

## BRYAN AND GUARANTEED DEPOSITS

Lincoln, Neb., January 5.—To the Editor of the Omaha World-Herald: It was strange that in your felicitations on the triumph of the principle of guaranteed deposits you should have omitted from among those to whom you gave credit the man who has for years been abused for advocating that reform and who, more than any other man, is entitled to the credit of forcing it upon public attention and making it a part of accomplished progressive legislation.

You say "Governor Shallenberger might justly be called the father of guaranteed deposits in Nebraska" because, as you say, "of his early and enthusiastic advocacy of this measure," etc. Without desiring to take from any man any credit that is due him I beg to say that Mr. C. O. Whedon of Lincoln has a claim ante-dating that of Mr. Shallenberger. In December, 1899, Mr. Whedon submitted to Mr. E. J. Burkett, then a member of the lower house of congress, a draft of a guaranteed deposits bill and urged Mr. Burkett to advocate its passage. Mr. Whedon also made a masterly argument before the United States supreme court, while the able efforts, before the same body, of Attorney General Mullen entitles him to recognition. Nor must we forget that it was a Nebraska lawyer I. A. Albert, who is entitled to the honor of drafting a bill in so perfect a form that the supreme court could find no fault with it.

As I say, I would not take from any man the credit belonging to him, but the vindication of this principle by the highest court in the land is of such tremendous importance to public interests and to the democratic party that no democratic paper should deny to Mr. Bryan the great credit which belongs to him in this connection.

On September 22, 1893, more than seventeen years ago, Mr. Bryan introduced in the house of representatives a guaranteed deposits bill.

In 1907, in public speech, newspaper interview and Commoner editorial, he urged this reform upon the American people. It was in that year and in January, 1908, that he exchanged his famous letters on this subject with James S. Forgan, the Chicago banker, and who can forget his dramatic meeting with the Economic club at New York, when he carried on his running debate with Lyman J. Gage and other financiers, defending the principle that has now been vindicated in law.

The Nebraska democratic convention in session at Omaha March 5, 1908, adopted the platform that not only made guaranteed deposits the issue in Nebraska, but made it a part of the democratic national platform for that year, and one of the leading issues in the presidential campaign. Mr. Bryan wrote that Nebraska platform and his strong speech at that convention in favor of guaranteed deposits will not soon be forgotten by those who heard it.

It will be seen, therefore, that in this as in other great reforms in Nebraska, as in America, Mr. Bryan was a pioneer.

There are those who imagine that Bryan and "Bryanism" are dead, but they are short sighted men. The tributes to the so-called progressiveness of Roosevelt and the applause for republican insurgents are in reality formal recognition of Bryan's great work and vindication of the things the smart representatives of trusts have derisively called "Bryanism," a term that has in the past been re-echoed ignorantly by many who now openly indorse the things they then denounced.

The recent decision of the United States supreme court is one of the most notable vindications ever given a public man. No personal or political prejudice should prompt any man or newspaper to undertake to distort the political meaning of this decision. It is a vindication of Bryan and Bryanism, but it is more than that. It is one of the many things happening during recent weeks which indicate to many thoughtful students of politics that the Bryan star is in the ascendancy, and that by 1912 the little politicians who have been throwing tin cans at him will be made to know that he is as potent in democratic national councils as he is secure in the affections of the American people.

E. B. QUACKENBUSH.

## THOMAS OF COLORADO

Hon. J. H. Crowley, Denver, Colo.—Dear Sir: Many personal friends have, within the past two days, inquired if I intended being a candidate for the vacancy in the United States senate caused by the death of Mr. Hughes, and have very generously offered me their support if I sought the position. I have, upon reflection, determined to answer these inquiries by ad-

ressing to you an open letter upon the subject.

It is superfluous for me to say that I would appreciate the honor of a seat in the senate of the United States from the commonwealth which has been my home for nearly forty years. I would, of course, accept the position if the general assembly deemed me worthy of the place; but, being aware of the existence of political differences between many of the democratic members of that body and myself, I shall enter upon no strenuous campaign for the place. These differences, while wholly impersonal, will naturally have their influence upon the ballots of individual legislators.

My convictions as to what democracy stands for are well known. I believe that pledges given officially by the party to the state and to the nation constitute solemn covenants with the people, and require observance at all times and performance wherever possible. Entertaining these views, my official conduct would be, as my private efforts have been, governed by them as far as possible. Indeed I owe it to my friends and myself to say with reference to state affairs, that every recommendation made to the general assembly by Governor Shafroth in his recent inaugural, commands my hearty and unqualified approval. As to these, I shall hereafter as heretofore, strive to the best of my ability to crystallize them into the jurisprudence of our commonwealth. They are to my mind so much more important than any individual ambition, however worthy, that I could choose between their speedy enactment and the senate of the United States, I would, without an instant's hesitation, say, "Give us these laws, and bestow your honors elsewhere." I would rather be instrumental in promoting the consummation of these beneficent measures than to hold any position within the gift of the people.

As to the national issues the platform of 1908 constitutes our articles of political faith. The dominant party has accepted and acted upon many of its precepts. Insurgent republicanism is builded upon it. The democratic future is roseate with hope because of it, and the campaign of 1912 will be successful or disastrous precisely as we shall advocate or abandon its policies.

