?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee will probably decide that for itself.

MR. CLAYTON: The resolution does not instruct them?

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not so understand it. The proposition was to refer it to a committee.

MR. CLAYTON: And no time is specified?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the original motion of the gentleman was that the committee should report at the next regular meeting of the Committee.

MR. CLAYTON: I understood it to be to report to this session of the Committee. That is the reason why I made the inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Michigan can speak for himself. I think it was to report at the next meeting.

MR. CAMPAU: My motion was that the Chair should appoint a committee for the purpose of determining the matter and no time was fixed for it to report. I presume the committee will report just as soon as they are enabled to investigate the matter thoroughly. I presume it will be given sufficient time.

MR. JACOBS: I move that the committee be instructed to report here at 4 o'clock.

MR. TILLMAN: I desire to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma how the committee can report until it investigates? How can it get the witnesses here by 4 o'clock? How can it determine who is the proper representative of the Democracy in this District until it has taken some testimony?

I move that we proceed to the consideration of the business for which we assembled, and that is the determination of a time and place for holding the next National Convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Tillman)?

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the Committee proceed to the consideration of the regular order of business for which the meeting was called.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first order of business is the selection of a place in which to hold the next National Convention.

MR. J. TAYLOR ELLYSON, of Virginia: I ask unanimous consent to present resolutions with reference to the death of my predecessor on the Committee, Hon. Peter J. Otey.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia.

MR. ELLYSON: I offer resolutions and ask for their present consideration.

The resolutions were read and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

WHEREAS, Since the last meeting of this Committee death has invaded our ranks and the Hon. Peter J. Otey, of Virginia, has for the last time answered the roll call and has been called from his labors here to his rest above, and whereas in the death of Major Otey this Committee has lost one of its most highly esteemed and useful members,

*Therefore, be it resolved,* That this Committee, sensible of its great loss, and highly appreciative of the services of the distinguished member whose death we so seriously deplore, desires

by this preamble and resolutions to place upon its records an expression of its lofty regard for one who was ever ready to give to the Democratic party of his State and nation the best energies of his noble life.

*Resolved further*, That these resolutions be spread upon our records and a copy of them be sent to the family of the deceased.

MR. JOSEPHUS DANIELS, of North Carolina: I move the appointment of a committee to draft suitable resolutions on the death of Mr. Sewall, Mr. Russell and Mr. Cornwell.

MR. J. G. JOHNSON, of Kansas: And others.

MR. DANIELS: And others who have died during the year.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there be no objection that will be the order of the committee.

MR. JEFFERSON MYERS, of Oregon: I desire to introduce a resolution concerning a historical event which we are now about to celebrate, the Lewis and Clark Exposition, which is the work of the Democratic party and Thomas Jefferson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the gentleman permit me? The Committee has just voted to proceed with the business for which the meeting was called, and I think the suggestion of the gentleman from Oregon will come in more properly afterwards. However, if the Committee desires to hear the resolution read, the Chair is perfectly willing to submit it. I made the suggestion merely in the interest of the proper conduct of business.

MR. TILLMAN: The regular order. Let us get through with our work. Some of us have work to do elsewhere.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee having ordered that the Committee proceed to the consideration of the business for which the meeting was called, the question is on fixing a time and place for holding the next convention. The Chair would like to have some indication from the Committee as to how it will proceed. I presume the representatives of the different cities which are candidates for selection as the place in which to hold the convention will want to be heard, and to have an opportunity to present their claims and to state the propositions they

wish to submit. If that is the wish of the Committee it will be done.

But before it is done I will state that I have had placed in my hands on the part of one of the representatives of the city of Chicago a proposition which he asks to have me present to the Committee, and I will now have it read by the Secretary if there is no objection.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: May I ask whether that should not properly be considered at the time all of these matters are being presented by the respective cities? Would it not be better to hear them all together?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair merely suggested that it be read for the information of the Committee, and not for action.

MR. CAMPAU: I thought perhaps it might not be fair to Chicago to have it presented at this time, not knowing what are the propositions of the other cities.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair thinks the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan is a good one, and the proposition will be submitted later.

MR. CAMPAU: I move that the respective cities which are candidates for selection as the place for holding the National Convention be invited to address us at 3 o'clock and that we now take a recess until that hour.

MR. CLAYTON: I suggest to the gentleman that he amend his motion so as to give each city one hour's time to present its case.

MR. TILLMAN: They may not want so much.

MR. CLAYTON: A half hour, then.

MR. CAMPAU: I will accept the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama.

MR. CLAYTON: A half hour?

MR. CAMPAU: A half hour.

MR. STONE: A half hour is a very short time in which to present the merits of a great city.

MR. JOHNSON: I suggest one hour. Give them a chance.

MR. THOMAS GAHAN, of Illinois: Thirty minutes?

MR. CLAYTON: That was the suggestion, and I think it was agreed to.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the Committee notify the representatives of the different cities which are candidates for the location of the next convention that the Committee will hear them at 3 o'clock and that thirty minutes will be given to each city.

MR. GAHAN: How many will be allowed to speak for each city?

THE CHAIRMAN: Each city will determine that for itself. They can have one or a half dozen speakers. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Campau).

The motion was agreed to.

MR. C. G. HEIFNER, of Washington: Before the Committee adjourns—

MR. TILLMAN: I move that we take a recess until—

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Washington has the floor.

MR. HEIFNER: I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. Myers, of Oregon, be permitted to take three minutes to present a resolution in which he is deeply interested. It will not take over three minutes.

MR. TILLMAN: I subside, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: The consent of the Committee is asked, on behalf of the gentleman from Oregon, to present a matter in a few minutes which is of very great local interest to him and his people. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

MR. JEFFERSON MYERS, of Oregon: I submit the following resolutions:

“WHEREAS, It has been due chiefly to the far-seeing purposes of eminent Democratic statesmen that the territorial boundaries of the United States have been extended from the limits that marked them at the time of the formation of the Constitution beyond the Mississippi and across the Continent to the Pacific Ocean; and,

“WHEREAS, It was Thomas Jefferson, apostle of American Democracy and father of the Democratic party, who carried through the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, which brought



to us the country from the Mississippi River to the Rocky Mountains; and,

“WHEREAS, It was Thomas Jefferson also who originated and provided the means for the Lewis and Clark Expedition, through which, followed by the enterprise of our pioneers, the domain of the United States was extended from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, from whose ports we may now have controlling influence in the commerce of the Orient; therefore,

“*Resolved*, That we recur with feelings of patriotic satisfaction to these achievements of Democracy and commend the expositions to be held in 1904 at St. Louis, Missouri, and in 1905 at Portland, Oregon, in commemoration of these actions and events, to the attention of the people of the United States.”

I move the adoption of the resolution.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the gentleman from Oregon.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

MR. STONE: I move that we take a recess until 3 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to and (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Committee took a recess until 3 o'clock p. m.

The following Sub-Committee to take up and determine the District of Columbia case was selected by the Chairman and announced at the conclusion of the meeting of the Committee: J. T. McGraw, Chairman, West Virginia; J. T. Ellyson, Virginia; W. B. Gourley, New Jersey; J. M. Guffey, Pennsylvania; N. E. Mack, New York.

#### AFTER RECESS—OPEN SESSION.

At the expiration of the recess the Committee resumed its session.

THE CHAIRMAN: By the order of the Committee, the hour of 3 o'clock was set as the time when the Committee would hear the representatives of the different cities which desire to be chosen as the location of the convention. Which city desires to be heard first?

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Call them alphabetically.

MR. THOMAS GAHAN, of Illinois: Judge A. A. Goodrich,

of Chicago, and Governor George W. Peck, of Wisconsin, will speak for Chicago.

MR. CLAYTON: I presume the gentlemen have been informed that thirty minutes has been allotted to each city.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was the order. I am glad the gentleman from Alabama reminded me of it. I presume the gentlemen have all been advised of it. Judge Goodrich will now present the claims of the city of Chicago.

MR. A. A. GOODRICH, of Chicago: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the National Committee, by direction of the Committee sent here from the city of Chicago and through them by the unanimous wish of all the people of the city of Chicago, regardless of party, I am delegated to tender to the Democratic National Committee of the United States and through them to the Democratic party of the United States a cordial and earnest invitation to locate the Democratic National Convention to be held this year within the confines of the city of Chicago, in the Commonwealth of Illinois.

It is needless for me, gentlemen of the Committee, to present to gentlemen like you, who have attended conventions time and again in that great city, the manifest reasons why a convention of this size, this magnitude and this greatness, representing as it will so much of the hopes of a great majority, as I believe, of the people of the United States, should be located there.

Chicago, gentlemen, as you well know, is the great convention city of the United States. Located as it is upon that magnificent inland sea, with the finest railroad facilities of any city in this country, with hotel accommodations second to none, with a people hospitable, with every advantage which a city can have—these are some of the reasons why you should locate this convention in that city.

Knowing full well, gentlemen, that a convention of this character is attended with expense, the people of that city, through this Committee, have made a proposition to your Committee which will, I presume, be read to you, if it has not been, signed by gentlemen who are amply responsible financially to carry it out.

In brief it is that within a reasonable time, long prior to the time when you will need any money, this Committee here, representing the city of Chicago, will have deposited in some bank to be selected by the Sub-Committee appointed from this National Committee, the sum of \$45,000, subject to the order of this Committee; that this Sub-Committee shall have the absolute power and right to control this money and to make all the arrangements and to pay all the necessary expenses for the convention. We have also pledged that the usual hotel rates in the city of Chicago will be charged to the gentlemen who are delegates and alternates to the convention as well as to the thousands of people who will be attendant upon it. This, in brief, is the offer we have made.

The city of Chicago does not believe that a great party, represented by a great committee, should put up its convention at auction to the highest bidder. We do not know what offers other cities may make, but we believe when we have paid all the expenses of the convention we have done all that a people ought to be asked to do.

I have no word to say as to the other cities; they will present their claims to you; but, gentlemen, it is true beyond argument that the city of Chicago is the one city in this country which can entertain and accommodate a great convention like this to the satisfaction of the thousands of people who will be there to attend it.

We tender to you, in addition, one of the finest halls that exists in any city in this country to-day, a hall capable of seating from eleven to thirteen thousand people, as the Sub-Committee may choose to arrange its seating capacity. It is the hall, I will state to you gentlemen, which has already been selected by the Republican National Committee for holding its convention of this year in that city. While the judgment in politics of the gentleman who is chairman of that Committee does not carry much weight with me, as a business man and as a man who know something about conventions his judgment does carry some weight; and after visiting the hall the other day he said it was the finest convention hall he had ever entered and could be arranged the best.

Chicago, gentlemen, will be proud of the honor of the location of this convention. We do not come to you asking it because it would carry the State of Illinois, or any other State, to have this convention located there. The Democracy of Chicago do not need, nor do the Democracy of Illinois need, anything to add to their patriotism and earnestness in this campaign. But we give this invitation to you because we believe that it is the proper place from all points of view.

I do not propose, gentlemen, not being a member of this Committee, to argue the political reasons why it should go there. But from every reason we believe that in your wisdom you should locate the convention there.

In the summer season, during which time the convention will probably be held, the climate of that city is par excellence as a beautiful and delightful summer resort. Some of you may have been there in the summer. I do know that we are favored every summer with large numbers of people from the South and from the Southwest who come there to spend their summers and enjoy the luxuries of the great cooling breezes which blow off from Lake Michigan.

Gentlemen, Chicago has a Democratic mayor and has had for eight years. Cook County to-day, for the first time in a number of years, has a Democratic sheriff. Can it be said, gentlemen (and I am only answering what I have heard whispered about the corridors of the hotel) that a Democratic convention will not be protected in that city and will not be permitted to do its business in an orderly and proper manner? Will any gentleman who has made this charge point to me the time when any convention has been held in Chicago which has not received proper protection in the due course of orderly business, when its delegates and members have not been protected upon the streets and in the hotels and in the convention hall? Has it come to this late day that this charge can be successfully made and be acted upon by any man fit to be a member of the great Democratic party and of its Committee which represents it here to-day?

Gentlemen of the Committee, come to Chicago. The only two times in recent days when you have nominated a Democrat

ior President who was elected were in Chicágo. [Applause.] I hope and believe that if you come there this summer and nominate your candidate, with the grace of God and the work of honest men who are Democrats your candidate will be elected. [Applause.]

I thank you, gentlemen, very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Committee, I present Governor Peck, of Wisconsin, who will speak for Chicago.

MR. GEORGE W. PECK, of Milwaukee: Mr. Chairman and fellow Democrats, three times the city of Milwaukee has been bereaved by not getting the Democratic National Convention to come there and be happy. We intended a few weeks or months ago to try once more, and then die in our tracks. Something happened to make us decide that we would not try to get the Democratic convention to Milwaukee this year, but we had got a great many gentlemen of the Committee to agree to support Milwaukee. Milwaukee will not be a candidate for the convention this year, but we desire to do the kindest thing by our suburb, the city of Chicago. [Laughter.] Chicago is the twenty-third ward of the city of Milwaukee [laughter], and we feel kindly toward it. It has more hotels than we have, and more money, and it will do the fair thing by Democracy.

The city of Milwaukee some day—and I intend to come here every time the National Committee meets—will get the convention. I started in when Senator Jones was a bright young man as a member of the Committee [laughter], and have talked to him and Senator Stone, who comes from Missouri, with his rubber boots [laughter]. I am going to stand by them as long as they live, and some day Milwaukee will get the convention and I shall be happy. In the meantime we have desired to turn everything we have in Milwaukee over to our neighbor, the city of Chicago, and to help them to entertain you. All the good cheer that you would have got if you had gone to Milwaukee we will take with us to Chicago, and we will return with you to Milwaukee, if you get tired of Chicago, which I doubt. Anything you may do for Chicago, gentlemen of the Committee, will be greatly pleasing to the city of Milwaukee, and if you decide to meet in Chicago you will be so near the

great Democratic city of Milwaukee and I will say the Democratic State of Wisconsin this time—I do not want that to get into the newspapers, but Wisconsin is liable to be a Democratic State—that you can go there also and feel that you are at home. But stop in Chicago; have your convention; nominate a ticket of which we may all be proud; and everybody in the Democratic party and half the Republicans will vote for and elect it. [Applause.] I thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If no one else desires to be heard in behalf of Chicago, which city will come next?

MR. NORMAN E. MACK, of New York: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the National Committee, New York would like to have the privilege of entertaining the Democracy of the country the next time the National Convention is held. Before introducing the gentleman at the head of the Citizens' Committee, I should like to have the Secretary read a message to me from the Chief Executive of the city of New York, as well as an invitation from the great Democratic Club of that city.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

Telegram.

DATED JAN. 11, 1904,  
New York.

*To Hon. Norman E. Mack, Member Democratic National Committee, Arlington Hotel, Washington, D. C.:*

As the representative of New York on the Democratic National Committee, will you do me the honor to present to the Committee in the name of the city of New York a cordial invitation to the Democratic party to assemble here in national convention. The Board of Aldermen has formally spoken its invitation and I join earnestly with it.

GEO. B. McCLELLAN,  
Mayor.

DEMOCRATIC CLUB,

NEW YORK, JANUARY 9, 1904.

*To the Democratic National Committee,*

GENTLEMEN: On behalf of the Democratic party in the city of New York, we request you to appoint that city as the place for holding the next Democratic National Convention.

We contend that from every point of view, from a consideration for the convenience of the members to the far more important one of the encouragement of national unity and enthusiasm, our city has advantages over every other.

While it is true that it is situated on the coast and not in the geographical center of our vast territory, it is the practical center, as here concentrate railroads from all portions of the Union, and it invites as it always receives business and pleasure visitors from all sections, so that in fact it is as near for the delegates generally as any other city, while it is far more convenient and attractive and can be reached with the greatest facility.

In local accommodations it far surpasses all others. Its hotels are so numerous and commodious that the arrival of the delegates, no matter how numerous, would scarcely affect their routine or strain their ordinary resources, while the well known liberality of their managers and the hospitable welcome of our citizens would make imposition upon the visitors impossible.

Two large auditoriums are at the disposal of the convention, the Central Palace, which will accommodate six thousand, and the Madison Square Garden, which will seat ten thousand.

The surroundings of the city are pleasant and attractive and would relieve the tedium of attendance if extended. The city itself in its magnificent museums, libraries, public buildings, picture galleries and theaters would offer unparalleled attractions to all tastes. It has just vindicated itself from malicious slanders which came from partisan opponents of its political majority by a vote of over sixty thousand above that of its detractors. And it would be well for the representatives of our people from all parts of the Union to see for themselves how well this vindication was merited and how groundless have been

the base charges against the Democracy of the great Empire City.

Without these votes, without the city of New York, the Democratic party, we fear, cannot carry the country or elect its candidate. We Democrats of the city have done our share always in the past and in the present, and are prepared to do it in the future, but we hope that our efforts shall be appreciated by our fellow Democrats. We have by our late triumphant election infused confidence into the party everywhere; we look to you to keep up that enthusiasm.

Will you do it? Will you assist us in bringing about harmony in all ranks of the party regardless of minor past differences? Will you give your approval to our efforts and your expression of good-will and thus encourage and confirm Democrats everywhere and make success at the polls assured?

Yours respectfully,

ROBERT A. VAN WYCK  
JOHN FOX,  
ROBERT B. ROOSEVELT,  
DANIEL O'DAY,  
RUDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER,  
JOHN F. O'ROURKE,

Committee of the Democratic Club.

MR. MACK: I present Senator McCarren, of New York, who will submit New York's claims.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen of the Committee, Senator McCarren will present the claims of New York City.

MR. PATRICK H. MCCARREN, of New York: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, ordinarily in the selection of a place for holding a national convention—and this argument I assume applies to both of our political parties—there are two controlling motives which would seem to animate the National Committee. The first one is the question of the commodious comfort of the delegates who are going to attend the convention; and in our country at the present day we know that the conventions of both parties are numerous attended. Those of us who attended the convention at Kansas City four



years ago can recall to mind the situation in that city. I do not hold the residents of that city nor the people of that State responsible for the discomfort which beset every delegate of the convention and those who attended the convention that year. The torridity of the climate and the discomfort were so pronounced that it was with a great deal of difficulty that the delegates were enabled to keep on their outer garments.

Now, in the selection of a place for holding our national convention it may be assumed that in all probability up to the present time there never has been a convention which will be so largely attended as the next Democratic National Convention, because it requires no great perception or extraordinary vision to see the signs of the times. The spectacle presented here in the city of Washington at an ordinary meeting of the National Committee is indicative of the great interest and sentiment which have taken possession of the Democrats all over the United States. They are very ominous; they indicate victory: and it seems to me a great deal of care and attention should be given to the question of providing comfortably for everybody who will attend the convention.

The next motive which would control the National Committee in selecting a place for holding a national convention, it seems to me, is the question of political advantage, if any. If there is any political advantage to be derived from the location of the place in which we shall hold our convention, it should be taken into account. It seems to me the spirit which animates every Democrat with whom I have conversed is one that is ready to subordinate much to the question of the political advantage of the location of the place of holding our convention.

Now, to apply the first reason, I think it is unnecessary for me to say that there is no more commodious place within the confines of the United States than is afforded in the territory of Manhattan Island, a part of the great city of New York. There we have more hotels than there are in any other similar territory in the United States. We have all kinds, all varieties of hotels. We have hotels which are within the means of the most humble, and we have hotels prepared to entertain those who can pay any price that may be charged. There is no disposition, nor will

there be any, on the part of the hotel proprietors in any way to alter their prices, and the greatest comfort can be afforded to the members of the convention and those who attend the convention by these various and numerous hotels that are within the great city of New York. That is one reason it seems to me why the Committee ought to select the city of New York.

Another reason is the salubrity of our climate. We are fortunately situated right on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, and New York is peculiarly a summer city. You can there wear comfortably a light overcoat in July, about which time in all probability, from what I hear, the next Democratic convention will be held. The characteristics of the city of New York and its temperature in summertime are so attractive as to make it essentially a summer city, and in that way the comfort of the delegates can be peculiarly considered.

We have attractions too numerous to mention. We have one of the best regulated, one of the cleanest and one of the most attractive cities from every standpoint on the American continent. We have in course of construction and will have completed by the time the convention is called one of the greatest underground tunnels in the world. We have just completed and opened the greatest bridge in the world. We have, as has been stated in the communication just read by the secretary, many other attractions which would possibly interest those who would attend the convention, if it be located in the city of New York. We have Coney Island within the reach of the delegates, accessible within fifteen or twenty minutes, at an expense of five or ten cents. We have many attractions which would probably interest delegates who have never visited the great city of New York.

