

laws Commission Government would not have a fair chance. I think it quite safe to say, however, that even if we are defeated, the cause has been greatly advanced, and it is only a question of time when the new method of administration will obtain in this city.

CHAS. E. FENNER.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

ANOTHER MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP "FAILURE."

Ceylon, Sask., Canada.

Your recital of the Manitoba telephone failure* suggests another government-ownership "failure" in Manitoba—the elevator system; a like effect, from similar causes. The moral of it all is to employ more trusty guards than a fox for your henhouse. Two years ago western grain growers in Canada were earnestly demanding government elevators as means of relief from extortion, but the most sanguine among them scarcely hoped to convince any Government without a vigorous and perhaps lengthy campaign. Imagine, then, the surprise of the Manitoba farmers in convention when they were called on by a member of the Roblin cabinet with a proposal to cooperate in the formulation of a plan for the Province to acquire a line of local elevators. The Grain Growers responded with suggestions embodying the results of their years of experience and study; but the Government had ideas of its own. The farmers soon saw that what Roblin wanted was not their suggestions, but their "O. K."

The bill finally brought down had a number of objectionable features, among the rest the power it gave the Government to interfere with the work of the Elevator Commission and to appoint or remove members on its own motion. Much time was spent and expense incurred in laboring with the Premier, but the bill was passed substantially in its original form, the grain growers' organization, however, declining to assume any responsibility for its success.

Though deeply disappointed, the organized farmers yet consented to nominate men for the Commission, on the promise that their work should not be interfered with. A very satisfactory Commission was chosen, and they proceeded at once to purchase and build elevators with judgment and economy. Then, with the farmers' mouths stopped, Roblin called an election and went back into power with tremendous majorities!

Once again safely incysted away from the troublesome voters, the Government took the purchasing of elevators into its own hands. It not only paid higher prices, but bought many that were antiquated, out of repair and badly located. In this way over \$1,000,000 was expended, and 174 elevators were acquired at about 100 points. These were used solely for shipping grain in car lots, as funds were not available to buy grain. So the chief sufferer, the small farmer with the wagon load, not only got no benefit, but in many cases his convenient elevator was taken from him and he compelled to haul to a more distant market. Good and experienced men

resigned from the Commission, and the system smelled of politics.

With this load to carry, is it surprising that the Commission complained of lack of support from the farmers and that the books showed a negative balance of \$125,000 in the two years of operation? The Premier conveniently blames the Grain Growers whose earnestly proffered advice he spurned at the beginning, but can he sidestep his own responsibility? It is a question whether his is a case of "after us, the deluge," or "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." It is at least worth noting that it is in Manitoba that the Initiative, Referendum and Recall have made the greatest progress in Canada.

By way of contrast, those who point to "failures" of public ownership in Manitoba should consider the public telephone system of the adjoining Province—Saskatchewan.

GEORGE W. ATKINSON.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Monday, July 1, 1912.

The Democratic Convention.

After forty-two balloting for President of the United States, the Democratic convention has not yet made a nomination. Neither has a platform been yet reported to the convention. The unusual procedure of making nominations before adopting the platform was in response to the advice of Mr. Bryan, who explained—

that the candidate for President should be nominated before the platform is adopted, the convention being of unusual importance and the Democratic hope of victory depending upon its measuring up to the requirements of the occasion; that the platform would not amount to much unless the candidate stands squarely upon it and is able to defend it; that a joint debate between the platform and the candidate would be fatal to the prospects of the party; that by changing the order the convention would be able so to shape the platform utterances as to give force to the candidacy; that the unprecedented character of the proposal is justified by the fact that extraordinary conditions require extraordinary remedies; and that the suggestion that any candidate would be willing to stand upon a platform prepared by the convention is answered by the fact that the Democratic candidate eight years ago amended the platform by telegraph, a procedure which did not take well with the public.

[See current volume, page 608.]