Let me add that the duty which death has imposed upon our democratic assembly is a serious and far-reaching one. In its presence candidates and personalities are of secondary importance. The nation awaits the action of our legislature, and will judge of the sincerity of our purposes and convictions very largely by the result. It is my earnest hope that the successor of Senator Hughes shall measure up to his high standards, be thoroughly identified with the progressive spirit of the hour, alive to the perils now menacing republican institutions, and determined to safeguard the rights, interests and welfare of the common people, by the recognition and enforcement of those great principles which Jefferson expounded and Lincoln obeyed.

If, in the opinion of my democratic brethren of the general assembly, I am such a man I will accept their commission and serve the people to the best of my ability. If, on the contrary, they believe that some other candidate more nearly squares with these requirements, it will become their duty to cast their votes for him and not for me. I have the honor to be,

Very sincerely your friend,  
C. S. THOMAS,

Denver, Colo., January 15, 1911.

## INVITING DISASTER

If the press dispatches correctly report the action of the Kentucky state committee it is inviting disaster. A refusal to include the selection of a senator in the call for a primary cannot be explained on any theory consistent with honest politics or the party's good. If the committee took the action reported without consulting the candidates its conduct is inexcusable. If it acted upon the suggestion of any candidate for the senate the name of the candidate should be given that the people may know who it is who is not willing to allow the people to pass upon his right to represent them. The time is passed when any man, claiming to be a democrat, can innocently favor dark lantern methods in choosing a senator. No democrat is fit for senator who is afraid to trust the people—consciousness of unfitness is the only explanation that fits the case. From now on until we secure the election of senators by popular vote, a refusal to submit the question to the people ought to be a conclusive argument against any candidate. Kentucky cannot afford to imitate Illinois in its senatorial elections.

## THE BALTIMORE "CONFERENCE"

The Baltimore "conference" or "celebration" called under the auspices of the reorganizers, did not create quite the stir throughout the country that its sponsors expected. According to the Associated Press reports there was plenty of "stir" at the banquet table. The speakers announced were as follows: Senator Joseph W. Bailey of Texas, Governor Eugene N. Foss of Massachusetts, former Representative Theodore M. Bell of California, former Senator Blackburn of Kentucky, Senator Robert M. Taylor of Kentucky, Senator Shively of Indiana, Representative-elect Martin W. Littleton of New York, Chairman of the National Committee Norman E. Mack and "Deacon" James C. Hemphill of Richmond.

Governor Foss was not present. An Associated Press dispatch prior to the hour of the banquet says:

"Before the toastmaster raps for order, however, the diners are expected to make away with 7,000 Lynn Haven oysters, seventy-five gallons of diamond back terrapin, 1,650 pounds of Jersey capons, 550 canvasback ducks, forty-five Smithfield hams, 1,000 cocktails, 550 quarts of champagne, 400 quarts of sauterne and \$325 worth of fancy ices, to say nothing of the "fixings" that go between the various main courses. The smoke from 3,000 perfecto cigars will make the air blue during the response to the various toasts."

Eleven hundred guests sat down to the banquet. An Associated Press report says: "On the stage in addition to the speakers were many members of congress from throughout the state of Maryland. Senator Tillman of South Carolina, Senator Rayner of this state, Henry Gassaway Davis of West Virginia, Senator Foster of Louisiana, Major James C. Hemphill of Virginia and other notables were in the front row."

Champ Clark delivered a tariff speech. Senator Bailey of Texas, who appeared to be one of the managers said: "If Champ Clark makes a better speaker than Mr. Harmon makes a governor we will name him for president, but if Governor Harmon makes a better governor than Champ Clark makes a speaker, then we are going to nominate Mr. Harmon."

Governor Harmon of Ohio delivered a speech on the tariff question; Joe Blackburn, former senator from Kentucky, attacked "new nationalism." The Associated Press report says:

"The banquet began soon after 7 o'clock, and it was half past ten before an attempt was made to secure order. The diners by this time were not easy to handle. Impromptu celebrations were in progress at many of the tables and improvised orators were holding sway to cheering coteries of enthusiasts gathered about them. Finally Toastmaster Ferdinand Williams of Cumberland began his opening address, despite the disorder. The men who sat at the speakers' table did their best to deliver the messages they had prepared for the occasion, but the confusion was so great that the voice of Toastmaster Williams was lost to everyone more than fifty feet away. When Former Senator Blackburn, the first speaker, mounted the table this act was taken as a sign that he had been introduced. He exhibited gestures which aroused applause, but his usual eloquence failed utterly to still the crowd. Occasionally the words 'democratic party' could be caught, and these were all the audience needed as a sign for renewed outbursts of handclapping and cheering, interspersed with 'rebel yells.' It was apparent that too much had been planned in the way of banquet speaking. The armory was too large, the diners too numerous and the acoustics too bad to permit of any semblance of order."

Following are extracts from the Washington dispatch carried by the Associated Press:

"Democratic senators and representatives who attended the Jackson Day banquet in Baltimore last night were discussing with unusual interest today the significance of a warning note, which came in the closing minutes of the dinner from former Representative Theodore Bell of California. Mr. Bell did not attempt to start a Bryan boom; in fact he eliminated the distinguished Nebraskan from any further consideration as the nominee either in 1912 or any succeeding presidential year.

"'Fate undoubtedly has decreed,' he said, 'that Mr. Bryan shall not be nominated a fourth time and that he shall never be elected president of the United States.' But Mr. Bell warned his hearers that if they were seeking a harmony which might bring about future democratic success, they must not continue a policy which omitted Mr. Bryan from consideration as a leader in the party councils."