

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-

nor-general, and brought on a condition which looks much like a popular revolt. In the process of the assimilation and Russification of Finland (vol. v, pp. 40, 234, 490, 502, 600), Count Bobrikoff, the governor-general, has been exceedingly drastic in his methods. As Russian officials describe him "he was personally haughty and austere and ruled firmly but justly." Unofficial dispatches from St. Petersburg say of him:

Lieut. Gen. Count Bobrikoff has been described as the most hated man in Finland. He was appointed governor general of Finland in 1899, when the Russification of Finland began. His measures for carrying out the Russian policy were necessarily severe. He abolished the Finnish army and compelled Finnish soldiers to serve in any part of the empire. He made Russian the language in all courts, and decreed that at the end of five years only Russian should be taught in the schools. When the citizens assembled to protest he dispersed them with Cossacks armed with knouts. He suppressed 150 Finnish newspapers. The last recorded act of Gen. Bobrikoff was in March of this year, when he issued a proclamation forbidding the people to darken their windows at "unusual hours." People who chose to go to bed before ten o'clock at night were subject to heavy fines. This step was due to the neglect of the Finns to illuminate their houses in honor of the beginning of the war with Japan.

His assassination occurred on the 16th, while he was entering the Finnish senate at Helsingfors. The assassin was Eugen Schaumann, a son of the Finnish Senator Schaumann. Two of Schaumann's bullets caused slight wounds in the neck and chest. The third penetrated the abdomen and necessitated a serious operation. The wounded governor-general was sent to St. Petersburg, but it was stated that his wounds were mortal. He died at 1 o'clock the following morning—the 17th.

The following letter, published in the Aftonbladet at Stockholm on the 20th, is said to have been sent by young Schaumann to the Czar. The published copy had been forwarded by Schaumann, so the Aftonbladet explained, to a friend not in Finland, with the suggestion that this was done because the writer doubted if the original would ever be allowed to

reach the Czar. The letter as published reads:

Sire:—Through the Senate, which is obedient to Bobrikoff, the latter has succeeded in creating lawlessness in Finland. Through lies and false representations Bobrikoff and Plehwe (minister of the interior) have induced your Majesty to issue ordinances incompatible with Finnish laws, which you promised at your succession to guard firm and unshaken. The best officials of the state have been removed without trial in favor of fortune-hunters and others ineligible to state offices under Finnish laws, and your most intelligent and truest subjects have been banished. Plehwe, whose duty it is to report to your Majesty all matters concerning the grand duchy of Finland, is not a Finlander, has no knowledge of Finland's laws and customs and has common interests with Bobrikoff. Therefore your Majesty does not get true knowledge of the real situation. As it is not probable that the real situation will be known to you in the near future unless Bobrikoff be removed, there is only one way to take in self-defense, and that is to render him innocuous. The remedy is violent, but it is the only one. Your majesty, I have done my deed alone after mature deliberation, and in the moment of death I swear there was no conspiracy. Knowing your good heart and good intentions, I implore solely that you seek information regarding the whole Empire, including Finland, Poland and the Baltic provinces. Signed with the deepest veneration, your Majesty's humblest and truest subject,
Eugen Schaumann.

It was reported from Copenhagen on the 20th that information had been received there of a revolt in Helsingfors, the capital of Finland. A band of Swedish revolutionists were reported to have sacked the offices of the governor-general on the 18th and killed eighteen employes, including a son of Admiral Pinken. They were also reported to have demolished the police offices, and it was believed that the revolt would spread. More serious news is anticipated, but all information was suppressed in official quarters.

The reports of fighting in the Russian-Japanese war (p. 171) are becoming intelligible, although nothing quite definite is yet at hand. While not relaxing their command of Port Arthur on the land side from Nanshan hill and the region of Kinchow (p. 134), the Japanese have made an aggressive movement northward to prevent the relief of Port Arthur by the

Russian army in their rear. In the course of this movement they fought a battle on the 16th, under Gen. Oku, at Vafangow, between Kinchow and Newchwang, in which they completely routed the Russians under Gen. Stakelberg. He had intended, according to his own report, to attack the Japanese right flank, but just as his troops were beginning their attack the Japanese fell upon his right flank with superior forces, and he was compelled to retreat to the north. His losses were heavy, but they are not yet reliably reported. According to Japanese reports the Japanese troops hung close to the rear guard of the retreating Russians, in a desperate effort to encircle the Russian right wing. This object seemed on the point of being accomplished when a violent thunderstorm, which broke in the middle of the night, choked up the roads that lay between the two armies and checked the advance of the Japanese. Freed from harassing pursuit the Russian army was enabled to retire gradually toward Haitchen; but it is announced from St. Petersburg that a sanguinary battle was in progress at that point on the 20th, and that the Russians were retreating still farther northward to Liaoyang. This is denied, however, by the Russian general staff at St. Petersburg; although there seems to be no doubt that severe fighting was taking place on the 21st at least as far north as Kaichow.

A rush out of Vladivostok under cover of night has been made by three Russian cruisers, which have since destroyed three Japanese transports, with a loss of life to the Japanese of about 900 out of 1,500. The transports were the Hitachi, the Idzumi and the Sado; the Russian cruisers were the Russia, the Gromoboi and the Rurik. At latest reports the Russian cruisers had not returned to Vladivostok, but neither had their whereabouts been discovered by the Japanese.

NEWS NOTES.

—The fifth annual automobile race for the James Gordon Bennett cup was won on the 17th by a Frenchman, Thery, who made 348 miles over a difficult and dangerous course in Ger-