When Alton B. Parker ascended the rostrum in the afternoon of the 25th to deliver the keynote

*See *The Public* of May 3, page 411.

speech of the convention, upon his election over Bryan as temporary chairman by 579 to 510 votes, the confusion incident to the departure of delegates and spectators from the hall was so great that his efforts to be heard were unavailing. In consequence the convention voted a recess until evening. Upon reassembling it listened to Chairman Parker's speech and then adjourned for the day. In his speech the temporary Chairman criticized ex-President Roosevelt and described the contest between him and President Taft as a "disgraceful brawl which terminated in the bedlam of Chicago;" attributed unjust distribution of wealth in the United States and the rise of the cost of living faster than average incomes, to the tariff and "the combinations restraining trade and competition, created for the purpose of wringing from the public every dollar which the tariff statutes make possible;" paid a special compliment to the "sagacious and intrepid Democratic leadership" which has secured special bills revising "the tariff downward ultimately to a revenue basis," and closed with this declaration:

For their crimes against American citizenship the present leaders of the Republican party should be destroyed. For making and keeping the bargain to take care of the tariff-protected interests in consideration of campaign funds, they should be destroyed. For encouraging the creation of combinations to restrain trade, and refusing to enforce the law for a like consideration, they should be destroyed. For the lavish waste of the public funds; for the fraudulent disposition of the people's domain, and for their contribution toward the division of the people into classes, they should be destroyed. For the efforts to seize for the executive department of the Federal government powers rightfully belonging to the States, they should be destroyed. All destruction will be theirs, this very year, if we but do our duty.



In the course of his speech, the temporary chairman had been conciliatory towards Mr. Bryan, and he urged—with the approval of the reactionary elements, as it afterwards turned out—that Bryan be made chairman of the committee to formulate and report the platform, a committee of which Bryan was already a member by choice of his State delegation. On this point Chairman Parker said:

My fellow Democrats, there is one place in this convention where he is wanted, one place where he is capable of rendering great service, service unsurpassed by anyone, that is the chairman of the resolutions committee, and I hope and believe that every member of the resolutions committee will honor himself by casting his vote for that great leader for chairman of that committee.

The place of chairman of that committee was accordingly offered to Bryan unanimously but he declined it in the following speech to the committee:

I appreciate the compliment, but I am not willing

to act as chairman. I am a believer in harmony, but I think that the committee, in its officers, ought to be in harmony with the convention, and I am not in harmony with the organization of the convention nor of the national committee which controls the organization of the convention. We used to have two kinds of Democrats, progressives and conservatives; we now have only one kind, progressive; but we find there is a wide difference in the definition of the word "progressive," and I do not define progressiveness as it is defined by a majority of this convention, and, believing in harmony, I want to be in harmony with the convention and I desire to be more free to represent the minority sentiment. I do not say that there will be a minority report, but it would not look well for the chairman of the committee to take in a minority report. It may be necessary for me to take in a minority report. I do not know that it will, but I do not want to place myself in that awkward position, and for that reason I decline.

As Mr. Bryan subsequently explained less formally, the reactionaries had "been trying to square themselves," having heard "from home" through a flood of telegrams, one effect of which was their desire for a Progressive chairman of the platform committee. Unable to secure Mr. Bryan, the committee named Senator Kern, who, though supporting Governor Marshall of his own State for the Presidential nomination, is a progressive of the Bryan type.



Not alone with the offer of the chairmanship of the platform committee did the reactionary element try to involve Bryan in their plans so as to cripple his leadership of the Progressive elements. They also offered him the permanent chairmanship of the convention. Mr. Bryan's attitude, as explained by himself in his letter through the Virgil V. McNitt syndicate as published in the Chicago Tribune of the 27th, was as follows:

My refusal of the permanent chairmanship was based partly on the fact that I did not regard it as a compliment to have the position tendered me by those who had defeated me for temporary chairman, and partly because I did not feel disposed to accept any responsibility for the conduct of the convention until it had done something to purge itself of its reactionary character.

But here also the repentance of the reactionaries for their ill-advised thrusting of Judge Parker into the temporary chair was manifest. Unable to get Bryan, they chose Senator James, another Progressive of the Bryan type. The original intention of the reactionaries had been to continue Judge Parker in the chair, as was done with Root at the Republican convention; they did try to continue Urey Woodson of Kentucky as secretary, but were defeated in the committee on permanent organization by E. E. Britton of North Carolina.



The reactionary elements were again defeated on

the 26th, this time upon the question of allowing the old unit rule of the party to override preference primary laws of the States. This was a defeat especially for Governor Harmon of Ohio and a pronounced victory for Mayor Baker of Cleveland. The story of Baker's defeat by Harmon on this point at the Ohio convention has been already told in these columns.* Under the laws of Ohio, delegates from certain Congressional districts, including the Cleveland districts, had been instructed by the voters of the Democratic party at the primaries to vote for Governor Wilson for Presidential nominee; but the State convention undertook to force these votes by the unit rule into the Harmon column. Mayor Baker, one of the district delegates instructed for Wilson, carried the question to the national convention. His point was that the unit rule can govern only when the State convention represents the people of the State as a whole; and that when a State law empowers the people of any part of the State to instruct their delegates, the State convention cannot override those instructions. In the credentials committee, Mayor Baker was again defeated, the action of the Ohio convention being sustained by 22 to 15. But he won his point on the floor of the convention. The minority of the committee brought in the following minority report, in his favor, and it was adopted on the 26th by the convention:

Resolved, that in casting votes on a call of the States the Chair shall recognize and enforce a unit rule enacted by a State convention, except in such States as have by mandatory statute provided for the nomination and election of delegates and alternates to national political conventions in Congressional districts and have not subjected delegates so selected to the authority of the State committee or convention of the party, in which case no such rule shall be held to apply.

