

MR. BRYAN'S SPEECH ON GUFFEY

Speaking before the national committee in the Guffey contest Mr. Bryan said, in substance: "I did not know until I reached Washington that Dr. Hall (the Nebraska committeeman) had sent me his proxy and I would not have used it but for the fact that I regard the Pennsylvania contest as one of great importance. Its decision will affect not merely the contestants and their states, but the standing of the national committee before the country. Mr. Guffey is not an unknown man. He is the man whose case was tried and whose claims were repudiated by the last national convention. He comes from a state notorious for its corruption. I am not responsible for his defeat at Denver. When my advice was asked I told them that they need not bother about him; that I would attend to him myself. He deliberately stifled the voice of the party in his state after it had spoken at the primaries and I would not have permitted him to take part in the campaign. The convention, of its own accord, put him off the committee by unseating his fraudulently elected delegates. When Mr. Kerr died the state committee of Pennsylvania, controlled by Mr. Guffey, put him back on the national committee in contempt of the national convention. It was an attempt on his part to rebuke the convention. You, the representatives of the national organization ought to resent the insult. If you do not, I, in the name of six and a half million democrats, do resent it.

"After his selection by the state committee his conduct become so repulsive to the party in the state that the very committee that selected him—eighty per cent of the personnel of the committee being the same—rescinded its action and selected another man, Mr. Palmer, for national committeeman. Mr. Palmer's selection has been indorsed by more than two-thirds of the state committee, by all the democratic members of congress from Pennsylvania and by thirty-seven of the forty-five democratic legislators of Pennsylvania. At the state election in 1910 more than two-thirds of the democratic voters of Pennsylvania revolted against Mr. Guffey's leadership—they being convinced that he was using his position and influence to aid the republican machine. He reduced the democratic vote from over four hundred thousand to less than one hundred and thirty thousand.

"Now, this national committee is asked to ignore the wishes of the democrats of the state and allow this man to continue to misrepresent Pennsylvania democracy. His attorney has not attempted to deny that the democrats of his state want him removed—he represents nothing but the predatory interests of Pennsylvania and the republican machine of his state. We can not afford to weigh a technicality against the known wishes of the voters of our party in that state. To use the language of Burke, 'You can not draw an indictment against a whole people'; neither can we disregard the successful revolution which is resisting political dishonesty in Pennsylvania. We have as brave and true a lot of democrats in the Keystone state as can be found in the union and we can not afford to enter a national campaign with the odium that will rest upon us if we turn a deaf ear to the just demand of the Pennsylvania democracy and retain on the committee a man who is a burden to his party at home and a disgrace abroad."

SENATOR HITCHCOCK'S SPEECH

The Irish World, published in New York, Patrick Ford, editor, publisher and proprietor, is making a great fight against the peace treaties and in its issue of January 13th, says: "The Commoner, which is the property and the personal organ of Mr. William Jennings Bryan, is very desirous that the unlimited arbitration treaty with England should be rushed through the senate in short order. In its issue of January 5 it states that there is not much difference between the view Mr. Taft takes of it and that held by Mr. Roosevelt! It declares it is a question of tweedledum and tweedledee. The only important thing is that the senate ratify the Anglo-American treaty off hand. Here is how The Commoner puts it: 'The treaty ought to be ratified at once—as it is, if possible, with the Roosevelt change if necessary; but let it be ratified at once.' We commend to The Commoner the reading of Senator Hitchcock's speech on the treaty Mr. Bryan's newspaper organ would have the senate dispose of in so cavalier a manner."

We have read Senator Hitchcock's speech. In that speech Mr. Hitchcock did not discuss the merits of the treaty. In fact in the speech which we find printed in full in the Irish World,

he said: "I have purposely avoided the discussion of both of these treaties for the reason that I feel that the initiative in this matter is in Great Britain."

The whole point, therefore, in Mr. Hitchcock's speech was that the ratification of the peace treaty with Great Britain would place us in "an entangling alliance" with that country.

This point was well answered by a simple question submitted to Mr. Hitchcock by Senator Rayner of Maryland. Senator Rayner asked, "Will the ratification of these treaties place us in an entangling alliance with France?"

That question remains unanswered and the senator from Nebraska made no effort to answer it.

Senator Rayner's question shows the absurdity of the contention that the ratification of these arbitration treaties means an alliance such as Washington warned us against. If the treaty made with Great Britain means an entangling alliance with that country then the treaty with France will mean an entangling alliance with France. Then when Germany and Japan and other nations come in for similar treaties that will be an alliance with those countries, and soon America will have an "alliance" with all the civilized world—an alliance for the promotion of peace and for the abolition of war.

God speed the day when such alliances as these shall be made.

THE KANSAS VICTORY

At a special election held in the Seventh Kansas congressional district January 9th, George Neeley, democrat, defeated his republican opponent by a majority of about 1,500. This is the district represented by the late Edmond H. Madison, insurgent republican. Two years ago Mr. Neeley was defeated by Madison by 5,000.

This gives the second democrat to the house of representatives from Kansas. Joseph J. Taggart having recently been elected to succeed the late Representative Mitchell.

