MR. BRYAN LINES UP 299 VOTES AGAINST 647

BRYAN IS VOTED DOWN ON ILLINOIS CONTESTS

Convention Rejects His Minority Report and Adopts the Majority Document After a Bitter Speech by the Nebraskan Against the Hopkins Men---Mr. Menzies, of the Credentials Committee, Makes a Spirited Reply

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 7.—The report of the committee on credentials says:

In those states and territories where no contests have been filed, we carefully examined the original credentials of the delegates and alternates, and find the same to have been correctly certified to the chairman of the national committee and the roster as presented by the chairman and secretary and submitted to this convention for its temporary organization is correct and accurate, and we unanimously recommend its adoption by this convention.

The committee says it gave all the time it could to the hearing of contests and after mentioning the contests in various states says:

In Illinois the several contesting congressional districts were asked to settle upon their representatives to speak for all the contests in that state.

After such consideration it was possible to give under these circumstances your committee report that in each of the following contests that the delegations as named by the national committee are entitled to seats as the regularly accredited delegates and alternates to this convention, viz: The District of Columbia, the First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth districts of Pennsylvania; the entire delegation from South Dakota; the Twelfth district in Ohio; the Eleventh district in New Jersey; the Second district in Maine; the First, Second, Sixth, Seventh, Ninth and Tenth districts in the delegation at large from Indiana.

Fight in Illinois

In the matter of contest in the Second, Third, Sixth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Eighteenth, Twenty-third and Twenty-fifth, and the seats of Ben S. Cable and John P. Hopkins from the state at large, in Illinois, your committee recommend that the delegations as named by the national committee are entitled to seats in this convention as the regularly accredited delegates and alternates. In the matter of the contest from the Twenty-first district of the state of Illinois, your committee reports that the names of Alfred Orendorf and A. Bearman as delegates, and J. M. Shumway and Jessie F. Griffin as alternates, are entitled to seats in this convention as the properly accredited delegates and alternates.

In the matter of the delegate to this convention from the state of North Dakota who was killed in a railway accident on his way to St. Louis, Jacob G. Birder, it appears that the alternate of said Birder, Frank O. Myrick, has given to Thomas R. Shaw his proxy to represent him at the convention, which proxy was filed with your committee. We recommend that said proxy be recognized and that said Thomas R. Shaw be received as the properly accredited representative in this convention.

In the matter of representation which the island of Porto Rico and the Philippine islands shall have in this convention, your committee recommends that each of said islands be accredited with six delegates and six alternates, and that the names of Charles M. Boerman, Hubert E. Shafer, D. M. Field, Miguil Sales, Dr. A. H. Molina and H. P. Leake, as delegates from Porto Rico be entitled to seats in the convention as the regularly accredited delegates, and that from the Philippine islands Oscar Sutro, W. D. Wisdom, Hugh Bonner, Judge A. C. Carson, Berry Baldwin and C. W. O'Brien as delegates, and that William N. Swarthout, Victor Delpan, D. W. Yancy, L. J. Lambert, J. M. Coin and T. Hodgson, as alternates, be admitted to seats in convention as the regularly accredited delegates and alternates.

Bryan's Minority Report

The minority report that Mr. Bryan moved as a substitute for the majority report began thus:

Illinois has a state central committee with one John P. Hopkins at its head. Finding itself in the minority in the state convention, said committee deliberately planned to override the Democratic vote of the state and secured by fraud and intimidation a majority of the delegates to the national convention. To this end they brought contests in a number of the districts outside of those controlled by the said committee, and placed their own men upon the temporary roll call of the convention.

Then they had a credentials committee made up, and as far as possible had the district members of the credentials committee taken from the contestants whom they had seated. This credentials committee, without intention to go into the merits of the contest, seated the Hopkins delegates in every instance. The minority of the committee on credentials presented a report, but Mr. Quinn, the chairman of the convention, declared that the minority report was only advisory and would be filed for record. He then put the vote upon the majority report and declared it carried and refused a roll call, although it was then and there demanded.

Presentation of Evidence

In the hearing before the credentials committee of this Democratic national convention but a very limited amount of time was allowed for the consideration of this contest, so short a time that it was impossible to present the evidence to the committee, the time being consumed in the arguments made by the attorneys for the contestants and contestees, but the evidence as a matter of record was presented before the subcommittee of the national committee on Monday, July 4.