In addition to all that, those of you who have read of the recent political contest in that great city can have the advantage, if you never have been there, of visiting the field upon which the Fusion forces met their Waterloo.

As to the political advantage, I wish to say in all seriousness that if there is any political advantage to be gained at all from the location of the convention, it is to be gained by locating it in New York, for there are three States so intertwined and so

interwoven and of such a kidney that the concern of one is the concern of all. Whatever affects the great State of New York correspondingly affects the State of New Jersey and the State of Connecticut. The same political atmosphere permeates the three States, and almost invariably as one goes, so go all three. So by the location of the convention in the great city of New York, while I want to say that the city of New York will be carried by the Democratic candidates, no matter where the convention is located [applause], we will carry it by a sufficiently large majority to make that influence felt in the adjoining States of New Jersey and Connecticut and insure them for the Democratic nominees, no matter who they may be.

In conclusion, I will say that the people of the city of New York and the citizens for whom I speak extend to you an invitation, and through them I wish to assure you a very hospitable sojourn if you come there. We are not here for the purpose of opposing any other city, but merely for the purpose of calling your attention in detail to the great advantages that the city of New York affords to a national convention, and in addition to say that we will guarantee the payment of whatever legitimate and incidental expenses may be necessary for the holding of the convention in the great city of New York, if you, by the wisdom of your votes, see fit to select it as the place. [Applause.]

MR. MACK: Mr. Cadigan, of New York, who represents the Hotelmen's Association of that great city, will also speak in behalf of New York.

THE CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I introduce to you Mr. Cadigan, who will speak in behalf of the city of New York.

MR. JOHN CADIGAN: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, after listening to my friend, Mr. McCarren, I feel that there is very little for me to say.

I am asked to speak on behalf of the facilities offered in the city of New York and the rates. If New York shall be favored with this convention by the members of the National Committee, within a territory of one mile in length and less than a half mile in width there are hotel accommodations for ten thousand people. The rates at these hotels vary in price from one to

ten or fifteen dollars a day. As Senator McCarren has said, it is within the reach of the humblest. It is also able to furnish accommodations for those who may feel that they can afford to be lavish. Our hotels are the best equipped of any in this country, and I am more or less familiar with all of them, from New York to San Francisco. When I came here I felt a good deal like observing the injunction "brevity is the soul of wit," and I want to show you how witty I can be, saying as little as I can and as much therein.

On behalf of the hotel men of New York I can assure you you will receive very hospitable treatment if you come there. There will be no exorbitant rates imposed upon any one, and if you come you will get the best treatment at our hands. I thank you for your kind attention, and I hope you will come to New York.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** If there is nothing further to be said in favor of New York, the Committee will now listen to those who advocate the selection of St. Louis.

**MR. STONE:** Mr. Chairman, St. Louis desires the honor of entertaining this convention, and I wish now to present to the members of the Committee, Hon. Rolla Wells, mayor of the city.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen, I introduce Mayor Wells, of the city of St. Louis.

**MR. ROLLA WELLS, of St. Louis:** Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, I will consume but a few moments of your time. Speech-making will be more in order after the next Democratic National Convention places in nomination its candidates, who we hope will be the next President and Vice-President of the United States. [Applause.]

It is for this Committee to designate where that convention shall be held. In your wisdom you will select the place best suited, taking into consideration first the party's interest, and, second, the convenience, comfort and pleasure of the delegates who will be in attendance.

It is my privilege, Mr. Chairman, to appear before you as the mayor of the city of St. Louis [applause], and as the execu-

tive of that municipality I am authorized on behalf of all its people to extend to you and the Democratic party a most cordial and earnest invitation to compliment the city of St. Louis by holding the next national convention in our midst.

The State of Missouri is one of the foremost Democratic States of this Union. Staunch and tried for many years in the past, we believe so it will be for unlimited years in the future. Its metropolis, the city of St. Louis, at the election in the fall of 1900 converted what was then a Republican majority of about seventy-eight hundred into a Democratic majority of about sixty-five hundred; then in the election of the spring of 1901 a Democratic majority of about ten thousand; afterwards, in the fall of 1902, a Democratic majority of about fourteen thousand, and, at the last election, in the spring of 1903, a Democratic majority of about eighteen thousand. Surely this is climbing the rounds of the ladder of enlightenment; and, gentlemen, in consideration of the Democratic stability of our great State and the redemption of the city of St. Louis, we ask your favor by designating our city as the meeting place of the next convention.

I come from a locality that is almost the center of population of this country. Our people have come, or are the offspring of those who came, from every State and section of this glorious land. I come from a united Democracy, and in that spirit I ask your indulgence.

Geographically the location of the city of St. Louis speaks for itself. Nowhere can you find a point more accessible or better provided with transportation facilities. We are prepared to offer you a convention hall which will be to your entire satisfaction. We are prepared to give you hotel accommodations which also will be to your liking. But on that subject the gentleman who will follow me will go more into detail.

On April 30th next, to continue until December 1st, the citizens of the city of St. Louis will open the gates of what will prove to be the grandest universal exposition the world has ever seen. That exposition has met with the approval of, and invitations to attend have been accepted by, our National Govern-

ment, by all our States and Territories, by governments of Europe and the Orient.

Now, gentlemen of this Committee, we ask of you, representing as you do several million Democratic voters, that the Democratic party, through you as its Committee, join with the National Government, our States and Territories and the foreign governments in approving what the citizens of St. Louis are doing for the education, profit and pleasure of the entire world, by encouraging us and complimenting our city by designating it for the meeting place of your convention.

Through the effort of the people of St. Louis the year 1904 will be a bright star in the shining history of our country. I ask you gentlemen to add luster to that star in designating St. Louis for the convention. [Applause.]

THE CHAIRMAN: At the request of Mayor Wells, I will direct the Secretary to read the written proposal submitted by the city of St. Louis.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 12, 1904.

*To the Democratic National Committee:*

The undersigned, for themselves, and representing and on behalf of The Business Men's League of the city of St. Louis, make the following proposition to the Democratic National Committee:

1st—That if the Committee will call the convention to meet in St. Louis, we will give to the Committee in cash the sum of \$40,000, to be paid to the Chairman thereof within thirty (30) days preceding the date fixed for the convention.

2d—That we will furnish to the Committee, and turn over into its charge, for the use of the convention, free of charge, the Coliseum—a steel constructed, fireproof building, with a capacity for 12,000 people—with ample adjoining committee room space, for the use of the convention and of the Committee.

3d—The Business Men's League, on request made within a reasonable time, will secure ample and convenient quarters

for the members of the National Committee, their families and friends, the delegations and for visitors.

ROLLA WELLS,  
J. EDW. SCHOERS,  
C. B. SMITH,  
E. C. ROBBINS,  
M. C. WETMORE,  
FRED W. FLEMING,  
HARVEY L. CHRISTIE,  
CHAS. W. KNAPP,  
EDW. D. EVOY,  
WM. FLEWELLYN SAUNDERS.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Is there some one else to appear on behalf of St. Louis?

**MR. STONE:** Let me introduce Mr. Charles W. Knapp, the managing editor of the *St. Louis Republic*.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen of the Committee, Mr. Knapp will further present the claims of St. Louis.

**MR. CHARLES W. KNAPP,** of St. Louis: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee, St. Louis proffers its invitation to the Democratic National Convention of 1904. Neither ignorant nor unmindful of the duties a host owes to guests, fully conscious of the obligations which hospitality imposes, we have come here to give the emphatic assurance of the people of St. Louis, of its official representatives, of its business organizations, that in every detail the convenience, the comfort, the expenses of the members of the Committee, of the delegates to the convention, of the great hosts of Democracy who will come to attend the convention, will be amply and completely protected. We bring you our emphatic guarantees that you will find in St. Louis unusual and exceptional hotel accommodations, and that you will have provided for you unusual and exceptional facilities of transportation both in coming to that city and in returning to your home.

In speaking of unusual hotel accommodations we have no disposition whatever to shut our eyes or to blind you to the fact that St. Louis from April 30 to November 30, being as it

will be the capital city of the world, will have unusual crowds throughout the whole of the seven months. But in anticipation of those unusual crowds we have made unusual preparations. We assure you that St. Louis will be, as it should be, for those seven months the greatest hotel city in the United States. We assure you that no city in the country, be it where it may, will have such provision for the accommodation of transient visitors as St. Louis will have. The evidence of that in some measure, if I may deal in figures, stands in the fact that before the Democratic convention assembles in the city of St. Louis there will be more than twice as many hotels as there were eight months ago, and the hotel capacity will be nearly or quite five times what it was.

We will have hotels having a total capacity, without needlessly crowding them, of more than 100,000 guests. We will endeavor to protect the visitors who come to us with respect to charges, to guard them against extortionate rates, and in the endeavor to carry out the guarantee which we are giving you now we have obtained already two practical assurances that speak for themselves. We have in the first place a guarantee, signed by ninety-seven of the old established hotels, having a capacity to entertain 21,000 guests, which guarantee is filed with the exposition company, that during the seven months of the Exposition, that is from April 30 to November 30, they will not increase their rates beyond the normal charges made in ordinary times.

As further assurance that that guarantee will be practically and completely fulfilled, we have the fact that the Exposition Company has made a contract for the erection of a hotel, to accommodate five thousand people without overcrowding, now in a forward state of progress, within the enclosure of the Exposition, at rates established in the contract, and under the control of the Exposition Company, so that they cannot be raised. With that hotel, so controlled with respect to its rates, it is practically impossible for the competitive hotels outside to advance their rates unduly.

But beyond that, there are two other great hotels, having in their aggregate capacity accommodations for several thousands



of people, under agreement with the Exposition Company, and upon ground that was leased and belongs temporarily to the Exposition Company, and by reason of that fact so controlled by the Exposition Company that they are also regulators of rates.

Perhaps it might not be out of place, if you will bear with me for a moment or two, for me to read to you the charges that are established for the hotel within the enclosure of the Exposition Company, known as the Inside Inn. It has a capacity for 5,500 people and it offers 500 rooms at a dollar a day, 500 rooms at a dollar and a half a day, 500 at two dollars a day, and the remainder, which are larger, with baths, at higher rates. The price of admission to the grounds is added to the rate of the Inside Inn, so that guests there will enjoy the advantage of remaining in the grounds day and night.

The other temporary hotels in the neighborhood of the Exposition grounds, that is within a distance of from a half to three-quarters of a mile, will number altogether about a hundred and twenty-five. There are several which will have accommodations for several thousand people. Twenty of the larger temporary hotels will accommodate altogether 30,000 people. Besides these large temporary hotels there will be, making up the remainder of the 125, hotels having a capacity ranging from 150 to 200 rooms.

Apart from these temporary hotels, the permanent hotels of St. Louis have been greatly increased. Most notable among them is one great fireproof hotel, within half a block from the Coliseum, the hall in which you will hold your deliberations if you come to St. Louis, which I have no hesitation in saying, because I know the facts, will be the finest hotel in the country, outside of the city of New York, barring none. If you want to go further away, into the quiet of the residence quarter, we will offer you four new fireproof hotels, ranging in capacity from accommodations for 500 up to accommodations for a thousand guests—hotels of high class.

If I have not, in the dry statistics which I have given you, offered some indication of the fact that St. Louis will afford ample accommodations in its hotels to meet the requirements of

all classes of people—those who must look closely to their expenditures and those who can afford to pay for what they want, no matter what it may cost—I certainly have failed in my endeavor.

But if I have done so let me address to your reason this consideration: St. Louis has been compelled, by a knowledge of the fact, coming from innumerable sources, that the attendance at this exposition is going greatly to exceed that of any other exposition this country has ever had, to make, as I told you, unusual provision to take care of its guests. It has been compelled to make the weakest link in its chain strong enough to bear the strain. It has been compelled to provide for the strain that will come when the greatest crowd is there. In the doing of that it has provided accommodations to meet in an exceptional and unusual way such gatherings as the Democratic National Convention will bring. It will happen, as you will readily appreciate (and that is the point I want to address to your reason) that when the week is fixed during which the Democratic National Convention is to be held, those people who would otherwise have come to the city to visit the fair, who do not desire to be incommoded by the crowds which attend a political gathering, the people who would come and bring women and children, will wait or come at an earlier date. Having, therefore, provision made to meet just such occasions as will arise during that week and as will arise during other weeks throughout the Exposition, we will be prepared to take proper care of the National Democratic Convention.

The same is true about the exceptional and unusual provision which we have made with respect to railroad transportation. It is not unimportant. It is not unimportant in the first place that this great gathering of the Democracy should be as nearly as possible at the center of the country; certainly at or near the center of its transportation system.

The requirements of the Exposition Company have led to negotiations, now practically completed, which assure a half rate from every corner of this land. Not alone that, but I will say that some of the railroad companies have given very assuring promises that on certain occasions, and we would hope to

make this one of those occasions, they will make still further reductions in rates. It has been indicated that we would possibly be able to get, and we expect to get it, a rate of eighty per cent. of a half rate for the round trip.

That has been made possible within the last two weeks by two things. The railroad companies of this country have been afflicted and disturbed at all great gatherings by the sale of their special excursion tickets to the general public who were not traveling simply for the purpose of attending the large meetings, but who were availing themselves of the low rates to make a saving, which cut into the revenues of the railroad. They had practically determined that they would not repeat their reduced rates for any city in the country unless they could be assured against the inroads of the scalpers.

We have done two things which have given them the confidence they require before they can give the reduced rates to St. Louis. In the first place, proceedings were taken in the courts by attorneys representing the railway companies, assisted by the general counsel of the Exposition Company. An injunction was asked for restraining the ticket scalpers from selling these reduced rate special tickets—non-transferable tickets. A temporary injunction was granted in the court of original hearing. The case was taken on appeal by the ticket scalpers to the highest appellate court of the State, the Supreme Court, and within a few days past the Supreme Court, after having had the matter under consideration for an extended period of time, after having given ample thought to the subject, rendered a decision sustaining the temporary injunction, and in the opinion so completely and thoroughly traversed the merits of the case that there is no question among lawyers as to what will be the attitude of the court if ever the permanent writ comes to the court to be sustained, or if cases are developed after the fair opens.

Secondly, reinforcing that, an ordinance has been passed by the municipal assembly, and it is to-day awaiting signature, unless it has been signed by the acting mayor to-day, making the sale of non-transferable tickets a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine. We have, therefore, the legal protection which the

railroad companies have asked, upon which they have given us the assurance of reduced rates.

Further, the necessity of meeting the convenience of people coming to this great Exposition has led to plans for a readjustment of railroad schedules, of railroad transportation matters, of train equipment, so that during the seven months of the Exposition there will be a complete and perfect system of railway transportation into and out of St. Louis.

Now, gentlemen, the representatives of St. Louis have come here, too, as missionaries of peace. We brought no enmities with us. We have acquired none since we got here. We are antagonizing none of the cities which are contending with us in friendly rivalry for the high privilege of entertaining this court of Democracy when it meets next June or July, as you may decide. We have come here simply and only to assure you an earnest welcome and whole-souled hospitality if you call the convention to meet in St. Louis. It will meet in a Democratic stronghold. It will meet really and truly in the house of its friends. It will meet in a city Democratic, in a State Democratic, and we will have them Democratic whether the convention meets there or not. We are not asking a bribe to carry the State. We will carry it whether we get the convention or do not get the convention. [Applause.]

If the Democratic National Convention comes to St. Louis it will conduct its deliberations in an atmosphere of peace, harmony and good will. It will proceed with an audience impartial, cheering it to the echo. It will have the active support of a friendly press. [Applause.] And more, it will come to a city which twice before has given its hospitality to a Democratic National Convention, and you will have roused in your minds omens of success. You will find going away from St. Louis once more the hosts of Democracy, departing to every corner of the land with banners carrying the symbols of victory, blazoned with the names of candidates who are to win, inscribed with the platform of a party committed unfalteringly to the undying principles of right. [Applause.]

**THE CHAIRMAN:** There remains to St. Louis two minutes.

MR. STONE: We will not consume it, Mr. Chairman. We will rest our case.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair does not understand the gentleman from Missouri.

MR. STONE: I am told by the gentlemen on the part of St. Louis that they will rest the case right here, except that they desire to make one amendment to the proposition submitted. With respect to the hotel accommodations which we will guarantee for the delegations, etc., they desire to insert this clause, "at the normal rates charged in ordinary times."

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary is directed to make a note of the change in the proposition of St. Louis.

MR. STONE: Write it in the body of the proposition.

MR. THOMAS GAHAN, of Chicago: We desire to have our proposition read.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will read the proposition of the city of Chicago.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

THE SHOREHAM, WASHINGTON, D. C.,  
January 12, 1904.

*Hon. James K. Jones, Chairman Democratic National Committee.*

DEAR SIR: Desiring that the Democratic National Convention of 1904 shall be held in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, we do hereby agree and guarantee that in the event of the said city of Chicago being selected for the meeting of said convention we will be responsible for the expenses of said convention to the extent of forty-five thousand dollars, and that there will on or before May 1st, 1904, be deposited to the credit of such Sub-Committee of the Democratic National Committee as may be appointed to make arrangements for said convention, the sum of forty-five thousand dollars, for the purpose of defraying all of the expenses that it may be necessary or proper to incur in the judgment of said Sub-Committee, in connection with the usual and necessary arrangements for the meeting of said convention. It is understood and agreed that said Sub-

Committee will return to the undersigned the unexpended balance of the amount so deposited with said Sub-Committee.

It is also understood and agreed that the arrangements for the meeting of said convention and all matters properly incident thereto shall be made under the direct control and supervision of the Sub-Committee of the Democratic National Committee, it being understood and agreed that if desired by the undersigned three thousand of the spectators' tickets that may be issued for admission to the convention hall shall be given to the undersigned for distribution. The undersigned further agree that they will arrange with the proprietors of the leading hotels of the city of Chicago that no allotment of headquarters, committee rooms, guest rooms, etc., shall be made until after the selection of rooms for headquarters, committee rooms, etc., of the Democratic National Committee shall have been made by the said Sub-Committee of the Democratic National Committee, such selection to be made not later than thirty days from the date hereof. It is likewise understood and agreed that the rates of charges to be made by the hotels of the said city of Chicago shall be reasonable and moderate and not above the usual rates of such hotels.

Respectfully,

ADAMS A. GOODRICH,  
JOHN P. HOPKINS,  
THOMAS GAHAN.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the city of New York desire to take any of the time it has remaining?

MR. MAXWELL EDGAR, of Chicago: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the city of Chicago, as the representative and secretary of the Iroquois Club, the club which for the past twenty-five years has upheld the banner of the Democracy in Chicago and the West, on behalf of five hundred members of that organization I should like to say that we would be greatly delighted to have the Democratic convention in our city. Furthermore, although I am not directly authorized to speak for the mayor of Chicago, his representative, Mr. McGann, the comptroller of the city of Chicago, is here, and I suggest that Mr. McGann be

allowed the privilege of the floor to set forth the views of the mayor of the city of Chicago on this question.

THE CHAIRMAN: If any other representative of the city of Chicago desires to address the Committee he will please come forward.

(There were cries of "J. Hamilton Lewis.")

MR. J. HAMILTON LEWIS, of Chicago: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I thank you very kindly, but the time allowed to Chicago was so amply filled by the distinguished gentlemen chosen by the Committee that I could add nothing to it, and could merely repeat it. I do not think it could be added to with any degree of success, and I see no necessity for attempting it. I thank you very kindly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the city of New York desire to submit anything further? If not, the Chair will assume that the Committee desires that persons not members of the Committee will retire, and the Committee will consider the pending question.

MR. C. G. HEIFNER, of Washington: I move that the representatives of the press be allowed to remain in the hall.

The motion was seconded.

MR. R. R. KENNEY, of Delaware: I move that the Committee take a recess for five minutes.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Committee took a recess for five minutes.

At the expiration of the recess the Committee resumed its session.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

MR. CLAYTON: I move that we take a vote by ballot for the selection of the city.

MR. TILLMAN: Why not *viva voce*?

MR. JOSEPHUS DANIELS, of North Carolina: I move that the representatives of the press be allowed to attend the session.

MR. THOMAS GAHAN, of Chicago: I move that that portion of the communication from Chicago referring to the return of any balance of the fund may be stricken out. Also, in that

part of the communication where it speaks about tickets an amendment should be made. Those tickets are to go to the subscribers to the fund and not to Mr. Goodrich and Mr. Hopkins and myself.

MR. NORTON CHASE, of Arizona: What authority has this Committee to strike out anything in the communication sent to it from the citizens of the city of Chicago?

