

masses in 1896 and 1900 is to be found in the fact that our campaign funds were insignificant in both campaigns. In 1892 the Democratic party collected a large campaign fund from the corporations. It spent more than \$1,000,000 in the two States of New York and Indiana alone, and what was the result? The most plutocratic administration this country had ever known. We witnessed a surrender to organized and predatory wealth so abject and so complete that seven years of exile from power have not entirely removed the stain from the party. You ask why I am opposed to the reorganization of the Democratic party? Because I want my party to define the rights of the people; I want it to be the fearless champion of their interests; I want it to present the moral issue involved in public questions and to appeal to the public conscience.

In closing, Mr. Bryan "hurled defiance," as the reports express it, "at that element within the Democratic party which is now clamoring for another reorganization," by saying:

I helped to reorganize the Democratic party to rescue it from the doctrine that makes money the master and all else the servant. I have never regretted what I did and I would do it again. Let the Republican party be challenged to meet the moral issue presented—this is democratic, this is patriotic. Let this be done, and unless reason and love of country have fled we shall fight without being ashamed. If we lose, it will be but a temporary defeat and will bring no disgrace with it. If we win, the victory will mean much for our country and for the world.

Meanwhile Mr. Bryan's insistence that it is more important for the Democratic party to be morally right than to win by pacifying monopoly interests, appears from the newspaper reports to be creating great commotion among the official class of Democrats. The following extract from Walter Wellman's Washington dispatch to the Chicago Record-Herald of the 24th seems fairly to summarize the situation in that respect:

William Jennings Bryan's "rule or ruin" pronouncement has stirred Democratic senators and representatives almost to a fury of indignation. Their public comments on Colonel Bryan's declaration that the Kansas City platform must be reaffirmed are caustic enough, but their private remarks are absolutely unprintable. Leading Democrats say they cannot understand Bryan's game. Some think he is determined to wreck the party in order to show that no Democrat can succeed in winning the

Presidency where he failed twice. Others believe he is consumed by vanity and a desire to advertise himself, and that he is also suffering under the sting of the snub—for that is what it was—administered to him by the Democratic national committee at its meeting here a few weeks ago. At any rate nine Democrats out of ten in Washington are thoroughly disgusted with his course. They say just as the party was trying to get itself in shape to put up a stiff fight for the Presidency this year Mr. Bryan comes along and kicks up a rumpus which can do no one on earth the slightest good, and which may do a world of harm.

In response to the distorted reports of his views (for which he has certainly given no occasion in his speeches), Mr. Bryan gave out the following interview at New York on the 27th:

While a great outcry has been made because I have demanded the reaffirmation of the Kansas City platform, and an attempt has been made to show that I want to fight over again the battle of 1896, those who are best acquainted with my real views have known that I have been misunderstood. Ever since 1900 I felt that the question of gold or silver is no longer of great importance. But that does not mean that I consider the question answered. I believe it has been absorbed in an issue of greater importance. In the same manner the questions involving trusts, labor unions and imperialism have been included in that larger question: "Shall the money changers rule the United States?" I do not favor making silver the paramount issue of the campaign. I do not favor making the trusts the paramount issue of the campaign. Neither do I believe it wise to make imperialism the paramount issue. The tariff would not be accepted as the paramount issue. But all should be merged into the greater question which I have put into words. That is my suggestion, and I am willing for it to be submitted in advance of the convention to the public to be passed upon by the majority of the Democratic voters.

Complete returns from the Australian Commonwealth elections (p. 646) are now at hand. They show the following result:

	Senate.	House.
Ministerialists	8	26
Opposition	13	26
Labor	15	23

The Opposition gains were in New South Wales, while those of the Labor party were in Queensland and West Australia. As New South Wales is distinctively the free trade State of the Commonwealth, and Victoria is as distinctively the protection State, a com-

parison of the results in these two States is interesting:

VICTORIA (pro.)		
	Senate.	House.
Ministerialists	3	16
Opposition	1	5
Labor	2	2

NEW SOUTH WALES (f. t.)		
	Senate.	House.
Ministerialists	0	3
Opposition	6	16
Labor	0	7

But little interest appears to have been taken in the election as a whole, hardly more than a third of the electors having voted. This could not have been due to any special neglect by women, who have been recently enfranchised; for about as many women voted as men. There were four women candidates, but none were elected. The Labor party is reported to have been the best organized and the least apathetic. Among the defeated candidates was Max Hirsch (author of Socialism versus Democracy), the leading single taxer and, next to Mr. Reid, the leading free trader of the Commonwealth. Mr. Hirsch had resigned a seat in the Victorian parliament in order to be a candidate for the Commonwealth parliament. Judging from the result as a whole the probabilities are that the tariff will not be altered. It is likely either that the ministry will go on with its old programme through petty bargains with the Labor party, or that (if the Labor party demands more than the ministry is willing to yield and presses its demands) a coalition will be formed against it.

The Iroquois theater disaster at Chicago (p. 659) has been made the basis of criminal proceedings against the principal manager and several city officials, including the mayor. This is in consequence of the verdict of the Coroner's jury rendered on the 25th, which recommends the indictment of Carter H. Harrison, mayor; of William H. Musham, chief of the fire department; of George Williams, building commissioner, and of Edward Loughlin, building inspector—all for official negligence. Also of William C. Saller, theater fireman; of James E. Cummings, stage carpenter; of William McMullen, operator of the flood light—for negligence as employes of the theater; and of Will J. Davis, president of the Iroquois theater corporation, for negligent