The report says that the contestants supported their case by hundreds of affidavits and hundreds of pages of documentary evidence, but that the contestees offered no affidavits and no documentary evidence except the report of the convention officers, and no evidence at all but their own unsupported oral statements.

The report then goes into a detailed analysis of all the testimony offered on behalf of the contestees, especially as concerned primary elections in the Second, Third and Ninth congressional districts. Mr. Bryan also entered into a summary of testimony concerning primaries in the Sixth, Tenth, Eleventh and Twelfth congressional districts, pointing out in some of the primaries, as he affirmed, the unjust treatment to which the majorities had been subjected.

"Under all the circumstances," he said, "the minority believe that it is imperatively necessary that this convention shall repudiate the outrageous action of the convention of Illinois. To do otherwise is to disregard the principles of the Democratic party."

The report recommended that the contestees be seated from the Second, Third, Ninth, Twelfth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Twenty-third and Twenty-fifth congressional districts, joining with the majority in seating the delegates from the Twenty-first district.

Bryan Speaks Bitterly

Mr. Bryan said in support of his minority report:

I came to this convention in the hope that we would be able to agree on platform, on candidates and have nothing to stir the feelings or rouse contention. I still hope that we shall be able to agree upon a platform that will represent the sentiments of all of us; that we can present it to the country as the platform of a united party. I will go further than that. I still hope that we shall be able to present to the country a ticket behind which can stand a united party.

And I regret that I am compelled to come in at this time and present a subject upon which your votes will be asked. But if there is one Democratic principle more fundamental than another, it is the right of a majority to rule. If you destroy the binding force of that principle there is nothing that can hold a party together. And, my friends, it is because I want the Democratic party to stand on that Jeffersonian principle of majority rule that I come here and present the minority report in this case.

In Illinois the majority was not allowed to rule. That convention was dominated by a clique of men who deliberately, purposely, boldly trampled upon the rights of the people of Illinois. The evidence shows that no band of train robbers ever planned a robbery upon a train more deliberately or with less conscience than they did, and these men who planned it and who carried it out, have the audacity, the impudence and the insolence to say that because they certify that what they did was regular, you cannot go behind their certificate.

Compares With Train Robbers

If that is good law in a Democratic convention it ought to be good doctrine in a court, and if good doctrine in a court then the only thing that train robbers will have to do in the future is to certify over their own signatures that it was a voluntary collection taken up for religious purposes, and deny you the right to go behind the returns.

They tell you that the law of the party in Illinois permits the state committee to present the chairman, and they deny the right of the convention to override the wishes of the chairman. Such a doctrine would be undemocratic if true, for such a doctrine would permit a past committee to fasten itself upon a new convention and dominate a new set of delegates.

But that is not all, for John P. Hopkins, two years ago, the same chairman of the same committee, presented the recommendation of the committee and asked a vote upon it and submitted it to the convention. Two years ago he recognized the right of the Democrats in the state convention to elect their temporary chairman. This time he did not dare to do it, for if he had done it he would have been repudiated by the convention there assembled. The minority presented a minority report as it wanted to, but as the chairman of the committee Mr. Hopkins brought Mr. Quinn up to the convention platform and handing him the gavel, said that he was the chairman of the convention, and Mr. Quinn, seizing the gavel, began his rule of tyranny, despotism and unfairness.

Shut Out Report

Then they had their state committee put on the roll the delegates whom they wanted, but when the credentials committee brought in a minority report he refused to consider it, he refused to allow a report upon it. And yet, in spite of the fact that that convention was not allowed to act upon its own credentials, was not allowed to decide the merits of its own delegates, yet, with all they stated, they did not seat enough, for more than half of the men actually seated by the Hopkins committee have signed petitions asking that they be sent back home and that Democrats who represent the people of that state be substituted for them in this convention.

In the hearing before the committee it was asked why did not they present a minority report in the committee appointed to select delegates at large? Well, there was a contest in that committee. This was opposition to Hopkins and Cable, but why would you expect that a minority report would be filed? Why should they expect it, when they had already held that a minority report was only advisory and could be put into the waste basket and need not be acted upon?

They are estopped from asking why a minority report was not filed. They made no attempt, they declared no purpose to substitute delegates for the various districts, and, today we admit in the report that if they had openly intended to substitute other men for the men selected by the districts they might have done so, but to do so it would have to be the act of the convention. The convention never attempted it.