The vote by which the convention adopted that minority report was 565½ to 491½. This result was further evidence of the turning of the tide away from the reactionaries, who had forced Judge Parker's election the day before, Bryan having supported Mayor Baker's contention.



The report of the committee on permanent organization having been adopted by the convention, Senator James took the place of Judge Parker in the chair on the 27th and Mr. Britton that of Mr. Woodson at the secretary's desk. The principal points of Senator James's address as permanent chairman were—

that the record of the Republican party is a record of "promises betrayed—arrogantly, defiantly betrayed," while that of the Democratic party is a record of promises faithfully and honestly kept; that President Taft was renominated "by the most wholesale, conscienceless and deliberate unseating

of delegates honestly elected that was ever perpetrated in American politics;" that the demand with reference to the tariff that its revision await the report of a Tariff Board, comes only when "the tariff has already been fixed so high" that the Protectionists "know they can get it no higher;" that the Tariff Board policy would take the "great right of taxation" "out of the hands of the people and" lodge it "in the hands of a board of five men;" that the Democracy aim to strike from the trusts every character of protection and "write a tariff law strictly for revenue only," and that the party "never will consent that our finances shall be Aldrichized or controlled by the money trust."



At the evening session of the 27th the most important episode of the whole convention thus far, as it was the most courageous and perhaps the most dramatic of any party convention in history, occurred. Immediately upon the session's being called to order, William J. Bryan was recognized by Chairman James to introduce a resolution regarding which he asked unanimous consent for its consideration without reference to the committee on resolutions. Following is the resolution as he first offered it:

Resolved, that in this crisis of our party's career and in our country's history, this Convention sends greeting to the people of the United States and assures them that the party of Jefferson and Jackson is still the champion of popular government and equality before the law. As proof of our fidelity to the people we hereby declare ourselves opposed to the nomination of any candidate for President who is the representative of or under obligations to J. Pierpont Morgan, Thomas F. Ryan, August Belmont or any other member of the privilege-hunting and favor-seeking class; and be it further Resolved that we demand the withdrawal from this Convention of any delegate or delegates constituting or representing the above named interests.

Mr. Morgan is a Republican. Mr. Ryan and Mr. Belmont are Democrats, the first a delegate in the Baltimore convention from Virginia and the other a delegate there from New York. Objection being made to immediate consideration of the resolution, Mr. Bryan moved to suspend the rules [requiring a two-thirds vote] and adopt the resolution. A point of order being raised by Governor Gilchrist of Florida that the convention had no right to take the action proposed, Chairman James ruled that the convention had this right, and thereupon the debate proceeded. Mr. Bryan said:

This is an extraordinary resolution, but extraordinary conditions need extraordinary remedies. We are now engaged in the conduct of a convention that will place before this country the Democratic nominee, and I assume that every delegate in this convention is here because he wants that nominee elected. And it is in order that we may advance the cause of our candidate that I present this resolution. There are questions of which a court takes judicial notice, and there are subjects upon which

*See Public of June 14, page 564.

