

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-two, 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 or 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 canvas in the state for governor, refused to be candidates before that convention. I honor Judge Prentiss of Chicago and Mayor Crollius 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 a 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 can not 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 endorse 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 today, but let this convention endorse 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 to the democrats of Illinois that justice which this gang deliberately and insolently denied them. (Applause.)

(Mr. Menzies of Indiana and Mr. Quinn of Illinois spoke for contestees.)

SECOND SPEECH.

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 (Mr. Menzies) 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 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 arguments, 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 re-elected 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-two delegates were the men who kept the path hot between the 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-two 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.)

Mr. Roosevelt's Threat.

In President Roosevelt's speech of acceptance there is one paragraph that is attracting attention. He says: "Three years ago I became president because of the death of my lamented predecessor. I then stated that it was my purpose to carry out his principles and policies for the honor and interest of the country. To the best of my ability I have kept the promise thus made. If next November my countrymen confirm at the polls the action of the convention you represent I shall under Providence continue to work with an eye single to the welfare of all our people." It will be seen that he does not now promise to carry out the principles and policies of his predecessor but feels at liberty to map out a policy of his own. This may be construed as a threat to run things according to his own views hereafter regardless of the principles and policies of his predecessor. If so, why does he not outline a policy? To be sure he is going to stand by the high tariff, but that was to be expected. No well informed man expects the republican party to reform the tariff. It is powerless to resist the demands of the manufacturers who every four years submit themselves to the fat-frying process and scare their employes with the threat of reduced wages. But on the trust question—what is the president going to do? The republican platform is so general and non-committal that the president is free to do most anything—or nothing. Will he enforce the criminal law against trust magnates? Will he propose new and efficient remedies? He ought to take the people into his confidence and give some intimation of his policy. Judged by his past he will do nothing to harm the monopolists, but then he was carrying out the policy of his predecessor. What will his policy be? And the laboring men, where do they come in? Is he for them or against them? On imperialism and militarism he goes beyond his predecessor and on the race question he is quite different from Mr. McKinley, but on economic questions some expect him to become a reformer. He has shown no reform symptoms thus far. No one who is afraid to speak out during the campaign is likely to be courageous after the election, but there are some who hope and these find, or profess to find, encouragement in the words above quoted.

Shall They Rule or Be Ruled?

Governor LaFollette of Wisconsin delivered an address July 18, 1903, at Chautauqua, N. Y., on the subject "Representative government." Although Governor LaFollette has not so far declared himself in favor of government ownership of railroads, what he said on that occasion and the things he has since said would lead one to believe that the time will come when the Wisconsin governor will be in the forefront of those who are battling for one of the most important reforms in the history of government.

Asserting that the people are rapidly losing control of their own government, Governor LaFollette pointed out that the New York legislative investigation of the Erie railway disclosed that more than \$1,000,000 was spent in one year for "extra legal services," and that money paid to political bosses was charged to "the India rubber account." He also showed that more recently the treasurer of the New York Central Railway company testified that his company had paid for legislation in one year \$60,000 and in another year \$205,000. He also quoted from the

correspondence which passed between the late C. P. Huntington and General Colton in regard to the payment of money for the passage of legislative measures and for the control of congressmen. In one of the letters from Mr. Huntington, that great railroad magnate used this language: "It is very important that his friends in Washington should be with us, and if that should be brought about by paying Carr, say \$10,000 to \$20,000 a year, I think we could afford to do it, but of course not until he had controlled his friends."

Having made this showing, Governor LaFollette said: "If there were no further evidences of the power of the railroads in legislation than that which is afforded by the statements from the record of the interstate commerce commission, it ought to arouse the entire country to such action as will bring congress to a sense of its responsibility to the people for some measure of justice and fair play."

The governor added: "The gravest danger menacing republican institutions today is the overbalancing control of city, state and national legislatures by the wealth and power of public service corporations."

In another portion of his speech Governor LaFollette read a letter bearing upon the action of the last congress. This letter was written to him by a United States senator under date of February 9, 1903. In this letter this senator wrote:

It is expecting too much from human nature that senators, whose every association is with the great railroad corporations and whose political lives largely depend upon them, should, in good faith, make the railroads a servant of the people and to be subject to the decision of the commission when a question of rates is raised. The senate committee is by a decided majority men who bear those relations to the railroads.

Well did Governor LaFollette say that the problem presented is a momentous one, that it asks for no appeal to passion or prejudice or fear, but calls rather for courage and patriotism and self-sacrifice—and calls sternly for solution.

Governor LaFollette said: "Shall the American people become servants instead of masters of their boasted material progress and prosperity, victims of the colossal wealth, this free land has fostered and protected? Surely our great cities, our great states, our great nation, will not helplessly surrender to this most insidious enemy which is everywhere undermining official integrity and American institutions. Surely, we shall not permit this government to abandon its traditions, its memories its hopes, and become the instrument of injustice and oppression. Surely, the American people will do their plain duty now as they did in the greatest epoch of this country's history. Surely, we shall meet the issues presented with rectitude and unflinching devotion, strong in the faith of ultimate triumph."

The Commoner is convinced that the only way to avoid a surrender to the insidious enemy which is undermining official integrity and corrupting political conventions is government ownership of railroads.

Ex-Governor Pattison Dead.

The death of ex-Governor Robert E. Pattison of Pennsylvania, is not only a loss to the party but a shock to those who attended the late democratic convention, and especially to those who served with him on the resolutions committee. He was present at the all-night session of the committee and while not in the best of health he did not appear to suffer more than the other members. It seems that he fell a victim to pneumonia and died on August 1. He has had a phenomenal record of success. Twice he overcame the republican majority and was elected governor of his state and twice he overcame the enormous republican majority in Philadelphia. As a member of the Pacific railroad commission he presented a minority report that showed both his moral courage and his sympathy with the people. He was a valuable man in the councils of his party and his place will be hard to fill.

State Ownership of Railroads.

The question of state ownership of railroads, as distinguished from federal ownership, is deserving of serious consideration. It would not only avoid the centralization which would necessarily accompany federal ownership but it would actually strengthen the states' position. It would also hasten the introduction of the system, for under state ownership any state desiring to buy or build a road could do so, while under federal