Declares It a Fraud

The convention was not asked to do it, and the evidence shows that the resolution that is a part of the record and upon which they relied was never introduced, was never passed, but is a fraud pure and simple presented here to this convention today.

Now what is the duty of the Democratic convention? The Democrats of Illinois are not like the Democrats of the South. Down South the Democrats have all the local officials and they can reward their members for their loyalty to the party. Up in Illinois there is a strong Republican party and the Democrats in Illinois are in many parts of the state struggling against overwhelming odds, but they are actuated by love of principle, not by hope of office.

But will you declare that the action of that convention is right? Will you support the methods employed? If they had a majority of the convention, why did they not permit a roll call? Why would they deny it if they had the votes there? Men do not go wrong as a rule unless they think it is necessary to carry out some object, and the only way that you can decide that the men did wrong unnecessarily is to decide that they were so perverted in conscience that they did wrong from choice rather than from necessity.

Their whole conduct shows that their purpose was conceived in sin, born in iniquity and carried out to the destruction of Democratic hopes in that state. Give the Democrats in Illinois something to vote for. Do not tell them that when they go to a Democratic convention they must go armed, prepare to fight their way up to the chairman. Let the Republican party stand as a representative of physical force, if it will. Our party stands for government by the consent of the governed.

Might Have Bolted

What could they do? They could either resist the force and risk the killing that would result, or you say they could bolt. Yes, three-fourths of the convention could have gotten up and walked out and left one-fourth in charge as the regular convention. They hoped for a roll call. They knew that whenever they could get a roll call they could assert their rights. They only had this one roll call, and when the convention was over these men had to submit to the decision of the Democratic minority of Illinois. These men ask this convention to seat the men who have the right to seats from the districts as shown by a majority of the votes.

They don't ask you to seat any one man; they don't ask you to seat any set of men. They do not ask you to seat Hearst men, Parker men or anybody's men. That convention was so open that two of the men who had been out and had made a canvass in the state for governor refused to be candidates before that convention, and I honor J. J. Prentiss, of Chicago, and Myer Crolius. I honor these men, who refused to go out as candidates of that convention, and if Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable had any respect for the rights to rule, they would have been ashamed to be here, the representatives of a minority.

But if they have not learned to be ashamed to misrepresent a great state, you ought to teach them that they cannot do it with the approval of the Democratic party of the United States. Not their sin rests upon these men. You do not bear it. But when you, if you do, decide to seat these men, these delegates from the districts, against the evidence presented in regard to the contestants from the districts and these two national delegates, in spite of the protests of 871 members—if you do that then you take from the shoulders of Hopkins and Quinn and Cable the odium that they do bear and put it upon the Democratic party of the nation.

You have not this condition in other states today, but let this convention indorse this principle and this convention will see more than one state here as the result of gavel rule. And it is because this question transcends the interests of any state or any candidate or any faction that I am here to present the minority report and to ask you to do to the Democrats of Illinois that justice that this gang denied them, deliberately and insolently.

Menzies Answers Bryan

Mr. Menzies, of Indiana, said:

It would be vain, indeed, on my part, to attempt to cope with the oratory of the gentleman from Nebraska, but in the facts of this case I think I have a peculiar advantage over him. I heard the facts last night as a member of the committee on credentials. He was conspicuous by his absence. If he had been present I am sure he would bear cheerful witness that that committee exercised patience, industry and fairness in attempting to arrive at a just conclusion in the case of the contest from the state of Illinois. The delegates now seated from Illinois came into this convention with credentials duly authorized by the constituted authorities of the party in Illinois.

After the certificates of the sitting delegation from Illinois were filed with the national committee, contests were filed. These contests were referred to a subcommittee of the national committee, who gave them a long and a patient hearing. After being passed upon by the subcommittee its action was indorsed by the full committee and the case was passed to the final court of appeals of the Democratic party to this convention, which sent it to its committee on credentials.

Not a Court of Appeals

The gentleman from Nebraska dealt in strong language and positive assertion, I think, unsupported by facts or evidence. I would like to know, however, great as he is, what has constituted him a court of appeals to pass on a contest in Illinois, and wherein his wisdom is superior to that of the committee on credentials of this convention. Great as he is, he is not so wise that he can know a case without ever having heard it.