we can assume that the American people are informed, and there is not a delegate in this convention who does not know that an effort is being made right now to sell the Democratic party into bondage to the predatory interests of this country. It is the most brazen, the most insolent, the most impudent attempt that has been made in the history of American politics to dominate a convention, stifle the honest sentiment of a people and make the nominee the bond slave of the men who exploit the people of this country. I need not tell you that J. Pierpont Morgan and Thomas F. Ryan and August Belmont are three of the men who are connected with the great money trusts of this country, who are as despotic in their rule of the business of the country and as merciless in their command of their slaves as any man in the country. Some one has said that we have no right to discuss the delegates who come here from a sovereign State. I reply that if these men are willing to insult 6,500,000 Democrats we ought to speak out against them and let them know we resent the insult. I for one am not willing that Thomas F. Ryan and August Belmont shall come here with their paid attorneys and seek secret counsel with the managers of the party. No sense of politeness or courtesy to such men will keep me from protecting my party from the disgrace that they inflict upon it. Now, my friends, I cannot speak for you. You have your own responsibility. But if this is to be a convention run by these men, if our nominee is to be their representative and tool, I pray you to give us, who represent constituencies that do not want this, a chance to go on record with our protest against it. If any of you are willing to nominate a candidate who represents these men, or who is under obligation to these men, do it and take the responsibility. I refuse to take that responsibility. Some have said that we haven't a right to demand the withdrawal of delegates from this convention. I will make you a proposition. One of these men sits with New York and the other sits with Virginia. I make you this proposition. If the State of New York will take a poll of its vote, and a majority of them—not Mr. Murphy, but a majority of the delegates—I repeat that if New York would, on roll call, where her delegates can have their names recorded and printed, ask for the withdrawal of the name of Mr. Belmont, and if Virginia will on roll call protest against the withdrawal of Mr. Ryan, I will then withdraw the last part of the resolution.

Congressman Flood of Virginia, the man who in a fight against Progressives led by Henry St. George Tucker, had covertly engineered Thomas F. Ryan's selection as a delegate, was the first to reply to Mr. Bryan. "In the name of the sovereign State of Virginia," he said, "I accept the insolent proposition made by the only man in this convention who wants to destroy Democratic success." Senator Vardaman of Mississippi and Delegate Price of Virginia opposed the second part of the resolution (which, because it trenched technically upon the rights of States, Mr. Bryan had offered to withdraw if requested by the New York and the Virginia delegations) but favored the first part.

After further desultory debate and much disorder Mr. Bryan closed as follows:

I do not intend that any delegate shall shield his negative vote against the principal part of this resolution by hiding behind the last part. I intend that the men who think that the first part of this resolution is either wrong or unnecessary shall have a chance to say so on roll call, and in answer to the argument of the gentleman from West Virginia that this question ought not to be up now for fear it will disturb harmony, I present him the Bible doctrine, and I challenge him to deny it if he can—the Bible doctrine, "if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off." I am sure that if it is worth while to cut off the right hand to save the body it is worth while to cut off Morgan and Ryan and Belmont to save the Democratic party. It is not necessary for me to defend my own Democracy. My friends, my reputation as a Democrat will not be worth defending whenever it becomes necessary to defend it against a charge made by a friend of Thomas F. Ryan's. I now withdraw the second part of the resolution.

Lewis Nixon of New York and several other Reactionary delegates protested against Mr. Bryan's being allowed to withdraw any part of the resolution, demanding a vote on it as a whole, but the Chair ruled that the author could perfect it as he chose. The question was then put on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, and the roll call began. Alabama led off with a solid vote in the negative, but as the voting proceeded, signs of a sufficient affirmative majority grew and the tactics of the opposition were changed. Alabama and some other reactionary delegations thereupon changed their vote to the affirmative. New York's vote was unanimous in the affirmative, apparently for tactical purposes. The final result was 899 for suspending the rules and adopting Mr. Bryan's resolution with the demand for expulsion of delegates omitted, and only 196 in the negative. So the resolution thus altered was carried by more than the requisite two-thirds. When this result had been announced, Mr. Bryan said:

This vote eliminates all of the reactionaries, and if the convention puts up a Progressive platform and our candidate secures such a reorganization of the national committee as to make that organization worthy of the confidence of the country, we can enter upon a winning campaign. There are some things which I think it would be wise for the candidate to do, but they need not be announced until his nomination.



Nominations of candidates for the Presidency followed immediately upon the adoption of Bryan's significant resolution, the call of States for this purpose beginning at 11 o'clock at night on the 27th. Alabama, by John W. Bankhead, nominated Oscar W. Underwood of Alabama; Arizona yielded to Missouri, and through Senator Reed Missouri nominated Champ Clark; Connecticut nominated

Simeon E. Baldwin through Henry Wade Rogers; Indiana nominated Thomas R. Marshall through Senator Shively; New Jersey nominated Woodrow Wilson through John W. Wescott; Ohio nominated Judson Harmon, through M. A. Dougherty. Through S. J. Boyle, Governor Burke released the North Dakota delegation from supporting him. The roll call began at 6:42 in the morning of the 28th and came to an indecisive end at 7:06, no candidate having two-thirds of the convention. Following is the vote:

First Ballot.—Clark, 440½; Wilson, 324; Harmon, 148; Underwood, 117½; Marshall, 31; Baldwin, 22; Sulzer, 2; Bryan, 1.

Necessary to choice, 728.



