

upon the subject, that there must come "some progressive party," we are in hearty accord. And with him we ask whether that will be the Democratic party made again democratic, or a new party springing spontaneously, as the Republican party did half a century ago, out of the other parties. Again, we agree with him that "progress can be made with much less waste of energy and expenditure of labor under an old organization than under a new;" and still again, when he implies that if the old one fails to rise to the occasion the new one will surely come.

We do not agree with him, however, that "the leaders of the party should forget their quarrels and unite," for those who are quarreling now, quarrel over the very issue at stake—democracy or plutocracy,—and there can be no real union between these two irreconcilable elements. If those leaders unite, the Democratic party will not rise to the occasion. Neither do we agree with Mr. Osborne in his slightly veiled and not very conciliatory intimation that Mr. Bryan should "put aside" his "personal ambitions" in order that the party may win. Were Mr. Bryan to lay aside what his enemies are pleased to call his "personal ambitions," he would be compromising with the enemies of democracy within the Democratic party, and would not only lose the confidence of the democratic masses but would deserve to.

Yet we do agree with Mr. Osborne, and most cordially, when in this connection he rises above the influences that have here and there diverted the true current of his thought, as we consider it, and says of this sacrifice of "personal ambitions":

Or if we grant that while such action would be magnificent it would not be politics, as it is played nowadays, let us come back to the people. For everything in a democracy does come back sooner or later to the people. If Democrats remain indifferent and discouraged how can they hope to succeed? But if they will arouse themselves to the struggle; realize their responsibilities; forget former defeats and divisions and think only of the future—of the chance to make their party once more what it was formed to be, has been, and can be made, the great party of progress, the party of democracy; if they will do this, not only can they again place their president in the White House, to occupy the chair of Jefferson, Jackson, and Cleveland, but they can start a new wave of genuine and orderly progress which will uplift the people of this democratic republic to a higher place than has ever yet been reached.

+

"Let us come back to the people!" That is the true word. But as we do come back to the people, what is the response we get? Is it not this as to policies?—Democracy for all in place of special privileges for some. And is it not this as to can-

didates?—The only leader in the Democratic party to-day who holds the confidence of the democracy of the whole country, is William J. Bryan.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, June 2, 1908.

Presidential Politics.

In reply to Mr. Taft's telegram in answer to Mr. Bryan's proposal regarding publicity of campaign contributions (p. 199), Mr. Bryan telegraphed Mr. Taft on the 26th as follows:

I am very much gratified to receive your telegram and trust the publication of your letter will add the weight necessary to turn the scales in favor of the measure. Elections are public affairs, and publicity will help to purify politics.

Mr. Bryan also wired Senator Culberson and Representative Williams on the same day, saying:

Please secure copies of my telegrams to Secretary Taft and his reply concerning campaign contributions. His letter to Senator Burrows may enable you to secure action on the bill.

But Congress took no action.

+

Although Mr. Taft is said to have a majority of the delegates to the Republican national convention, it is now reported that the seats of 229 of them are contested, and that 147 of these contests involve a hard fight between the Taft and the anti-Taft managers. They include eleven State contests, involving 44 delegates; ninety district contests, involving 180 delegates; two Territorial contests, involving 4 delegates, and a fight over a single delegate in Pennsylvania, making a total of 229 delegates involved in the fighting. The hearing of the contests will begin before the national committee on the 5th.

+

Mr. Taft has evoked criticism, of which his Republican adversaries are making much, because in his Memorial Day address at Grant's Tomb, in New York, he included in his story of Grant as the military hero of the Civil War this incidental reference to the unpromising beginnings of Grant's military career:

But in 1854 he resigned from the army because he had to. He had yielded to the weakness of a taste

for strong drink, and rather than be court-martialed he left the army. He returned from Vancouver, on the Pacific coast, to his family at St. Louis, without money, without property—a disheartened man.