Now, let us get right down to the heart of this contention—the very pith of the controversy, and it is primarily whether the action of the constituted authorities of the Democratic party of Illinois is to be trampled upon by bare assertions of fraud, unsupported by evidence, and whether the regular action of the duly chosen and elected convention of the party, acting under the forms of law established by the party, is to be ignored for matters of pique, chagrin and disappointment.

Discusses Gavel Rule

Something has been said about gavel rule, a new figure of speech in political nomenclature. The objection has been made to the action and conduct of the temporary chairman of the state convention of Illinois. I want to tell you right here an undisputed fact—that that gentleman was elected as temporary chairman at 10 o'clock and the convention assembled at high noon.

He was unanimously re-elected chairman at 5:30 p. m. and during all this interval of time he was guilty of all the political sins known to the calendar.

The same convention that elected Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable delegates at large, who are challenged here, nominated a state ticket, without a protest as to its regularity or its right to do so. That same convention chose presidential electors, which the contestants here recognize as the valid bona fide electoral ticket of Illinois.

Now, something has been said here about 871—I think that was the number of protests, but nobody, if I understood the gentleman from Nebraska, gainsaid the 871 protests. If he had been present as your committee was last night he would have heard letters read from those so-called protestants; he would have heard telegrams read denying the right of anybody to put their names on the protests. It is a remarkable fact that this pronounced specimen of ex parte evidence was never submitted to the contestants or their attorneys in this case. Not one of them ever had the privilege of looking into or examining any of those protests.

No Protests Heard

I am authoritatively told—by the chairman of your committee—they were never heard of, before any organized tribunal, until at half past 11 o'clock last night, when we took up the contests from Illinois. No protests against the right of Mr. Hopkins or Mr. Cable was ever heard until last Saturday when the national committee assembled in this city. During all this interval of time—nearly four weeks—not a protest was heard against the right of the delegates at large from Illinois to sit in this convention.

Now, gentlemen, the main question, the very pith of the controversy, is whether the constituted authorities of the party, acting on forms of political procedure, established by the party, shall be recognized here, or whether a case based on ex parte evidence, upon bare assertion, without facts to support it, will be recognized as a precedent in the Democratic party. The gentleman from Nebraska forcibly said he believed in the great elementary principle of Democracy, that the majority should rule. I stand behind him and will always follow him in the advocacy of that principle, but I have been taught by that same great mind that promulgated to man that cardinal principle of freedom that the will of the majority should be ascertained in some well ordained, defined method of parliamentary procedure, and unless ascertained that way it was not the will of anybody, either the majority or minority.

Chairman Quinn Is Heard

Frank J. Quinn, who was chairman of the Illinois convention, said:

I am and always have been a Democrat who believes that the majority of the Democratic party should rule. I am so good a Democrat that I do not reserve the right to vote until after the Democratic convention. I am so good a Democrat that I never call a man a train robber and a thief unless I know the facts to be so. I am so good a Democrat that in 1896, standing upon the platform of the Democratic national convention, I stumped Illinois and hurled the lie into the teeth of Democrats and Republicans who charged that William J. Bryan was dishonest and a repudiator. In 1896 I ran for the office of recorder of my county and I was defeated, but I never assumed the right, by reason of that defeat, to nominate harbor masters, coroners and mix up in Democratic petty quarrels all over the state.

For nine long hours the national subcommittee heard contests. W. J. Bryan was there three-quarters of an hour. He was not present when this vote was heard before the committee on contests, and he read to you a brief argument of Mr. Tolman, of Chicago, who is here contesting us as attorney for the contestants.

Accuses Dunlap

This is a contest for the purpose of advancing the personal spleen of Willard Fillmore Dunlap, of Illinois, who sits here upon the stage prompting Mr. Bryan. What do you think of a man who says in order to be fair we will give each side fifteen minutes to argue this case, when he has already taken up an hour and a half in argument? I want to say to you that if Mr. Bryan wants to be fair, let him answer this question to you: Mr. Bryan, when, where and from what source came any objection to the selection of Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable? His answer will be the gavel rule. No protests will be heard.

We held our convention on the 14th day of June last. No notice of contest was ever served upon any of the men whose seats are now attacked until last Saturday. We came here without a bit of proof except what we could gather up, and came unprepared for a contest, not knowing any was contemplated or that any right to make a contest existed.