THE CHAIRMAN: The proposition on behalf of Chicago was submitted by Mr. Gahan and two other gentlemen, and I suppose the gentleman from Illinois speaks for himself and his associates. He wants to modify his proposition.

MR. GAHAN: Yes, sir.

MR. W. B. GOURLEY, of New Jersey: There is another matter. The Chicago proposition does not include a hall free, and I understand the proposition from St. Louis does. I ask for information on that point.

MR. GAHAN: Our communication contemplates everything free.

MR. J. G. JOHNSON, of Kansas: Mr. Goodrich specifically stated that in addition to all other things a hall would be furnished.

MR. GAHAN: Certainly; that is the intent of the proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from Illinois will see that his proposition is modified as he desires it and is made to express what it intends to mean.

A motion was made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Heifner) that members of the press be allowed to remain during the session of the Committee. What is the wish of the Committee in that regard?

MR. CLAYTON: I do not understand that the gentleman has made that motion since the Committee reassembled.

THE CHAIRMAN: He made the motion before the recess. Does the gentleman make the motion now?

MR. HEIFNER: I do not renew the motion—

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought it was still pending.

MR. HEIFNER: Because older members of the Committee think it should not be done. However, I personally favor it.



**THE CHAIRMAN:** The business before the Committee is the selection of a place for holding the next National Convention.

**MR. R. B. TILLMAN,** of South Carolina: In order that there may not be any misunderstanding or any bitterness hereafter; because there will be contentions as to what was proposed and what was not, I suggest that the Secretary read the propositions just as we are going to vote upon them.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The gentleman from South Carolina means as modified.

**MR. TILLMAN:** As modified. Let us understand what we are doing.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The Chair intended to direct the Secretary to do that as soon as the Committee was ready to proceed to business. The Chair would like to have the gentleman from Illinois pay attention to the reading, in order to see if the Secretary has made the modification as he desires it to be made. The Secretary will read the proposition of Chicago as modified.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

THE SHOREHAM, WASHINGTON, D. C.,

January 12, 1904.

*Hon. James K. Jones, Chairman Democratic National Committee.*

DEAR SIR: Desiring that the Democratic National Convention of 1904 shall be held in the city of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, we do hereby agree and guarantee that in the event of said city of Chicago being selected for the meeting of said convention we will be responsible for the expenses of said convention to the extent of forty-five thousand dollars, and that there will on or before May 1st, 1904, be deposited to the credit of such Sub-Committee of the Democratic National Committee as may be appointed to make arrangements for said convention, the sum of forty-five thousand dollars, for the purpose of defraying all of the expenses that it may be necessary or proper to incur in the judgment of said Sub-Committee, in connection with the usual and necessary arrangements for the meeting of said convention.

It is also understood and agreed that the arrangements for

the meeting of said convention and all matters properly incident thereto shall be made under the direct control and supervision of the Sub-Committee of the Democratic National Committee, it being understood and agreed that if desired by the undersigned three thousand of the spectators' tickets that may be issued for admission to the convention hall shall be given to the subscribers to the above fund for distribution

MR. GAHAN: That is right.

The Assistant Secretary resumed the reading of the proposition as follows:

The undersigned further agree that they will arrange with the proprietors of the leading hotels of the city of Chicago that no allotment of headquarters, committee rooms, guest rooms, etc., shall be made until after the selection of rooms for headquarters, committee rooms, etc., of the Democratic National Committee shall have been made by the said Sub-Committee of the Democratic National Committee, such selection to be made not later than thirty days from the date hereof. It is likewise understood and agreed that the rates of charges to be made by the hotels of the said city of Chicago shall be reasonable and moderate and not above the usual rates of such hotels.

Respectfully,

ADAMS A. GOODRICH,  
JOHN P. HOPKINS,  
THOMAS GAHAN.

MR. CLAYTON: I move that the Committee now proceed to vote by ballot for a place for holding the next Democratic National Convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will the gentleman withhold the motion for a moment? I should like to ask if anybody wishes to have the St. Louis proposition read again?

MR. GOURLEY: I ask to have it read.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let it be read first, and then the motion will be in order.

MR. TILLMAN: I want to make an inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from South Carolina.

MR. TILLMAN: As I recall the reading of the St. Louis proposition, we are offered a given sum of money and a hall.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary was just going to read the proposition.

MR. TILLMAN: The Chicago proposition offers us a given sum of money without a hall, and without any guarantee as to what the hire will be for the hall that is supposed to be at our service for a sum of money. In other words, we do not want to get tangled up with a proposition to go to a city where we will be charged exorbitantly for a place in which to hold our convention.

MR. GAHAN: I hope the gentleman from South Carolina and all gentlemen will understand that our proposition—I reiterate it—contemplates paying for a hall and for all the necessary expenses pertaining to the convention.

MR. TILLMAN: Does that mean out of the \$45,000?

MR. GAHAN: Yes, sir.

MR. NORMAN E. MACK, of New York: I want to say just a word about New York, in order that our position may not be misunderstood.

THE CHAIRMAN: After the order is made as to how the vote shall be taken, I presume the gentlemen of the Committee will be heard to say what they wish to present. It will be more strictly in order that it should be done then. The reading of the St. Louis proposition as modified has been asked for. The Chair directs the Secretary to read it.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 12, 1904.

*To the Democratic National Committee:*

The undersigned, for themselves, and representing and on behalf of The Business' Men's League of the city of St. Louis, make the following proposition to the Democratic National Committee:

1st—That if the Committee will call the convention to meet in St. Louis, we will give to the Committee in cash the sum of \$40,000, to be paid to the Chairman thereof within thirty (30) days preceding the date fixed for the Convention.

2d—That we will furnish to the Committee, and turn over

into its charge, for the use of the convention, free of charge, the Coliseum—a steel constructed, fireproof building, with capacity for 12,000 people—with ample adjoining committee room space, for the use of the convention and of the Committee.

3d—The Business Men's League, on request made within a reasonable time, will secure ample and convenient quarters for the members of the National Committee, their families and friends, the delegations and for visitors at the normal rates charged in ordinary times.

ROLLA WELLS,  
J. EDW. SCHOERS,  
C. B. SMITH,  
E. C. ROBBINS,  
M. C. WETMORE,  
FRED W. FLEMING,  
HARVEY L. CHRISTIE,  
CHAS. W. KNAPP,  
EDW. DEVOY,  
WM. FLEWELLYN SAUNDERS.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Clayton) moves that the vote be taken by ballot on the question of the location of the city.

**MR. TILLMAN:** Has that motion a second?

**MR. KENNEY:** I second the motion.

**MR. TILLMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest against any such un-Democratic proceeding. Not only has it never been done, to my knowledge in any Democratic convention, State or National, but I think it is not conducive to our purpose in meeting here, which is to get through this business. We do not want to be fooling and counting and somebody charging that we stuffed ballot boxes or voted wrongly or something of the sort. Let the roll of States be called and let each man respond for himself as to what city he wants to vote for.

**MR. NORMAN E. MACK,** of New York: Inasmuch as the other two cities, St. Louis and Chicago, have placed before you gentlemen a very definite statement or proposition so far as concerns the expense and all that, I think you ought to under-

stand our position a little more thoroughly and definitely than you do.

We did not offer any fixed amount for the reason that we did not think it was wise to do so, but I desire to say that should the city of New York be selected by the Committee we will do as much for the delegates, for the National Committee, for the comfort of everyone who attends the convention as any one of the other propositions, made by either St. Louis or Chicago, contemplates. We have not made a definite proposition because we did not think it was wise to do so. But that does not mean that the city of New York will not do everything that is proper and right for the entertainment of the National Committee should you gentlemen think it wise to select New York City as the place for holding the National Convention next June or July.

MR. GAHAN: I move that the motion to proceed to vote by ballot be laid upon the table. It is un-Democratic—

MR. CLAYTON: Will the gentleman pardon me?

MR. GAHAN: Will you pardon me?

MR. CLAYTON: I can save time by withdrawing my motion. That makes your speech unnecessary. [Laughter.]

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to vote by ballot is withdrawn. The question is on the selection of the location of the next National Convention. Is the Committee ready for the question? (Question, question.) Unless some member desires to submit further remarks, the Secretary will call the roll, and each member of the Committee will vote for the city of his choice when the name of his State or Territory is called.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

MR. JOHN F. SHAFROTH (when the name of Colorado was called): Under instructions I vote for New York City.

MR. THOMAS TAGGART (when the name of Utah was called): By instructions I vote for Chicago.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced New York 6, Chicago 20, St. Louis 23, as follows:

For New York—Colorado, Florida, New Jersey, New York, Arizona and Oklahoma.—6.

For Chicago—California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, In-

diana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming.—20.

For St. Louis—Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Alaska, Indian Territory and New Mexico.—23.

THE CHAIRMAN: A majority not having been cast for any city, the Secretary will again call the roll.

The roll having been called, the result was announced, Chicago 21, St. Louis 28, as follows:

For Chicago—California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming.—21.

For St. Louis—Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Alaska, Arizona, Oklahoma, Indian Territory and New Mexico.—28.

THE CHAIRMAN: A majority vote having been cast for St. Louis, it is selected as the place for holding the next convention.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: I move that the vote be made unanimous.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next question is the time when the convention shall be held.

MR. J. M. GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania: I move that Wednesday, the 6th day of July, be fixed.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wednesday, the 6th day of July, is suggested as the day for holding the convention.

MR. J. G. JOHNSON, of Kansas: I wish to suggest a day which perhaps is better—Wednesday, the 8th of June.

The motion was seconded.

MR. JAMES P. CLARKE, of Arkansas: The Democratic State Convention of Arkansas is called to meet on the 14th of June, by resolution of the last State Convention, and there is no authority to change the time; at least there is none known. I do not know what an exigency might bring to the front, but it would probably require a stretch of authority on the part of the State Central Committee.

MR. JOHNSON: With that statement I would not like to insist upon my motion.

MR. JEFFERSON MYERS, of Oregon: In Oregon it comes on the 5th of June, and the date suggested by the gentleman from Kansas would be too early for us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the gentleman from Kansas withdraw his motion.

MR. JOHNSON: I withdraw it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any other suggestions? The motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Guffey) that the 6th day of July be selected is now pending. Is the Committee ready for the question? (Question.) The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wednesday, the 6th day of July, is fixed as the day for the meeting of the convention.

MR. W. J. STONE, of Missouri: I will inquire of the Chair, for I am acting without consultation and somewhat on the spur of the moment, how many constituted the committee on arrangements the last time?

THE CHAIRMAN: My recollection is seven.

MR. DANIEL J. CAMPAU, of Michigan: Seven.

MR. STONE: I move that the Chair appoint a committee on arrangements, consisting of seven members, to look after such arrangements as are necessary preliminary to the meeting of the convention and to perform the usual duties of such a committee.

MR. JOHNSON: The Chairman of this Committee to be *ex officio* chairman thereof.

MR. STONE: The Chairman of this Committee to be *ex officio* chairman thereof.

MR. JOHNSON: That is the way we had it before.

MR. STONE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there a second to the motion?

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. STONE: I should like to make an inquiry so that there may be no misunderstanding about it. My remembrance is that the special committee on arrangements has always provided tickets and for the distribution of the tickets and the like. Is it necessary that there should be any special authority, by the action of the whole Committee, to clothe the special committee with that power?

THE CHAIRMAN: My impression is it never has been done, and the committee being clothed with authority to make the arrangements, it will be understood to have charge of the matter, of course, accountable to the full Committee when it meets.

MR. STONE: Of course, always. It will have to report its action to the full Committee.

MR. CLAYTON: The details have always been left to the Committee.

MR. STONE: I thought so.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are two matters here that I deem it my duty to present to the Committee. One is a cablegram which I called to the attention of the Committee this morning. It is as follows:

Cablegram.

FROM HONOLULU, 1/12/'04.

*James K. Jones, 915 M St., Washington.*

We endorse Palmer Woods and urge appointment as National Committeeman for Hawaii.

D. KAWANANAKOA,

JOHN EFFINGER,

RICHARD TRENT,

F. R. HARVEY,

JULIUS ASH,

Territorial Central Committee Members.



Prince David, who was a delegate at the last National Convention, is the first signer.

I will state in this connection that a month ago, when I was advised of the death of Mr. Cornwell, I had a cablegram from a man in Hawaii, signing himself as a member of the local committee, asking that there should be no action taken toward filling this vacancy until the local committee should have an opportunity to make a recommendation. Mr. Woods had been recommended to me by a number of persons at the time and I felt, from what recommendations had been made, that probably he was a good man for the appointment. But I did not know him personally, and as there was a request made that no action should be taken until the local committee had time to operate, I took no action whatever, and have left the matter open.

MR. TILLMAN: I will make a motion, if I am allowed to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: The gentleman from South Carolina.

MR. TILLMAN: I move that the matter of the vacancy from Hawaii be referred to the committee which has in charge the vacancy in the District of Columbia, with power to recommend to the next meeting of the Committee the proper person to fill the same.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here is another communication to which I will ask the Committee to listen. It is from the Chairman of the Democratic Central Committee of Porto Rico. I am asked to present it to the Committee, and I do so in compliance with the request of the writer.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

'GUAYAMA, PORTO RICO,

HEADQUARTERS DEM. CEN. COM. OF P. R.,

January 2d, 1904.

*Hon. James K. Jones, Chairman National Democratic Central Committee, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: The Democratic party here desires to affiliate with the national organization of Democrats. We, there-

fore, appeal to you to determine our status as being analogous to that of a Territory and invite us to send up six delegates to the next National Convention and to recommend our admittance there.

Our party here is composed of the best element: men of ability, integrity, moral and financial worth, nine-tenths of whom are white.

We pay taxes to the Government, send our quota of soldiers and support the flag. We hope through the success of your organization to benefit by the *Constitution* as well. Awaiting your favorable action, 12th instant, I am sir,

Most respectfully,

D. M. FIELD,  
Chairman Dem. Cen. Com., Porto Rico.

MR. CLAYTON: I move that it be referred to the same committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved that this matter be referred to the same committee.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. J. G. JOHNSON, of Kansas: Before the motion is put I should like to say a word. There is a difference between this proposition and the Hawaiian proposition. The Hawaiian proposition is that we name a certain man a member of this Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: To fill a vacancy.

MR. JOHNSON: This one is that when we are making up the roster for the National Convention we invite representation from the Territory of Porto Rico. The propositions are entirely different; and it seems to me that some action should be taken upon this communication, and that the Chairman should be instructed one way or the other, whether to accede to the request or not.

MR. CLAYTON: Porto Rico is not a Territory. She is a possession.

MR. C. G. HEIFNER, of Washington: I am not anxious to precipitate a discussion, but I am a Democrat, and I am in favor of the doctrine that when a man is taxed he should be repre-

sented. Therefore I am in favor of extending to the people of Porto Rico the right to sit in the next Democratic Convention. I believe that is Democracy. I move that the Chairman authorize the Democrats of Porto Rico to send representatives to the National Convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to make a suggestion to the Committee, one that it might be well to consider. What are the powers of this Committee in this connection? The National Convention makes up the representation to the National Convention, and the National Convention has fixed the rule and the representation that each State or Territory is entitled to in the convention. This Committee, I think, could make a recommendation to the National Convention, but I do not think the Committee would have the right to fix the representation. My impression is, though of course I leave that to the better judgment of you gentlemen—

MR. CLAYTON: The Chairman has stated what has been the rule heretofore. We have never allowed any representation until the National Convention has allowed it. We have no authority to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is my impression.

MR. R. R. KENNEY, of Delaware: This matter should go to the Special Committee and let them make a recommendation whether or not representatives from Porto Rico should have seats.

THE CHAIRMAN: The matter has already been referred to the Committee.

The Chair desires to announce the committee which it was authorized to appoint this morning.

I regret very much that I have not had an opportunity to consult gentlemen whom I have thought of putting upon this committee. I have endeavored to constitute it of gentlemen as convenient to Washington as it may be, so that they can have their meetings whenever they choose to have them, and at the same time to compose it of gentlemen removed as much as possible from the local influence here. I have not consulted a member of this Committee, and hope that each one of them will be willing to sacrifice his own time and convenience sufficiently

to serve. I name as members of the committee, Mr. McGraw, of West Virginia; Mr. Ellyson, of Virginia; Mr. Gourley, of New Jersey; Mr. Guffey, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Mack, of New York.

MR. J. TAYLOR ELLYSON, of Virginia: I move that the Committee adjourn.

MR. WILLIS J. ABBOTT, of Nevada: Before the motion to adjourn is put, I should like to state that I have just been informed that Mr. Bryan is on his way to the hotel and will be here in a few moments. I do not know whether the Committee desires to take any formal action, but if any member of the Committee wishes to see him he will undoubtedly be in the hall very shortly.

MR. J. R. JACOBS, of Oklahoma: What is the power of this Special Committee on the District of Columbia and Hawaii to report, and when shall it report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee was appointed and given jurisdiction over certain matters and I presume it will report when it is ready. I cannot say anything about that. I am not authorized to speak for the committee.

The Chair was authorized this morning to appoint a Committee on Memorials with respect to deceased members. The Chair has not had an opportunity to-day to look over the Committee and make a memorandum, and I will take the liberty, with the permission of the Committee, of announcing in a day or two the committee, and will let it go to the newspapers or notify the gentlemen who are appointed, as the case may be.

A motion to adjourn is pending. If there is nothing further to be said the Chair will put the motion.

MR. JOHN T. MCGRAW, of West Virginia: Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that some steps should be taken by the Committee looking to the matter of party organization between this and the calling of the convention. Ordinarily, after the convention, it takes two or three months to prepare our campaign book. It is always late in its publication. On either side of the House our friends in Congress are making a record. It seems to me if the Committee be not in funds, some steps should be taken

looking to the preparation of the party for the approaching campaign, without waiting until after the next convention.

I think a very great deal of clerical work could be done, such as the collection of information, the getting together of materials and the taking into consideration of matters that affect the several States of the Union. I do not know whether or not any such steps have been taken on the part of the Committee. I do not know whether or not the chairman of the Committee is following that plan, nor do I know whether it is advisable to do so. But it occurs to me that between this time and the meeting of the convention in St. Louis, there is a very great deal of clerical work that could be done and a very great deal of information that could come from the several States of the Union which would be very valuable to the successors of this Committee. If the Committee be not in funds, some steps should be taken looking to the getting of sufficient funds to do at least the clerical part of that which will have to be done after the meeting of the next convention.

I illustrate it again by the campaign book. I think there is no member of this Committee who has not felt that the publication of that book is always delayed. There is a very great deal of information that goes into the campaign book which can be collated and got together before the meeting of the next convention as well as it may be subsequent to that date. It seems to me, without waiting until July next, without waiting until the organization of the next committee, some steps should be taken in the best form which will suggest itself to the Committee, through a Sub-Committee or under the direction of the Chairman of this Committee, to get together the information we need, and looking to the organization of the party between this and the next meeting of the Committee.

MR. J. G. JOHNSON, of Kansas: I wish very earnestly to emphasize what Mr. McGraw has said. I have had more or less to do with the last two campaigns, and I can say, without any qualification, that one of the hardest propositions which has come before the Committee has been the very thing he suggests; that is, the collation of matter which has necessarily

been put into the campaign book after the convention has met and adjourned.

Now, there are, as we all know, certain issues which Democrats emphasize in every campaign. The parties are constantly making history in regard to them; it is nearly all accessible here in Washington, and it seems to me, just as Mr. McGraw has said, that some steps should be taken immediately to collate that matter and get it in form, not to publish it, but get it in form to publish in the campaign book as soon as possible after the adjournment of the convention.

In order to bring the matter before the Committee for action, I move that the Chairman be requested to undertake that work. He resides here in Washington and is well situated to do it. I move also that he be authorized to employ such help as in his judgment may be necessary and advisable in that work, and if I can get a second to my motion I will ask that it be put.

The motion was seconded.

MR. MCGRAW: I suggest to Mr. Johnson to amend his motion so as to authorize the Chairman of this Committee to appoint a Sub-Committee of three, if in his judgment it be necessary.

MR. JOHNSON: I accept the amendment.

MR. STONE: I want to inquire who prepared the last book. Was it done by this Committee or the Congressional Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: It was done by the National Committee.

MR. CLAYTON: The gentleman means two years ago?

THE CHAIRMAN: Then it was done by the Congressional Committee.

MR. CLAYTON: But in the last Presidential election it was done by this Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: In every Presidential election it is prepared by the National Committee, and in off years by the Congressional Committee.

MR. CLAYTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there had been embodied in the motion something about where we are going to get the money to do all this, it would have been a little more complete and effective.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kansas as modified.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. W. B. GOURLEY, of New Jersey: I move that the Committee adjourn, subject to the call of the Chair.

