

At the first meeting of the committee for the hearing of this case the ballots were presented for inspection. A subcommittee was appointed to ascertain how many illegal ballots were contained therein. It was agreed that in order to facilitate their work their sessions should be secret. The subcommittee opened the ballots from three precincts, and finding that it took one week to examine them, asked the House for authority to employ an expert, which was granted. Since that time the expert has been examining the ballots, and on Thursday last made his report to the committee. The committee then ordered that each of the parties should have one week's time in which to examine the ballots, and if then either of us desired to send for the expert for the purpose of examining him that we should have that privilege. After that the case was to be set for argument before the committee.

On Thursday afternoon I commenced examining the ballots, and continued doing so during Thursday, Friday and Saturday. I do not believe that 2,732 illegal votes were cast (that being my majority as returned), yet my examination disclosed the fact that the assurances which I had received as to the regularity of the votes in many of the precincts were not true, and that there were illegal votes therein which tainted the polls, and the polls so tainted gave me a greater plurality than my returned majority in the district.

The fact was a bitter disappointment to me, but nevertheless true.

The law is that when a poll is tainted by fraud and it is impossible to purge the poll of the fraudulent votes, the vote of the entire precinct, legal and illegal, must be thrown out.

The committee has given me every opportunity to ascertain the illegal vote so as to save the valid vote in those precincts. Until I saw the ballots last Thursday, I thought the illegal vote could be detected and separated from the legal vote, but I must confess that my inspection has convinced me that it is impossible to do so in this case.

The law being as I have stated, and the number of precincts tainted containing majorities for me greater than my returned majority, I must say that if I were a judge upon the bench considering this case I would be compelled to find against myself, and as the vote in the contested precincts aggregates less than one-tenth of the vote in the Congressional district, I would be compelled to find that according to law Mr. Bonyng is entitled to the seat. (Applause.)

I did my best to have an honest election. My law partner, with my approval, organized a citizens' committee composed of both Republicans and Democrats who desire a fair election. The headquarters of that committee, as shown by the evidence in this case, were in the law offices of Rogers, Shafroth & Gregg, Denver, Col.

I have always been in favor of pure politics, and when the test is applied to an election at which I was voted for as one of the candidates upon the ticket I should not shirk my duty or change my convictions concerning honest elections.

I therefore will say to the Committee on Elections No. 2 and to the members of this house that they can seat Mr. Bonyng at their earliest convenience.

As this is the last time I will have the opportunity of addressing the House, I want to thank the Committee on Elections No. 2, and particularly the chairman, Mr. Olmsted, and the subcommittee, Mr. Miller, Mr. Currier and Mr. Sullivan, for the fair and impartial manner in which they proceeded to investigate this case. Every suggestion which I made as to the investigation was readily concurred in.

I wish also to say that I appreciate the repeated declarations of Mr. Bonyng in the record that I was not a party to or in any manner connected with any of the frauds or irregularities charged. I also desire to thank the Members of this House for the uniform courtesy and evidences of respect which I have received during the eight years of my service in Congress. I have formed friendships here upon both sides of the Chamber which I shall cherish through life. I fully appreciate the high character of the men who compose this body, but it is only when I am about to leave that I fully realize the distinguished honor it is to serve as a Member in the greatest legislative body on the face of the globe. Wishing you all a happy and prosperous future, I will say good-by. (Loud applause.)

A UNITED DEMOCRACY.

An address delivered by Hon. Lucius F. C. Garvin, Governor of Rhode Island, etc., before the Young Men's Democratic club, in Providence, Feb. 22, 1904.

From 1894 to 1900, inclusive, the Democratic party was weak and divided. This was true both nationally and in this State.

Beginning in 1901, there has been a steady growth locally, in vigor, numbers and unity, and both in the election of last November and of the pre-

ceding year, the two parties have been very equally matched. Not only have the two wings of the Democratic party here moved in harmony, but numerous recruits of the very best quality have been drawn from the Republican ranks.

