

Christian country without coming to regard the Bible as the word of God has already repudiated its authority. The young man or young woman who postpones until grown the acceptance of Christ as Savior, Teacher and Example has already rejected him. Those who complete their education without forming or desiring a connection with some church enter upon the work of life with prejudice against the church and its activities.

"It is Doctor Leland's business, as it will be his pleasure, to counsel students in matters of religion. He will, as far as possible, represent the parent in deep personal interest in the student's welfare; he will bear the responsibilities of the shepherd, adding the spiritual enthusiasm of the pastor. He will point out and warn against the perils which the student may encounter; he will answer the questions that may arise in the student's mind; he will build up the student's faith and strengthen him for the work of life.

"If any are perplexed about the theories of creation he can show them that all theories of creation must begin with something and that no one has yet advanced a more rational theory of creation than that presented in Genesis: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.'

"If any are disturbed by attacks on the Bible he can show them that the critics who reject the Bible can not, with all the advantages of modern civilization, produce a book equal to it as a moral guide; he can show them that the Bible's miracles do not surpass in mystery the miracles that are daily performed through the instrumentality of the Bible in the regeneration of hearts and lives.

"If they question the divinity of Christ he can spread before them the proof that justifies Christ's claim that He was not a man, aspiring to be a god, but God, condescending to be a man; he can show how Christ's code of morals fits into every human need, how the Savior's measure of greatness is revolutionizing the world and how the meek and lowly Nazarene is becoming the commanding figure of all time.

"If the students lack appreciation of the church and underestimate the value of membership in it, he can teach them how co-operation multiplies strength and make them understand how ungrateful it is in one to borrow his morals from the church and then throw his influence against it by remaining outside.

"Dr. Leland takes upon himself an exacting task and deserves our cordial support. I feel sure that he will continue to merit commendation from those who come into contact with his work, but his greater reward will be found in the gratitude of the students and their parents and in the consciousness that he is ennobling the lives of men and women and, through them, leaving upon the world an impression for good."

WHAT PROGRESSIVE DEMOCRACY WANTS

To the Editor of the Columbus O. Dispatch: Sir—If Attorney General Hogan and Allen W. Thurman will examine the election returns of 1896, 1900 and 1908, and compare them with the vote that Palmer and Buckner received in 1896, and also compare the votes received by Parker and Davis in 1904, with the number of votes received by Mr. Bryan in the three elections mentioned above, they will probably discover that the Bryan democrats are in the majority in the democratic party, and that the clique of reactionary Grover Cleveland democrats are very much in the minority. If the aim of the democratic party is to secure some offices at the sacrifice of principles, it ought to be defeated in 1912, and if the party nominates Harmon or any other Wall street reactionary democrat, he will meet the fate that Alton B. Parker met in 1904. The Ryans, Belmonts, Rayners, Underwoods, Baileys and Martins of the democratic party, who represent plutocracy, would like to see Bryan eliminated, but they know deep down in their hearts that this wish is not going to be fulfilled.

Wall street secured the nomination of Alton B. Parker in 1904, and contributed its money to secure the election of Roosevelt, and Wall street wants Harmon nominated in 1912. That is one reason why he shouldn't be nominated, and the other reasons are, first, that he is not a progressive democrat, and has never been allied with any progressive movement, but on the other hand he has been allied with the worst elements of the democratic party in Hamilton county and elsewhere; second, he deserted to the enemy in 1896, and showed that he favored plutocracy rather than democracy; and third, he was a party to the scheme in 1908 whereby Bryan was to be traded for Taft and Harris for Harmon—in other words, Taft for president and Harmon for governor. In several places in the northern part of the state, photos of Taft and Harmon appeared side by side. Unless the democratic party nominates a progressive in 1912 it will go down to defeat, as it did in 1904, for Harmon does not fill the bill. He has been weighed in the balance and found wanting.—Progressive Democrat, Columbus, O., Aug. 16, 1911.

PIPPA'S SONG

The year's at the spring, and the day's at the morn;

Morning's at seven; the hill-side's dew-pearl'd;
The lark's on the wing; the snail's on the thorn;
God's in His heaven—all's right with the world!

—Robert Browning.

Mr. Bryan's Speech at the Conservation Congress

Mr. Bryan: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—I am sure that whatever you may think of my speech you will agree with me that I was justified in asking you to listen to these other speakers. I believe in the conservation congress. The good that it does is difficult to calculate. How many of the thousands who are assembled tonight have given to the subject of conservation the thought or study that it deserves. The arguments that are presented at such a meeting as this help to make up the public opinion that controls our governments, state and national. A large number of subjects are brought before a congress for its attention. The speeches made present the subject from different points of view, and each one turns upon the subject the light of his intelligence, and the warmth of his heart. When we go from such a meeting we go enlightened, and with our views enlarged. We go prepared to communicate to others something of the information that we have received, and to impart to them something of the zeal that we feel. A number of subjects have been presented here, and I am sure that this meeting will be worth all that it has cost those who have brought it about or participated in it. Take the thought, for instance, that has been presented by Senator Owen. I am so glad that I insisted upon his speaking, for his ability and public spirit are only equalled by his modesty, and if I had not insisted, I am afraid you would have lost the benefit of the speech that he has delivered. And yet what one of us will forget the splendid illustration that he has given us in the story told of the difference we make between the human being with a priceless soul and the animal that can be converted into dollars and cents on demand? We need to have this matter brought to our attention, and I venture the assertion that there is not one present in this audience that will not go from this meeting tonight with the conviction that our nation could afford to subtract a little from its appropriations intended to prepare us to kill people, and spend money in the preservation of human life.