MR. STONE, of Missouri: Before that motion is put permit me to say just a word.

MR. GOURLEY: I withdraw the motion for that purpose.

MR. STONE: Mr. Chairman, I would hardly feel that I had done the right thing—I know I would not—if I permitted this Committee to adjourn without returning to you, as I now do, my very appreciative thanks, not only on my own account, but on behalf of the delegation which came here from St. Louis, and on behalf of the people of St. Louis, for the very distinguished honor you have conferred upon that metropolis in locating the great convention there.

I wish to say now that I have been requested by Mayor Wells, Colonel Wetmore and others to say to this Committee that whilst they did not put it in their proposition, it is their intention to turn over to this Committee not \$40,000, but more than \$50,000. [Applause.]

MR. W. B. GOURLEY, of New Jersey: I renew the motion that the Committee do now adjourn, subject to the call of the Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the Committee adjourn, subject to the call of the Chairman.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chairman.

## MEETING OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

---

JEFFERSON HOTEL, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Pursuant to call, the Democratic National Committee was called to order by Hon. James K. Jones, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on July 4th, at 10 o'clock a. m., at the Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis. Mo. On a call of the roll the following members and proxies responded :

Henry D. Clayton.  
James P. Clark.  
James H. Budd (proxy) M. F. Tarpey.  
Adair Wilson.  
Homer S. Cummings (proxy) Wm. F. Sheehan.  
R. R. Kenney.  
George P. Raney (proxy) Walter F. Coachman.  
Clark Howell.  
E. M. Wolfe (proxy) W. P. Hurlburt.  
Thomas Gahan (proxy) John P. Hopkins.  
Thomas Taggart.  
Charles A. Walsh.  
J. G. Johnson.  
Urey Woodson.  
N. C. Blanchard (proxy) Henry Lehman.  
Geo. E. Hughes (proxy) Elliot Danforth.  
Arthur P. Gorman (proxy) L. Victor Baughman.  
Geo. Fred Williams.  
Daniel J. Campau.  
F. D. O'Brien.  
Wallace McLaurin.  
William J. Stone.



James S. M. Neill.  
 James C. Dahlman (proxy) W. J. Bryan.  
 True L. Norris.  
 W. B. Gourley.  
 Norman E. Mack  
 Josephus Daniels.  
 J. B. Eaton.  
 John R. McLean (proxy) S. E. Johnson.  
 M. A. Miller (proxy) S. M. Garland.  
 James M. Guffey.  
 George W. Greene  
 B. R. Tillman.  
 Maris Taylor.  
 James M. Head.  
 R. M. Johnson.  
 David C. Dunbar (proxy) D. H. Peery.  
 John H. Senter.  
 J. Taylor Ellyson.  
 W. H. Dunphy.  
 John T. McGraw.  
 T. E. Ryan.  
 John E. Osborne.  
 Louis L. Williams.  
 J. A. Breathitt.  
 H. B. Spaulding.  
 H. B. Ferguson.  
 J. R. Jacobs.

In connection with the temporary organization of the National Convention, the Chair stated that the Committee on Arrangements for the Convention begged leave to recommend the following temporary officers of the Convention: Hon. John Sharpe Williams, of Mississippi, Temporary Chairman; Hon. C. A. Walsh, of Iowa, Temporary Secretary; Col. John I. Martin, of Missouri, Temporary Sergeant-at-Arms.

On motion of Mr. Daniels, of North Carolina, the recommendations of the Committee on Arrangements were accepted, and the gentlemen named were duly elected for the respective positions.

The Committee on Arrangements further recommended that the Temporary Secretary be authorized to select such Assistant Secretaries, Reading Clerks, and other assistants as he might deem proper; that the Temporary Sergeant-at-Arms be authorized to select such Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, and other assistants, as he might deem proper, and that the Temporary Doorkeeper be authorized to select such assistants as he might deem proper.

On motion of Mr. Clayton, of Alabama, these recommendations were adopted by the National Committee.

The Chair stated that the Committee on Arrangements had fully discharged its duty; that in the course of its labors it had been necessary for him to appoint a sub-committee, consisting of Messrs. D. J. Campau, J. G. Johnson, Norman E. Mack and Charles A. Walsh, to take charge of the actual detail arrangement and work of the Convention; that the Citizens' Committee of St. Louis had turned over to the Chairman of the National Committee the \$40,000 pledged, some of which money had already been paid out in completing arrangements of the Convention.

The Chair further stated that the present National Committee would turn over to the new Committee all of its records, books, etc., accumulated during the past eight years, as well as whatever money remained after all expenses of the Convention had been paid.

On motion of Mr. Jacobs the report of the sub-committee on arrangements was adopted by the National Committee.

The Committee then proceeded with the making up of the temporary roll of the Convention.

On motion of Mr. Jacobs, of Oklahoma, all delegates and alternates against whom no contests had been filed with the National Committee were placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

By order of the Chair, the Assistant Secretary read the following list of contests filed with the Committee:

South Dakota.

District of Columbia.

Pennsylvania—First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Districts.

Ohio—Twelfth District.

New Jersey—First and Second Districts.

Maine—Second District.

Indiana—First, Second, Sixth, Seventh, Ninth and Tenth Districts, and delegates for the State at large.

Illinois—Second, Third, Sixth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Eighteenth, Twenty-first, Twenty-third and Twenty-fifth Districts, and two delegates for the State at large.

On motion of Mr. Johnson, of Kansas, the Chair was authorized and directed to appoint as many sub-committees, of five each, as there were States in which contests were pending before the Convention, and that the contests from each of those States be referred to one of the said sub-committees, which sub-committees should report at an adjourned meeting of the National Committee for final action of the Committee.

At this point Hon. W. J. Stone, of Missouri, was designated as acting Chairman of the Committee, and immediately took the chair.

On motion of Mr. Jacobs, of Oklahoma, the Committee directed the managers of the press seats for the Convention to issue to all members of the National Committee five tickets each to be selected from the allotment set aside for the weekly press.

On motion of Mr. Wilson, of Colorado, the Committee took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m., same day.

## RECESS.

The Committee reassembled at 2 o'clock p. m., July 4th.

On motion of Mr. Howell, of Georgia, the Committee requested Mr. Hitchcock, in charge of the press seats, to appear before the Committee for the purpose of explaining the allotment and distribution of press tickets.

Mr. Hitchcock appeared before the Committee and made a full statement of the plan that he had arranged for the distribution of press seats.

At this point the Chair announced the following sub-committees on contests:

Illinois—William J. Stone, Missouri, Chairman; Adair Wilson, Colorado; T. D. O'Brien, Minnesota; Norman E. Mack, New York; John T. McGraw, West Virginia.

Ohio—J. B. Breathitt, Arizona, Chairman; W. B. Gourley, New Jersey; R. M. Johnston, Texas; G. F. Williams, Massachusetts; J. T. Ellyson, Virginia.

Maine—J. B. Eaton, North Dakota, Chairman; Henry Lehmann (proxy), Louisiana; Marius Taylor, South Dakota; J. R. Jacobs, Oklahoma; Wendell P. Hurlbut (proxy), Idaho.

South Dakota—M. F. Tarpey, California, Chairman; M. A. Miller, Oregon; T. L. Norris, New Hampshire; W. F. Sheehan (proxy), New York; Wallace McLaurin (proxy), Mississippi.

Pennsylvania—James M. Head, Tennessee, Chairman; R. R. Kenney, Delaware; Urey Woodson, Kentucky; Thomas Taggart, Indiana; H. B. Spaulding, Indian Territory.

District of Columbia—H. B. Fergusson, New Mexico, Chairman; J. S. M. Neil, Montana; W. H. Dunphy, Washington; W. F. Coachman (proxy), Florida; D. H. Peery, Utah.

Indiana—B. R. Tillman, South Carolina, Chairman; S. E. Johnson (proxy), Ohio; Josephus Daniels, North Carolina; James P. Clarke, Arkansas; George W. Greene, Rhode Island.

New Jersey—Henry D. Clayton, Alabama, Chairman; Francis G. Newlands, Nevada; J. G. Johnson, Kansas; J. H. Senter, Vermont; J. E. Osborne, Wyoming.

On motion of Mr. Tillman it was decided that when the Committee adjourned it be to meet at 10 o'clock a. m., July 5th, to hear the reports from the various sub-committees on contests.

Announcement was thereupon made by the Chairman of each sub-committee of the time and place of meeting of his sub-committee.

On motion the Committee adjourned to meet on the following day, July 5th, at 10 o'clock a. m.

MEETING TUESDAY, JULY 5, 1904.

The Democratic National Committee was called to order at

10 o'clock a. m., on July 5th, by the Chair. A quorum responded to the call of the roll.

Mr. Tillman, of South Carolina, filed the unanimous report of the sub-committee on the Indiana contest favoring the seating of the contestees.

On motion of Mr. Kenney, of Delaware, the report was adopted, and the names of the contestees were ordered to be placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

Mr. Clayton, of Alabama, filed the report of the sub-committee on the New Jersey contest, unanimously recommending that the delegation headed by James Smith, Jr., be placed on the preliminary roll of the Convention and moved the adoption of the report.

The motion was duly seconded and the report adopted.

The Chair directed that the names of the contestees be duly placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

Mr. Tarpey, California, filed the report of the sub-committee on the South Dakota contest, and moved in behalf of said sub-committee that the names of the contestees be placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

The motion was duly seconded and the report adopted.

The Chair directed that the names of the contestees be placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

Mr. Head, of Tennessee, filed the report of the sub-committee on the Pennsylvania case, favoring the seating of the contestees, and moved the adoption of the report.

The motion being duly seconded, the report was adopted.

The Chair directed that the names of the contestees be placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

Mr. Breathitt, of Arizona, filed the report of the sub-committee on the Ohio contest, favoring the seating of the contestees, which, on motion of Mr. Taggart, Indiana, was adopted by the Committee.

The Chair directed that the names of the contestees be placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

Mr. McGraw, of West Virginia, filed the report of the sub-committee selected by the National Committee at its meeting in Washington City, on January 12 last, to determine the Dis-

trict of Columbia case. The report favored the seating of James L. Norris as a member of the National Committee.

The report was adopted by the Committee, and the Chair directed that the names of the contestees be placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

On motion of Mr. Clayton the Committee took a recess until 2 o'clock, same day.

#### RECESS MEETING.

The Committee was called to order at 2 o'clock p. m., July 5th. A quorum responded to the call of the roll.

Mr. McGraw, of West Virginia, filed a supplemental report of the sub-committee in the District of Columbia case, showing the results of the primary elections held in the District of Columbia under rules and regulations prescribed under the direction of said sub-committee.

On motion of Mr. Senter, of Vermont, the report was adopted.

Mr. McGraw, for the same sub-committee, to whom was also referred the vacancies from Hawaii, recommended that Mr. P. P. Woods, of Mahukoma, be made a member of the National Committee, to represent Hawaii.

On motion of Mr. Senter, of Vermont, the recommendation was adopted.

Mr. McGraw, for the same sub-committee, to which was referred the question of the representation in the National Convention of delegates from Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, recommended that the delegates from those Islands be given seats in the temporary organization of the Convention.

On motion of Mr. Senter, of Vermont, the report was adopted.

Mr. Ferguson, of New Mexico, filed the report of the sub-committee on the District of Columbia contest, favoring the seating of the contestees.

On motion of Mr. Kenney the report was adopted.

The Secretary read an appeal from the action of the sub-committee on the Ohio contest.

The Chair directed that the appeal be filed.

Hon. W. J. Stone, Missouri, filed the report of the sub-committee on the Illinois contest, favoring the seating of the contestees.

On motion of Mr. Howell, of Georgia, the report was adopted.

On motion of Mr. Howell, of Georgia, which motion was amended by Mr. McGraw, it was ordered that Messrs. Clark Howell, W. J. Stone, James M. Guffey, Norman E. Mack, and H. D. Clayton, be appointed a sub-committee to prepare a series of resolutions indicating the high esteem and affection in which the members of the Committee regarded their Chairman; and in addition, that this sub-committee draft independent resolutions commending the efficiency of the Secretary and Sergeant-at-Arms; that these resolutions be spread upon parchment at the expense of the Committee, and sent to the Chairman, as well as to the Secretary and Sergeant-at-Arms.

The motion was duly seconded and unanimously adopted by a rising vote.

Chairman Jones responded with sincere thanks to the Committee for its cordial expressions.

At this point the report of the sub-committee on the Maine contest was filed, recommending that the contestees be seated.

The report was adopted, on motion of Senator Tillman, and the Chair directed that the names of the contestees be placed on the temporary roll of the Convention.

On motion of Mr. Clayton the Committee adjourned.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF 1904.

NEW YORK, July 26, 1904.

Pursuant to a resolution adopted by the National Convention held at St. Louis, Hon. James K. Jones called the Democratic National Committee to order at the Hoffman House, New York, at 12 o'clock m. this day. On the call of the roll the following members and proxies responded:

Alabama—Henry D. Clayton.

Arkansas—William H. Martin.

- California—M. F. Tarpey.  
Colorado—John I. Mullins.  
Connecticut—Homer S. Cummings.  
Delaware—Richard R. Kenney.  
Florida—Jefferson B. Browne (proxy) J. T. Fanning.  
Georgia—Clark Howell (proxy) J. K. Ohi.  
Idaho—Simon P. Donnelly.  
Illinois—Roger C. Sullivan.  
Indiana—Thomas Taggart (proxy) J. T. Fanning.  
Iowa—Charles A. Walsh (proxy) W. J. Deford.  
Kansas—John H. Atwood.  
Kentucky—Urey Woodson (proxies) J. P. Hopkins, W. F. Sheehan.  
Louisiana—N. C. Blanchard.  
Maine—Geo. E. Hughes.  
Maryland—L. Victor Baughman.  
Massachusetts—Wm. A. Gaston.  
Michigan—Daniel J. Campau.  
Minnesota—T. T. Hudson.  
Mississippi—C. H. Williams (proxy) O. W. Catchings.  
Missouri—W. A. Rothwell.  
Montana—Chas. W. Hoffman (proxy) J. W. Bailey.  
Nebraska—Jas. C. Dahlman.  
Nevada—John H. Dennis (proxy) C. D. Van Duzer.  
New Hampshire—True L. Norris.  
New Jersey—Wm. B. Gourley.  
New York—Norman E. Mack.  
North Carolina—Josephus Daniels.  
North Dakota—H. D. Allert.  
Ohio—John R. McLean.  
Oregon—Frederick V. Holman.  
Pennsylvania—J. M. Guffey.  
Rhode Island—George W. Greene.  
South Carolina—B. R. Tillman.  
South Dakota—E. S. Johnson.  
Tennessee—R. E. L. Mountcastle.  
Texas—R. M. Johnston.  
Utah—D. H. Peery.



Vermont—Bradley B. Smalley.  
 Virginia—J. Taylor Ellyson.  
 Washington—John Y. Terry (proxy) J. W. Kern.  
 West Virginia—John T. McGraw.  
 Wisconsin—Timothy E. Ryan.  
 Wyoming—John E. Osborne (proxy) J. W. Bailey.  
 Alaska—Arthur K. Dalany (proxy) D. B. Hill.  
 Arizona—Ben M. Crawford (proxy) J. E. Bell.  
 District of Columbia—James L. Norris.  
 Hawaii—Palmer P. Woods (proxy) W. H. O'Brien.  
 Indian Territory—R. L. Williams.  
 New Mexico—H. B. Ferguson (proxy) J. E. Lamb.  
 Oklahoma—Richard A. Billups (proxy) A. Belmont.  
 Porto Rico—D. M. Field (proxy) J. W. Bailey.

On motion of Mr. Clayton, of Alabama, Hon. M. F. Tarpey, of California, was elected Temporary Chairman of the Committee.

On motion of Mr. Norris, of the District of Columbia, Mr. Henry Lehmann, of Louisiana, was elected Temporary Secretary.

On motion of Mr. Holman, of Oregon, Col. John I. Martin was elected Temporary Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. Mack, of New York, in behalf of the Democratic Club, of New York City, extended an invitation to the members of the National Committee and their friends to attend a reception at the Club House this evening (July 26th) between the hours of 9 and 11.

On motion of Mr. Blanchard, of Louisiana, the invitation of the Democratic Club was unanimously accepted, and the thanks of the Committee were extended to Mr. Mack to be conveyed to the Club for the courtesy.

Mr. Mack announced that arrangements had been completed for a trip by the members of the National Committee to Esopus to visit Hon. Alton B. Parker, on the morning of July 27th.

On motion of Mr. Bailey, of Texas, the Committee unanimously decided to attend in a body.

On motion of Mr. Bailey, the Committee proceeded with the making of a permanent organization, the Chairman to be selected first.

On motion of Hon. John W. Kern, of Indiana, Hon. Thomas Taggart, of Indiana, was unanimously elected Permanent Chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

On motion of Mr. Blanchard, the Chair was authorized to appoint a Committee of three to wait upon and escort Mr. Taggart to the chair.

The Chair appointed Messrs. Blanchard, Ellyson and Kern as said committee.

Mr. Blanchard presented Mr. Taggart, who was escorted to the chair.

On motion of Mr. Sullivan, the Committee proceeded to the election of a Secretary.

Mr. Urey Woodson, of Kentucky, was nominated by Mr. Cummings, of Connecticut.

Mr. C. A. Walsh, of Iowa, was nominated by Mr. Tarpey, of California.

The vote was taken, resulting in 36 for Mr. Woodson and 12 for Mr. Walsh.

On motion of Mr. Deford, the election of Mr. Woodson was made unanimous.

On motion of Mr. Kenney, of Delaware, the Committee proceeded with the selection of an Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Edwin Sefton, of the District of Columbia, was nominated by Mr. Woodson, of Kentucky, and was unanimously elected Assistant Secretary of the Democratic National Committee.

On motion of Mr. Bailey, the Committee proceeded with the election of a Sergeant-at-Arms and Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms.

On motion of Mr. Bailey, Col. John I. Martin was elected Sergeant-at-Arms and Col. Samuel Donelson was elected Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms of the Democratic National Committee.

On motion of Mr. Sheehan, the Committee adopted the following resolution:

That the Chair be authorized to appoint not to exceed two Vice-Chairmen, as his judgment may determine; that the Chair be authorized to appoint an Executive Committee of not less than five nor more than seven members; that the Chair be authorized to appoint a Finance Committee of not less than three nor more than five members, and if in the judgment of the Chair these two committees should be amalgamated into an Executive Committee, then the Executive Committee shall be composed of seven members; that if at any time the exigencies of the campaign should, in the judgment of the Chairman of the National Committee, require it, or if it becomes advisable at any time for the proper conduct of the campaign, that the Chairman of the National Committee be authorized to appoint a committee or committees for any State or States as the occasion may demand.

Mr. McGraw moved that the Executive Committee, when selected, be authorized to elect a Treasurer of the National Committee and report the same immediately to the Chairman of the National Committee. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clayton and adopted.

The motion being made and seconded, the thanks of the Committee were extended to Hon. James K. Jones and the other officers of the old National Committee.

On motion of Mr. Clayton, the Committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.

## APPENDIX.

---

Speech of Champ Clark, of Missouri, Permanent Chairman of the National Democratic Convention, and Chairman of the Committee to Notify the Nominee for President, Notifying Honorable Alton B. Parker of His Nomination, at Esopus, New York, August 10, 1904.

---

MR. CLARK said: Judge Parker: The most momentous political performance known among men is the quadrennial election of an American President. The supreme Executive power of 80,000,000 free people changes hands with simplest ceremony and most perfect order. While the contest for votes is waged with earnestness and enthusiasm, sometimes with much heat and bitterness, the ready acceptance of the result by the defeated is the surest augury of the perpetuity of our institutions.

Presidents come and Presidents go, but the great Republic, freighted with the hopes of the human race for liberty, goes on forever.

All history proves that a government bottomed on popular suffrage is a government by party. Experience shows that he serves his party best who serves his country best. The names most fondly cherished are those of men who devoted their time, their energies, their talents, their fortunes and their lives unselfishly to the promotion of the public weal. Stronger incentive to high and patriotic endeavor no man hath than the hope to stand through all the ages in that goodly company.

Out of the masterly debates and profound deliberations of

the St. Louis Convention emerged a reunited party, which goes forth conquering and to conquer. The flower of the Democracy assembled there to consult on the state of the country and to take measures for restoring the government to the principles enunciated by the fathers, from which it has drifted far in these latter days.

Every phase of Democratic opinion was represented by brave, honest and able champions in that great conclave of free and patriotic men.