Let me tell you about gavel rule in that convention. The report of every committee was unanimous except one. Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Cable were selected by a committee of twenty-five, one from each congressional district, and the report was unanimous, and they were unanimously elected. That is gavel rule. The report of the committee on permanent organization, made at 5 o'clock, was unanimous in my favor, and I was unanimously elected the chairman of that convention, Judge Browning putting the motion.

They Are in the Saddle

We are the Democrats who believe in working at the polls, in working before elections, and in working after elections, to elect Democrats. We put in our time, we organize the counties, and the gentlemen whose seats are here contested are the men who are in the saddle, who control the party, and that delivered its electoral vote to Grover Cleveland in 1892.

The only thing that we ask of you is this: Mr. Bryan wants his personality to influence your judgment. We ask you, do you know the facts? We ask you, are you prepared to vote, or will you look for the facts to the conclusion of this committee of yours? We ask you for fair play. We ask you for fair treatment. The state of Illinois and its rights are greater than the desires or wishes of any man.

Bryan Makes Second Attack

When Mr. Quinn had concluded, Mr. Bryan made a second speech, saying:

The first speaker said I had not heard the evidence. I stayed in the subcommittee of the national committee and heard evidence until 3 o'clock in the morning, and I have heard more evidence than the gentleman who talked to you and who impeached my knowledge of this case. More than that; I have examined affidavits; I have examined protests and I know ten times as much about the facts of this case as the gentleman who dared to impeach my right to speak upon the platform.

The gentleman tries to obtain credit for the report of the national committee. The national committee referred this case to the credentials committee on the ground that the national committee did not have time to investigate the merits of the case, and in doing so said that there was evidence to show that questionable methods prevailed. In some cases the delegates selected by the district conventions were replaced by persons who had not been selected delegates from the districts and in some instances it was at least doubtful whether the substitutions were properly made. That was the report, unanimous, of your national committee after listening nine hours to the testimony. And now this committee listens two hours and does not give a chance for a single bit of evidence, but only argument, and then tells you there was no fraud and that you ought to seat these contestees.

Everything Was Unanimous

The gentleman says he was unanimously re-elected five hours after he began his gavel rule. Yes, my friends, everything done in that convention was unanimous. If you don't believe it read the sworn testimony of the highwayman who controlled the convention. The gentleman says that he is not a man who bolts or who waits until the convention decides, but the man with the gavel rule tries to force upon the state two men who bolted in 1896. These two men, who were chosen by this convention against the protests of 871 men, were the men who kept the path worn between their headquarters and Republican headquarters when hundreds of Democrats of Illinois were marching up to support the ticket.

Mr. Quinn asks where does a protest come from against John P. Hopkins, and wanted me to answer it. I will answer it. It comes from 871 better Democrats than John J. Hopkins ever was. I am willing that the men who left us should come back and be Democrats. I am willing that they shall come back and share with the party in the shaping of its destiny, but God forbid that the loyal Democrats shall by force and intimidation be made to march between the soiled banner of these men.

The minority report was rejected by a vote of 299 to 647, Illinois not voting, and the majority report was then adopted.

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

Minority Leader Who Was Given a Tremendous Personal Ovation in the Convention Yesterday

EX-SENATOR PETTIGREW

Is Seated With His Delegation in Spite of His Defiance

THIEF STEALS JEWELS FROM BISHOP'S WIFE

COOPERSTOWN, N. Y., July 7.—Fifty thousand dollars worth of jewelry belonging to Mrs. Potter, wife of Bishop Henry C. Potter, of New York, was stolen from a safe in the office of the Clark estate here.

The boxes in which the jewels had been kept were found in the cellar of the building, empty and with blood stains. The thief entered the office early in the morning and remained secreted until the office force went out to luncheon. A reward of $1,000 has been offered for the thief's arrest.

ADOPTS A BRYAN PLANK ON TARIFF

Full Committee on Resolutions Makes Change in Subcommittee's Platform

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 7.—Immediately after the full committee on resolutions convened at 8 o'clock this evening Senator Daniel, as chairman of the subcommittee, read the subcommittee's draft of a platform. The committee entered upon the consideration of the tariff plank, Senator Tillman, Mr. Bryan and others suggesting changes.

Some doubt was expressed by the gold Democrats over being able to hold their plank before the full committee.