An adjournment having been taken on the morning of the 28th until 4 in the afternoon, the convention, upon assembling at that hour, remained in session (except for an intermission early in the evening) until 3:30 on the morning of the 29th. During that session eleven ballots were taken, making twelve in all. There was no great change from the first ballot until the tenth, when the New York delegation by a vote of 81 for Clark to 8 for Wilson transferred its entire support of 90 votes from Harmon to Clark under the unit rule, thereby making the ballot as follows:

Tenth Ballot.—Clark, 556; Wilson, 350½; Harmon, 31; Underwood, 117½; Marshall, 0; Baldwin, 31; Bryan, 1; Kern, 1.

Following is the final ballot of the session ending at 3:30 a. m. on the 29th:

Twelfth Ballot.—Clark, 547½; Wilson, 354; Harmon, 29; Underwood, 123; Marshall, 30; Kern, 1; Bryan, 1; not voting, 2½.

Necessary for a choice two-thirds of the total of 1088, being 728.

According to the dispatches, Mr. Bryan, though still counted for Speaker Clark under instructions, was supporting Governor Wilson with his personal influence.



The balloting on the 29th ran from the thirteenth to the twenty-sixth, inclusive, and there was no intermission from the assembling of the convention at 1 o'clock in the afternoon until its recess at 11 o'clock at night. Until the fourteenth ballot there was no significant change from the tenth, when New York's delegation had transferred its united support from Harmon to Clark; but after Bryan's explanation in the course of the fourteenth ballot, the vote for Clark steadily declined and that for Wilson steadily rose, New York supporting Clark under the unit rule until the last ballot of the day. Mr. Bryan's explanation, read by him from the rostrum, was as follows:

Nebraska is a progressive State. Only twice has

she given her vote for a Democratic candidate for President, in 1896 and 1908, and on both occasions her vote was cast for a Progressive ticket running upon a Progressive platform. Between these two elections, the election of 1904, she gave a Republican plurality of 85,000 against a Democratic reactionary. In the recent primary the total vote cast for Clark and Wilson was over 34,000, and the vote cast for Harmon was something over 12,000, showing that the party is now more than three-fourths Progressive. The Republican party of Nebraska is progressive in about the same proportion. And the situation in Nebraska is not materially different from the situation throughout the country west of the Alleghenies. In the recent Republican primaries fully two-thirds of the Republican vote was cast for candidates representing Progressive policies. In this convention the Progressive sentiment is overwhelming. Every candidate has proclaimed himself a Progressive. No candidate would have any considerable following in this convention if he admitted himself out of harmony with progressive ideas. By your resolution, adopted night before last, you, by a vote of more than four to one, pledged the country that you would nominate for the Presidency no man who represented or was obligated to Morgan, Ryan, Belmont, or any other member of the privilege-seeking, favor-hunting class. This pledge, if kept, will have more influence on the result of the election than the platform or the name of the candidate. How can that pledge be made effective? There is but one way—namely: to nominate a candidate who is under no obligation to those whom these influences directly or indirectly control. The vote of the State of New York in this convention as cast under the unit rule does not represent the intelligence, the virtue, the Democracy, or the patriotism of the ninety men who are here. It represents the will of one man—Charles F. Murphy—and he represents the influences that dominated the Republican convention at Chicago and are trying to dominate this convention. If we nominate a candidate under conditions that enable these influences to say to our candidate, "Remember now thy creator," we cannot hope to appeal to the confidence of the Progressive Democrats and Republicans of the nation. Nebraska, or that portion of the delegation for which I am authorized to speak, is not willing to participate in the nomination of any man who is willing to violate the resolution adopted by this convention and accept the high honor of the Presidential nomination at the hands of Mr. Murphy. When we were instructed for Mr. Clark the Democratic voters who instructed us did so with the distinct understanding that Mr. Clark stood for progressive Democracy. Mr. Clark's representatives appealed for support on no other ground. They contended that Mr. Clark was more progressive than Mr. Wilson, and indignantly denied that there was any cooperation between Mr. Clark and the reactionary element of the party. Upon no other condition could Mr. Clark have received a plurality of the Democratic vote of Nebraska. The thirteen delegates from whom I speak stand ready to carry out the instructions given in the spirit in which they were given and upon the conditions under which they were given; but some of these delegates will not participate in the nomination of any men—I can-