The St. Louis Convention carried out no cut and dried programme. Its delegates were not mere automatons or marionettes moving and talking when the strings were pulled by one man. Speech and action were absolutely free, and the great debates which took place there will constitute part of the permanent political literature of the country. No effort was made to gag or bridle anyone. If a delegate had a pet idea which he was anxious to exploit, he was given an adequate and respectful hearing before either the Platform Committee or the entire Convention. Every man had his say. To none was opportunity denied. Out of it all grew such unity as encourages lovers of liberty and of pure government everywhere.

We enter upon this campaign with the strength which grows out of the union of a mighty party, with the enthusiasm born of truth, with the courage that emanates from a righteous cause, with the confidence of men animated by noble purposes and lofty patriotism.

The principles of Democracy are grounded in eternal truth. As formulated by the father of Democracy they are not for a day, but for all time, and are as applicable at this hour as when he proclaimed them in his first inaugural address, which has become a classic. The necessity for putting them into practice is as pressing now as it was then. To once more make them the basis of our political action is the pleasant, but arduous task assigned you by the Democracy of the land.

To serve the whole American people, without discrimination, faithfully and well; to distribute the blessings of the Federal Government impartially among all our citizens; to lighten the burden of government by reducing taxation to the

minimum, and by rigid economy in the public service; to administer the powers conferred by the Constitution justly, wisely, fearlessly, vigorously and patriotically, without diminution and without usurpation; to maintain freedom of thought, freedom of speech and freedom of the press; to promote the sacred cause of human liberty everywhere by the wholesomeness of our example; to vindicate and glorify the theory and the practice of representative government; to secure its blessings to our posterity for all time—these always have been, are, and forever must be the aims and purposes of Democrats.

These aims and purposes have been carefully, clearly and comprehensively set forth in the declaration of principles which was unanimously reported to the St. Louis Convention in July last by the Platform Committee, after more than sixteen hours spent in its consideration, in which every great live issue is frankly, boldly and fully discussed, and which was unanimously and enthusiastically adopted by that Convention, composed of delegates from every constituency under our flag.

There was a splendid array of Presidential candidates before the St. Louis Convention, supported by loyal friends and ardent admirers. An unusually large number of them were placed in nomination for the greatly coveted honor. You were chosen with such enthusiasm as foretells success. Having, on the only ballot, received the two-thirds majority indispensable by Democratic usage, your nomination was made unanimous with the heartiest approval of your illustrious competitors. "Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority" has ever been a cardinal tenet of Democracy: and the signs of the times indicate that you will be supported at the polls by the Democratic hosts with the same unanimity with which you were nominated.

The hope is not too extravagant for entertainment that in this campaign our candidates will have the support not only of every Democrat in the land, but also of every voter, by whatever political name called, who believes that the Constitution of the United States is a living reality, and that it applies equally to high and low, to great and small, to public official and to private citizen.

They will also be supported, let us hope, by all men, without regard to political affiliations, who favor maintaining the lines of demarkation between the legislative, judicial and executive departments of the government, the separation of which has been generally regarded as the most salutary and difficult achievement of the masterful statesmen who framed the Constitution. It is believed and hoped that as President you will use every legitimate influence at your command to restore and preserve the healthful equilibrium among the departments established by the Constitution.

The most marked characteristics of the bulk of the American people are reverence for the Constitution and obedience to law. Your long and conspicuous career as a jurist in one of the highest courts in the world—the period which you have spent in studying and expounding constitutions and statutes—causes your countrymen to believe that into the exalted Executive office to which they are about to call you, you will carry that profound respect for the Constitution and the law, which, with you, has become a confirmed mental habit and upon which depends the perpetuity of our system of government—the best ever devised by the wit of man—a system whose beneficent results have made up the most puissant nation on the whole face of the earth. To preserve it in its integrity and its full vigor is the high mission of the Democratic party whose head you have now become.

Into your hands the Democracy has committed its standard with abiding faith in your courage, your integrity, your honor, your capacity and your patriotism; believing that under your leadership we will achieve a signal victory; hoping that your administration will be such a fortunate, such a happy era in our annals as to mark the beginning of a long period of Democratic ascendancy, and that you will so discharge your duties as to rank in history as one of the greatest and best beloved of American Presidents.

The Convention, according to Democratic custom, appointed a Committee, of which it did me the honor to make me Chairman, for which I am deeply grateful, to convey to you official

information of your selection as the Democratic candidate for President of the United States.

Speaking for the Committee, with pleasure I hand you this formal notification of your nomination, together with a copy of the platform unanimously adopted.

In its name and by its authority I have the honor to request you to accept the nomination unanimously bestowed.

May the nomination find fruition in election. May the God of our fathers guide, protect and bless you, both as candidate and as Chief Magistrate of the Republic.



LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE  
of  
ALTON B. PARKER

---

SEPTEMBER 26th, 1904

---

*To the Honorable Champ Clark and others, Committee, etc.*

GENTLEMEN :

In my response to your Committee, at the formal notification proceedings, I referred to some matters not mentioned in this letter. I desire that these be considered as incorporated herein, and regret that lack of space prevents specific reference to them all. I wish here, however, again to refer to my views there expressed as to the gold standard, to declare again my unqualified belief in said standard, and to express my appreciation of the action of the Convention in reply to my communication upon that subject.

Grave public questions are pressing for decision. The Democratic party appeals to the people with confidence that its position on these questions will be accepted and endorsed at the polls. While the issues involved are numerous, some stand forth pre-eminent in the public mind. Among these are,—Tariff Reform, Imperialism, Economical Administration and Honesty in the Public Service. I shall briefly consider these and some others within the necessarily prescribed limits of this letter.

IMPERIALISM.

While I presented my views at the notification proceedings concerning this vital issue, the overshadowing importance of this question impels me to refer to it again. The issue is oftentimes referred to as Constitutionalism vs. Imperialism.

If we would retain our liberties and constitutional rights unimpaired, we cannot permit or tolerate, at any time or for any purpose, the arrogation of unconstitutional powers by the executive branch of our government. We should be ever mindful of the words of Webster, "Liberty is only to be preserved by maintaining Constitutional restraints and just divisions of political powers."

Already the national government has become centralized beyond any point contemplated or imagined by the framers of the Constitution. How tremendously all this has added to the power of the President! It has developed from year to year until it almost equals that of many monarchs. While the growth of our country and the magnitude of interstate interests may seem to furnish a plausible reason for this centralization of power, yet these same facts afford the most potent reason why the executive should not be permitted to encroach upon the other departments of the government, and assume legislative, or other powers, not expressly conferred by the Constitution.

The magnitude of the country and its diversity of interests and population would enable a determined, ambitious and able executive, unmindful of constitutional limitations and fired with the lust of power, to go far in the usurpation of authority and the aggrandizement of personal power before the situation could be fully appreciated or the people be aroused.

The issue of Imperialism which has been thrust upon the country involves a decision whether the law of the land or the rule of individual caprice shall govern. The principle of imperialism may give rise to brilliant, startling, dashing results, but the principle of Democracy holds in check the brilliant Executive and subjects him to the sober, conservative control of the people.

The people of the United States stand at the parting of the ways. Shall we follow the footsteps of our fathers along the paths of peace, prosperity and contentment, guided by the ever-living spirit of the Constitution which they framed for us, or shall we go along other and untried paths, hitherto shunned by all, following blindly new ideals, which, though appealing with brilliancy to the imagination and ambition, may prove a will o'

the wisp, leading us into difficulties from which it may be impossible to extricate ourselves without lasting injury to our national character and institutions?

#### THE TARIFF AND TRUSTS.

Tariff reform is one of the cardinal principles of the Democratic faith, and the necessity for it was never greater than at the present time. It should be undertaken at once in the interest of all our people.

The Dingley Tariff is excessive in many of its rates, and, as to them at least, unjustly and oppressively burdens the people. It secures to domestic manufacturers, singly or in combination, the privilege of exacting excessive prices at home and prices far above the level of sales made regularly by them abroad with profit, thus giving a bounty to foreigners at the expense of our own people. Its unjust taxation burdens the people generally, forcing them to pay excessive prices for food, fuel, clothing and other necessaries of life. It levies duties on many articles not normally imported in any considerable amount, which are made extensively at home, for which the most extreme protectionists would hardly justify protective taxes, and which in large amounts are exported. Such duties have been and will continue to be a direct incentive to the formation of huge industrial combinations, which, secure from foreign competition, are enabled to stifle domestic competition and practically to monopolize the home market.

It contains many duties imposed for the express purpose only, as was openly avowed, of furnishing a basis for reduction by means of reciprocal trade treaties, which the Republican administration, impliedly at least, promised to negotiate. Having, on this promise, secured the increased duties, the Republican party leaders, spurred on by protected interests, defeated the treaties negotiated by the Executive, and now these same interests cling to the benefit of these duties which the people never intended they should have, and to which they have no moral right.

Even now the argument most frequently urged in behalf of the Dingley Tariff, and against tariff reform generally, is the

necessity of caring for our infant industries. Many of these industries, after a hundred years of lusty growth, are looming up as industrial giants. In their case, at least, the Dingley Tariff invites combination and monopoly, and gives justification to the expression that the tariff is the mother of trusts.

For the above-mentioned reasons, among many others, the people demand reform of these abuses, and such reform demands and should receive immediate attention.

The two leading parties have always differed as to the principle of customs taxation. Our party has always advanced the theory that the object is the raising of revenue for support of the government whatever other results may incidentally flow therefrom. The Republican party, on the other hand, contends that customs duties should be levied primarily for protection, so-called, with revenue as the subordinate purpose, thus using the power of taxation to build up the business and property of the few at the expense of the many.

This difference of principle still subsists, but our party appreciates that the long-continued policy of the country, as manifested in its statutes, makes it necessary that tariff reform should be prudently and sagaciously undertaken, on scientific principles, to the end that there should not be an immediate revolution in existing conditions.

In the words of our platform we demand "a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses, and for the common weal, and not by the friends of its abuses, its extortions and discriminations."

In my response to your Committee I pointed out the method under which a gradual reduction of Customs duties may be accomplished without disturbing business conditions. I desire again to express the opinion that this method should be followed.

It is true that the Republicans, who do not admit in their platform that the Dingley Tariff needs the slightest alteration, are likely to retain a majority of the Federal Senate throughout the next Presidential term, and could, therefore, if they chose, block every attempt at legislative relief. But it should be remembered that the Republican party includes many re-

visionists, and I believe it will shrink from defying the popular will expressed unmistakably and peremptorily at the ballot box.

The people demand reform of existing conditions. Since the last Democratic administration the cost of living has grievously increased. Those having fixed incomes have suffered keenly; those living on wages, if there has been any increase, know that such increase has not kept pace with the advance in the cost of living, including rent and the necessaries of life. Many to-day are out of work, unable to secure any wages at all. To alleviate these conditions, in so far as is in our power, should be our earnest endeavor.

#### TRUST REMEDIES.

I pointed out in my earlier response the remedy, which in my judgment, can effectually be applied against monopolies, and the assurance was then given that if existing laws, including both statute and common law, proved inadequate, contrary to my expectations, I favor such further legislation, within constitutional limitations, as will best promote and safeguard the interests of all the people.

Whether there is any common law which can be applied and enforced by the Federal courts, cannot be determined by the President, or by a candidate for the Presidency.

The determination of this question was left by the people in framing the Constitution, to the Judiciary and not to the Executive. The Supreme Court of the United States has recently considered this question, and, in the case of the Western Union Telegraph Co. vs. The Call Publishing Co., to be found in the one hundred and eighty-first volume of the United States Supreme Court reports, at page 92, it decided that common law principles could be applied by United States courts in cases involving Interstate Commerce, in the absence of United States statutes specifically covering the case. Such is the law of the land.

#### RECIPROCITY.

In my address to the Notification Committee I said that tariff reform "is demanded by the best interests of both manu-

facturer and consumer." With equal truth it can be said that the benefits of reciprocal trade treaties would enure to both. That the consumer would be helped is unquestionable. That the manufacturer would receive great benefit by extending his markets abroad hardly needs demonstration. His productive capacity has outgrown the home market. The very term "Home Market," has changed in its significance. Once, from the manufacturers' point of view, it meant expansion; to-day the marvellous growth of our manufacturing industries has far exceeded the consumptive capacity of our domestic markets, and the term "Home Market" implies contraction, rather than expansion. If we would run our mills to their full capacity, thus giving steady employment to our workmen and securing to them and to the manufacturer the profits accruing from increased production, other markets must be found. Furthermore, when our manufacturers are dependent on raw materials in whole or part imported, it is vital to the extension of their markets abroad that they secure their materials on the most favorable terms.

Our martyred President, William McKinley, appreciated this situation. He pointed out in his last address to the people that we must make sensible trade arrangements if "we shall extend the outlets for our increasing surplus." He said, "a system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued and healthful growth of our export trade. . . . The period of exclusiveness is past. The expansion of our trade and commerce is the pressing problem. Commercial wars are unprofitable. A policy of good will and friendly relations will prevent reprisals. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not."

This argument was made in the interest of our manufacturers, whose products, he urged, "have so multiplied, that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention." He had come to realize that the so-called "stand pat" policy must give way—that there must be a reduction of duties to enable our manufacturers to cultivate foreign markets. The last words of this President—who had won the affection of

his countrymen—ought to be studied by every man who has any doubt of the necessity of a reduction in tariff rates in the interest of the manufacturer. They present with clearness a situation and a proposed remedy that prompted the provision in our platform which declares that, "We favor liberal trade arrangements with Canada and with peoples of other countries where they can be entered into with benefit to American agriculture, manufactures, mining or commerce."

The persistent refusal of the Republican majority in the Federal Senate to ratify the reciprocity treaties negotiated in pursuance of the policy advocated alike by Mr. Blaine and Mr. McKinley, and expressly sanctioned in the fourth section of the Dingley act, is a discouraging exhibition of bad faith. As already mentioned by me, the exorbitant duty imposed on many an imported article by the Dingley tariff was avowedly intended by its author not to be permanent, but to serve temporarily as a *maximum*, from which the Federal Government was empowered to offer a reduction, in return for an equivalent concession on the part of a foreign country. President McKinley undertook honestly to carry out the purpose of this section of the act. A number of reciprocity agreements were negotiated within the prescribed limit of two years, which, if ratified, would have had the two-fold result of cheapening many imported products for American consumers, and of opening and enlarging foreign markets to American producers. Not one of those agreements has met with the approval of the Republican masters of the Senate. Indeed they did not even permit their consideration. In view of the attitude of the present Executive, no new agreement under the general Treaty power need be expected from him. Nor does the Republican platform contain a favorable reference to one of the suspended treaties. This section of the Dingley act stands forth as a monument of legislative cozenage and political bad faith.

#### INDEPENDENCE FOR THE FILIPINOS.

In some quarters it has been assumed that in the discussion of the Philippine question in my response, the phrase "self-government," was intended to mean something less than inde-

pendence. It was not intended that it should be understood to mean, nor do I think as used it does mean less than independence. However, to eliminate all possibility for conjecture, I now state that I am in hearty accord with that plank in our platform that favors doing for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans; and I favor making the promise to them now that we shall take such action as soon as they are reasonably prepared for it. If independence, such as the Cubans enjoy, cannot be prudently granted to the Filipinos at this time, the promise that it shall come the moment they are capable of receiving it will tend to stimulate rather than hinder their development. And this should be done not only in justice to the Filipinos, but to preserve our own rights; for a free people cannot withhold freedom from another people and themselves remain free. The toleration of tyranny over others will soon breed contempt for freedom and self-government, and weaken our power of resistance to insidious usurpation of our constitutional rights.

#### AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP.

The pledge of the platform to secure to our citizens, without distinction of race or creed, whether native born or naturalized, at home and abroad, the equal protection of the laws and the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges open to them under the covenants of our treaties, as their just due, should be made good to them. In the accomplishment of that result it is essential that a passport issued by the government of the United States to an American citizen shall be accepted the world over as proof of citizenship.

#### CIVIL SERVICE.

The statute relating to Civil Service is the outcome of the efforts of thoughtful, unselfish and public spirited citizens. Operation under it has frequently been of such a character as to offend against the spirit of the statute, but the results achieved, even under a partial enforcement of the law, have been such as to both deserve and command the utterance of the



Democratic party that it stands committed to the principle of Civil Service reform and demands its just and impartial enforcement.

#### RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS.

A vast expanse of country in the West, portions of which are to be found in each of the sixteen States and Territories, mentioned in the law, is directly affected by the national statute—the outcome of intelligent and persistent efforts of leading citizens, providing for the reclamation of the arid lands for the benefit of home-seekers. During the years of the development of the measure which finally received the vote of every member of the upper house of Congress, it encountered opposition, based to a large extent upon the view that the aim of its promoters was to secure the benefits of irrigation to private owners at government expense. The aim of the statute is, however, to enable this vast territory to reclaim its arid lands without calling upon the taxpayers of the country at large to pay for it. Whether the purposes of the bill will be fully accomplished must depend in large measure upon the ability, sobriety of judgment, independence and honesty of the officers of the Interior Department having this great work in charge.

In 1902 the main canals and ditches in the region affected aggregated more than fifty-nine thousand miles and the work of reclamation is but in its infancy. The total cost of construction of the necessary head-gates, dams, main canals, ditches, reservoirs and pumping stations was at that time a little over ninety-three millions of dollars, which of itself suggests the hundreds of millions that may eventually be invested in the territory covered by the statute. The magnitude of the conception, and the enormous expense its carrying out involves, make us realize the overwhelming importance of a broad, capable and honest administration of the work authorized by the statute, if effect is to be given to that part of the plan that relieves the country at large from ultimate liability.

#### PANAMA CANAL.

An Isthmian canal has long been the hope of our statesmen,

and the avowed aim of the two great parties, as their platforms in the past show. The Panama route having been selected, the building of the canal should be pressed to completion with all reasonable expedition.

The methods by which the Executive acquired the Panama Canal route and rights are a source of regret to many. To them, the statement that thereby a great public work was assured to the profit of our people is not a sufficient answer to the charge of violation of National good faith. They appreciate that the principles and healthy convictions which in their working out have made us free and great, stand firmly against the argument or suggestion that we shall be blind to the nature of the means employed to promote our welfare. They hold that adherence to principle, whether it works for our good or ill, will have a more beneficent influence on our future destiny than all our material upbuilding, and that we should ever remember that the idea of doing a wrong to a smaller, weaker nation, that we, or even all mankind, may have a resultant good, is repugnant to the principles upon which our government was founded.

Under the laws of the United States the duty is imposed on the Executive to proceed with due diligence in the work of constructing the Canal. That duty should be promptly performed.

#### AMERICAN SHIPPING.

Our commerce in American bottoms amounts to but nine per cent. of our total exports and imports. For forty years prior to 1861, when the Republican party came into power, our merchant marine carried an average of eighty per cent. of our foreign commerce. By 1877 it had dwindled to twenty-seven per cent. Now we carry but a contemptibly small fraction of our exports and imports.

American shipping in the foreign trade was greater by almost one hundred thousand tons in 1810—nearly a hundred years ago—than it was last year. In the face of the continuous decline in the record of American shipping during the last forty-three years, the promise of the Republican party to restore it is without encouragement. The record of the Democratic party gives assurance that the task can be more wisely entrusted to it.

It is an arduous task to undo the effect of forty years of decadence, and requires the study and investigation of those best fitted by experience to find the remedy,—which surely does not lie in the granting of subsidies, wrung from the pockets of all the taxpayers.

#### INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

Recent disclosures, coupled with the rapid augmentation of government expenditures, show a need of an investigation of every department of the government. The Democrats in Congress demanded it. The Republican majority refused the demand. The people can determine by their vote in November whether they wish an honest and thorough investigation. A Democratic Congress and Executive will assure it.

#### ARMY AND NAVY.

We are justly proud of the officers and men of our Army and Navy. Both, however, have suffered from the persistent injection of personal and political influence. Promotions and appointments have been frequently based on favoritism instead of merit. Trials and court-martials have been set aside under circumstances indicating political interference. These and other abuses should be corrected.

#### PENSIONS FOR OUR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

The National Democracy favors liberal pensions to the surviving soldiers and sailors and their dependents, on the ground that they deserve liberal treatment. It pledges by its platform adequate legislation to that end. But it denies the right of the Executive to usurp the power of Congress to legislate on that subject. Such usurpation was attempted by Pension Order No. 78, and effect has been given to it by a Congress that dared not resent the usurpation. It is said that "this order was made in the performance of a duty imposed upon the President by act of Congress," but the provision making the imposition is not pointed out. The act to which the order refers, which is the one relating to pensions to Civil War

veterans, does not authorize pensions on the ground of age. It does grant pensions to those "suffering from any mental or physical disability, or disabilities, of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which so incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor as to render them unable to earn a support." This specified requirement of incapacity is in effect set aside by Order No. 78 as to all persons over sixty-two.