+

Mr. Bryan made eight speeches in Nebraska on the 1st, the principal one of them being at Crawford, where he addressed an audience of over 3,000. On the 2nd the Democratic convention of Nevada instructed its national delegates to vote for Bryan's nomination first, last and all the time. United States Senator Newlands heads the delegation. Arkansas gave the same instructions.

+ +

Labor in Politics.

Pursuant to the decision of the trade unions of Illinois to take political action (p. 178), an official call for a State convention was issued on the 1st by E. R. Wright, president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor. It is called for the 21st. Every central labor body in the State is urged to send five delegates to the convention, and those representatives will be the only ones entitled to vote, although all union men are invited to be present and take part in the discussion. The principal object of the gathering as announced in the call is to consider the new direct primary law and its relation to organized labor. It is the intention of the unionists to take advantage of the primary law to place candidates in nomination for public office who are friendly to organized labor.

+

It was reported on the 31st that John Mitchell, former president of the United Mine Workers of America, may be a candidate at the Illinois primaries for the Democratic nomination for Governor.

+

The political action committee (p. 178) of the Chicago Federation of Labor was appointed on the 27th by John Fitzpatrick, the president. It consists of 50 members selected with reference both to wards and trades.

+ +

Referendums in Oregon.

At the election in Oregon on the 1st, both the woman suffrage and the so-called single tax amendments (p. 170) were lost on referendum. The "recall" amendment appears also to have failed. The details are not yet reported.

+ +

Congress.

An agreement on financial legislation, regarded a week ago as hopeless (p. 199), came about a

few days later suddenly and sensationally. At the meeting of the conference committee of the two Houses on the 26th, the Republican members carried a compromise emergency currency bill, a merging of the Vreeland bill of the lower House with the Aldrich bill of the Senate. As Mr. Vreeland afterward explained on the floor of the House, the cloak of the Aldrich bill has been retained but its body has been ejected from the cloak.

+

This compromise bill of the conference committee came before the House on the 27th. No general debate was allowed and in a few minutes the measure passed by a vote of 166 to 140. All the Democrats voted against it, as did the following Republicans: Brumm, Penn.; Calderhead, Kan.; Campbell, Kan.; Cooper, Wis.; Darragh, Mich.; Fowler, N. J.; Henry, Conn.; Hill, Conn.; Lindberg, Minn.; Morse, Wis.; Murdock, Kan.; Nelson, Wis.; Prince, Ill., and Waldo, N. Y.

+

The bill went immediately to the Senate, where it was taken up on the 28th. Early on the 30th it became evident that a "filibuster"—a long debate for the purpose of preventing a vote on the bill—was under way under the leadership of Senator La Follette (Republican), of Wisconsin. In the course of the filibuster, which included several demands for roll calls in order to disclose the absence of a quorum, Vice-President Fairbanks ruled that a roll call cannot be demanded by any Senator if another Senator has the floor and refuses to yield, and was sustained by 32 to 14. He also ruled that he could count a quorum present if that were the fact, even though a quorum did not answer to roll call. Mr. La Follette spoke continuously from noon of the 29th to 7:30 o'clock in the morning of the 30th, nearly 20 hours. Senator Stone, of Missouri, and Senator Gore, of Oklahoma, assisted him, Senator Stone taking the floor when Senator La Follette yielded it, and speaking until luncheon recess at 2:15 in the afternoon of the 30th. Mr. Stone was followed by Mr. Gore, who spoke until 4:25. A few minutes before Mr. Gore closed, Mr. Stone came to his side and notified him of his (Stone's) readiness to resume. But when Mr. Gore actually closed, Mr. Stone had gone to the cloak room. As Mr. Gore is blind, he did not know of this, and supposing that Stone was in his seat, yielded the floor. At that moment Mr. Stone was being entertained by Senator Elkins, and Mr. La Follette, depending upon Gore and Stone, was in the corridors. Before any of them knew of the crisis, Senator Aldrich had got the floor and moved a roll call on the passage of the bill. Efforts were made by Senators Hepburn and La Follette to recover the floor rights of the minority, but the