

Indiana	30
Louisiana	18
Mississippi	20
New York	78
Tennessee	24
Texas	36
Total	266
Oney—	
Massachusetts	26
Wall—	
Wisconsin	26
Gray—	
Delaware	6
Uninstructed—	
Alabama	22
Colorado	10
Kansas	20
Kentucky	26
Maine	12
Michigan	25
Minnesota	22
Montana	6
Nebraska	16
New Hampshire	8
North Dakota	8
Ohio	46
Oklahoma	8
Oregon	8
Pennsylvania	68
Rhode Island	8
South Carolina	18
Utah	6
Vermont	8
Virginia	24
West Virginia	14
Total	384
Contests—	
District of Columbia	6
New Jersey	24
Total	30

William J. Bryan spoke on the 20th at the anti-Parker conference of Democrats (p. 171) in Cooper Union, New York. This conference was called to order by Melvin G. Palliser, and was presided over by Samuel Seabury, one of the judges of the City Court of New York city. In addition to Judge Seabury, Mr. Palliser and Mr. Bryan, the speakers were J. W. Forest, Albert J. Boulton and Frederick W. Hinrichs. The auditorium was full of people and thousands are reported to have stood in the surrounding streets vainly endeavoring to gain admittance to the crowded hall. The conference adopted resolutions wherein Judge Parker's majority for chief justice of the Court of Appeals in 1897 is explained on the ground that the name of his opponent did not appear on the ballot of the Citizens' Union in New York city, and he is described as "the candidate of tariff beneficiaries, imperialists, monopolists and those who profit by special privileges and seek to uphold them as vested rights." The conference warned the national con-

vention against nominating Parker. In the course of his speech, occupying an hour and a half in delivery, Mr. Bryan said:

I believe, according to statistics, the platform upon which I ran in 1900 received in this state 124,000 votes more than Judge Parker received the last time he was a candidate for office in this State. And therefore I think I am entitled to say that I have some evidence that the doctrines we cherish in the West are not so unpopular in New York State as some would have you believe. . . . I am glad to speak on this platform with one who has disagreed with me on some questions. I am not at all ashamed to stand on this platform with one who in 1896 opposed my election to the Presidency. It does not lessen my opinion of Mr. Hinrichs' honesty that he should have openly opposed me. I respect him a good many times more than I do the man who opposed me secretly. The influence that Mr. Hinrichs had he cast against me openly. The influence that David B. Hill had he cast against me secretly, lacking the courage to come out in the open. Late in the Fall of the year Mr. Hill wrote a letter to a Republican in this State and stated that he had not then decided what he himself would do; that, while he was a Democrat, he had not made up his mind. His refusal to say one word to indicate what he would do cast every influence he had against instead of for the ticket. Now this gentleman who speaks here to-night as a representative of those who differed with us on the money question agrees that there is a great issue running through all these questions. I agree with Mr. Hinrichs that the great question in this campaign is not the money question, nor the trust question, nor imperialism, nor any other of those questions, but it is the question as to whether we shall have a plutocracy or a democracy. . . . I charge that while Judge Parker has concealed his views from the mass of the people, he has made known his views to the people who are putting up the money to push his candidacy. On the 18th of this month Harper's Weekly had an editorial which brags of the success Judge Parker and his friends have met without letting his views be known. . . . Harper's Weekly says that Judge Parker's strength is due to the adroit work of Mr. Belmont. If you will look at the contract Mr. Belmont got while Mr. Cleveland was President you must know that he gets a good consideration for his work. Would he do so adroit work for a man and not know his views? . . . Do you suppose the man who lends money with such careful security is going to lend money for this campaign without knowing that

he is going to get the goods after the campaign is over? The Democrats of this country are honest. Will they look favorably on a candidate that adds hypocrisy to his other sins? Hypocrisy, because a man who tells you that judicial ethics prevent him from taking the public into his confidence and then takes into his confidence these men who are adroitly managing his campaign, is a hypocrite in all that the word implies. If Mr. Parker dealt honestly with the Democrats of this country he would say to Mr. Belmont as he has said to the farmer and the laborer, "I cannot talk to you, as my lips are sealed by the office I hold." But if he had said that, he would never have been proposed for the nomination by any New York newspaper or any of the men who are backing him to-day. A man who discloses to the money magnates his inner conscience and views and then pretends that he cannot lower the dignity of the bench by taking the public into his confidence I denounce as one who does not deal honestly with the people from whom he expects support.

After Gov. Peabody, of Colorado, had released San Miguel county from military occupation, upon the granting by the Federal Court at St. Louis of a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of President Moyer, of the Western Federation of Miners, and Moyer had consequently been delivered by the military into the custody of the civil authorities at Telluride (p. 169), he was transferred by those authorities on the 18th to a secret service agent of the Mine-Owners' Association and transported to Cripple Creek, where the military are still in control. The charge upon which he is held is participation in an explosion in the Vindicator mine, Nov. 1, 1903, which resulted in two deaths. On the 21st he was arraigned before a justice of the peace at Cripple Creek—one of the appointees in place of a regular justice forced under the military occupation to resign under threats of death. The charge preferred against Moyer was murder. He was prosecuted by Deputy District Attorney Crump, attorney for the Mine-Owners' Association, who was thrust into his office as prosecutor by mob action under military protection.

Military usurpation by Russia in Finland has provoked the assassination of the Russian gover-