The war closed nearly forty years ago. In the meantime many of our soldiers and sailors long survived the age of sixty-two, and passed away without receiving any pension. Skillful pension attorneys hunting through the statute failed to find there a provision giving a pension to all who had reached sixty-two. Many prominent veterans urged the justice of congressional action giving a service pension to all veterans. Bills to that effect were introduced in Congress. And not until March of this year did any one ever claim to have made the discovery that the President had power to treat the statute as if it read that when a claimant had passed the age of sixty-two years he is necessarily disabled one-half in ability to perform manual labor and therefore entitled to a pension.

The President of the Civil Service Commission, General John C. Black, formerly Commissioner of Pensions and Commander-in-Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, indicated his view of the order when in a recent address he thanked the President for what he had done, and advised his hearers to use their influence that a *law* might be passed to the same effect. Full confidence after all seems not to have been placed on the defense of justification, for it is pleaded in mitigation that a former Democratic President did something looking in that direction. Even if that were so—which is not admitted—our present duty would be none the less plain and imperative. Our people must never tolerate the citation of one act of usurpation of power as an excuse for another. The first may possibly be due to mistake; the second, being based on the first, cannot be. In explanation, however, it should be said that the order relied on simply provided that the age of seventy-five years should be regarded as evidence of inability to perform manual labor. Few men are

able to perform manual labor at that age, but nearly all men are at sixty-two. The first order is based on a fact that experience teaches, the other is based on the assertion of that which is not true as a general rule.

The old inquiry, "What are you going to do about it?" is now stated in a new form. It is said by the administration, in reply to the public criticism of this order, that "It is easy to test our opponents' sincerity in this matter. The order in question is revocable at the pleasure of the Executive. If our opponents come into power they can revoke this order and announce that they will treat the veterans of sixty-two and seventy as presumably in full bodily vigor and not entitled to pension. Will they authoritatively state that they intend to do this? If so, we accept the issue."

This suggests the suspicion, at least, that the order was made to create an issue—that it was supposed to present a strong strategic position in the battle of the ballots. On the assumption that the order, as stated by the Administration, is revocable at the pleasure of the Executive, it having been an attempted, though perhaps unwitting encroachment upon the legislative power, and, therefore, unwarranted by the Constitution, I accept the challenge and declare that if elected, I will revoke that order. But I go further and say that that being done, I will contribute my effort toward the enactment of a law to be passed by both houses of Congress and approved by the Executive that will give an age pension without reference to disability to the surviving heroes of the Civil War; and under the provisions of which a pension may be accepted with dignity because of the consciousness that it comes as a just due from the people through their chosen representatives, and not as largess distributed by the Chief Executive.

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS.

The foreign relations of the government have in late years assumed special importance. Prior to the acquisition of the Philippines, we were practically invulnerable against attacks by foreign States. Those tropical possessions, however, seven thousand miles from our shores, have changed all this and have

in effect put us under bonds to keep the peace. The new conditions call for a management of foreign affairs the more circumspect in that the recent American invasion of foreign markets in all parts of the world has excited the serious apprehension of all the great industrial peoples. It is essential, therefore, more than ever, to adhere strictly to the traditional policy of the country as formulated by its first president and never, in my judgment, wisely departed from—to invite friendly relations with all nations while avoiding entangling alliances with any. Such a policy means the cultivation of peace instead of the glorification of war, and the minding of our own business in lieu of spectacular intermeddling with the affairs of other nations. It means strict observance of the principles of international law and condemns the doctrine that a great state, by reason of its strength, may rightfully appropriate the sovereignty or territory of a small state on account of its weakness. It means for other American states that we claim no rights and will assume no functions save those of a friend and of an ally and defender as against European aggressions. It means that we repudiate the rôle of the American continental policeman; that we refuse to act as debt collector for foreign states or their citizens; that we respect the independent sovereignty of each American state and its right to preserve order and otherwise regulate its own internal affairs in its own way; and that any intervention in its affairs by us is limited to the single office of enabling its people to work out their own political and national destiny for themselves free from the coercion of any European state.

#### REFORM IN GOVERNMENTAL EXPENDITURES.

Twenty-eight years have passed since the Democratic party of the State of New York, in convention assembled, recommended to the National Democracy the nomination of Samuel J. Tilden as its candidate for the Presidency, and declared it to be “their settled conviction that a return to the constitutional principles, frugal expenses and administrative purity of the founders of the Republic is the first and most imperious duty of the times,—the commanding issue now before the people of

the Union." This strong expression was called forth by the national expenditures for the year 1875, which amounted to \$274,000,000,—a situation which, in the opinion of a majority of our people, justified an imperative demand for reform in the administration of public affairs. As the expenditures of the last fiscal year amounted to the enormous total of \$582,000,000, it is evident that a thorough investigation of the public service and the immediate abandonment of useless and extravagant expenditures are more necessary now than they were then. This astounding increase is out of all proportion to the increase of our population, and finds no excuse from whatever aspect we view the situation. The National Democratic Platform declares that "large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service." Can there be any doubt of the accuracy of this statement? Between the expenditures of the year 1886, amounting to \$242,000,000, and those of the last fiscal year—the seventh after Grover Cleveland ceased to be President—aggregating \$582,000,000, there is a difference so great as to excite alarm in the breasts of all thoughtful men. Even excluding the sum of \$50,000,000 paid for the Panama Canal rights and to the State of Panama, the expenditures of the last fiscal year exceeded the sum of \$532,000,000, being more than double the expenditures of the government for all purposes during the first year of Mr. Cleveland's administration.

The expenses of the first four years succeeding the last Democratic administration amounted to the enormous average of \$511,000,000 per year. This large expenditure was due to a considerable extent to the cost of the Spanish-American War, which occurred during that period; but the termination of that war brought no relief to the Treasury, for the average annual expenses of the government, during the three subsequent years ending June 30, 1904, were about \$519,000,000, which is the largest sum hitherto reached, during a like period, since the close of the Civil War.

This draft upon the revenues of the country has had the effect which might have been anticipated, and now we have

presented the reverse of the situation, which led to the famous observation, "It is a condition, and not a theory, which confronts us;" for, although the present incumbent found at the close of the first fiscal year, during which he assumed control of the administration, a surplus of receipts over expenditures of more than \$91,000,000, there was an excess of expenditures over receipts at the close of the last fiscal year of \$41,000,000, and the official monthly reports made by the Treasury Department show that the expenditures are continuously and rapidly increasing, while the receipts are diminishing.

In this connection it is interesting to note the recent administrative orders forbidding government officers from making public any statement of estimates on which future appropriations are to be based.

If a man of ordinary intelligence and prudence should find in the operating expenses of his business such a tremendous percentage of increase, would he not promptly set on foot an inquiry for the cause of the waste, and take immediate measures to stop it, especially when trusted employees have been found dishonest and convicted, and a widespread impression exists that a thorough investigation may discover other cases of malfeasance? When the Chief Executive reported to Congress that, "through frauds, forgeries and perjuries, and by shameless briberies the laws relating to the proper conduct of the public service in general, and to the due administration of the Post-Office Department have been notoriously violated . . .," there was a general popular demand for a rigid, sweeping investigation by Congress, in addition to that undertaken by the Executive himself. Such an investigation the Republican majority in Congress would not permit, although the minority insisted that the interests of good government demanded it. And the minority was right. The liberality, patriotism and national pride of the people should not be made an excuse for waste of the public funds. Official extravagance is official crime.

There is not a sentence in the Republican platform recommending a reduction in the expenditures of the government: not a line suggesting that the increase in the cost of the War Department from \$34,000,000 in 1886 to \$115,000,000 in 1904,



should be inquired into; and not a paragraph calling for a thorough investigation of those departments of the government in which dishonesty has been recently disclosed.

The people, however, can by their votes, if they desire it, order such an investigation and inaugurate a policy of economy and retrenchment. It is safe to say that this will not be accomplished by endorsing at the polls the Republican majority of the House of Representatives which refused the investigation and made the appropriations, nor by continuing in power the administration which made the disbursements.

Reform in expenditures must be had in the Civil, Military and Naval establishments in order that the national expenditures may be brought to a basis of peace and the government maintained without recourse to the taxes of war.

#### CONCLUSION.

I have put aside a congenial work, to which I had expected to devote my life, in order to assume, as best I can, the responsibilities your convention put upon me.

I solicit the cordial co-operation and generous assistance of every man who believes that a change of measures and of men at this time would be wise, and urge harmony of endeavor as well as vigorous action on the part of all so minded.

The issues are joined and the people must render the verdict.

Shall economy of administration be demanded or shall extravagance be encouraged?

Shall the wrongdoer be brought to bay by the people, or must justice wait upon political oligarchy?

Shall our government stand for equal opportunity or for special privilege?

Shall it remain a government of law or become one of individual caprice?

Shall we cling to the rule of the people, or shall we embrace beneficent despotism?

With calmness and confidence, we await the people's verdict.

If called to the office of President, I shall consider myself the chief magistrate of all the people and not of any faction, and shall ever be mindful of the fact that on many questions of

national policy there are honest differences of opinion. I believe in the patriotism, good sense and absolute sincerity of all the people. I shall strive to remember that he may serve his Party best who serves his Country best.

If it be the wish of the people that I undertake the duties of the Presidency, I pledge myself, with God's help, to devote all my powers and energy to the duties of this exalted office.

Very truly yours,

ALTON B. PARKER.

SPEECH OF JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, OF MISSISSIPPI, TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO NOTIFY THE CANDIDATE FOR VICE-PRESIDENT, NOTIFYING HONORABLE HENRY G. DAVIS OF HIS NOMINATION FOR VICE-PRESIDENT, AT WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, WEST VIRGINIA, AUGUST 17, 1904.

We have been appointed by a most notable Convention as a Committee to notify you of your nomination by the Democracy as their choice for Vice-President of the United States. We desire to express the pleasure we feel in having been selected for this purpose, and our confidence in you, your faithfulness, honesty, and wisdom. The people see in you one of the best products of the best period of American institutions, a period whose salient characteristics were local self-government, individuality, equal opportunity, and freedom; freedom to work, freedom to buy and sell, freedom to compete in industrial life, resulting in a rare self-dependence; freedom to develop, as one's own master—and not merely as the well-trained and well-managed industrial servant of another. They see in you what Oliver Wendell Holmes said was a rare thing: a “self-made man, who is yet not proud of his maker.”

Just before leaving home, I said that I was going to West Virginia, with some others, to notify you of your nomination. One of my brother's little boys, standing by, said: “Uncle John, he must be a mighty big goose if he has not heard of that already.” In a certain way, the notification, with which we are charged, is perfunctory and unnecessary, and yet it is well to maintain, by some degree of formality, that respectful observance which is due to great events. The nomination by a

great party to the great office to which we call you—the Vice-Presidency—carrying with it the duty of presiding over the Senate of the United States and the possibility of succession to the Presidency, is a great event.

As soon as I learned that I was, by resolution of the Convention, to be the mouthpiece of the Committee for the performance of this pleasant task, I began to look about me in order to see how the duty had been fulfilled by others. I found from recent examples in the Republican camp, that for a notification speech, a historical essay is altogether the proper thing, absolutely necessary for the emergency. We shall therefore entitle our notification address: "*A Brief Historical Disquisition upon Some of the Blunders of our Ancestors, as Viewed from the Standpoint of the Wisdom of Republican Statesmen, who have embraced the Strenuous Life.*"

The first of these consisted in discriminating against the red man—the Image of God in Cherry—on account of his race and color and "previous condition." Our ancestors said it was on account of the inherent, or inherited, race-traits, tendencies, and supposed incapacities, of which his color was but the outward sign. Be that claim pretense or sincerity, we found, to our astonishment, that "the door of opportunity and hope" in the way of office-holding and voting had been closed to Lo! the poor Indian. He was not invited in by the selectmen in Connecticut, nor by the electors of the self-governing towns in Massachusetts, to help govern our ancestors nor the country, which they had committed to their charge, nor did our ancestors promise to assimilate him. This first violation in America of the Divine Right of Manhood Suffrage and of the cherished fundamental dogma, that all men of all races are equally capacitated to govern themselves, and especially to govern others, has doubtless been the "Iliad of all our woes." Plainly it was what the Boston *Transcript* so elequently calls "Colorphobia." We could not account for it, except perhaps upon a line of thought suggested by a sentence in the notification address of the Permanent Chairman of the Chicago Convention. Informing the President of his nomination by the Republican party to succeed himself, Mr. Cannon said: "By blood, by in-

heritance, by education, and by practice, we are a self-governing people." Are we to believe that Mr. Cannon meant to intimate, *c converso*, that nobody was of self-governing capacity, except by blood, inheritance, education, or successful practice? If so, it is feared that he is getting back to our ancestors' blunder, and may, moreover, incur the danger of receiving the approbation of some of those benighted creatures known as Southern Democrats. We wondered if our ancestors in New England, New York, and Virginia had been stupid enough to have had some notion, the converse of Mr. Cannon's utterance, in their heads, and if they had based their action on the fact that the "noble red man" had none of "the blood" of self-governing races in his veins, none of that subtle force of "heredity," which accounts for so much and which is so hard to be accounted for itself, or if they thought that he had not for any sufficient length of time been "educated" to the task of governing white men, or had had no "practice" in it, except such as seemed to lead to the conclusion that he was not capable of it.

The next great blunder in the early history of our people consisted in their taking up arms against King George and his forces, when the latter were actuated, as they themselves frankly confessed, only by the kindest designs of "benevolently assimilating" to themselves our resources and our opportunities. You, Sir, who have a Republican son-in-law and, therefore, possess culture, by affinity, at least, will hardly believe that our ancestors were stupid enough to fight against the principle, which we so frankly recognize in the Philippines, viz., that it is perfectly right, self-evidently proper, for a flag to cover and emblemize two entirely different sorts of government—one for ourselves, "at home," protecting individual, civil, and political liberty and pretending, at least, to furnish full and equal opportunities for industrial development, and another for others, "in the colonies,"—absolute and discretionary in its character and avowedly limiting industrial development there, by the necessities of commercial exploitation for the benefit of the "home" merchant and the "home" manufacturer. We know now, of course, that all our ancestors' talk about "inalienable rights" of self-government, "no taxation without repre-

sentation," *habeas corpus* and right of trial by jury, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly, were only a pretext resorted to by ranting "insurgents," in order to throw off the "civilizing influences" of the best government which the world had that far witnessed. We have not been stupid enough to confine to mere words our apology for this mistake in our history; we have apologized by deeds of confession. It seems strange that we could, as a people, have prospered industrially and otherwise, as we have prospered, so marvelously, Sir, in all our history, both as Colonies and as States, in spite of this monstrous error—this unholy rebellion.

We found another period of popular hysteria, that is incomprehensible to us, in view of some enlightening facts in our recent history. Some men in the troublesome little town of Boston, masquesading as Indians, seized and threw into the sea certain cases of tea belonging to certain merchants of the East India Company. That this was a violation of law, no man in England or America had any doubt; that the violators of the law were amenable to punishment under the law, through its usual processes, amongst which were indictment by a grand jury and trial by a petit jury, none doubted. With a wisdom, however, equalled only by that of the present occupant of the Chief Executive's chair in these United States, these usual law remedies, against law-breakers, were ignored by that sapient statesman, King George, as being reeds too weak to depend upon in an extremity like that. The consequence was that the entire population of Boston, men, women, and children, observers of the law as well as law-breakers, were punished by the passage of the Boston Port Bill; thus in a fashion royally excommunicating the little town, commercially and industrially. Then came that strange and unaccountable outbreak of popular hysteria to which I have referred. Not only all New England rose in wrath, but distant Virginia and remote South Carolina caught the frenzy and said, in effect, this foolish thing: "If Government can disregard the forms of law, whenever, in Government's opinion, the forces of law are too weak, and can punish the innocent without trial, because of the deeds of violators of the law, then are we none of us safe, even to the remote

confines of Carolina, or within the depths of the woods of Maine—safe neither in our persons, nor our properties, nor in the pursuit of our happiness—the very difference between a free Government and a despotism being that a free Government operates within the prescribed bounds of law, and a despotism is a Government in accordance with some individual's discretionary notion of justice or necessity." You will remember that all the wisdom of King George's Council could not put an end to this wanton fury, even though the Council answered: "This concerns nobody except the town of Boston." Our ancestors "got worse and worse," until their misguided counsels led to the foolish result of "insurrection" and a free and independent American Government!

We have, however, made the *amende honorable* for this silly business by our Governmental strenuosity at Indianola, Mississippi. Not long since it was alleged, although not proven, notwithstanding the fact that there was a United States Marshal to arrest, a United States grand jury to indict, and a United States petit jury to convict, that certain people in the town of Indianola, Mississippi, had conspired together for the purpose of preventing an incumbent of a Federal office from continuing to hold that office. True, there is a plain statute of the United States, "writ large," on the pages of the Revised Statutes, providing punishment for those guilty of that identical crime. It was, perhaps, however, thought that the alleged crime could not be proven in a court of justice under the ordinary forms of law; that the ordinary forces of law, as in the precedent cited in Boston, were "too weak" or not to be altogether "relied upon" by those in authority. The necessary and righteous consequence was that, recurring to the precedent established by that miracle of wisdom, George of Hanover and his Cabinet, we promptly and strenuously deprived the little town of Indianola of all mail facilities, proceeding to punish for the law-breaking intent of a few—if indeed such intent ever existed—which I frankly admit is questioned—all of the town—men and women, doctors, lawyers, merchants—black and white—thus by a White House decree excommunicating them from the intelligence of the world. Our ancestors, incomprehensibly, even

after they had had the wisdom of the Boston Port Bill fully explained, persisted in their madness and folly, refusing to be enlightened, and still hung on with dangerous fanaticism to the belief that only the guilty ought to be punished and even the guilty only after a trial. Not so with our wiser generation in the Indianola case. It concerned nobody but Indianola. Again I wonder how we managed to prosper, as we have prospered so miraculously in all our history, in spite of a historical folly like this, unconfessed, even, until a very recent date; though now, thank God, nobly shaken off!

The next great historical blunder, in spite of which, strange to say, we have, as I cannot too often repeat, prospered right along in every step of our history, with now and then a temporary drop-back, was the immolation by our ancestors of the nation's industrialism upon the altar of free trade, first between the Colonies and afterwards between the States, throughout the common domain, notwithstanding already existing State lines furnished convenient places, opportunity and temptation to establish custom houses—those potent encouragers of commerce. Republican statesmen have now made it too plain for any reasonable man to doubt it that this was a grave mistake. What we ought to have fought for during colonial days was a high protective tariff to keep British products out of the American market, and another high tariff to keep American products out of the British market; thus enriching both Britain and America, and ourselves doubly in our double capacity as revolutionists and British subjects. Then, after we had accomplished our independence, and each State had become a separate sovereignty, South Carolina ought to have protected herself against Pennsylvania and New England, Pennsylvania ought to have seen to it that a line of custom houses prevented the invasion of her sacred soil by the products of the Jerseyman, the Marylander and the Delawarean.

We ought to have encouraged inter-state trade by stopping it, as much as possible, thus pursuing in that regard the enlightened policy which prevails in regard to our international trade.

Then, after forming the present Union, the Constitution



itself ought to have prescribed to the States "mutual 'protection' by mutual taxation and consequent universal prosperity."

What an enormously rich country the little State of Rhode Island would have been now but for the influx of the cotton raised by the pauper labor of South Carolina and Georgia—slave labor for a long time, and therefore worse than pauper labor! How rich Florida would have been if, instead of raising pineapples and oranges and such products, as an unreasoning sun seems to recommend, she had kept the rye and barley and wheat and woolen goods of the Northern States out of her confines and had "created," at some little expense to her people, it is true, but still with much pride and self-glorification, purely "Floridian industries" of these and all other things! Each community on the surface of the earth, Sir, should "raise everything and make everything which it possibly can," regardless of the cost to its people of making and raising it, and if they will not make and raise everything, of their own accord, then the people ought to be taxed, until somebody consents to accept the profits of law-created industries for the altruistic purpose of giving them away to American, Polish, Hungarian, and other labor.