Is it not strange how much more interest we can feel in the battleship and in the new gun than we feel in the preservation of the life and health of those about us? We need a speech like this to wake our consciences to our own neglect, and to give us a better idea of proportion when we look at things about us.

You heard last night a speech upon public health from one who has done so much to arouse the nation to the unspeakable iniquity of the adulteration of food. Who will estimate the benefit of such a speech as that delivered to an audience with such intelligence as this audience represents?

The president presented, as I understand it, a thought that has been emphasized today. The idea that there should be in every agricultural county of the nation a representative of the government, an expert on agriculture, to assist the people of that community to a better and more intelligent production of the crops to which the soil and climate are adapted. An idea like that needs only to be presented in order to be accepted and approved. The fact is that what we need is instruction. In Leeds, England, a year ago, I was speaking at a dinner in the mayor's office. I was emphasizing the fact that our difficulties and controversies are largely due to misunderstandings and that misunderstandings are largely due to a lack of acquaintance with each other, and there flashed into my mind that quotation from Holy Writ, the last prayer of our Savior: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." And I was impressed, as I had never been before, with the fact that ignorance is a large cause of sin. It is ignorance that we have to combat; when the people are once enlightened and understand a subject, you can trust their patriotism, their good intent, and their sense of justice. These meetings help by instructing, and we go from them not only with larger information, but with a stronger determination to do our part in the correction of evils that need a remedy. As I sat tonight and listened to those who spoke before me, a thought came into my mind, and I venture to impart it to you. It is a proverb of Solomon's. I do not know of a better motto for the conservation movement. It was suggested by the gentleman

from Indiana that necessity compels us to conserve the nation's resources when we become aware that they are being impoverished, and I thought of this proverb of Solomon's, "The wise man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself, but the foolish pass on and are punished." What is conservation except looking ahead, the making of provision against coming dangers that may be prevented? Wisdom manifests itself in foresight. If we had had more foresight we would not have need of as much energy as is required today to protect that which is being wasted. I suggest, therefore, as a proper motto for the conservationists this wise saying of Solomon: "The wise man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself, but the foolish pass on and are punished."

Let me gather up some of the scattered threads of the discussion to which the delegates have listened. I am not an expert in any part of this conservation work. I confess that I am one who has been blind, during a part of my life, to the needs that are now so clearly recognized. I have had work that has engrossed my attention; I have been busy, but not with matters of conservation such as have been discussed. Possibly I represent some in the audience who have not had their attention turned to these subjects. I am grateful to those who have brought me into contact with this information, and I shall endeavor to make up for lost time by larger effort along these lines.

The subject has grown upon me as I have examined into it, and have listened to those who have spoken upon different branches of it. The first thing that claimed my attention was the preservation of the forest. I found that we were exhausting our timber supply. I found that it was a matter merely of calculation, a simple matter of mathematics; that we could take the number of acres of timber land remaining, subtract the yearly cut, and calculate how long it would be before it was practically destroyed, and then, when on the other side, we examined the amount of land planted in trees and compare that with the yearly destruction, it was easy to see we were approaching a time when our timber supply would be exhausted. I became interested at once, as you must be interested, in legislation that has for its object not only the protection of that timber which remains, but the replanting of such ground as can be reforested. I am interested, as you are, in protecting this country from exhaustion of its timber supply.

Then, my attention was next called to another reason why our timber should not be destroyed, and I am a little ashamed to admit to you, that it is not very many years ago since I first began to think of the protection of our water sheds. I wonder how many in this audience have felt, until tonight, as indifferent as I felt until a few years ago. I wonder how many tonight realize how serious a question it is. Two years ago last June I crossed the crest of the Rockies, and as I went over the ridge, I saw patches of timber, and then areas of naked land, I found that wherever there was timber there was snow; and when I came near to these patches of timber, I found little streams running down to make the brooks and rivers. But wherever the timber was gone there was no snow; it was perfectly dry, and then I realized as I had not before, how God in his infinite wisdom has established these great reservoirs that never need repair, while man in his folly has been destroying them, and then endeavoring to replace them by building great dams, and forming great lakes that will in time fill up and have to be abandoned. What supreme folly it is to allow the water sheds to be denuded and these natural reservoirs destroyed, only to spend money after a while to replace them with inferior substitutes. What does it mean to have a nation's water supply imperilled? Have you ever been in a city that was threatened with a water famine? Have you ever been where they discussed the necessity of a larger water supply? What would it mean to the people living upon the slopes of the Rockies if these water sheds were destroyed and the rain of the winter ran off, and left us with no reservoirs to supply our surface streams and the veins from which we draw through wells? When people tell me that the water shed question can safely be left to the states in which these water sheds are, I tell them that while I am glad to give every reasonable presumption to the state, I insist that the people of this nation have, on the fundamental doctrine of self preservation, the right, when necessary, to protect their water supply in the