Surely Kansas has turned its face toward the light.

CONGRATULATIONS TO VARDAMAN

Former Governor and United States Senator Elect James K. Vardaman was exonerated of all blame in alleged irregularities concerning the handling of state funds. This was the report of Mississippi's joint legislative investigating committee and both houses of the legislature adopted the report.

Friends of Governor Vardaman in other states had implicit confidence that he would be exonerated and they will be glad to see their judgment vindicated. Mr. Vardaman is a faithful friend of the public interests and he will be a power for good in the United States senate.

SENATOR JAMES

A Kentucky legislature, by a vote of 105 to 28, selected Ollie M. James to succeed Senator Thomas H. Paynter. Mr. James' term in the senate will begin March 5, 1913.

Ollie James is now serving his fifth term in the lower house of congress. He has been a faithful worker for democratic principles and he will faithfully represent Kentucky in the senate. Democrats in every state in the union will join The Commoner in congratulations to Senator Ollie James—and congratulations to the great state of Kentucky.

"BIRDS OF A FEATHER"

If the readers of The Commoner will run over the names of those voting to retain Mr. Guffey on the committee against the protests of the democrats of the state they will find ALL the members who are closely affiliated with the interests and a few who ought to have known better than to take his side. A few might plead coercion by conditions.

OHIO DEMOCRATS

The Democratic Progressive league, which was organized at Columbus, January 2nd, has opened headquarters at No. 510-511 Harrison building, Columbus, Ohio, secretary of the league, W. W. Durbin, in charge. Mr. Durbin desires to get into communication with the Ohio democrats who approve of the work that the league has undertaken.

THE THIRD TERM

Now that Mr. Roosevelt's attitude as to a third term is known—"he does not desire it and will make no effort to secure it but will accept it if it comes to him"—the country may well consider the third term precedent which he stands ready to disregard. It is not worth while to quibble as to whether it would be a third term. Mr. Roosevelt set that question to rest by his own clear and emphatic interpretation of the case just after his election in 1904. The only question presented is, Are the people ready to overthrow the precedent set by Washington, Jefferson, Jackson and others and open the executive office to the ambitions of those who may want to hold the position permanently?

When the two-term precedent is violated who will set us a new and more binding precedent? If Mr. Roosevelt can bring himself to accept a third term will he refuse a fourth and a fifth? And why should he be asked to run again? Is he more deserving than Washington and those who have refused to rush where Washington was afraid to tread? Are we confronting any crisis which he alone has the ability and courage to meet?

The issue between plutocracy and democracy is clear. His election is not necessary for the protection of plutocracy—predatory wealth can be safely entrusted to President Taft or to a Wall street democrat. Neither is his election necessary for the advancement of democracy. Mr. La Follette goes farther in that direction than Mr. Roosevelt (if the people demand a republican) and progressive democrats go farther still.

What emergency coerces the country into extending an invitation to some future "man on horse back." Is Mr. Roosevelt the only man who can save the republican party from defeat? And if so, is a party worth saving that has but one man fit for the presidency? And again why reward Mr. Roosevelt for forcing Mr. Taft on the country? That is a queer way of making good the guaranty he gave the president.

Who will give a good reason for a third term?

BALTIMORE, JUNE TWENTY-FIFTH

The democratic national committee in session at the national capital, selected Baltimore as the place and June 25th as the date for holding the democratic national convention for 1912.

The committee also adopted a presidential primaries resolution. The resolution adopted was a modification of one proposed by Senator Chamberlain of Oregon. It was framed by a sub-committee, headed by Clark Howell of Georgia, and was as follows:

"That in the choice of delegates and alternates to the national democratic convention of 1912 the democratic state or territorial committees may, if not otherwise directed by law of such states or territories, provide for the direct election of such delegates or alternates if in the opinion of the respective committees it is deemed desirable and possible to do so with proper and sufficient safeguards.

"Where such provision is not made by the respective committees for the choice of delegates and alternates and where the state laws do not provide specifically the manner of such choice, then the delegates and alternates to the said national convention shall be chosen in the manner that governed the choice of delegates from the respective states and territories to the last national democratic convention."

A sub-committee on arrangements for the convention at Baltimore is to be appointed by the chairman of the national committee to consist of the chairman, Vice Chairman P. L. Hall, Secretary Urey Woodson and seven other members of the committee. Chairman Mack will name the seven additional members upon his return to his home in Buffalo.

Democratic conventions and nominees held and made in Baltimore were as follows:

- 1832, May 21—Jackson and Van Buren.
1836, May 20—Van Buren and R. M. Johnson.
1840, May 4—Van Buren.
1844, May 27—Polk and Dallas.
1848, May 22—Cass and Butler.
1852, June 1—Pierce and King.
1860, June 18—Douglas and H. V. Johnson.
1860, June 28—Breckinridge and Lane.
1872, July 9—Greeley and Brown.

A writer in the Chicago Record-Herald says: For many years Baltimore was chosen by the democrats as the place for their conventions. The first convention of the party was held there