I have known people foolish enough to answer that "if New Jersey had 'created' a great New Jersey banana industry, we will say (because bananas could be easily raised there under glass and in forcing beds), it would have made bananas very much more costly than common people would like and that perhaps it is better for New Jersey to raise potatoes and peaches and manufacture various things naturally profitable and, with the profits of the capital and labor thus plebeianly employed, buy bananas." But the men who say that, of course, are lacking in patriotism—"a cheap banana makes a cheap man," and we "hurl foul scorn" at those who are so lacking in self-dependence as not to be willing to pay whatever is necessary to be paid out of the pockets of consumers, in order to prevent the pauper banana, raised by pauper labor, grown on pauper soil, nourished by pauper sunshine—vile foreigner, as it is—from invading New Jersey. I know there are a lot of old-fashioned, out of date people, principally Democrats, who say that the

watchword of industrial progress among communities, is not isolation and independence of production, but reciprocity and inter-dependence; that isolation leads to feelings of estrangement and inimity among the peoples; that industrial inter-dependence constitutes a sort of world-effective bond to keep the peace. I need not stop to tell you that such men are "mere theorists." One of them might be granted plenary power for a thousand years and at the end of that period would not have given any change of occupation to such capitalists and workingmen in Maine, as are, or might be made to be, desirous of raising sun-kissed plants. The base Cobdenite would leave the workingmen of Maine and Vermont "unprotected," to devote their labor selfishly to other things, merely because the cultivation or manufacture of these other things is naturally more profitable.

How in the world it has happened (though I confess it did happen) that during colonial times, when there were no custom houses between the several Colonies and when, moreover, all the products of Great Britain had free access to our markets, our laborers yet worked at wages very much higher than those which then prevailed in Great Britain, I cannot understand. Now it has happened since we became a Federal Nation, that the comparatively pauper negro-labor of Central Mississippi has not been able to run the high-priced white labor of Central New York out of the farming business, when it is remembered that there is nothing which can be grown in New York which cannot be grown equally well in Mississippi, I also cannot understand. Nor can I understand how it is that wages in California should have been, for years, two or three times what they were in Maryland, although the products of the comparatively pauper-labor of Maryland had free access to California and although that comparatively pauper labor itself was secured, by the Constitution, in the privilege of migration to and sojourn in California. Stranger yet, the pauper labor of all Europe was daily flocking both to Maryland and California! I again do not understand, I doubt if even Uncle Joe Cannon himself can fully understand these foolish facts. Some people have been silly enough to say that the white man in Central New York need not fear the competition of the black man in Central Mis-

Mississippi, nor any diminution of his wage because of that competition. They say, forsooth, that the white man in New York is a more efficient laborer—quicker, steadier, and more intelligent—than the black man in Mississippi; that he does more work in a day, turns out more product in an hour, works more days in a week, is idle fewer weeks in a year, has more self-control, foresight and frugality and, being himself, for these reasons, more prosperous, makes the community in which he lives more so. These same people are absurd enough to add, that the highest priced labor is, as a rule, the cheapest labor and that the lowest priced labor is, as a whole, the dearest, and that, somehow, it has happened, in the history of the world, that the home of low priced labor has never been the home of highly developed agriculture, or prosperous industrialism, and that the most prosperous and profitable industrial communities have always paid the highest daily wages. They even go so far as to say—perhaps you, like me, have with consternation heard them say—that the very reason why certain labor *is* high priced is *because* it is efficient and therefore a better investment for capital, when output is considered, than the lower priced labor with whose products it comes in competition. Of course, you and I know better than that—we have learned better from our Republican friends. We know that the reason why labor was more highly paid, even in Colonial times, in America, than the same labor, for the same work, was paid in Great Britain, *must* have been the existence of some sort of “protective” legislation, keeping out of America the pauper labor, and the products of the pauper labor, of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. It is true that we have not thus far found the law upon the statute books, and we are told, by ignorant historians that there was none; but, whether that sort of legislation has been yet found or not, it must have existed, because superior wages and the prosperity of the working man *must* be attained, and *can only* be attained, by force of a policy of legislative protectionism. The lost statute will be found after a while—never fear, Sir—because the theory cannot be sustained in any other way, and the theory, as our Republican friends tell us, is “our fixed national policy;” hence to doubt it would be disloyalty.

A wise man entertains a sovereign contempt for a great many sorts of errors, but the sovereignest of all should be visited on the designing idiot who says that the price of labor depends upon the amount of work to be done in a country, and the number of men capable and desirous of doing it; in a word, on demand and supply of labor. That particular sort of peculiarly inspired idiot attempts to explain that the high wages which were paid in California and all the new States for those employed on farm, in store, mine, or forest, in comparison with the wages paid in older States, which were without free lands and with comparative abundance of laborers, is to be accounted for by this same scarcity of workingmen and abundance of new work in the new States. This same featherless biped—we cannot be too severe on him, Sir—carries his explanation further and tells you that the superiority of our wage rate in colonial times, and always since then, over that existing in Great Britain and on the Continent, has been due to this same fact, viz. : paucity of workingmen and abundance of work in America.

How lacking in subtlety of intellect! Instead of seeking out, in remote metaphysical places, reasons satisfactory to a curious mind, he contents himself, like "a brother to the ox," with facts that happen to obtrude themselves right in front of his nose. These be, Sir, mere demagogic appeals to "the basest set in the land—the farmers," as our fellow citizen in the White House is reported to have called them. What is the "brother to the ox" fit for anyhow, save to be taxed for the "creation" of otherwise unprofitable enterprises? It is plain, Sir, to me and to you and other strenuositities, that an industry, created by taxation and maintained by legislation, must, necessarily, be more profitable to the taxpayer and to the consumer and, therefore, to the Commonwealth, than an industry which does not require any legislation to make it profitable in the first instance, nor any taxation of consumers to keep it on its feet after it has been once "created," by the base agencies of soil, climate, natural aptitude, or other environment.

That reminds me of another blunder of our ancestors, both under the common law in Great Britain and in the United States. They seem to have entertained a notion that combina-

tions in restraint of trade—seeking monopoly and throttling competition—are, in some way, adverse to the development of individuality and somehow poison the life of trade. They went so far as to contend that the highest object of man's existence is not to be well-managed, even at a living money-profit to himself, but that it is *to learn to manage himself well*. We know now that combinations of corporations, seeking, with the power of monopoly, the resultant power of taxing consumers by raising prices to extortionate figures, under the shelter of tariff-laws shutting out foreign competitors; and seeking, the further resultant power to bear down the price to be paid to the farmer raising the raw material, and the yet further resultant power of regulating wages, by reason of the fact that, after the process had gone on far enough, workingmen have no where to go to get work, except to the concerns in the combination, we know that these are, on the whole, beneficial institutions in a free Republic of self-governing men. They may appear to be doing some harm, may appear, at first blush, indeed, to be blocking that broad opportunity for individual effort, which you enjoy, Sir, when you advanced in an unfinished lifetime from the position of a brakeman on a train to that of a leader of men, as a railroad and industrial captain, and which many a country merchant, since become a merchant prince, also once enjoyed. These are only phenomena, however, mere outward-seemings of evil. Nevertheless great combinations of industrial corporations, seeking monopolistic control, we now know from our Republican friends, to be "industrial evolutions," "necessary to modern development," and it is blasphemy against Almighty God Himself to contend against this, His law of evolution. There are those, who urge that Federal statutes "need not aid the evolution," but they are plainly mistaken, because, it being once granted that it is God's law—as all evolutionary progress must be granted to be—then the conclusion seems to be clear, that it would be both sacrilegious and irreligious not to assist the evolutionary process, so wisely and so recently discovered.

Sir, there is hope for the Republic as long as it continues to move forward in the tried ways of the Old World, divorcing itself from outgrown American landmarks. That we are mov-

ing and divorcing, there is no doubt! Standing now in the dawn of the Twentieth Century, having forbidden the reading of the Declaration of Independence in a part of the country's domain; with courts ready to decide that the Constitution is not a written letter to be read and obeyed, but a dancing panorama, "changing itself to suit changing conditions;" having put our foot down, wisely and firmly, upon freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and freedom of the press and freedom of association in Colorado and in those "appurtenant appendages," where freedom of speech, press, and assembly might be awkward for us; having joined the holy alliance of land-grabbing nationalities; having discovered that God's command against robbery and theft does not apply to men in the aggregate, acting as nationalities, when robbing communities of their independence, or "benevolently assimilating" their resources—amid all these reversals of the historical blunders of our past, I boldly aver that we need not despair of the Republic.

True, there are those who say, with blind fatuity, that the Dingley tariff law did not exist always, that everyone of its schedules is not *unchangeably* to be worshipped, that the Republican party itself was not born until a comparatively recent date, and that yet the country, on the whole, has always prospered. *They* say that its prosperity has been owing to new and cheap lands, inviting the brawn and muscle of the white men of the world to their cultivation—skimming from the surface of the human ocean its wave-crests of courage and enterprise. They say it has been owing to a magnificent area of free trade, first between the Colonies and then between the States—an area that has grown, by Democratic-American expansion of homes, institutions and industry, and not by British-Republican-Crown-Colony-Conquest, until it early became larger than any area of untrammelled free trade which exists, or has ever existed on the earth. They say it was due also to our freedom from the tax-burdens of militarism and the consequent ability to devote our resources, thus saved, to the education of the people and to their betterment in home and industrial life. They point to the fact that, even during the period of our existence as Colonies, that

constant movement of laboring men from the Old World to our shores, which still continues, was going on; that this movement was accelerated after we became a separate sovereignty on the earth, and that it was still more accelerated after the mooted question of the possibility of a dissolution of the Union had been finally settled. They say that this very movement to America of workingmen, under both high tariffs and low tariffs after we became a Federal Republic, and under no tariffs at all, as in Colonial days, was proof of the fact that higher wages have been paid, at every stage of our history, to white men working in fields and factories and mines and forests in the United States, than were being paid to the same white men working in similar pursuits in the old country. They say that this is because the currents of labor flow, unlike the currents in our rivers, towards the highest level—towards the place where the rate of wages and the standard of living are highest. They say—these foolish people—nearly all Democrats—that taxes are necessary evils and never in themselves a blessing to be sought for; that there is some element of common sense in the old aphorism of having as little governmental interference with the affairs of men as is possible, consonantly with the protection of life and liberty and property. All of which illustrates to what heights of palpable absurdity so-called intelligence can climb!

Another error of our grandfathers in connection with our foreign affairs comes over my very soul with weighing-down emphasis. George Washington—who, however, was nothing but a plain Virginia planter, a sort of broad-acred farmer and, therefore, one of the “basest set”—not to be thought of in the same breath with such platform-makers as the Senator from Massachusetts, or such virile history-makers as our fellow citizen in the White House—George Washington thought, and possibly his Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, had a great deal to do with inspiring him to think that our wisest, best, and most patriotic foreign policy consisted in amicable relations with all the other nations of the world and entangling alliances with none of them; in other words, that our chief concern was to keep our own house in order, with the notion in our stupid heads that the sum total of the rightful purpose of all just

Government is the freedom and happiness of the citizen! How wonderful it is that we prospered with that sort of a foreign policy, and maintained, withal, the respect and good will of the world!—wonderful, indeed, when we consider what we now know to be accepted sound axioms of international policy! We know now, from our fellow citizen in the White House, that the peoples, who may expect our tolerance and friendship, are “those who maintain order and prosperity,” those “who govern themselves well,” “those who pay their financial obligations,” and that it may become a “duty,” which we cannot ignore, “certainly in the Western Hemisphere,” to “intervene” in some way, more or less indefinite, in the domestic affairs of “those who do not do all these things,” nor “behave with decency in political and industrial matters”—whatever in the world that may mean—but who, by the omission of the doing of all these things, do “loosen the ties which bind together civilized society,” which ties, of course, God has appointed us his mundane-vice-gerent-mechanics to tighten up again. With these new ideas of our duty as a Nation Militant, it may not be very long before we are firing off cannon to celebrate the glorious use of the United States army and navy somewhere in South America, as a constabulary to collect debts due to European Governments, concessionaries, or traders. Let us live in the hope of that great day and—when we see it—let us close our eyes, gradually but triumphantly cease to breathe, and as our heart-beats grow voluntarily weaker and weaker, surrender our souls at last to the God who gave them, with the grateful exclamation: “Now, Lord, Thy servant *hath* seen it!”

What a queer, old-time, childish idea was that of our ancestors, that the President of the United States is simply a Chief Executive and that his duty consists in executing the laws as they are written!

I need not tell you, Sir, that when you are elected Vice-President, it will be your first duty, as a sort of heir-apparent to the Crown, to train yourself and to influence your chief, Judge Parker, to train himself in the way of usurping the functions of the other Departments of the Government. Your opportunity will not be as great as that of the President himself, but, as



President of the Senate, you may have some opportunity—the opportunity of changing the Senate rules on your own motion, or doing some other revolutionary thing, which, as a play to the galleries, will make your good old Welsh name forever famous as that of one of the most spectacular and strenuous of men. Men, Sir, are not responsible for the size of their opportunities. They are responsible for not taking advantage of them—sometimes for not making them, as *in re* Panama Republic, for instance.

It will be your duty, as a part of the Executive branch of the Government, to look down with contempt upon the Legislative branch. You will soon learn, even if you do not already know, having once been a Senator, that “the cattle,” who inhabit the Senate Chamber and the other wing of the Capitol—the Lower House (which has been constantly getting lower and lower every day for many years)—are but little, if any, better than the other “cattle,” who sent them there—the farmers and mechanics and doctors and preachers and merchants of the United States. Influence the President to feel as you do. He will be told, perhaps, that an Executive officer can go too far and finally outrage beyond tolerance the feelings of these “cattle.” He may be told that “any man who has such a profound contempt for the Legislative branch of this Government is unfit to be the head of its Executive branch.” What stuff! And yet, this last sentence is an actual quotation from a member of Congress! Tell your chief, that the man who uttered that sentiment was only a Southerner, and not even a Southerner of the right sort—not “an Image of God in Ebony”—but just a white man, of that “coarse and brutal strain,” which has turned loose upon the world George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, Robert E. Lee, Abraham Lincoln, Geo. H. Thomas, Admiral Farragut, Sydney Lanier, and Thomas Nelson Page.

As to the common herd who send these cattle to Washington, all you need to do with them is to talk platitudes about “civic righteousness” and the “strenuous life.” What they want to do is to sit in the galleries and witness the play. Make yourself the star performer, according to your opportunities.

Remember especially that all prosperity amongst the people is due to Government and that Government, in taking with the

hand of taxation from one man, in order to hot-house the prosperity of another, has, in some way or another, benefited and enriched both. Do not stop to explain how this is possible. It would take too much time. It might, besides that, be embarrassing. If anybody is impudent enough to insist upon knowing how it could possibly come about, tell him that you are not teaching a kindergarten, and tell him, moreover, that it is your duty to "do things," and not to be bothered with any consideration of whether you are doing them right or wrong.

In conclusion, Sir, PRAY FOR WAR—nobody can tell what great things war will end in when once begun. It might result in making of your chief the first "Emperor and Lord Protector of the Western Hemisphere." You could, of course, in that event, as heir-apparent, share his glory. Your legal title might, by Executive decree, become "Prince *D'Outre Mer*." Besides peace is a tame and un strenuous thing and "smothers out the finest instincts of manhood."

Shakespeare said: "In thy right hand carry gentle peace to silence envious tongues." Our fathers thought this good morality and sound policy for Nations, as well as for individuals. We know now that the right thing to do is to "Speak softly, and carry a big stick."

Who was the fool who said, "War is hell"? My word for it, he never saw a real war.

Remember, above all things, that our chief duty as citizens, but especially as rulers, is not to be "weaklings" or "cowards." A weakling, Sir, is a strangely domesticated animal, who listens before he acts, weighs evidence before he decides, and modestly venerates greatness—in others; who actually prefers "these piping times of peace" to the "pomp and circumstances of glorious war!" Weaklings, Sir, are "men who fear the strenuous life, the only national life that is really worth the living," as our fellow citizen in the White House said when denouncing those opposed to the Philippine conquest—the life of Crown-Colony-Conquest, the Life-Militant, in a word. We are getting to be as a people, your Committee is glad to say, splendidly military. A flag, brass band, and a choice assortment of epaulettes, escorting a Secretary of War to or from the depot in Washington, when he augustly arrives or departs, ap-

peal to the higher flights of our patriotic imagination, as nothing else does or can.

If I have, in some measure, in these words, speaking to the Committee, been your mentor, attribute it, in part, to my shorter experience on the world's stage and my consequent superior wisdom; but still more to the fact of my close study and assimilation of the wisdom of Republican statesmen, both in and out of the White House. I hold, after mature deliberation, in common with the "greatest of these" and one of the youngest, that youth necessarily insures the possession of wisdom, because—the older a man is the more he has forgotten, don't you know.

It has been a pleasure to us to do our duty, to notify you of your nomination. This has been a pleasure notwithstanding the fact that you have already been, in a manner, notified by Hon. Elihu Root, who, while pretendedly notifying Senator Fairbanks, "could not keep his mind off'n you," as the darkies say, and whose speech principally consisted in saying: "Go to, thou art an old man!" and in bemoaning the fact that you might possibly die before you get to be President. So might he, for that matter. That would be bad enough, but not as bad as a case I know of—the case of a man, who was once elected Vice-President, and who, becoming President later, "tickled the ears of the groundlings, but made the judicious to grieve."

In further comment upon Hon. Elihu Root's speech of notification of your nomination, I will hazard the remark, in reply to one of exceeding good taste on his part, that it is better to run the risk of incurring, as in due course of the flesh we all must, physical "inability," than to have been born with that peculiar mental and moral "inability" for any possible task in life, which consists in taking ourselves too seriously, and nobody else with respect or reverence.

Mr. Davis, it is a sincere pleasure to know and to be able to help to place in high position a man of your character and sense and modesty—a man who, as the result of a long life of continence, temperance, self-containment, and useful and honest industry, presents a picture, in virile, though advanced age, of that *mens sana in corpore sano*, which is a delight to the eye, a satisfaction to the soul, and was taught by wise ancients to be the *summum bonum* of individual earthly existence.

LETTER OF ACCEPTANCE  
of  
**HENRY G. DAVIS.**

---

ELKINS, W. VA., October 3d, 1904.

*Hon. John Sharp Williams, Chairman, and other Members of  
the Committee.*

DEAR SIRs: In accordance with custom, and my promise when notified by your Committee at White Sulphur Springs, on August 17th, of my nomination for the office of Vice-President, I submit the following observations upon some of the questions now before the country.

TIMES PROPITIOUS FOR CHANGE.

The times are propitious for the reinstatement of the Democratic party in control of the Government. The public mind is being disillusioned of the pretension of the Republican party, so long and so arrogantly made, that the material prosperity of the country depends upon its own ascendancy. Thoughtful and patriotic people are becoming more and more distrustful of the heady and personal element of the present administration, and are more than willing to see it replaced by one that better recognizes constitutional and other lawful restraints. They demand that the present wasteful extravagance in the expenditure of the money, drawn by taxation from the industry of the people, shall cease and that economy and honesty in the public service shall be again regarded as virtues in the high places of the Government.

EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT.

The expenditures per capita of the Government are increas-

ing at an alarming rate. When the present Administration went into power there was a large surplus, but notwithstanding the enormous taxation, the revenues therefrom are not now adequate to meet the demands made by reckless appropriations. The revenues fell short during the last fiscal year of over \$40,000,000. In the first sixty days of this fiscal year, the expenditures exceeded the receipts by \$24,000,000, and if this rate of excess should continue the deficit for the present fiscal year would be in the neighborhood of \$140,000,000. This needless deficit is due to the extravagance of the Administration and can only be met by imposing additional taxes or selling bonds, thereby increasing the interest bearing debt of the Government. Which course will the Republicans adopt? The cost of government during the fiscal year was \$7.14 per capita, which means that the average tax paid in some form or another by every family of five persons towards the support of the national administration of public affairs was over \$35.00, which in the case of wage earners is a considerable percentage of their entire earnings for the year. No more money should be taken from the people, by taxation direct or indirect, than is necessary for the needs of a government economically administered. To show the rapid growth of the cost of government, it is only necessary to give the total expenditures in the last fiscal year of the following administrations:

Buchanan, 1860,	\$63,000,000.	Per capita,	\$2.01.
Cleveland, 1892,	\$345,000,000.	Per capita,	\$5.29.
Roosevelt, 1904,	\$582,000,000.	Per capita,	\$7.14.

#### ARMY.

In answer to criticisms upon the size and expense of maintaining the Army, the President has said that the number of soldiers now is no greater per capita than in former times. But an army then was necessary to protect settlers from the Indians and to do other police duty in the unsettled portion of the country, conditions which do not now exist. The Army, however, has greatly increased in cost, much faster relatively than it has in numbers.