These forces have been able to unite because they agreed upon local issues. Dissatisfied and solidified because of the abuses of power by the dominant party, they readily joined forces for constitutional reform.

What has been done in the State may, and logically will, occur upon the larger, the national stage. The majority of the people of this country have had enough, and more than enough, of foreign complications and exploitations to the neglect of domestic concerns. Regular Democrats, bolting Democrats, and a multitude of Republicans, are demanding the restoration of a government by and for the people. They are tired of the despotism of unscrupulous trusts and corporations, and regard the means made use of by the dominant party to restrain them as trivial and futile.

They believe that the repeal of the numerous laws conferring special privileges, and the substitution thereof of a few general, simple and just laws, are both right and pressingly expedient, and that in this way the government can most highly subserve the welfare of its citizens. Republican orators and editors, assuming the role of the philosopher, are asserting that the Democratic party is hopelessly divided; but the wish is father to the thought. The Gold Democrats will never return, we are told. Why not? In 1896, bimetallism was made the leading plank in the party platform. Since campaigns are usually fought upon one issue, any members of a party who are strongly opposed to that issue, are justified if they withdraw from the party for the time being. Many sterling Democrats did so withdraw in 1896, some of whom returned four years later when imperialism became the dominant question. No doubt a portion of those who withdrew in 1896 and remained away in 1900, were Democrats only in name. They should be in some other party, and a good proportion of them are now safely and satisfactorily at home in the Republican domicile.

Hundreds of thousands of Democrats, who really preferred monometallism to bimetallism, voted for Mr. Bryan in 1896. They, too, were justified in so doing for the reason that, whilst the free coinage of silver was then the most prominent issue, it was not, in their opinion, the most important.

For my part, I can see no reason why the great body of the Democrats who

supported Palmer and Buckner in 1896 should not now be welcomed back into the ranks of the regular Democratic organization. In a reunion of this character, I can perceive no sacrifice of principle whatsoever.

The live issues of the day are the tariff, the trusts and our foreign policy.

All Democrats of every stripe agree that the tariff should be so altered as to no longer shelter the trusts, that it should be made impossible for any American industry to sell to foreigners more cheaply than to our own citizens, and that import taxes upon the raw materials of many industries are a serious obstacle to the sale of their products abroad.

All democrats are opposed to private monopolies of every kind, including the trusts, and believe that much more effective measures can be found for their destruction than any which have been applied or recommended by the present administration.

All Democrats are agreed that our foreign policy should be in harmony with the principles upon which this government is founded, and that the constitutional liberty which has been our boast should be extended to every inch of American soil.

Only the money question remains as a bone of contention. In its old form, as between the single standard and the double standard, the question, for the present, at least, is not pressing or vital. It never was a question of principle, but only a difference of opinion as to the better means of reaching the common end, a sound and stable currency.

There remains the difference as to the reaffirmation of recent national platforms. This certainly is a very small matter to divide upon. Manifestly, it is a question of expediency only, and any supporters of Mr. Bryan who would prefer to indorse the Kansas City platform, may well yield that inconsequent preference for the sake of harmony and union.

Speaking for myself, I think that no party should ever reaffirm a former platform. If a party holds the same views to-day as a year ago, then let it express them in the same language, if thought desirable; but as a matter of fact seldom would two conventions or committees make use of the same form of words upon any subject. Political conditions never remain unchanged for two successive years, and the new circumstances call for a new expression. If the members of the committee on resolutions of the last national convention were reappointed at St. Louis, they would draw up a different platform, and

be consistent in so doing. To do otherwise would be to put new wine into old bottles.

Moreover, the Democratic convention of next July should invite to its support, not merely the stalwarts of four and eight years ago, and the real Democrats who held aloof during those elections, but also that great multitude of Republicans, who, being at heart democrats, believe in a government by the people, rather than that which now obtains, a government by monopolies.