After considerable discussion the committee adopted Bryan's tariff plank in lieu of the declaration submitted by the subcommittee. It is said to not differ materially from the latter. The Bryan plank is shorter and more direct than that of the subcommittee. It declares in effect that all tariff for protection is robbery and advocates a gradual reduction along lines that will not disturb business interests.

Senator Pettigrew presented a plank providing for government ownership of the railroads, which, he said, would cover all phases of the trust question to his satisfaction. His plank follows:

"The government should own the railroads engaged in interstate commerce and operate the same force service and not for profit so that all shippers shall pay the same rate without reference to the amount of their shipment."

The committee took up the income plank, which was opposed by Senator Hill in a speech of fifteen or twenty minutes. Senator Tillman replied, urging the incorporation of the plank in the platform. He was heartily applauded. The plank was first offered by Williams, of Mississippi, and then withdrawn. Bryan then offered a plank on the same subject, upon which occurred the discussion.

Mr. Bryan made a vigorous plea for the income tax plank, asserting that it was true Democratic doctrine.

CRANKS AT PARKER

Judge Begins Watching St. Louis Convention

ESOPUS, N. Y., July 7.—The prospect of a new railroad station at Esopus outweighed the doings of the Democratic national convention in the mind of Judge Alton B. Parker today, if one might judge from his conversation. It is a fact, however, that he watched the bulletins telephoned to his house from Kingston today with an interest which even his calm demeanor could not quite conceal. His drive this afternoon with Mrs. Parker and their little grandson was of brief duration, and some of those familiar with the judge's movements admitted that he remained rather closer at home than usual. The drive was begun in spite of an overcast sky and a light sprinkle of rain, and illustrated indirectly one of the marked characteristics of the man—his disregard of weather conditions.

Judge Parker tonight discussed the new station, but maintained his usual reserve when politics was mentioned.

Part of the judge's time today was occupied in sitting for his portrait to a New York artist. There are to be several more sittings. Judge Parker refused to say for what purpose the portrait would be used.

Letters from cranks of various kinds are beginning to make their appearance in the judge's mail. One of them received a day or two ago, purports to give him warning of a "dastardly plot" against his person, and told him to remain close at home. Another writer from Virginia, signing himself "A Lunatic," but evidently a person of intelligence, is sending a series of numbered postal cards, one a day, devoted to denunciation of the exponents of "safe and sane Democracy." The judge attached no importance to these communications. The few visitors to Rosemont today were all of personal friends, with the exception of the artist, the photographer and a woman magazine writer who failed to get past the vigilant private secretary.

INVITES BRYAN TO JOIN PROHIBITIONISTS

Swallow, Presidential Candidate, Commends Bible Verse to Nebraskan

HARRISBURG, Pa., July 7. — Rev. Dr. Silas C. Swallow, the Prohibition nominee for president, tonight sent the following telegram to William J. Bryan at St. Louis:

"My Dear Bryan: Read Numbers, 10th chapter, 29th verse. Come."

Following is the verse:

"And Moses said unto Hobab, the son of Raguel, the Midianite, Moses' father-in-law, 'we are journeying unto the place of which the Lord said, "I will give you;" come thou with us and we will do thee good, for the Lord has spoken good concerning Israel.'"

WOMAN MAY HAVE MET DEATH BY FOUL MEANS

Bloody Garments Are Found in Battered Buggy

Special to The Globe

LA CROSSE, Wis, July 7.—A dark crime may lie hidden in connection with the arrival of a foam-flecked horse and battered buggy containing the blood-stained outer garments of a woman at one of the local liveries early this morning. The rig was hired by an excited young man early in the evening. He was seen to drive into one of the valleys near here, but was not seen since. The condition of the rig and the blood stains indicate a serious accident or a foul crime. The police have found no clew.

Tornado Destroys a Port

SAN FRANCISCO, July 7.—Private advices are received by cable that the Port of Champerico, Guatemala, was almost, if not wholly, destroyed last Tuesday by a tornado. Details are lacking, but the few words received indicate that the landing facilities were swept away. It is not believed that the port will be able to receive or ship goods for two months.