The expenses were:

Under Buchanan in 1860.....	\$16,500,000
Under Hayes in 1880.....	38,000,000
Under Roosevelt in 1904.....	115,000,000

#### PANAMA.

We all hail as the harbinger of the new era, in the commerce of the world the inception of the great work of building the canal that is to join the two great oceans; but we deprecate the action of the present Administration, which inflicted a wound upon our national honor by its disregard of the rights of a weaker nation, in order to gain a doubtful credit for energy in forwarding that great enterprise. Territory of a neighboring republic, with which we are at peace, was seized by a band of revolutionists, protected by the guns of the United States Navy, and erected into a State over night, which the President promptly recognized as an independent nation—a gross offense against a friendly republic which it was helpless to resent.

#### IMPERIALISM.

These and many other unwarranted things that belong more to an Empire than a Republic have occurred under the present Administration, and brought deep concern and alarm to thoughtful and patriotic minds. They must be regarded as the first fruits of Imperialism and show how fast we are drifting towards absolutism and centralized power. The effect of the imperialistic tendency of the Republican party upon our foreign affairs is in opposition to the teachings of the founders of the Republic, and so impressed was Washington with the importance of keeping aloof from the affairs of other nations that in his farewell address he warned his countrymen especially against foreign entangling alliances. Imperialism is hurtful and abhorrent in a free government and subversive of free institutions. The policy of imperialism—if it can be said to have a policy—is always dangerous to liberty. Its powers are first exercised in far off territory and on conquered people, but once adopted for acquired and distant possessions, it becomes sooner or later the rule of the home Government. Liberty and free

Government have always been secured at the cost of great sacrifices, but history teaches us that both can be easily lost without the knowledge of the people.

#### TARIFF.

Our Federal Constitution has appropriated to the exclusive use of the General Government the power of indirect taxation, covered by the popular designation of "tariff duties." In excluding the States from this domain of taxation, there is an implied and wise partition of the taxing power between the States and the Federal Government. Except in the exigencies of war, the taxing power has been exercised by Congress largely in the direction of the imposition of duties upon imports.

No one expects to change this arrangement, which has proven so convenient to the General Government and so conducive to the interests of the States, whose resort to other sources of revenue is left untrammelled. Indirect taxation, however convenient, needs, by reason of its indirectness, to be watchfully guarded, lest abuses should attach themselves unknown by the people.

That many of the existing tariff rates are excessive and enable powerful combinations to extort unjust and oppressive tribute from the people cannot be controverted. The tariff is undoubtedly too high upon such articles, as enables the manufacturer to sell his products abroad cheaper than at home. Steel rails are a conspicuous example in this respect. It is admitted that they are being made for \$15.00 a ton. A few years ago they were freely sold in this country at \$17.00 a ton. They are now selling at the mills here for home consumption at \$28.00 a ton and for the foreign market at from \$18.00 to \$22.00 a ton. This unjust discrimination against our people is made possible only by a tariff that on this article is entirely too high.

The average selling price of a hundred articles, taken principally from the iron and steel list, is found to be about 20 per cent. higher in this country than abroad. Relief from these conditions will only come through the success of the Demo-

cratic party, which stands for a wise, conservative and gradual change in the tariff laws, which will equalize the burdens of taxation and make honest competition possible. But in making such changes its purpose will be to legislate with a due regard for the labor and capital involved in industrial enterprises.

#### TRUSTS.

It is estimated that there are in the United States between two and three hundred combinations of capital and corporate interests known as trusts, which have grown up in the last few years under Republican rule. Some of them are so conducted as to be pernicious and harmful to the general interest. With the power they are able to exert, they can lessen competition, control prices and regulate to their own advantage the law of supply and demand. Individual effort is helpless against such strong rivals, and the natural right of all persons to barter and trade is unnaturally restricted. The effort of these trusts is to control or monopolize, and these monopolies, when unrestrained, seem to produce conditions which bring about strikes and disorders, and disturb the business affairs of the country.

#### LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT.

Local self government, that came to us not as the gift of the National Government, but as the legitimate outcome of the reserve powers of the States and of the people, is the very corner-stone of our political structure, and the best assurance of liberty regulated by law. It can only be maintained by strict observance of the limitations of the Federal Constitution. The Democratic party has always resisted, and will continue to resist, the encroachment by its enemies upon the fundamental right of the people of the several States. All power comes from the people and should be surrendered only in the interests of the people, and whenever this power is used for selfish interests it is not only an abuse, but usurpation.

#### ARBITRATION.

The declaration in the St. Louis platform in favor of arbitration is one that appeals to my sense of fairness. Nations



and States have employed to advantage this method of settling disputed questions, States have invoked its aid with good results, and individuals frequently have resort to it in adjusting questions of difference. The Hague Tribunal, representing the sentiment of conciliation, is the highest practical expression of intelligent thought on this subject. The principles of arbitration are the same whether governing in the great Court of Nations or applied in the affairs of industrial life. Its permanent establishment as a part of the industrial system of the country, upon a basis of mutual consent of all parties to a controversy, would insure more friendly relations between employer and employed, for the interest of the workman and the employer is identical. It affords a safe and equitable method of determining differences that may arise and has been called "a reasonable and natural mode" of settling such disputes. The spirit of arbitration is kindred to the love of law and order. It is the arbiter of peace instead of war, and makes for happiness instead of sorrow.

#### RACE ISSUE.

All lovers of their country must deprecate the rehabilitation by the Republican party of a disappearing race issue, at a time when every effort should be made to promote rather than retard the progress which was being made in the States where slavery had existed, towards kindlier relations between the two races. The revival of this issue, with all its attendant evils, must of necessity retard the development of the Southern States, whose people are struggling manfully with conditions left by the war, and seriously interferes with the industrial progress of both races.

#### FRAUD IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

Peculation and fraud in the public service under the present administration, especially in the Post Office and Land Departments, reached such proportions that knowledge of the evils practiced became public property. Prosecutions naturally followed, but a thorough and impartial investigation by Congress, proposed and urged by the Democratic minority, was refused

by the Republicans at the mandate, it is believed, of the Administration. Congress adjourned earlier than at any long session for many years for the purpose, it is believed, of preventing further agitation of the question and in an effort to curtail expenses.

#### CIVIL SERVICE.

Offices are created and filled in pursuance of law to carry on the government, and not to further party ambitions and the selfish purpose of any citizen. Many of the hundred thousand Federal officeholders, servants of all the people, while under salary, are now vigorously, some covertly and some openly, working and contributing in the present campaign to secure the success of the Republican party, in defiant violation of the Civil Service laws, rules and regulations. Several members of the Cabinet and other officials of the Government, forsaking their duties and the Departments at Washington, are spending their time in making speeches and using all the influence and power of their official positions to elect their chief.

#### JUDGE PARKER.

The late Democratic Convention, and its candidate for President, have given signal exhibition of a mutual respect and confidence almost unprecedented in our political history, and our party has received new inspiration and hope in its appeal to the people, who always appreciate and admire courage, character and discretion in their leaders. Our candidate has these qualities and can be depended upon at all times to observe that self control in speech and action which is so necessary to safe reasoning and sound judgment.

With unabated trust in the efficiency of the cardinal principles of our great party, when applied to the practical administration of government, to realize the blessings of peace and prosperity for all, and believing that the people will correct the present abuses of administration by a change of party in power, I await with confidence the result of their judgment at the polls.

Very truly yours,

H. G. DAVIS.

This page in the original text is blank.

## MEMBERS OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

---

- Alabama*—H. D. Clayton, Eufaula.  
*Arkansas*—William H. Martin, Hot Springs.  
*California*—M. F. Tarpey, Alameda.  
*Colorado*—John I. Mullins, Denver.  
*Connecticut*—Homer S. Cummings, Stamford.  
*Delaware*—Richard R. Kenney, Dover.  
*Florida*—Jefferson B. Browne, Tallahassee.  
*Georgia*—Clark Howell, Atlanta.  
*Idaho*—Simon P. Donnelly, Lakeview.  
*Illinois*—Roger C. Sullivan, Chicago.  
*Indiana*—Thomas Taggart, Indianapolis.  
*Iowa*—Charles A. Walsh, Ottumwa.  
*Kansas*—John H. Atwood, Leavenworth.  
*Kentucky*—Urey Woodson, Owensboro.  
*Louisiana*—Newton C. Blanchard, Baton Rouge.  
*Maine*—George E. Hughes, Bath.  
*Maryland*—Lewis Victor Baughman, Frederick City.  
*Massachusetts*—William A. Gaston, Boston.  
*Michigan*—Daniel J. Campau, Detroit.  
*Minnesota*—T. T. Hudson, Duluth.  
*Mississippi*—C. H. Williams, Yazoo City.  
*Missouri*—W. A. Rothwell, Moberly.  
*Montana*—Chas. W. Hoffman, Bozeman.  
*Nebraska*—James C. Dahlman, Omaha.  
*Nevada*—John H. Dennis, Reno.  
*New Hampshire*—True L. Norris, Portsmouth.  
*New Jersey*—William B. Gourley, Paterson.  
*New York*—Norman E. Mack, Buffalo.  
*North Carolina*—Josephus Daniels, Raleigh.  
*North Dakota*—H. D. Allert, Langdon.

- Ohio*—John R. McLean, Cincinnati.  
*Oregon*—Frederick V. Holman, Portland.  
*Pennsylvania*—J. M. Guffey, Pittsburg.  
*Rhode Island*—George W. Greene, Woonsocket.  
*South Carolina*—B. R. Tillman, Trenton.  
*South Dakota*—E. S. Johnson, Armour.  
*Tennessee*—R. E. L. Mountcastle, Knoxville.  
*Texas*—R. M. Johnston, Houston.  
*Utah*—D. H. Peery, Salt Lake City.  
*Vermont*—Bradley B. Smalley, Burlington.  
*Virginia*—J. Taylor Ellyson, Richmond.  
*Washington*—John Y. Terry, Seattle.  
*West Virginia*—John T. McGraw, Grafton.  
*Wisconsin*—Timothy E. Ryan, Waukesha.  
*Wyoming*—John E. Osborne, Rawlins.  
*Alaska*—Arthur K. Dalany, Juneau.  
*Arizona*—Ben. M. Crawford, Clifton.  
*District of Columbia*—James L. Norris, Washington.  
*Hawaii*—Palmer P. Woods, Mahukona.  
*Indian Territory*—R. L. Williams, Durant.  
*New Mexico*—H. B. Ferguson, Albuquerque.  
*Oklahoma*—Richard A. Billups, Cordell.  
*Porto Rico*—D. M. Field, Guayama.

## OFFICERS OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

---

THOMAS TAGGART, *Chairman.*  
DE LANCEY NICOLL, *Vice-Chairman.*  
GEO. FOSTER PEABODY, *Treasurer.*  
UREY WOODSON, *Secretary.*  
EDWIN SEFTON, *Ass't Secretary.*  
JOHN I. MARTIN, *Sergeant-at-Arms.*  
SAMUEL DONELSON, *Ass't Scrg't-at-Arms.*

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

WM. F. SHEEHAN, *Chairman.*  
AUGUST BELMONT.  
JAMES SMITH, JR.  
JAMES M. GUFFEY.  
JNO. R. McLEAN.  
THOS. S. MARTIN.  
TIMOTHY E. RYAN.

This page in the original text is blank.

# INDEX.

---

	PAGE
Adjournment of Convention, final.....	329
Alderson, John D., nominates Henry G. Davis .....	264-266
Assistant Secretaries .....	3
Bailey, Joseph W., thanks to.....	328-329
Ball, Thomas H., nominating speech of .....	209-210
Beard, John S., seconds nomination of Wm. R. Hearst.	185-186
Birder, Hon. Jacob P., death of.....	254
Blumenberg, Milton W., official reporter .....	3
Bryan, William Jennings, argues in favor of minority report of credential committee on Illinois. .90-108, 113-114	
Bryan, William Jennings, addresses the Convention. . . .	236-245
Bryan, William Jennings, speech on Judge Parker's telegram .....	285-293, 303-307
Cannon, Frank J., remarks of.....	245-246
Cannon, Rev. John F., prayer of, at opening of Con- vention .....	2-3
Carmack, E. W., seconds nomination of Judge Parker.	165-168
Carmack, E. W., remarks of, on Judge Parker's tele- gram .....	299-303
Chicago, discussion before National Committee for holding Convention at.....	345-349, 364-365, 368-374
Clark, Champ, of Missouri, speech of, on assuming permanent chairmanship.....	124-136
Clark, Champ, speech of, nominating General Cockrell.	210-213
Clark, Champ, notification speech of, to Judge Parker.	395-399
Clark, W. A., nominating speech of.....	272



	PAGE
Cockrell, Gen. Francis Marion, nomination speeches in favor of .....	210-213, 216
Cockrell, Francis Marion, telegram from .....	253
Cole, E. E., nominates John Sharp Williams.....	226-228
Coler, Bird S., votes cast for.....	249-250
Collins, Patrick A., nominating speech of.....	214-215
Committee to notify candidate for President .....	322-323
Committee to notify candidate for Vice-President.....	323-324
Committees.....	40-46, 140-141, 322-325
Committees to notify nominees.....	325
Convention officers, thanks to .....	326
Convention proceedings, publication of.....	327
Credentials, Committee on .....	40-41, 55-59
Cummings, Homer S., speech in favor of Judge Parker's nomination .....	178-180
Darrow, Clarence S., speech of, in seconding Wm. R. Hearst's nomination.....	189-191
Daniel, John W., reads report of Committee on Reso- lutions .....	145-155
Davis, Henry Gassaway, speeches in favor of his nom- ination.....	264-266, 268-269
Davis, Henry Gassaway, letter of acceptance of nomi- nation .....	435
Deford, W. A., first Assistant Secretary .....	3
Delegates to the Convention, list of, by States.....	59-85
Delmas, D. M., nominates William R. Hearst.....	168-176
Democratic National Committee, meeting of. 325, 328, 330-394	
District of Columbia, seating of delegates from.....	85-90
Dubois, Fred T., nominates George Turner.....	266-267
First day's session.....	1-46
Fitzgerald, John J., nominates Wm. R. Hearst.....	231-232
Fourth day's session.....	252-329
Francis, David R., invites delegates to visit St. Louis Exposition .....	38-39
Glennon, Archbishop John J., prayer of, at the second day's session.....	47

	PAGE
Gray, George, nominating speech by L. Irving Handy in favor of.....	180-184
Hamlin, Charles S., remarks of, on Judge Parker's telegram .....	296-299
Handy, L. Irving, nominates Hon. George Gray.....	180-184
Harris, W. A., nominates Colonel Cockrell .....	216-218
Harris, W. A., a proposed nominee for Vice-President	267-268
Hearst, William Randolph, nominating speeches in favor of .....	168-176, 189-191, 198-200, 231-232, 245-246
Hearst, William Randolph, telegram from.....	254
Hillman, W. J., seconds nomination of Judge Parker..	184-185
Hobson, Capt. Richard Pearson, addresses the Convention .....	144
Illinois, report of minority committee from .....	90-122
James, Ollie M., reports from Committee on Resolutions.....	144
Johnson, J. G., speech of, nominating Wm. R. Hearst..	199-200
Johnston, Rev. John T. M., D.D., prayer of, at fourth day's session.....	252-253
Jones, James K., call for Convention.....	1
Kern, John W., speech of, in favor of Judge Parker's nomination .....	191-197
Knapp, Charles W., speech in favor of holding Convention at St. Louis.....	358-363
Limitation of seconding speeches .....	207-208
Littleton, Martin W., speech of, on nominating Judge Parker .....	156-165
Louisiana Purchase Exposition, invitation to delegates to visit.....	38-39
Louisiana Purchase Exposition management, thanks to	328
MacCorkle, W. A., remarks of.....	235-236
Martin, John I., temporary Sergeant-at-Arms .....	3

	PAGE
McCarren, Patrick H., presents claims of New York for holding Convention there.....	351-354
McClellan, Mayor Geo. B., telegram from, to National Committee .....	349
Members of Democratic National Committee .....	443-444
Miles, Gen. Nelson A., nomination speech by David Overmeyer in favor of.....	200-207
Minority reports .....	84-85, 90-122
Molina, A. H., of Porto Rico, speech of.....	53-54
Morris, Free P., nominates James Robert Williams..	256-258
Myers, Jefferson, resolutions on Thomas Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana.....	343-344
National Committee, constitution of .....	140-141
National Committee, thanks to chairman of.....	326
National Committeemen from Oregon and Indiana ...	327
National Convention, the next .....	326
New York, claims of, for holding Convention at.....	350-355
Nomination of candidate for Vice-President.....	319-321
O'Donnell, T. J., speech of, in favor of Judge Parker's nomination .....	176-178
Officers and Executive Committee of Democratic National Committee.....	445
Olney, Richard, nomination speech in favor of .....	214-215
Organization of the Democratic National Committee of 1904.....	390-392
Otey, Peter J., resolutions on death of .....	340-341
Overmeyer, David, nominating speech of.....	200-206
Overmeyer, David, nominating speech in favor of ex-Senator Wm. A. Harris.....	267-268
Parker, Judge Alton Brooks, nominating speeches in favor of 156-168, 176-180, 185-188, 191-198, 209-210, 228-231, 233-234	
Parker, Alton Brooks, telegram to Convention on gold standard, discussion on.....	274-318
Parker, Alton Brooks, letter of acceptance of nomination for President .....	400-417

	PAGE
Permanent Organization, Committee on.....	42-43, 54-55
Permanent Organization, report of Committee on.....	123
Platform and Resolutions, Committee on.....	44-46
Poe, John Prentiss, nominating speech of.....	268-269
Porto Rico and the Philippines.....	48
Porto Rico, standing of, in National Committee.....	376-378
President, nomination of candidate for.....	156
President, votes cast for.....	247-250
Resolutions, Committee on, report of.....	141, 144-155
Rinehart, George F., favors nomination of Wm. R. Hearst.....	198-199
Robertson, F. C., nominating speech of.....	258-263
Rose, David S., nominating speech of.....	218-225
Rules and Order of Business, Committee on.....	43-44
Rules, Committee on, report of.....	47-54
Ryan, Michael J., nominating speech of.....	228-231
Sale, Rabbi Samuel, prayer of, at third day's session..	138-139
Schley, Buchanan, remarks of.....	213-214
Second day's session.....	47-137
Sefton, Edwin, elected Assistant Secretary of National Committee.....	393
Sheehan, W. F., moves adjournment of Convention..	251
Smith, Jas., Jr., remarks of.....	225-226
Speeches, limitation on.....	255-256
Spencer, John W., nominating speech of.....	263-264
St. Louis, efforts of, to secure Convention.....	355-364
St. Louis, thanks to the people of.....	327
Stickney, O. N., seconds nomination of Wm. R. Hearst	245
Sutro, Oscar, endeavors to secure recognition for Phil- ippine Islands.....	52, 86-87
Taggart, Thomas, elected Permanent Chairman of Democratic National Committee.....	393
Telegram from Presidential nominee, discussion on, ..	274-318
Temporary officers.....	3
Third day's session.....	138-251
Tillman, Benjamin R., nominating speech of.....	232-234

	PAGE
Tillman, Benjamin R., discusses Judge Parker's tele- gram .....	280-285
Turner, Geo., a proposed nominee for Vice-President .	258-263, 266-267, 269-271
Vacancies on national ticket .....	325
Vacancies, Special Committee on.....	333
Vardaman, James K., nominating speech of .....	215-216
Vice-President, nomination of candidates for .....	256
Vice-President, votes cast for .....	317-321
Vice-Presidents, honorary, of the Convention .....	142-144
Vote for candidate for President.....	246-250
Wall, Edward C., nominating speech of David S. Rose in favor of.. ..	218-225
Walsh, Charles A., temporary Secretary.....	3
Weaver, James B., remarks of, on Judge Parker's tele- gram .....	294-296
Wells, Rolla, speech of, in favor of holding Convention at St. Louis.....	355-357
Williams, James Robert, nominated for Vice-President by Fred P. Morris.....	256-258
Williams, John Sharp, speech of, as temporary Chair- man .....	4-38
Williams, John Sharp, nomination speech of E. E. Cole in favor of, for President.....	226-228
Williams, John Sharp, statement of.....	234
Williams, John Sharp, discusses Judge Parker's tele- gram .....	277-279, 309-313
Williams, John Sharp, notification speech of, to Henry G. Davis.....	418-434
Williams, Robert, nominated by John W. Spencer for Vice-President.....	263-264
Woodson, Urey, elected Secretary of National Com- mittee .....	393
Wright, Moses, speech of, in favor of Judge Parker's nomination .....	186-188
Wright, Sam S., speech of, in seconding Judge Parker's nomination .....	197-198