not say for how many I can speak, for I have not had a chance to make a poll—but some of these delegates will not participate in the nomination of any whose nomination depends upon the vote of the New York delegation. Speaking for myself and for any of the delegation who may decide to join me, I withhold my vote from Mr. Clark as long as New York's vote is recorded for him. And the position that I take in regard to Mr. Clark I will take in regard to any other candidate whose name is now or may be before the convention. I shall not be a party to the nomination of any man, no matter who he may be, or from what section of the country he comes, who will not, when elected, be absolutely free to carry out the anti-Morgan-Ryan-Belmont resolution and make his administration reflect the wishes and the hopes of those who believe in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. If we nominate a candidate who is under no obligation to these interests which speak through Mr. Murphy, I shall offer a resolution authorizing and directing the Presidential candidate to select a campaign committee to manage the campaign in order that he may not be compelled to suffer the humiliation and act under the embarrassment that I have in having men participate in the management of his campaign who had no sympathy with the party's aims and in whose Democracy the general public has no confidence. Now having explained the position taken by myself and those in the delegation who view the subject from the same standpoint, I announce my vote.

To his written statement, and in concluding the discussion his statement had precipitated, Mr. Bryan added:

Now I am prepared to announce my vote. With the understanding that I shall stand ready to withdraw my vote from the one for whom I am going to cast it, whenever New York casts her vote for him, I cast my vote for Nebraska's second choice, Gov. Wilson.

Mr. Bryan was supported by 11 others out of the 16 Nebraska delegates until the nineteenth ballot, when the change to Wilson in this delegation rose from 12 to 13. It rose to 14 on the twenty-third ballot and remained at that point throughout the remainder of the session. The totals on the first and the last ballots of this day are appended:

Thirteenth Ballot.—Clark, 554½; Wilson, 356; Harmon, 29; Underwood, 115½; Marshall, 30; Bryan, 1; and Foss, 2.

Twenty-sixth Ballot.—Clark, 463½; Wilson, 407½; Harmon, 29; Underwood, 112½; Marshall, 30; Bryan, 1; Foss, 43.

The large increase in Governor Foss's vote began with the twenty-second ballot, when the Massachusetts delegation voted for him as a unit, their 36 votes with other changes giving him a total of 45, which had fallen to 43 on the twenty-sixth ballot by the defection of 2 Massachusetts votes to Wilson. At 11 o'clock at night the convention took a recess until 11 o'clock a. m., of Monday, the 1st of July.

Sunday's interval was marked on the one hand by a published protest from Speaker Clark and a response by Mr. Bryan. Speaker Clark made his protest in the form of a letter to William J. Stone, chairman of the Missouri delegation, in reply to one from Senator Stone, who had declared with reference to the two-thirds rule that it "was abrogated by practice long ago," for—

whenever during the last sixty years a candidate has received a majority of the votes his title to the nomination has been recognized and has been ratified immediately by the addition of a sufficient number to meet the technical requirement of two-thirds. The precedent made during all these years has become a party law as binding in morals and in equity as if it were a written statute.

The Stone letter called for an assurance to the Missouri delegation that Mr. Clark would under no circumstances permit his name to be withdrawn, they pledging themselves thereupon to vote for him on every ballot. In his reply, Mr. Clark said that "if a majority of the delegates had not declared their preference for him "as their candidate" he could not entertain Mr. Stone's proposal, but under the circumstances he wished Mr. Stone to—

say to my friends that I accept with deepest gratitude their renewed assurances of loyalty and now declare without qualification that my name will remain before the convention, subject to no trade or dicker, until two-thirds of the delegates shall ratify or refuse to ratify the action of the majority.

In the course of his letter Speaker Clark said:

It is undoubtedly true that the custom of our party was violated when the convention refrained from ratifying by a two-thirds vote the expressed wish of the majority. This was done, according to my understanding, at the instigation of Mr. Bryan. . . . Although Mr. Bryan's words are shrewdly chosen to avoid making a direct charge upon me, the implication is plain. It is that, if elected President of the United States, I would consider myself "obligated" to those whom he mentions and that I would be "under the control of those influences." It would be unbecoming in one holding my present official position to express the indignation which I feel at these veiled aspersions upon my character. . . . As Speaker of the House of Representatives, as a lifelong Democrat, proud of my party; as an American, I pronounce Mr. Bryan's implied accusations both false and infamous.

