

OREGON

Representatives—

- 1st Dist.—W. C. Hawley, Rep.
 2nd Dist.—James Harvey Graham, Dem.; N. J. Sinnott, Rep.
 3rd Dist.—Esther Lovejoy, Dem.

PENNSYLVANIA

U. S. Senate—

Leah Cobb Marion, Prohibition.

Representatives—

- At Large—Luther S. Kauffman, Pro.
 7th Dist.—Freeland S. Brown, Dem.
 10th Dist.—Wm. Ropp, Soc.
 13th Dist.—Harry G. Seltzer, Dem. and Pro.
 15th Dist.—Edgar R. Kless, Rep., indorsed by Prohibition party.
 16th Dist.—I. Clinton Kline, Rep. and Prohibition.
 18th Dist.—Mrs. Flora J. Diefenderfer, Prohibition.
 20th Dist.—Chas. A. Hawkins, Dem. and Pro.; E. S. Brooks, Rep.
 21st Dist.—James D. Connelly, Dem. and Pro.
 25th Dist.—Milton W. Shreve, Prohibition and Independent.
 29th Dist.—George J. Shaffer, Dem.
 32nd Dist.—Geo. E. Briggs, Pro.; E. O. Gunther, Soc.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Representative—

5th Dist.—W. F. Stevenson, Dem.

SOUTH DAKOTA

U. S. Senate—

U. S. G. Cherry, Dem.; Tom Ayres, Non-partisan.

Representatives—

- 1st Dist.—C. A. Christopherson, Rep.
 3rd Dist.—Harry L. Gandy, Dem.; Wm. Williamson, Rep.

WASHINGTON

U. S. Senate—

Geo. F. Cotterill, Dem.; Wesley L. Jones, Rep.

Representatives—

- 3rd Dist.—George P. Fishburne, Dem.
 4th Dist.—Fred Miller, Dem.; John W. Sommers, Rep.
 5th Dist.—C. A. Fleming, Dem.; Thomas Corkery, Rep.

WEST VIRGINIA

Representatives—

- 1st Dist.—M. M. Neely, Dem.
 3rd Dist.—R. F. Kidd, Dem.

WISCONSIN

Representatives—

11th Dist.—A. P. Nelson, Rep.

WYOMING

Representatives—

At Large—Frank W. Mondell, Rep.

MR. BRYAN

Mr. Bryan suffered a thorough beating at San Francisco, an overwhelming defeat on all he fought hardest for. He was given respectful attention by the dominant forces but that was all. It is an interesting question whether he ever can come back as a leader of his party. He received similar treatment, though perhaps not quite so severe, for he did keep a gold plank out of the platform, at the hands of the convention which nominated Judge Parker, whose subsequent emphatic repudiation at the polls helped restore Mr. Bryan to party power. Something like that might happen again, but Mr. Bryan is older now and tired.

Mr. Bryan has seen accomplished many of the reforms for which he has worked so hard. Despite his frequent defeats, he is a notably successful man. He is not by nature a statesman, lacking the patience and the balance, but a moralist, a reformer and a preacher. In his field he is a great man and a wonderful influence for good. In that field, at least, he will be great as long as he lives.—Columbus, Ohio, State Journal.

VOTE DRY

Find out where your candidates for the House of Representatives and the Senate stand on the Volstead law, and vote for those who favor strict enforcement and are against any increase in the alcoholic content or other weakening of the statute. PROHIBITION IS HERE AND MUST STAY.

President Wilson's Appeal for League

President Wilson, in an appeal issued from Washington, October 3, urged the indorsement of the League of Nations issue at the election. The text of the appeal follows:

"My Fellow Countrymen:

"The issues of the present campaign are of such tremendous importance and of such far-reaching significance for the influence of the country and the development of its future relations and I have necessarily had so much to do with their development that I am sure you will think it natural and proper that I should address to you a few words concerning them. Everyone who sincerely believes in government by the people must rejoice at the turn affairs have taken in regard to this campaign. This election is to be a genuine national referendum. The determination of a great policy upon which the influence and authority of the United States in the world must depend is not to be left to groups of politicians of either party, but is to be referred to the people themselves for a sovereign mandate to their representatives. They are to instruct their own government what they wish done.

"The chief question that is put to you is, of course, this:

"Do you want your country's honor vindicated and the treaty of Versailles ratified? Do you in particular approve of the league of nations as organized and empowered in that treaty and do you wish to see the United States play its responsible part in it? You have been grossly misled with regard to the treaty, and particularly with regard to the proposed character of the league of nations, by those who have assumed the serious responsibility of opposing it. They have gone so far that those who have spent their lives, as I have spent mine, in familiarizing themselves with the history and traditions and policies of the nation must stand amazed at the gross ignorance and impudent audacity which has led them to attempt to invent an 'Americanism' of their own, which has no foundation whatever in any of the authentic traditions of the government.