CHAMP CLARK STIRS THE CONVENTION

Permanent Chairman Says People Should Not Follow Roosevelt

ST. LOUIS, Mo., July 7.—Following is the address of Champ Clark, of Missouri, permanent chairman:

In his haste, King David said that all men are liars. Had he been in Chicago while Senator Henry Cabot Lodge was reading the Republican platform, he would, no doubt, have pronounced the same opinion more leisurely, for surely there never was more mendacity packed into the same space in any document purporting to be a grave state paper. Shakespeare says:

"Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just;
And he but naked though locked up in steel
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted."

CHAIRMAN CHAMP CLARK

In the impending conflict our quarrel is just and we are in the right beyond all cavil. To state it in a general way, our contention is that the government shall be restored to the democratic-republican basis on which the fathers of the republic intended it to rest and shall be made once more a government of the people, by the people and for the people, instead of a government of the classes, by the classes and for the classes.

> To state it with more particularity, we insist that exorbitant taxation shall be reduced to just and reasonable rates; that extravagance in appropriations shall cease; that economy shall prevail in all the transactions of the government; that all the departments shall be thoroughly investigated from top to bottom by congressional committees; that all evil-doers of whatever degree shall be driven from the public service and properly punished; that all trusts shall be proceeded against by indictment, as are common and smaller criminals; that the constitution accompanies the American flag into our new possessions.

The proposition that we must support President Roosevelt's Philippine policy, if he has any, right or wrong, is the veriest rot—a tale told by an idiot. I am willing to go as far as any one in patriotism; I will support my country in any emergency; but President Roosevelt is not the country. The time has not yet arrived—I pray Almighty God that it will never arrive—when the American people will accept the arrogant dictum of Louis XIV, if repeated by an American president—"I am the state."

If President Roosevelt is at all worthy of his high position he must entertain a supreme contempt for those political supple-jacks, particularly for those claiming to be Democrats who go about with a sanctimonious moan, saying: "The president is wrong in his Philippine policy, but we must support the president."

Resistance to England

Out upon all such cringing idiocy! Suppose a case: Suppose that when George III. undertook to force our fathers to pay the stamp tax Patrick Henry, instead of delivering that great lyric speech before the Virginia house of burgesses which precipitated the revolution and which still stirs the heart like strains of martial music, had arisen in his place and said gently as a sucking dove: "His most gracious majesty is wrong about this stamp tax business, but we must, as loyal subjects, support him, right or wrong." And suppose Washington, Jefferson, Warren, Adams, Greene, Lee, Hamilton, all that glorious host of warriors and sages, had weakly agreed to that, what would we be today? Instead of being the richest, most puissant republic in all the flood of time, we would still be English colonies, ruled by British proconsuls and governor-generals without any voice whatever in the government under which we live.

Those immortal state builders were reared on the fiction that "the king can do no wrong," but when he did do wrong they boldly and iconoclastically trampled that preposterous falsehood under their feet and wresting a continent from his iron grasp, dedicated it as the home of freedom and to the twin propositions that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" and "that all men are created equal."

There were men in the land in 1776. Are there only manikins now? I do not believe such a monstrous libel. George III. did wrong. Our fathers fought and conquered him. Theodore Roosevelt does wrong. We will oppose and overthrow him.

Support the president's policy, eh? Will some gentleman please tell us what that policy is? Has he any? If so, why doesn't he say so? The truth is he has none. He is an opportunist waiting for something to turn up. He is letting things drift and they are drifting to the deuce. Meantime our soldiers are being killed and are dying of disease in shoals. For what purpose? Will anybody undertake to say? I defy any jingo to stand up and declare with straight face what the president's policy or the Republican policy is. No one will say; no one can say; but some say—more's the pity and shame—"the president is wrong—but we must support the president."

To this complexion has it come at last by reason of the new-fangled jingoism that we must shut up our thinkers, close our mouths and chloroform our consciences in order to be considered patriots.

It avails nothing to claim—as some do—that Col. Roosevelt is better than his party. It is to be hoped most fervently that he is a great deal better; but truth to tell a president cannot be better than his party. If he tries to be he is ruined politically. Johnson, Hays, Arthur and the younger Harrison all tried that experiment and all of them were refused second terms either in convention or at the polls. So it will be with Col. Roosevelt. His party friends may deem him better than his party. He may think so himself, but nevertheless the party will drag him to its level.

> No man ever found himself in worse political company than does President Roosevelt in this year of grace. He is in the hands of the Republican Philistines and they will bind him with their withes.

In every state in the Union it is a

Continued on Seventh Page.