To restore either our State or nation to the control of a majority of the voters is an Herculean task. It can only be done by the united and determined action of all those who have a living faith in our form of government. It calls for the best energies of both laborers and capitalists, of the highly educated and the common people. To bring about such union, we are called upon to devote our every effort, and, short of an abandonment of principle, to make any personal sacrifice to patriotism.

MULLIGAN ON SUBSIDIES.

Mulligan and Donovan were "on time," as usual, and Flynn's tobacco box had been depleted by two pipefuls of tobacco, which were not yet half smoked, when Brooks entered. It was a cold night, and Mulligan's cordial hail and invitations were strongly seconded by the cozy comfort of the glowing fire in the big stove, and the cheery faces of his two friends. At this moment Mr. Smeel, editor of the Daily Patriot, entered, and, greeting Brooks familiarly, selected a cigar. Brooks had already lighted his, and, when Smeel had done the same, he suggested that they step down to the stove and get warmed before going out. Smeel promptly acquiesced, and, locking arms with Brooks, laughingly remarked, as they sauntered down the room: "Any port in a storm!" A Democratic haven isn't so bad, on a cold night like this!"

"No," retorted Brooks, with a show of equal good humor, "the Democratic haven is the only safe retreat from Republican storms!"

"Good alvn'n", Mистер Smeel," said Mulligan, as the two gentlemen came up. "Is ut a Dimmycrat Mистер Brooks wud be mak'n' av ye?"

"Oh, I'm a democrat already," answered Smeel. "The difference is that my kind of democracy is spelt with a small d, and Brooks' begins with a—anarchy! ha! ha! ha!" and Mr. Smeel seemed to enjoy himself.

"I belave," said Mulligan, "th' divil begins wid a schmall d, too, and an angel wid a!"

"Ha!" (It was Donovan. He couldn't help it. That great big "Ha!" burst forth from his mouth like a clap of thunder. He choked back the rest of them, the easier by means of resorting to his trick of snatching off his hat and scratching his head and contorting his features). "And yet," continued Mulligan, "it might be ye wudn't take me wurrud f'r ut, if I was to tell ye thot I'm an angel."

"Oh, you're all right, Mulligan," said Smeel, in a patronizing tone, and with a furtive glance seaward!

Now, Mulligan was a good-natured man, but high-spirited, and could not easily brook patronage, especially from an intellectual inferior; but from such a creature as Smeel! It was too much.

"Is ut quite safe f'r ye to give yer indorsement, Mистер Schmeel, to a mon thot confesses to be'n' the same kind av an 'anarchist' thot Mистер Brooks is?"

"I hope, Mr. Mulligan, you are not going to take offense at a joke," said Smeel, deprecatingly.

"Oh, ut's jok'n' ye was?"

"Why, certainly."

"And were ye jok'n' the half hunder times ye've said the same t'ing in yer editorials, in the Daily Patriot?"

"Oh, but you must remember, Mr. Mulligan, that all's fair in war; and politics is war."

"Websther gives a difinition av a saart av politics thot agrees wid yer shtatmint; an' ut's this: 'Artful an' dishonest management to secure the soocess av political measures or party schemes; political thrickery.' But 'e says thot this is politics in a 'bad sense.' His furrst difinition av politics is: 'The science av governmint: thot part av ethics which has to do wid the rigulation an' governmint av a nation or shtate, the priservation av uts safety, peace and prosperity; the defense av uts existence and roights agin furrin contrhol or conquest, the augmintation av uts stren't' an' reay-soorces, an' the protiction av uts citizens in their roights, wid the priservation and improovemint av their morals.'

"And if ye are jokin' whin ye call a dimmycrat an anarchist, how are we to know whether ye are jok'n' or not whin ye write in support av the ship soobsidy job, as ye did in yestherday's paaper?"

"Well, to set your mind at rest on that score, Mr. Mulligan, I'll say that I was never more serious than I am in supporting that measure."