"Americanism as they conceive it reverses the whole process of the last few tragic years. It would substitute America for Prussia in the policy of isolation and defiant segregation. Their conception of the dignity of the nation and its interest is that we should stand apart and watch for opportunities to advance our own interests, involve ourselves in no responsibility for the maintenance of the right in the world or for the continued vindication of any of the things for which we entered the war to fight. The conception of the great creators of the government was absolutely opposite to this. They thought of America as the light of the world, as created to lead the world in the assertion of the rights of peoples and the rights of free nations; as destined to set a responsible example to all the world of what free government is and can do for the maintenance of right standards, both national and international. This light the opponents of the league would quench. They would relegate the United States to a subordinate role in the affairs of the world.

"Why should we be afraid of responsibilities which we are qualified to sustain, and which the whole of our history has constituted a promise to the world we would sustain? This is the most momentous issue that has ever been presented to the people of the United States, and I do not doubt that the hope of the whole world will be verified by an absolute assertion by the voters of the country of the determination of the United States to live up to all the great expectations which they created by entering the war and enabling the other great nations of the world to bring it to a victorious conclusion, to the conclusion of Prussianism and everything that arises out of Prussianism. Surely we shall not fail to keep the promise sealed in the death and sacrifice of our incomparable soldiers, sailors and marines who await our verdict beneath the sod of France.

"Those who do not care to tell you the truth about the league of nations tell you that Article 10 of the covenant of the league would make it possible for other nations to lead us into war, whether we willed it by our own independent judgment or not. This is absolutely false. There is nothing in the covenant which in the least interferes with or impairs the right of congress to declare war or not declare war according to its own independent judgment, as our constitution provides. Those who drew the covenant of the

league were careful that it should contain nothing which interfered with or impaired the constitutional arrangements of any of the great nations which are to constitute its members. They would have been amazed and indignant at the things that are now being ignorantly said about this great and sincere document.

"The whole world will wait for your verdict in November as it would wait for an intimation of what its future is to be.

"WOODROW WILSON."

HARDING ASSAILS WILSON LEAGUE PACT

A Kansas City, Mo., dispatch carried by the Associated Press under date of October 8, follows: A day of militant campaigning against the Paris league of nations was closed by Senator Harding tonight with a speech in the Kansas City convention hall, replying directly to the appeal for league support recently addressed to voters by President Wilson. Answering the president's declaration that the league covenant would not take from congress the power to declare war, the republican nominee pronounced the obligations of article ten so clear and unmistakable that congress would be compelled to fulfill them or bring dishonor on the nation. "This obligation is absolute and unqualified," said Mr. Harding. "Whenever certain specified circumstances arose, no matter how much we might regret it, we would have to keep our promise or sneak out of it. Let no one be deceived; the choice would be between two things, war or dishonor."

Article ten bore the brunt of the candidate's attack in his address here, but during the day in other Iowa and Missouri cities he aimed his blows at many other parts of the covenant. The whole scheme, he characterized as a "militaristic" alliance, which in actual operation in Europe had shown itself "not worth a continental."

In his speech tonight the nominee cited invasion of Poland as an example of the complications into which, he said, the United States easily could be drawn under article ten. He referred to Great Britain's failure to furnish aid to the little republic and said he would not look with satisfaction on any such a failure by this nation if it were a league member.

"The statement which the president made to the country a day or two ago," said Mr. Harding, "emphasizes his inflexible determination to secure the adherence of the United States to the league, precisely as the covenant is written. We know from authoritative declarations that the mind of the democratic candidate and that of the democratic president are in perfect accord. We may assume therefore that the president speaks for the candidate and announces the policy which he will follow if elected.

"Those who oppose the treaty in its present form—and there are quite a number of respectable and intelligent people who oppose it—are charged with gross ignorance and impudent audacity." He (the president) tells the people that there is nothing in the covenant which in the least interferes with or impairs the right of congress to declare war or not to declare war, according to its own independent judgment.

"The fallacy of this position has been exposed again and again. Article ten, in words of the utmost precision, binds us to an obligation which under certain easily foreseeable circumstances will require the use of armed forces. It is true that the constitution invests congress with the sole power to declare war, but if war shall become necessary in order to fulfill this or any other treaty provision, congress must either declare war or repudiate the obligation.

"This obligation assumed by the signatories to the covenant is absolute and unqualified. Whenever certain specified circumstances arise, no matter how much we might regret it, we would have to keep our promise or sneak out of it. Let no one be deceived; the choice would be between two things—war or dishonor.

"Poland is a member of the league. Poland was invaded by Russia, her territorial integrity therefore violated by external aggression and the precise case contemplated by article ten, was presented to Great Britain. But England did not furnish aid to Poland because a large body of her people opposed it. I, for one, would look with no satisfaction upon similar action by my countrymen if we were a party to the league. If we promise, we must keep faith.

"The case of Poland may be repeated many times. Under this provision we shall no longer