Following are the essential parts of Mr. Bryan's statement, over his signature in his Virgil V. McNitt Syndicate letter of the 30th, as it appeared in the Chicago Tribune of the 1st:

The same influences which at Chicago defied popular sentiment in the Republican party were here in force. I found that, having defeated the Progressive program at Chicago, they were bent upon defeating it here. Here cunning was substituted for boldness, and the Progressive brand was being used to mask the real character of the work outlined. . . . It distressed me to have to do anything that might

result in injury to the political fortunes of Mr. Clark. I have known him for eighteen years, rejoiced in his selection as minority leader, and a year and a half ago regarded him as more likely than any one else to fit into the conditions in so far as I could then estimate them. If he had made good use of the opportunity he had, he would have been nominated by acclamation, but instead of leading the Progressive element of the party—the element with which he had always been identified—he became impressed with the idea that his special duty was to harmonize the two elements of the party and prevent any break in the ranks. The leader and the harmonizer are two entirely different persons, and Mr. Clark chose to be the latter. There are times when the harmonizer is the most available candidate, but the situation is different just now. The country is alive with Progressive ideas and Progressivism has not been defeated at Chicago. Two or three million Republicans are following the proceedings of this convention and waiting to see whether they can use the Democratic party for the rebuking of stand-pat Republicanism or be forced to organize a new party. Mr. Clark's first mistake was in attempting to overlook the radical difference which exists in the Democratic party between the Progressives and Reactionaries. His second was in selecting managers who sought to advance his cause by manipulation rather than by that candid appeal which befits the present hour. . . . There is too much at stake to risk defeat, as we would risk defeat if we had to spend the campaign in explaining how a candidate could owe his nomination to predatory interests without danger to his administration. Mr. Clark's friends spurn the thought of his being influenced by such support, but they forget that the mass of the people cannot know Mr. Clark personally, as his intimate friends do. I know him well enough to have confidence in his high purpose and in his good intent, as I have in the purpose and intent of other candidates. I believe that he would try to carry out the people's will, but few, if indeed any, can entirely fortify themselves against the unscrupulous influence exerted by favors received. We do not allow judges to accept favors from litigants and the President continually acts as an arbiter between the organized and the unorganized masses. But even if we could feel certain that the securing of a Presidential nomination by the aid of those directly connected with the exploiting class would have no influence whatever upon Mr. Clark's official conduct, we could not possibly hope to impart this confidence to millions of voters who, not enjoying the personal acquaintance of Mr. Clark, would have to rely upon newspaper reports, and it must be remembered that in the contested States the Republicans have five to one, if not ten to one, the advantage of us. I announced that we would withhold our vote from Mr. Clark so long as New York supported him, and that we would apply the same rule to other candidates; that is, that we would not enter into partnership with Wall street.

In another statement on the 30th Mr. Bryan thus explained his meaning regarding the New York delegation:

New York is not necessary to a nomination, and

under the circumstances should not be permitted to dictate the nomination. When I say "dictate" I mean that no candidate should be nominated unless he has the necessary votes without counting New York's votes. I do not mean to say that the vote of New York would vitiate a nomination if the candidate had enough votes to nominate him without New York, for in that case the party would not be under obligation to Mr. Murphy for his nomination; but if Mr. Murphy furnished the votes necessary to carry the candidate across the line and give him this position of distinguished honor and importance, the candidate who accepts the nomination under these circumstances puts himself under obligations to Mr. Murphy and to the influences which speak through and control him, and I contend that a candidate so obligated would not appeal to the confidence of the public and would not, if successful at the election, be free to serve the public with singleness of purpose.

In the latter statement Mr. Bryan named Senator Kern of Indiana, Senator James of Kentucky, Senator O'Gorman of New York, Senator Culberson of Texas and Senator Rayner of Maryland as suitable candidates, saying that—

if either Mr. Clark or Mr. Wilson will announce his willingness to rely entirely upon the Progressive vote, and his determination not to accept the nomination if given under conditions which would obligate him to Mr. Murphy, there is no reason why the convention should not agree on one of these.

With reference to Speaker Clark and Governor Wilson, Mr. Bryan added:

Both have made records which commend them to the confidence of the Democrats of the country; but no record of past achievement, however good, is sufficient to save a man from censure if in order to receive the nomination he is willing to blind his eyes to the bribe of office which the privileged class usually dangles before the ambitious. If the feeling that has been aroused between the two leading candidates is such that the Progressive forces cannot agree upon either—I contend that there should be no such feeling—it ought to be easy to agree upon such third person, who, not having been a candidate, is not handicapped by animosities engendered by an adverse verdict at the Democratic convention and primaries.



When the Convention resumed its sessions at 11:15 a. m., on the 1st, the first ballot (the 27th of the convention) showed no great changes. It was as follows:

Twenty-seventh Ballot.—Clark, 469; Wilson, 406½; Underwood, 112; Marshall, 30; Harmon, 29; Foss, 38.

Wilson's vote rose on the 28th ballot to 437½ through transfers from Marshall by the Indiana delegation; and on the 30th it was 460 to Clark's 455, the first ballot on which it took the lead. On the 31st ballot Wilson's vote was 446½ to 475½ for Clark. The total vote at 3:30 in the

afternoon, when the convention took a recess until 8 o'clock was as follows:

Thirty-fourth Ballot.—Clark, 447½; Wilson, 479½; Underwood, 101½; Foss, 28; Kern, 2.

Upon reassembling at 8 in the evening of the 1st, the first ballot showed the following results:

Thirty-Fifth Ballot.—Clark, 433½; Wilson, 494½; Underwood, 101½; Harmon, 29; Kern, 1; Foss, 28.

Throughout the night's session, Clark's vote fell to 422 on the 39th ballot and rose to 430 on the 42nd, while Wilson's rose to 501½ on the 39th but fell to 494 on the 42nd. The final ballot of this day's session was as follows:

Forty-Second Ballot.—Clark, 430; Wilson, 494; Underwood, 104; Harmon, 27; Gaynor, 1; Foss, 28; Bryan, ½; James, 1; Kern, 1; J. Hamilton, Lewis, 1; not voting, ½.

At 43 minutes past midnight of the 1st the result of the 42nd ballot was announced and the convention adjourned until 12 o'clock noon of the 2nd. It was at this time reported that Bryan had under consideration a plan for a recess until August and nation-wide preferential primaries in the interval.

This is the longest Presidential convention ever held except the Democratic convention of 1860, at Charleston, wherein slavery problems ended the old political regime of that time. Douglas had a majority, but not two-thirds, and the convention split. One faction subsequently nominated Douglas at Baltimore, and the other Breckinridge.

Regina Nearly Destroyed.

Regina, capital of the Province of Saskatchewan in western Canada, a city of 30,000 inhabitants, was struck by a tornado at 6 o'clock on the evening of the 30th, and nearly swept away. The number of dead is variously estimated at from 50 to 400, and the property loss is roughly put at \$10,000,000. The parliament house, just finished at a cost of \$2,000,000, built of steel and concrete, was badly shaken and damaged. Warehouses, retail stores, banks, and the houses of the finest residence district, were turned into masses of wreckage. Automobiles filled with people were hurled high in the air and deposited blocks away. Other cities in the Province suffered, among them Qu'Appelle and Melville.

Tax Reform in Ontario.

Preliminary steps have been taken to secure the submission of a by-law on tax reform to the people of Toronto at the New Year elections, the Civic Legislation and Reception Committee hav-

ing unanimously carried the following resolution, on motion of Controller McCarthy:

That the Board of Control be instructed to report funds to enable the Assessment Commissioner to make a full report on the subject of tax reform, and that he be permitted to visit the cities necessary to give him the information required.

The resolution was introduced by Controller Church, who asked that legislation be sought to permit the assessment of land at a higher figure than improvements.

Sex Hygiene.

At the convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs at San Francisco on the 26th, the committee on the teaching of sex hygiene, of the department of education, submitted the following conclusions from the facts it has gathered:

(1.) That it is generally conceded by educators, physicians, and social workers that there is urgent need for personal and sex hygiene instructions in our schools. (2.) That such instructions should be grounded in biology. (3.) That it should include more than mere physical facts. (4.) That it is dangerous to introduce it into elementary and secondary schools until it is required in normal schools and teachers are carefully selected and prepared for the work. (5.) The instruction should be given to parents and gradually to the general public. (6.) That popular prejudice against such instruction is rapidly disappearing. (7.) That such instruction is essential to eradicating the social evil and controlling disease.

Mexico.

The Orozco revolution seems to be losing ground. The movement in Sinaloa is said to be dead. [See current volume, page 543.]

One of the plans evolved by the Madero government through its department of public welfare, colonization and industry, to provide arable lands for division among the people—one of the chief planks of Madero's revolutionary platform—according to a dispatch of the 22d, is now under way. This plan contemplates the drainage and filling in of the great shallow bed of Lake Texcoco, some two and a half miles east of the City of Mexico. The work will require five years, it is estimated, and an expenditure of \$2,000,000. Thousands of acres of waste land, now partly covered with water to the depth of two feet, and the remainder either useless swamp or dry, sandy stretches, the latter giving rise to the frequent dust storms which sweep the capital in the dry season, are to be reclaimed. This land, according to plans which are being worked out, is to be placed on sale to individual Mexicans at the lowest possible figure and on long-term payments. [See vol. xiv, p. 933.]